

HORACE SEAUVER, EDITOR.
JOSIAH P. MENDUM, PROPRIETOR.
[For terms, see the eighth page.]

Original Communications.

For the Boston Investigator.

"The Testimony of the Rocks."

MR. EDITOR:—Those who have read the sketch of Hugh Miller's life, will remember that in matters of religion he was strictly Orthodox. As a church member, he believed in the existence of a God, who created all things; in the goodness of that God; in the Bible account of the creation of man; in the fall of man—by which misery, disease, and death, came into the world; and also the Noachian deluge, as narrated in the Scriptures.

Now let us see what he was driven to confess as a geologist, by the "Testimony of the Rocks."—a testimony greater and more reliable than any written upon parchment, as he admits himself. (See "Testimony of the Rocks," pages 102 and 103.) He says:—

"This early exhibition of spine and sting,—of weapons constructed alike to cut and to pierce, to unite two of the most indispensable requirements of modern armor—a keen edge and a strong back—nay, stranger still, the examples furnished in this primeval time of weapons formed not only to kill, but also to torture, must be altogether at variance with the preconceived opinions of those who hold that until man appeared in creation, and darkened its sympathetic face with the stains of moral guilt, the reign of violence and outrage did not begin, and that there was no death among the inferior creatures, and no suffering.

"But preconceived opinion, whether it holds fast with Lactantius and the old schoolmen to the belief that there can be no antipodes, or assert with Cocchini and Bellarmine that our globe hangs lazily in the heavens, while the sun moves around it, must yield ultimately to scientific truth. And it is a truth as certain as the existence of a southern hemisphere, or the motion of the earth around both its own axis and the great solar centre, that untold ages ere man had sinned or suffered, the animal creation exhibited exactly its present state of war."

Here we see, in spite of the Bible (see Rom. v., 12, and 1st Cor., xv., 21,) that he was forced to admit the existence of misery, torture, and death, long before the existence of man, and that too notwithstanding the authority of the early Fathers. What Mr. Miller's ideas of the goodness of his God was, he does not inform us, but at page 103, makes the following remarks:—

"It has been weakly and impiously urged, as if it were merely with the geologist man had to settle this matter, that such an economy of warfare and suffering—of warring and of being warred upon, would be, in the words of the infantile Goethe, unworthy of an all-powerful and all-benevolent Providence, and in fact a libel on his government and character. But that grave charge we leave objectors to settle with the Creator himself."

In passing, however, I would ask believers in the doctrine of Universalism how much consolation they find in the "Testimony of the Rocks," and what guarantee—although their "God is love"—that he has not prepared a place, or state of torment, for the souls of men after death, supposing men had souls which could exist independent of the body? But to proceed.

Although Mr. Miller clung so tenaciously to the idea that the different races of men sprung from one

source, and geographical centre, yet he says of animals and vegetation, page 344:—

"We now know that every great continent has its own peculiar fauna; that the original distribution must have been, not one, but many; further, that these areas, or circles around these centres, must have been occupied by their pristine animals in ages long anterior to the Noachian deluge; nay, that in even the later geological ages, they were preceded by animals of the same general type. There are fourteen such areas, or provinces, enumerated by the later naturalists."

On page 350, he says:—

"The vegetable centres are estimated at twenty-five by Schouw."

Now here we have the testimony of Mr. Miller and his "Rocks," to show that the animal kingdom radiated from at least fourteen different centres, and the vegetable from twenty-five; that the fauna of each great continent is peculiar to itself; and yet in order to make the Bible and geology harmonize, if possible, on some point, he limits mankind to one centre from which to radiate, and thereby makes out the account of the Noachian deluge a probability.

His theory of how that deluge occurred, by the sinking of that portion of the earth surrounding the Caspian Sea, as far as it had been settled by man, and how it rose again, thereby drowning all but eight persons, is certainly ingenious, but it is too lengthy for quotation here. Mackintosh, however, says:—

"It is really amusing to observe with what complacency a modern geologist will set about the raising or sinking of a continent. In order to reach the conclusion at which he aims, he makes no scruple whatever at heaving one half of the continent of Europe up or down a thousand feet or so, and that not once or twice, but as often as suits his convenience; and all this he will accomplish with a few dashes of his pen."

