

BLUE GRASS BLADE

A. T. Parker
High and Ashland East Side

WE AIM TO CUT DOWN ERROR AND ESTABLISH TRUTH.

VOLUME XVI.—NUMBER 35

LEXINGTON, KY., DEC. 29, 1907

Published Weekly.—\$1.50 per Year, in advance

HOW TO AMELIORATE

The Sufferings of Mankind by Following a Simple Law of Supply and Demand.

SAME RULES MUST APPLY IN LABOR.

(By J. H. Selwartz.)

Overproduction of any commodity brings a slump in its market value. The same law applies to the labor market of the world.

Socialists advocate their principles of common ownership as a panacea for all the ills that affect present day society.

While much they advocate is along the right line of progression yet there has been something confronting the human race which has obstructed its path of progress more than private ownership with its rents, profits, interests, etc.

The church with her imperial mandate, 'replenish and multiply the earth,' has peopled the world with the poor, the wretched, and the degenerate.

Every child has a right to be well-born. Not a millionaire nor a pauper. Had we no paupers we would have few millionaires. Statistics show that the wretched poor contribute to idle rich, yet neither is fit to do so. While the children of the one are reared in idleness and luxury, the offspring of the other must slave in their poverty and ignorance. It takes out a straw upon the current to turn the lives of either into channels of crime.

Had the poor the scientific knowledge of procreation thereby enabling them to regulate the number of their offspring—instead of the repressing and multiplying 'process'—bringing into their homes as many as are welcomed and no more, as many as could be well-raised and no more, as many as could have an equal opportunity with others of the race and no more, what a different world this might be!

But just as long as the church dominates the ignorant masses with her "Do thus and so or be damned," just that long will there exist an overproduction of the helpless poor.

The surplus must live. They crowd the farms, shops, and factories everywhere like starving pigs at the trough. This drives down wages. This creates profits. How shall we remedy it? Intelligently decrease the production. Were there fewer poor children there would be fewer pauper laborers. As long as the labor market is over crowded so long will wages be low, and millionaires will thrive.

Both the overfed and underfed are fruits of this pernicious bible doctrine. Not long ago, I myself heard a preacher declare from his pulpit that every woman should be compelled to bring forth into the world as many children as nature would allow. He went so far as to recommend official investigation where the multiplication of the race was neglected.

Pool that he was ignorant or otherwise. Was there some mercenary motive which impelled him to such a declaration, or was it really his object ignorance of surrounding conditions.

Wouldn't it be wiser to compel official intervention where there is overbreeding? Yet I think neither necessary. What then? I say atheism. Cast down from their thrones the gods of superstition; destroy the structure upon which it is built, the bible; make mankind the highest intellectual being in existence and woman its god who shall say when and how often she shall reproduce her kind, then and not till then can we all have happy, comfortable homes, inhabited by a superior race.

Then, only will the supply be equal to the demand and no more.

I see but one way to reach this ideal state, and that is through evolution, and not revolution; through education, and not through compulsion. Evolution is as much a factor for betterment in the moral and social world as in the physical.

What Mr. Burbanks does with plants by artificial means evolving

quickly what might take nature can we atheists hurry along the evolution of society by placing environments or thousands of years. So men around those with which we come in contact that will lead them on to atheism, in which in turn leads ultimately to human emancipation.

Recently on his 70th birthday Mr. Carnegie said: "I believe in the doctrine of evolution, and I am well aware that it is the ruling principle of scientific thought today. It is a comforting personal creed. So fast is man advancing today that one no older than I am has had in his lifetime unanswerable and overpowering proof of it."

I heartily agree with Mr. Carnegie that "man is advancing" and go a step farther—man is advancing in the same ratio as the church is declining.

The signs of the times point our way. A few years ago, in my own rural community, where the church flourished in regal splendor, it is now a poverty—begging mendicant.

The cry on every hand is, the church is going down and Carnegie says "man is advancing."

Socialism is doing much towards educating the masses, while I doubt its establishing a national commonwealth, it is most assuredly a positive factor in showing the individual his place in society and nature making himself equal to any man, overcoming his superstitious reverence for the rulers of the earth and the heavens. When people can become absolutely atheistic and make the mothers of the race our only gods choosing for themselves their number of children, poverty will vanish, misery become less and squalor disappear from the earth.

?

SOUL GOT A SOUL?

One of those Literary Posers that Comes From the Brain of a Materialist.

(By Otto Wettstein.)

