

Parker A T 20sep 03 23 W Main

EDITED BY A HEATHEN IN THE INTEREST OF GOOD MORALS

PUBLISHED WEEKLY; \$1.00 A YEAR IN ADVANCE

VOL. XII. NO. 10.

LEXINGTON, KY., SUNDAY, APRIL 26, E. M. 303.

\$1.00 A YEAR



Charles C. Moore Editor



TERMS OF THE BLADE. 1 issue for one year \$1.00.

Terms.—\$1.00 per year, in advance; foreign subscription, \$1.50.

Make all Money Orders, Drafts and Express Orders payable to the Blue Grass Blade, Lexington, Ky.

When you change your address advise this office giving your old as well as the new address.

When you send your subscription say whether you are a new or old subscriber.

The address slip on the paper will show expiration of subscription, and serve as a receipt as the date changes as soon as the subscriber pays.

Subscriptions to this publication are not discontinued at expiration unless so ordered by the subscriber. The courts invariably hold a subscriber responsible to the publisher for the subscription price of all papers received until the paper is paid for in full up to date and ordered discontinued.

Office of publication: 161 East Third street, near Walnut.

Entered at the Post Office at Lexington, Ky., as Second Class Mail Matter.

Address all communications to BLUE GRASS BLADE, P. O. BOX, 393, Lexington, Kentucky. Fayette Telephone, 619. Cumberland Telephone, 307.

THE DAMNED STUFF CALLED ALCOHOL.

I believe that alcohol, to a certain degree, demoralizes those who make it, those who sell it, and those who drink it.

I believe from the time it issues from the coiled and poisonous worm of the distillery until it empties into the hell of crime, death and dishonor, it demoralizes everybody that touches it.

I do not believe that anybody can contemplate the subject without becoming prejudiced against this liquid crime.

All you have to do is to think of the deaths—of the suicides, of the insanity, of the poverty, of the ignorance, of the distress, of the little children tugging at the faded dresses of weeping and despairing wives, asking for bread; of the men of genius it has wrecked; of the millions who have struggled with imaginary serpents produced by this devilish thing.

And when you think of the jails, of the almshouses, of the prisons, and of the scaffolds upon either bank, I do not wonder that every thoughtful man is prejudiced against the damned stuff called alcohol.

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

"Keep Church and State forever separate."—Grant.

"In no sense whatsoever is this government founded upon the Christian religion."—Washington.

"The divorce between Church and State should be absolute."—Garfield.

COLLEGE of MEDICINE & SURGERY, Chicago

Four years Graded Course. Laboratories fully equipped. Abundance of Clinical Material. FEES MODERATE. Fall term opens in September. Write today for Catalog to FLORENCE DRESSLER, M. D., So'oy 645-247 Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill.

Does the United Need More Population Is President Roosevelt Right

It is stated in the press that seven-teen babies were born in one tenement house in Cincinnati, in the month of February. Let us remember that February is the shortest month in the year. The Chicago Record-Herald says that "six babies were born in one Chicago tenement in five days."

President Roosevelt should be informed of these facts. In his "strenuous life" the fact that the population is growing rapidly in this neck-of-the-woods would cheer him up a bit. Our robust, rollicking President who sends his pictures to parents who have triplets, should have his photo struck off by the thousand and sent to the mothers in the tenements and slums who have children by the dozen, and whose offspring starve, freeze and die from want of life's necessities, and are "thrown in with the city's dead." May be the picture of the President who thinks "American families should be large," would help the mothers to bear their children, and their sufferings and privations with resignation.

Mr. Roosevelt may know something about soldiering, athletics, and some other things, but it is exceedingly unbecoming in him, as a man, to even approve of the American family being large. We greatly doubt if Nature had decreed that the father should bear the children in travail, if the Roosevelt family would be as numerous as it is. It is very easy for a father to bloat into large families, but it is in very bad taste. The President has harped upon fine healthy children, and cites his half dozen rosy, robust olive branches.

Why should not the Roosevelt family be healthy and happy? Born into life surrounded by every comfort and luxury. A government palace to shelter them, summer and winter resorts at their disposal. They can order a palace, car and tour the continent, or a government vessel for a cruise in the interest of their health and happiness, all at the expense of the toiling, wronged and robbed tax payers. Why shouldn't they be healthy and happy? But I very seriously doubt if they are either one.