If Mr. Miller had left the story of the Noachian deluge for priests to harp on, and admitted that the different races of men, like other animals, have sprung and radiated from different geographical centres, it would have seemed more rational, and consistent with Nature.—[To be continued.]

Yours, &c., D. K. EMERSON.
Stoughton, (Wis.), Feb. 14, 1861.

For the Boston Investigator.

Pugilistic Clergymen.

MR. EDITOR:—For more than forty years I have had ample opportunities for observing the developments of Human Nature; and long since the conviction was forced upon my own mind, that what is called religion never altered a man's real disposition. Human Nature remains the same in its elements always. Hence, clergymen and their followers act precisely as they would do, if there were no such thing as religion. Read the following account, which I take from the Boston Transcript, of Feb. 20th:—

"A SINGULAR CASE.—The English papers report that the Rev. J. Sumner Brockhurst, of Emmanuel College, horsewhipped the Rev. Edward Dodd, Fellow of Magdalen College, and Vicar of St. Giles's, Cambridge. Having been brought before the Vice Chancellor, and formally convicted of the assault, Mr. Brockhurst was suspended from all his degrees for a period of four years. Mr. Dodd was commended by the Vice Chancellor for his conduct under such remarkable provocation, as exhibiting the utmost Christian forbearance. The criminal made the following singular statement in justification of his assault:—He says that he was told that a Fellow of the College had actually omitted from the grace the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and had said when asked for his reason, that it was on account of the presence of a Jew at the table. But Christ died for all men, and I say that the man who would omit the name of Christ in asking a blessing on a college dinner, must be lost indeed; but when I found that the omission was to

please a wealthy fellow-commoner, I felt that matters had reached a point that a man feeling the veneration I do for the Lord Jesus, must take notice of. * * * Having finished the infliction, I threw down the whip at his feet and said, 'Now, Sir, I have done that to you, take it up if you dare, and do it to me.' I then said to the bystanders and college servants, after I had taken up the whip, 'Go and tell all over the University that Mr. Brockhurst, of Emmanuel, has horsewhipped Mr. Dodd, of Magdalen, for having been false to his Saviour and false to his friend.' I made some observation to the crowd without the college. If I said, 'Thank God; I pray God to pardon me if I used his name irreverently, but I don't think I did. If I did, I did it in the cause of the Saviour.'"

"A singular case," indeed! And this is the worst term the Transcript (which has strong, sectarian proclivities) can apply to such conduct as this. But this case is not so very singular. I have known clergymen who were similarly pugilistic. One in New London, (Conn.) in the year 1827, by the name of Robert Bowser, an Englishman, and a preacher in the Methodist Episcopal Church, attempted to chastise one of his clerical brethren, in the street, who was vastly his inferior in size. And I once referred your paper to a Methodist priest in New York, (John A. Collins,) who was then connected with the Methodist Book concern. He was from Baltimore, and bitterly opposed to his anti-slavery brethren; and when he heard of one of them (Charles K. True), who had become conspicuous in that cause, Collins was so angry that he declared he "could wring True's nose, to the glory of God." This is a cant phrase among votaries, doing certain deeds, as they say, "for the glory of God." And observe in the above account of the Reverend Mr. Brockhurst, how very pious he was, (as the Methodist Judean down East, when speaking in Lovefeast, said, he was "pious as hell.") So, this pious priest in England, his great "veneration for the Lord Jesus," bid him thus to horsewhip a brother clergyman, and for the cause that his brother did not "say grace" over his dinner, in a style to suit the pugilist.

Another of these pugilistic priests I knew in 1840, when I was editing a paper in New York. This man persecuted me with a malignity that was truly characteristic of a sectarian bigot; and a few years since, he was arrested for having assaulted a man with a cane, in the streets of Washington city.

The Reverend William W. Walker, as reported in the papers a few days since, was arrested in Westmoreland County, Va., and bound over to keep him from fighting a duel with J. E. R. Crabb.

Such is the account which faithful history gives of popes, bishops, priests, elders, ministers, and Christians; they get angry, they steal, and fight, and they commit adultery, and murder, precisely as if there were no such thing as they call religion. What they call religion, is a notion they have of invisible things, of which nothing is known; and it does not, and cannot alter the elements which enter into the composition of human nature. S.