If matter does not think, what is it that thinks? We know living animal forms think, but have absolutely no knowledge of physical activity in the absence of physical activity. Something thinks, nothing cannot think; hence knowing no thought in the absence of physical structure, it follows of necessity that thought is a product of matter—generated from the marvelous dynamic vital chemical processes of the living animal.

Why divest "the crowning work of nature" (or of "God") of capacity or powers to think and insist that a (mythical) soul-man or spirit within man thinks? Why ignore the important fact that instead of explaining the basis of thought the soul hypothesis leads us into far greater mystery. Place your spirit-man beside the physical man, and are we not again confronted with identical or vastly greater mystery by the question: How does this spirit think? You then posit thought but have no thinker—absolutely nothing tangible which thinks. Has a soul a soul, a spirit a spirit within its outer form? If not, if you can believe a decarnate soul, of which you know absolutely nothing and which has neither body, parts, organs or brain, can think, and whose attenuated form is invisible to normal vision, inscrutable and beyond scientific research, if you can believe this overtopping mystery what logical right have you to challenge the Materialist to explain thought?

Thinking is an every day, plain self-evident fact, but we are conscious of it only as a function or process of man and the lower animals. In the absence of such animal forms we are not aware and have no evidence of thought or physical processes; hence this proves beyond cavil and doubt that (organized living) matter is the sole cause or basis of all mental phenomena. And if the church, or the world's societies of physical research will ever produce in the open court of science a veritable living soul or spirit, you will, after due analysis, find that it also is matter.

HOW HOT IS THE SUN?

Figures Given Based Upon Recent Experiments With Furnace Heat. A Few Interesting Facts From Science.

The following is reproduced from the Literary Digest:—

If we mean by "the sun," the sun's rays as they reach the earth after passage through its atmosphere, we have a question answerable by means of the ordinary thermometer, in connection with simple apparatus. But what would be indicated by a device for measuring temperature if it were plunged into the mass of the sun itself? This is a difficult question, but physicists have not hesitated to attempt its solution. The consensus of several different methods seems to indicate that the temperature of the sun is somewhere near 10,000 degrees F. Professor Millochau, a French physicist, who has studied the subject by means of observations from the summit of Mont Blanc, contributes to the *Revue Scientifique* (Paris, September 7) an account of recent work along this line. He writes:

"All work done with the object of ascertaining the sun's temperature has been directed toward measurement of its calorific effect on the earth, or what physicists have named the solar constant. This is the heating effect produced in one minute on a cubic centimeter of water receiving solar radiation through a blackened surface at the limits of the terrestrial atmosphere."

That our ability to measure this effect is yet limited appears from the table given by the author. The values for the solar constant vary all the way from 1.8, obtained by Pouillet in 1837, to 4, by Angstrom in 1890, a difference of over 100 per cent. The last result, that of Hensky in 1905, is 3.3. Mr. Millochau thinks that these variations are not wholly due to inaccuracy, but partly to the fact that the sun's heat is really not constant, but changes from year to year. The correction for the absorption of the earth's atmosphere is also very difficult to make. But supposing we could be sure of the absolute value of this constant, would this enable us to get an idea of the actual temperature of the sun itself, that is, the registration of a thermometer plunged into the solar mass? Yes, answer the author—provided we are able to agree on a definition of this temperature. A body emits more or less radiation according to its constitution, and physicists have agreed that a black body emits and absorbs the maximum possible amount of radiation. Experiments on furnaces have been made with a view to obtaining the relationship between their temperature and the intensity of their radiation, and on the basis of these the sun's temperature would be from 5,600 degrees to 7,000 degrees C., according to the various values assigned to the solar constant. Another method is to measure the temperature to which the sun's radiation raises a black body on the earth's surface. The so-called law of Stefan states that the sun's temperature would be proportional to the fourth power of this quantity, which would give between 5,000 degrees and 6,000 degrees.

The author's own work at the Mont Blanc observatory was done with the so-called pyrometric telescope devised by Fery in 1902 and used by him to measure the temperature of furnaces. This instrument concentrates the radiation from the body under observation on a thermoelectric couple, where it generates a slight electric current measurable with a galvanometer. Results are obtained with a body of known temperature, and these afford means of calculating that of an inaccessible body. Millochau's telescope was standardized by an electric furnace heated to 1,400 degrees C. (about 2,500 degrees F.), and the sun's temperature as obtained by its use, was found to be 5,480 degrees C. Says the author:

"We have seen that by applying Stefan's law to the numbers given by various observers for the solar constant, we find that the sun's temper-

ature is between 5,600 degrees and 7,000 degrees. Wilson and Gray in 1902 made a direct measure of this temperature (by means of the thermoelectric pile) and obtained 5,573 degrees, and measurements made with the pyrometric telescope lead to the figure 5,663 degrees. There is yet a third method of evaluating the solar temperature; it consists in an application of the physical law of displacement known as the 'law of displacement.' The product of the wave-length corresponding to the maximum of intensity in the spectrum emitted by the body, multiplied by its temperature, is a constant quantity which has been found by experiment to be 2,9000. Now the maximum of energy in the solar spectrum is found near wave-length 0.5, which would make the temperature 5,800 degrees.