The great pity is, that the President's family has not a few sets of twins and triplets as an example to the American people. If nature would only reverse the order of things and decree that the President himself should become the mother of a "large American family" in the shape of twins or triplets, the sex that has to this time have mothered the race, would no doubt, with a restful smile, listen to dissertations on the size of American families.

Actual experience is a wonderful help in the discussion of vital questions. The great boast of the government is that we are increasing our population so rapidly, and that the United States is reveling in prosperity. The prosperity boasted is a falsehood save for the parasites who revel in shameful luxury at the expense of the life blood of their fellows. Not one family in ten in our country own a shelter or enough ground to be buried in. Not one family in twenty are in fairly comfortable circumstances. The struggle to make ends meet is a fierce one, and they already have more children than they can properly care for. The children of the idle rich grow up to be profligate loafers, and rot at the top of the social ladder, while the poor at the bottom are starved, stunted and driven. The children that are already here are born to slavery and suffering. The mothers of this crime cursed nation bear the brunt of physical and mental agony, privation and self-sacrifice to increase the population, and what do they get for it? They are not even allowed a voice in the affairs of the country, yet they are taxed to the last penny by compulsion, without being allowed to say what they want done with the money that is taken from them on the highway robbery system.

Not one child in ten is born of voluntary motherhood. The heart agony of women who bear the children against their will, (and there are millions of such women in this country today), is the blackest crime against the human race. Ninety-nine per cent of such children are the victims of tyranny and injustice. What else do women get for all their sacrifice and suffering? Millions of American women who are mothers are forced into the world to earn a living and for their service they get but little more than half that is paid to men for the same service. Large corporations employ women because they can get them cheap, and then testify that they do their work better than men. Yet while women are making this desperate struggle to support themselves and children, the cry is raised "that women are crowding men out of the business world, and they ought to get back to their homes and families." But the truth is, while most of them have families they have no homes. Yet the cry comes from the white

house that larger families are needed in the United States.

There is no inherent right that belongs to one sex that does not belong to the other, and it is woman's inherent right to say when she will become a mother, and how many helpless children she will launch in this mystery of life, just as man elects when he will become a father.

The truth is, there are a large per cent of the men of the United States today that are totally unfit to become fathers, or capable of sublimer functions than ministering to their degraded sexual natures. This class of men, and they are a host, have no respect for womanhood or motherhood, yet the palace and the hovel swarm with their progeny. There is nothing in American civilization so cheap and so desecrated as female virtue, and nothing so outraged as motherhood.

There is not one woman in twenty in the United States that is fit to become a mother. We have all about us the silly, giggling, thin waisted, high-heeled abortions, frivolous flirts, husband hunters, and parson's puppets, beside the kitchen drudges, invalid wives whose health has been wrecked by frequent child bearing, factory slaves, and illy paid working girls, who are forced to sell their virtue for bread. How can such men and such women under present conditions bring into the world healthy robust noble children and raise them properly?

We greatly doubt if President Roosevelt ever inquired into real conditions or gave serious thought to them, but whether he has or not, there is a truth that cannot be realized too soon, it is that the perpetuity, the glory and the grandeur of this American nation depends on its motherhood and the kind, not the number of the children they bring into the world. Better that our population should never increase and we move on to race suicide, rather than that it should increase through injustice, sacrifice and suffering to women and the children they bear.

The "size of the American family" is a vital question, and President Roosevelt could do his country lasting service by calling in the ablest women of the Republic to discuss it with his cabinet, instead of dogmatizing on it, and distributing his picture to large families. What to do to establish justice among the population that is now here is of greater importance than to encourage the growth of population by any method. This should be suggested to President Roosevelt by all women and men who desire the establishment of justice and the reign of peace and plenty in the American Republic.

JOSEPHINE K. HENRY, Versailles, Kentucky.

Special Invitation

To the Satellites of the Freethought World for Articles.

I am delighted with the many excellent articles I have received from all parts of the country on "Why I am an Atheist". I have carefully read over each article and prepared it for publication. As it now looks we will have enough to occupy the entire issue of the Blade and it will make good propaganda literature.