Boston, Feb. 21, 1861.

For the Boston Investigator.

Henry Ward Beecher and Company.

MR. EDITOR:—In an article published in the Investigator twelve or fifteen years ago, I expressed the opinion that the Beechers think too much to be always slaves. This may be a mistake; yet some of them may with propriety be called arch-heretics. One of them has adopted the Hindoo theory, that men are punished in this world for sins committed by them in a previous state of existence. This is like hanging a man for crimes of which he and no other person has any knowledge. Another avows that she embraced the Orthodox creed by smothering her reason, and

that she heartily loathes the doctrines which for many years she professed to believe. I think she is now a member of the Episcopal church, which shows that at least she does not harmonize on the subject of religion with the mob. Another has publicly declared that the slavery of ministers is as great an evil as African slavery, which no doubt is correct.

Henry W. Beecher a few years ago was frequently a buffoon in the pulpit; but in that respect he has apparently reformed. Within a year I have read at least fifty of his sermons. It is evident he has no regard for Christianity, as it is usually understood; but being very popular and well supported, he does not say anything directly against it. He often lugs Scripture into his discourses, with the obvious design of making his hearers think that he reverences the Bible. Most of his sermons contain but little except absolute nonsense. For example:—he recently occupied a whole discourse in trying to show that men ought to eat God, or eat at him, every day. Many of his sermons are equally ridiculous.

No doubt one reason why he writes so much nonsense, is, that he writes vastly more than any person can write, and write well. It is very common for people to deliver a discourse they do not understand, if he who delivered it belongs to their party, and is a person of distinction. If I should preach to his hearers such nonsense as he generally preaches, no doubt they would leave the house in disgust. But in him, nonsense is wisdom. Still, he frequently says things that are intelligible, and such parts of his sermons are very liberal. Sometimes almost a whole discourse is of this character. On the whole, he says a great many just such things as Infidels would say, and such things as ministers and Christians in general would very much dislike. As one of his baldersdash sermons is printed every week in the New York Independent, (which may almost be called an Infidel paper, and has a large circulation,) he must be doing very much to promote Infidelity.

For this reason I strongly desire that he may live and preach and publish for many years to come. Under the garb of Christianity he no doubt is doing vastly more to spread Infidelity than he could do if he was an avowed Infidel; for multitudes read his sermons who would never read a word which was known to be written by an Infidel.

Rev. Edward Hitchcock, D. D., L. L. D., promotes Infidelity by showing that many parts of the Bible are not true. Henry Ward Beecher does it by showing that every crime on earth can be supported by the Scriptures. Hence he says, "When the Bible is opened that all the fiends of hell may pass through it to make mischief on earth, I say, blessed be Infidelity." And he goes on to say that Christians frequently stop those who are advocating any good cause, "by stuffing into their mouths the leaves of the Bible." His religion is substantially the religion of Infidels. I have never seen in his writings any allusion to future punishments, which, seems to show that he is a Universalist. MOSES B. CHURCH.

Rochester, (Iowa), Feb. 20, 1861.

[The reason why the sciences have not advanced, is, that scholars have been afraid to depart from the ideas entertained by the schools, lest they should sacrifice their prospects, or draw down upon them the ire of old fashioned professors; and, if a man dare advance a sentiment with respect to morals, or religion, at variance with what was whipped into his grandfathers, a thousand years ago, it is immediately said, "he is wise above what is written;" and he is everywhere represented as that terrible monster—an Infidel.]

For the Boston Investigator.

Brahmin Gangooly on Caste.