WOMAN LIKES TO OBEY

The Word in the Marriage Service Amounts to Very Little as You Grow to Regard it.

OPINION OF A WOMAN ON THE SUBJECT.

(Clipping.)

The editor has asked me to discuss the following question: "Do Women Like to Obey?"

The editor thinks they do.

"It would be interesting to know he says: how women, especially young and sentimental women, feel in regard to this suggested change. From the point of view of justice, of common fairness, it seems ridiculous to ask the bride to promise to obey. But we are inclined to think, strange as it may seem, that a great many young brides would be very sorry to have the obedience clause left out of the marriage service."

This is not an age of obedience to any set idea.

The woman who loves (and respects the man she loves, as the self-respecting woman who remains in love must) could not disobey the wishes, expressed or understood, of her husband.

She would find no happiness in wounding, displeasing or disillusioning him.

To do as he wishes is her chief delight. To please him is her pleasure. Just so the man who really loves regards the wishes of his wife so long as she inspires him with respect for her good sense and fairness of mind.

When either husband or wife ceases to inspire the respect—when either descends to petty tyranny, unreasonable exaction, or becomes diseased with jealousy—then "obedience" becomes a sin and an absurdity and is only possible to the cowardly or weak mind.

This is a woman's century, and she is not infrequently found using her power in the wrong directions. There are more men today "obeying" the whims of unreasonable wives than there are wives obeying tyrant husbands.

I have heard a woman promise to obey at the altar, looking like a meek angel under her veil, and in less than two years have seen her stalwart husband afraid to lift his hat to an old sweetheart on the street for fear of a scene afterward, and afraid to refuse an extravagant wish of his wife lest she fall ill with nervous prostration as was her habit when crossed.

I have known a strong man to live for more than thirty years in absolute terror of killing his nervous and "delicate" wife by disobeying any wish of hers, however selfish or unreasonable, and to precede her to the grave—still with that fear in his heart.

So, after all, the word "obey" in the marriage service matters little.

It is temperament, not ritual, which decides everything in marriage.

But since no woman "obeys" unless she wants to, through her love or fear, the word is useless, and ought to be expurgated from the service.

The woman who does not obey a good man she loves, through love, will not be forced to it by a word; the woman who, because of a promise obeys a bad man, ought not to be abetted or upheld by a law.

The word obey was first used when woman's position socially and intel-

lectually was considered far inferior to that of man, and when she was in every way dependent upon him for her recognition in the world and for her maintenance.

That is all changed—woman and man are comrades in independence and equals in all the walks of life.

With these other changes which have come to them, the marriage ritual should change and omit the word "obey."

That would not prevent any woman from the happy obedience of love.

JEWS

ON LIQUOR QUESTION

Article Reproduced by Request Showing Hebrew Opinion on the Issues of Temperance and Prohibition in America.

NOT DRINKING BUT DRUNKENNESS CONDEMNED

(Reprinted.)

Upon the earnest request of a friend of the Blade the following well written article is given publication, taken from the columns of the *St. Louis Modern View* and afterwards published in the *Post Dispatch*.

Whether it be due to the American temperament which is ever beat on trying new ventures, or it be the result of an intelligent desire to eradicate an evil that has wrecked many a home and broken many a heart, prohibition seems to be the order of the day. The South, in many a State and county, has already set the example, and other parts of the country will, no doubt, soon follow.

What the effect of such a policy, if adopted from coast to coast, may be upon the country's prosperity is hard to foretell. But one thing seems certain. The health and happiness of the people will hardly be increased to the extent the prohibitionists would have us believe they would.

Neither will virtue and morality be much benefited by the measure. Temperance is a moral condition and morality cannot be controlled by legislation. All legislation can do is drive a certain phase of immorality from openness into secrecy, which change can in no way be considered a gain.