In the call for the contributions I excluded Dr. Bowles, Mr. Wycarver, Mr. Kaufman, Mrs. Henry, Mrs. Closs and Dr. Wilson from participating. But the edition of the Blade will not be complete without a contribution from their able pen; and if we are going to use the edition for propaganda purposes, we certainly must have articles by each and every one of the above named versatile writers. With the tacit consent of all I now especially extend an invitation to Dr. Bowles, Mr. Wycarver, Mr. Kaufman, Mrs. Henry, Mrs. Closs and Dr. Wilson to send me their contribution on "Why I am an Atheist" at their earliest opportunity.

I would also be pleased to receive articles on this subject from Brother Kidder, Brother Armstrong, Dr. Barnes, Dr. Poote, Marilla M. Ricker, Judge Ladd, Walter Hurt and the many other satellites in the Freethought world.

This compilation will be the first of its kind (as far as I know), consisting as it will, of diversified opinions from all classes of men and women. The articles thus far received have sincerity from beginning to end; and the men and women tell their "story" and derive at conclusions in a masterful manner and style. I hope that interest in this novel scheme will be aroused; and all that are able to write will send in their articles at an early date. Address: MORRIS SACHS, Atlas Bank Bldg. Cincinnati, O.

BIBLE READING

AND PRAYING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Supreme Court of California has just decided that the reading of the Bible in the public schools of that State is unconstitutional and is no longer obligatory as heretofore. The State of Nebraska has just made the opposite decision. These two decisions coming close together, illustrate the fickleness of the law and the tracking subserviency of lawmakers.

In both instances Bible reading in the public schools is unconstitutional. One State upholds its constitution and the other defies it.

I should greatly rejoice over the decision of California had it been made at the command of Rationalists. But I don't think it was. It is a Catholic decision. The Catholic clergy oppose Bible reading in the public schools and it was at their command the decision was made; so WE have no crow a comin'.

So long as this question is one of Catholicism down Protestant, I care little about it. If anything, I prefer Bible reading to Catholic dictation. I do not worry so much over Bible reading in the schools, anyhow, as many Liberals are given to doing. If I had never read and studied the Bible for myself, I would never have been a Freethinker. I went to Sunday school, I studied the book. I committed whole chapters to memory. I knew all the big stories, and I heard it read and expounded at the public school. I learned to question and doubt. When the Age of Reason fell into my hands I was prepared to comprehend it. I knew at once what Paine was talking about. I saw right through the imposition. Had I not thus been prepared, I would have rejected the Age of Reason as lying riddle.

If the people who don't know the Bible, who believe it, and who are unaffected by Rationalistic revelation. As to reading the Bible and praying in the public schools the most objectionable feature is that of imposing a Christian ceremony upon unwilling individuals, and thus violating the most sacred principle of republican government.

This angers a great many and they have just cause to resent it. It is in reality force—joined to political servility—and it is an audacious, brazen crime.

But its effect upon Freethought must be measured by the results of the crime. To what extent is it Christianity advanced and Freethought retarded by this imposition? In the first place Christianity obtains political recognition and gains a certain amount of respect, influence and pull, while Freethought has to do the crab act as gracefully as it can.

But there is a reactionary effect to be considered, which largely makes up for our ignominious retreat.

The very act itself—the open violation of the constitution, brings contempt upon Christianity in thousands of minds. Nearly every one knows that it is unlawful, and that those men who would force their religion upon unwilling minds, by union of church and State are in fact criminals.

The clergy thus weaken their influence. Opposition both silent and pronounced is the result. The clergy thus keep their own wallow agitated. They give us something to talk about. We point to them as a dangerous element in the State, show that they are violators of the constitution, and therefore enemies of good government, and non-respectors of the law and of individual rights.

While they often succeed in forcing the Bible upon the public by brow-beating weak legislators and judges, at the same time, they do not get off without being branded themselves as law-breakers and men who selfishly seek to propagate their oriental beliefs at the expense of other citizens who do not hold the same views.

After all, does the contempt they receive pay them? Do they get value received for their law-breaking? Does an open Bible really add to the power of the church? Among Catholics, most certainly not. They progress only because they guide the youthful mind from the Bible. Their children are taught at their communion and completion of their catechism that they have acquired all the knowledge of the Bible needed. They seldom look into a Bible after that, and it is only the individual of superior brain who ever leaves the church.