Mr. Editor.—I have read some extracts from the book of the converted Brahmin, Gangooly, and find that his narrative of Jagannath differs from mine; he has slightly alluded to the Orthodox history, but gives a rational, and, as he believes, a historical account of the youthful Krishna, whom he describes as the mortal son of a king of Agra: being about such an explanation as many Unitarians, Deists, and Atheists give of the history of Jesus. Even the one-sided accounts given by English writers, indicate that many Hindus explain that most of the avatars (so called), are historical mortals, who have, by successive exaggerations, become deified; and whose heroic or useful acts, have been exaggerated into miracles. That Gangooly gives his explanation, apparently, as a popular idea in a village of Bengal, is another evidence of the injustice of Christian anathemas on the superstition of the Hindus. Though we must admit, that as Gangooly has discovered that Christianity is the true religion, he may dislike to relate the version of the life of Krishna that an orthodox Vaishnava Brahmin ought to believe in, lest his new patrons should discover that between Krishna and Christ there is a distinction without any important difference.

But, if I may judge of Gangooly by "the extracts," he writes on some subjects in the pride of Brahminism, and from a limited experience, and thus gives a false impression regarding some Hindu customs; for instance, he tells us, not the true operation of the system of castes, but that which Brahmins generally have always wished to be true; for, if true, they would be lords paramount over things temporal and spiritual, instead of adapting themselves to the new superstitions of the inferior castes, and filling menial offices, as so many of them do. If, as Gangooly states, the Hindus, as a religious duty, support every member of a Brahmin's family, how is it that Brahmins condescend to be coolies to sudras, and to mendicant sects, and "have recourse to almost every calling in order to support themselves"? (Ward's View, &c., of the Hindus; and L. E. Knowlidge, "Hindus.") Something like Gangooly describes may be true of his village, and in his experience; small communities, living generation after generation the monotonous lives of common people, do cherish customs as if they were sacred ordinances; but, wherever and whenever the circumstances arise that tempt to change—that make any custom be felt to be ikesome—the Hindus can throw that custom off, as we can throw off our long cherished customs of thought or action. They have to suffer, as we suffer, from the regrets and reproaches of relations, friends, and neighbors, who are not prepared to throw off time-honored ideas and customs when we are. Facts in support of this are abundant. I published in "The New Harmony Advertiser," four articles, setting forth some of these facts.

I do not believe that one half of the caste regulations that we hear of exist generally, in practice; they are found in Hindu books. The Jewish religion trammels its disciples by rigid injunctions respecting rites, observances, and observances, in almost all the acts of life; but from a knowledge of the London population of Jews, I can say that the majority disregard many of these injunctions, adding either contrary to their spirit, or to both letter and spirit; the few rigidly Orthodox regarded this degeneracy, some with pity, some with indignation and contempt, but the majority, probably from community of feeling, were very easy with the offenders; and so long as the backsliders did not throw off the synagogue, and did attend to some of the most important rites and ceremonies, they could not be said to suffer for their unorthodoxy. Even if one committed the greater sin of leaving the synagogue for the Christian church, the penalty was not too hard to bear. I know such an offender, who married a Protestant, and whose numerous offspring were educated as Protestants, and during fifty-eight years they have been respected, and partly sustained in business, by a Jewish population.

Such is the case with the Jews, whose Scriptures tell them that they, and they only, are the chosen people, (but, as they are human, their reason tells them the contrary,) is it not reasonable to suppose that Hindus, who believe that all religions come from God, who readily take part in Mohammedan celebrations, and pay reverence to the memory of the great and good men of that faith, are more tolerant of change than most people are; and is it not absurd to suppose that any unpleasant consequences can attend him who takes to carpentry instead of his father's trade of catching fish?

It is true that a man loses caste if he makes any marked change in his creed or occupation; but when he desires that change he doesn't care for what he loses, any more than a Methodist cares for the loss of that sectarian appellation, when he renounces both his church and its creed. It is true that a low caste man cannot become a Brahmin, because to that he must have pure Brahmin blood in his veins; but he can become a priest, he can expound the Vedas, nor by Brahminical law, but by more powerful public opinion, in defiance of the Brahmins, just as we can ex-

pound the Christian Scriptures in defiance of our priesthood. There are many instances of this; and Wilson, one of the highest authorities, says, "their teachers are frequently taken from the lower castes, and the distinction of caste is in a great measure lost in the similarity of schism."