But this is not the only thing the advocates of prohibition seem to overlook, in their zeal for temperance. They seem to confuse cause and effect in this instance. While it is true "that drink has proven a curse" in this country, yet the evil lies not in the drinking but, rather in the conditions that bring about drunkenness.

The laxity of home ties and the lack of proper home surroundings, two allies at the root of the evil. As long as the saloon will appear more attractive than the fireside and a man's confers more congenial than his conjugal companion, the state of intemperance and immorality will exist. And even if the saloons be closed by law, and the selling of liquors prohibited by legislation, the moral status of the people will not be improved. Healed in by code, but unhampered by conscience, man will find other avenues to vice to gratify his unbridled desires.

Our own fathers certainly displayed an intimate knowledge of human nature when they laid so much stress upon the proper care and culture of the home. It is to this fact alone that we must attribute the healthy state of affairs among us Jews. We owe it solely to our homes, which have always been (and happily still are) pervaded by a moral atmosphere, that the curse of drink is practically unknown and the problem of intemperance scarcely felt by us Jews.

We are not total abstainers, but we have been trained to moderation. We use liquor, but we do not abuse it. Already in Biblical times our people were taught that the total abstainer is not the best type of moral man.

The Nazirite who pledged himself to total abstinence from strong drink was commanded in the Bible to bring a sin offering. And rightly so, for, by his conduct he gave evidence of an utter misconception of the Jewish view of life. Judaism does not demand from us the extinction or the suppression of desire, but it asks us to regulate, to purify and to ennoble it.

ATHEIST

BURIED FROM EPISCOPAL CEMETERY

Captain Murphy Died as he had Lived and a Cousin of W. J. Bryan Preached the Funeral Sermon in which he Excoriated Creeds and Dogmas While the Body Lay Among Habitants of Faith.

SPEAKER LEANED UPON THE BIBLE WHILE HE HEAPED COALS UPON CHRISTIANITY.

The following was originally published in the *Cincinnati Enquirer* and as it contains so much to encourage, so much to cheer and aid us in the work of human freedom, it is given prominence in the Blade that our readers may be instructed thereby.

Despite the inclement weather Spring Grove Chapel was thronged at 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon with persons to hear the funeral sermon over the remains of the late Captain Lucien Murphy, who died as he had lived, an atheist. The sermon was delivered by his son-in-law, John Bryan of Yellow Springs, Ohio, who is a cousin of William Jennings Bryan. He stood on the same spot as have hundreds of the most prominent clergymen and divines of this country, and denied during his address that there is a God, the while he leaned upon the Holy Bible, which had been placed with the Episcopal book of prayer upon the desk.

Incongruous enough was the fact that, while Bryan was explaining the views of himself and his dead father-in-law, the casket reposed on a coffin carriage which was draped with a pall on the four sides of which were inscribed the following Scriptural quotations in gilt letters:

"The Lord Giveth, the Lord hath taken away." "I am the Resurrection, and the Life." "I know that my Redeemer liveth."

When John Reid, the care-taker of the chapel, made arrangements for the funeral, he asked the belief of the deceased, and was told that in life he had been an infidel.

"We have never had a service over an avowed infidel in the chapel before," said Reid, "so I just laid out the Episcopal prayer book and the Bible and covered the casket carriage with the pall bearing the Scriptural quotations. If they had asked that these be removed I would not have removed them unless Superintendent Salay had so ordered."

Just prior to the funeral cortege leaving Eyrich's undertaking establishment John Bryan asked if any one wanted to say anything, and John Eyrich repeated the Lord's prayer.

The funeral service was to have taken place at 3 o'clock but a tedious wait followed the arrival of the funeral party at the chapel as Mr. Bryan was over at the office in the building at the cemetery entrance. He entered the chapel about 20 minutes after 3 o'clock and delivered the following address:

BRYAN'S ADDRESS

"For the sole benefit of the living, we who loved him gather about all his material remains in an humble manner to consider the great character and life of Captain Lucien Murphy.

"He and I were born about the same time, and were taught in our childhood that this material body which we now surround would on some uncertain day, at the sound of a trumpet, arise exactly as in life, and endure a monotonous, endless existence. Such things are imposed on children and women still in some back corners, but Captain Murphy and I soon had sense enough to reject them. The name or thing or being called od was presented to us when children in such a way as to appear to be a big, cruel fiend or demon; and we soon got sense enough to reject the idea of God. We know that all things went on about us according to certain qualities of matter, and that the universe around us though influenced by similar qualities and conditions. We noticed that if any infinite intelligence existed about us, he she or it most often

(Continued on Fourth Page.)