Nothing can be plainer than, that there is a greater defection from the church among Protestants, for the simple reason that they are given greater opportunities for knowing the full contents of the Bible—its wisdom and folly, its love and lies, its virtues and vices, its faith and filth, its justice and brutality, its truth and tricks, its ghosts and gullibies, its smooth-sayers and suckers, its priests

and pretensions, its dollars and damnation.

I am opposed to having the Bible read in the public schools as generally read, that is, the selection only of certain chapters which have the semblance of purity. But I would champion its reading, if it was made obligatory that it should be read straight through, the bad as well as the good, the corrupt as well as the clean.

Here, again, the clergy exhibit their knavery and deceit, in forcing their divine revelation upon the youth of the land at the public expense, which divine revelation is so devilish rotten that care has to be exercised in reading it.

People generally, even the boys and girls are finding this out. Does it pay the clergy to expose the Bible to the close scrutiny even of boys and girls. If they take the American boy of today for a sucker they are badly fooled.

It's a question with me which gain the most converts, the clergy or Freethinkers.

The agitation which follows forcing Bible reading upon the children is always favorable to our side, even when we are beaten. They never convert one of us, while it furnishes us with argument for converting a lot of them. Besides boys and girls now read the papers and their attention is called to the agitation. They become interested seeing that they themselves are concerned. Their curiosity is whetted to know what these "certain parts are which are not fit to be read." They find out. First thing you know, another Freethinker.

I advocate fighting these cases every time, as the agitation is always sure to bring to the knowledge of thousands of boys and girls that there are parts of the Bible too vulgar and indecent to be read in school, and thus they learn the true character of the book, and take their first step in Liberalism.

So, in fact, I am always glad when the clergy make such fools of themselves. They help us without knowing it.

Even when they are successful in carrying their point they help us, for the more the Bible is read, the less it is believed. But they are such dummies they cannot see this. I know by my own experience when a boy in school, Bible reading and praying were generally wearisome to me. Nearly every pupil regarded it as one of the disagreeable exercises, and was glad when the school day was over.

I believed the Bible and believed in prayer, and was a regular Sunday school attendant and never missed a night of the revival services.

Still when the teacher read the Bible I grew awfully, awfully tired, and every one else seemed the same. And when he prayed, the fun began, the boys and girls would wink and smile at each other, and toss notes, and paper wads would hit the ceiling and grains of parched corn would be thumbed across the room, and pins with points upwards fixed in the seats, and a whole lot of little tricks were played. We had a teacher once who caught on, and he then prayed with his eyes open. I never could see that Bible reading and praying in schools made better boys, or influenced their beliefs to any great extent. In fact, it made them all tired, and they held the teacher in more or less contempt, and the reading led to discussions and discussion is always fatal to revelation and inspiration. So either way you take it, Bible reading in the public schools, is playing in to our hands.

The Catholic routs the Protestant and the Protestant routs us, and we rout them both. Now the Bible is in now it is out, the children catch or to lots of funny things, and the poor old Bible is kicked around like a foot ball. Contention over this book among preachers of different denominations by legislatures, by the laity by the press, all serve to sink it into disrespect. It is no longer generally venerated. It is simply a book "Only this and nothing more."

It is pretty hard to have to stand having the Bible forced upon us by the law; but that very force tends to awaken opposition, and contentment between Christians themselves, and more or less disgust and disrespect for both Bible and clergy follow.

The more God the Protestant puts into the schools, the more the Catholic denounces them as "Godless." And the more they put hair and scratch the more they enlighten the public on the bigotry, intolerance and spitefulness which govern them; and the more the Bible is brought into disrespect.

The worst thing that can happen the reputation of a woman is to make her the subject of dispute. It's the same with religion. The fights and broils of a religion, which is always shouting "Peace" and "Love," reveals its true character.

So, in my opinion, it is always a healthy sign, to see these Bible-in-the-school contentions.

If the Bible is kicked out, it is good, for it is an example for other Legislators to follow—a precedence—the church is made to understand that the State is its superior—that he law comes first, and the public generally takes cognizance of the same.