Gangooly says even a king cannot become a Brahmin. In opposition to the practical import of this, is the fact, set forth in the Vedas, that some of the Rishis (sages, or priestly bards,) who by intuition perceived divine truths, and poured them forth in some of the sacred hymns and prayers comprised in the Vedas, were of the warrior caste; a fact so inconsistent with Brahminical assumptions and exclusiveness, that some Brahmins have invented narratives of miraculous circumstances to account for exceptional cases of such momentous significance. Genealogies of royal families of the warrior caste show that members of their families have renounced the diadem, to become ascetics, and they are recognized as holy men, and founders of Brahminical sects.

Gangooly says, "In Hindu countries everything is fixed, binding, and must be attended to. * * * They do not and cannot seek after a change." Gangooly, if he knew the history of his country, would know that Buddhism caused a national change, in which caste was renounced as well as the national religion, by the voluntary act of the people. He would know that the Sikh nation was formed principally by Hindus, who between 100 and 150 years ago assembled from various castes—renouncing castes, creeds, and holy books. Their members made them appear dangerous to the Mohammedan government, which, in seeking to subdue them, proved their power, and they became, what they still are, a military people; but caste is not among them.

Gangooly himself is a sufficient illustration; in renouncing the religion of which he was a holy member, and taking up Christianity, he disproves that "everything is fixed, and must be attended to." That which he has done, millions of Hindus may do, if they feel the desire to do so; he has committed a double offence against the highest caste, and is liable to all the disabilities that any can encounter. He is not banished his country, or his village; he has, I suppose, visited England and this country under the influence of the missionary societies, to give assurance to those whose money sends missionaries to christianize the Hindus, that they do sometimes make a convert. He will return to India to convert others. Of those who will take any notice of him, some will feel contempt that in abandoning a superstition he was educated in, he could accommodate his mature judgment to a foreign superstition of about the same quality as the one he has renounced; but, I believe he would meet with more polite indifference than would be experienced among English or Americans, by a converted Christian, who should not only declare Christianity a superstition, but should strive to cause the worship of Vishnu and Krishna to supersede that of Jehovah and Christ. The priesthood would spurn, denounce, and in Europe prosecute and punish him; bigoted families would shun him as an outcast from grace, and an outrager of almighty custom; and a large number of those whose reason is untrammelled by superstition, but whose pecuniary interest makes them "run with the stream," would imitate their bigoted neighbors. The Christian would lose caste, as much as Gangooly will.

I do not find that persecution has been as general a feature of Brahminical, as it has of Christian practice. A statement of severe rules in favor of the Brahmins, is constantly kept before us, but they are not rules in operation; they are not, nor have they ever been, that we know, the laws of any place in any time; they are found in an ancient book of unknown date, and unknown author, "The Laws of Manu," which contains enough that is excellent to justify Hindus having a respect for it. But it is admitted, that "for a long time it has formed only a very small part of the Hindu judicial system," and "learned Hindus say that many laws enacted by Manu were confined to the first three ages of the world"; that is, previous to this last reconstruction of the world, since the Hindu flood. (See Penny Cyclopaedia, "Manu.") We might as well refer to the "Books of Moses," to find the laws of this country, as to the "Laws of Manu," to find Hindu laws; yet, almost invariably, that which we are told of Brahminical intolerance, is the repetition of the same questions from this same book; we are scarcely ever presented with actual cases, such as the history of Christianity presents in horrid abundance. There have been cases of Brahminical persecution. Buddhism, which would not persecute, is supposed to have been overcome by such means; but by many facts, I am assured that Brahminism has not persecuted with the intensity and consistency that characterizes Christianity.

Caste exists everywhere, not established by systematic, though partly abortive efforts of a dominant class, as in India; but growing spontaneously from habit, superstition, and arrogance of opinion, of station, and of wealth. Aristocracy is a caste; a quaker loses caste if he marry out of "the society"; a working man abandons caste when he is able to set up

gentleman; and a gentleman is discarded from caste if he has to become a working man. Differences of creed make different castes; and the follies and inconveniences of caste exist everywhere, though more systematized in India than elsewhere.

Last month, a Hindu professor of Hindustanee, acknowledged to be by far the most competent of the candidates for teaching that language, at Cambridge University, was rejected by the priesthood because he was a heathen! (London Dispatch, Dec. 9.) And if my memory do not deceive me, Sir Isaac Newton and his associates, the priesthood of Cambridge University, rejected a Mohammedan teacher of Arabic, on the same high caste principle; exhibiting an intolerance which, on Christian testimony, is not exhibited by Brahmins. It is well said, that, to be consistent with this, we ought to have "a cry of heretical boots and infidel breeches, and a call for godly tea, and port of sound church principles."