If the Bible is accepted, then the Catholic raises sheel, and says the schools are demoralized and Godless, and wants the Bible out, and then the Rationalists dip in, and the old book is stamped upon by saint and devil alike. Meanwhile inquisitive child hood asks "what's the trouble all

about?" And learns that Christians hate each other on account of the Bible, and from the Infidels they learn that there is a lot of naughty stuff in it not fit for their eyes; and just as soon as a boy learns this, he goes and hunts up all the stories of incest and prostitution and Onanism and sodomy and seduction and rape and concubinage and massacres and virgin stealing and tells the other boys about it.

So, the agitation is to be welcomed, for it don't make much difference either way to Rationalists. When Christians succeed in getting the Bible in, then other Christians won't let it stay in. It's a case of "Off agin, on agin, gone agin."

And Infidels catch the coon both a' comin' and a' givin'. W.

Ingersoll and Jesus

Mr. Francis Murphy, a somewhat widely known and windy temperance orator, is reported by the press of this city to have said in a public address on Easter Sunday—which is the greatest Jesus day in the year—that Robert G. Ingersoll once told him while the tears streamed down his face, that Jesus was the most wonderful personage that ever touched this earth. I believe Mr. Murphy was lying when he made this statement, and that Col. Ingersoll did nothing of the kind and said no such thing. Col. Ingersoll was not a Jeremiah, and his emotions were under such control that he did not weep like that gentleman or a sprinkling pot, when talking about Jesus or any other character that has figured in the world's history. Neither was he given to gushing, and no man familiar with his views or possessing any knowledge of his nature, will ever believe this emotional story of Murphy, the sentimental and sensational wind bag. Col. Ingersoll's views of Jesus have been preserved in cold print, and while he expressed admiration for some of his characteristics, he also had criticisms for this "wondrous personage," but as far as known there were not traces of tear drops on his manuscript that recorded his thoughts. The highest compliment that Ingersoll ever paid to any man was to William Shakespeare, but for

we remember the words "Sleep at the time—there was nothing to weep about, and unlike Jeremiah, "his eyes" did not "runneth down with water."

Ingersoll was a man with a tender heart and great sympathy, but to say that he wept over Jesus when talking to Francis Murphy is enough to make a horse laugh. I can imagine Mark Twain weeping over the grave of Adam, for he said he did, but what in hades, sheel or zehena, Ingersoll could find to weep about when thinking of Jesus, is beyond my comprehension. Had he been an emotional Methodist with much feeling and little sense, like all those people, he might have wept and wiped the accompanying moisture from his nose; but Ingersoll, the philosopher, the level-headed lawyer and the man of extraordinary common sense, a crying over Jesus the Jew myth, is too much to believe or receive with seriousness. Why did not Murphy work off his emotional tale while Ingersoll was living, and could refute it? If it was a true story, how could this windy worder, with so much hot air to expell in cheap talk, have kept it locked up so long in his breast, or wherever he carries his stories, without getting rid of it? He has us for all his stories for a large supply is needed to keep him a going, and as he just sprung this one on a somewhat wearied public, the most reasonable explanation is that he just evolved it from his inner consciousness; but when he put it forth expecting any one but a credulous Christian to believe it, he made one grand mistake; for nothing about it has the appearance of truth, and it is so utterly unreasonable it is safe to presume as previously remarked, that Mr. Murphy lied.

CHANNING SEVERANCE, Los Angeles, Calif.

EDITOR

OF BLUE GRASS BLADE RETURNS FROM ABROAD AND STILL LIKES KENTUCKY.

The editor of the Blue Grass Blade, Mr. Charles C. Moore, arrived in the city yesterday morning after an absence of several months abroad. Mr. Moore visited the Holy Land, Egypt and other countries bordering on the Mediterranean. He returned to Lexington over the C. & O. train from the East, having arrived in New York city last Monday. On his way home Editor Moore stopped off at Washington.

Mr. Moore visited his sister, Mrs. M. M. Brent, and her daughter, Mrs. Charles Dabney, in New York city. While in Washington he was the guest of his niece, Mrs. Joseph Atkins.

Editor Moore has been abroad collecting material for a new book which he expects to bring out soon, and which he will call "Dog Fennel in the Orient." He expressed himself as being well enough pleased to remain in Kentucky.—Lexington Herald.