We have long been deluded by the assurance that the caste system, with all the inflexibility and tyranny over soul and body, ascribed to the Indian system, existed in ancient Egypt. Now the learned Egyptian antiquaries positively affirm that caste did not ever exist in Egypt. (See Types of Mankind.) I never saw any evidence that it did; and we have been almost as much deceived as to its influence where it does, as where it did not exist.

MARGARET CHAPPELLSMITH.
New Harmony, (Ind.), Jan. 20, 1861.

For the Boston Investigator.

Nature and Art—Mind and Matter.

Mr. Editor.—There is an artificial turgor over the reality of our existence. The glare of external objects upon our senses cripples the penetrative power of our consciousness, as to this actual substantiality beneath the compact crust; and yet, we are aware the real exists, and must exist as a basis, or the turgor could not. Select, for instance, the street of a commercial city. You find a dense mass of buildings on each side, and pavements under foot; vehicles, and animals, and merchandise, move through the thoroughfare, addressing the eye, the ear, the smell, the touch.

Where is Nature? Buried under the paving-stones and rubbish, and excluded by the buildings. Her agents—air, light, and water, cold and heat—are all modified by the surroundings. Below the surface is a network of sewers, aqueducts, and gas pipes; garbage, sluggish water, and stench, with their generations of subterranean inhabitants, are the contents. The atmosphere above seems with dust, noise, and odor. Consider the street as it once was; its natural condition; actual land, covered with grass and wild flowers, and decorated with trees. Acorns and nuts, or fruit, perhaps; the song of the birds, chirp of the crickets, hum of the bee, nibbling of the sheep, lowing of cattle, grazing of horses, rustling of the plants and grass by wind, bird, and grasshopper, the flashing speech of the squirrel, generated a melody now unknown in that crushed district. These are permanent accompaniments of Nature, liable to be set aside temporarily, and ready at any time to resume their occupations in the haunts of their predecessors, while the products and works of art must decay.

So with the mind of man; it may be temporarily obscured and bewildered by surrounding objects and events; but, these are transient and must pass away; the turgor must crumble and disappear; the disappearance will reveal the real interior, which has been only suspended from the sight and attention. The mind can afford, on account of its durability, to await its time; and will finally resume its empire, though nations disband, cities perish, and pyramids pulverize. Neither Nature nor mind is compelled to force its way through the superincumbent strata of art and of matter. It has only to wait awhile, and these will dissolve, and leave both in their primitive freshness and vigor, as the dissipated cloud leaves free passage for the splendor of the briefly concealed sun. As there is an elasticity in the constitution of Nature which will finally rise above the rigid clamp of art, so is there an elasticity in the mind which defies the transient envelopment of matter and its bewilderingments. The real work is incessantly going on beneath all this superficial bustle, so chaotic and conflicting in its character. A perfect uniformity of human nature is the substratum which is no more disturbed by the upsurge above, than is the augmenting coral fabric at the bottom of the ocean agitated by the winds on its surface. Beneath, is the actual theatre of operation where the unity of plan can be executed on the substantial integrity of human nature, as the only proper subject to be elaborated into a higher quality or degree, and prepared for a higher sphere and more extensive employments.

LIBERALIST.

SUNDAY.—The New York city dailies are opposing the repeal of the penal statutes for the observance of the "Sabbath." Effectually protected in their own Sunday labor, they can afford to deny the people innocent amusements, and healthful freedom on that day.

For the Boston Investigator.

Judge Tabor and Joseph Treat.

Mr. Editor.—Enclosed you will find two dollars for the subscription for the next year of — of this place, and two dollars for the new subscriber I promised you, for the new year's gift.

In this connection I would like to say a word or two in confirmation of the testimony of Judge Tabor. I never shrink from the avowal and defence of Infidelity, whenever I am questioned on the subject; and never allow any one in my presence to eulogise Christianity, without giving my disclaimer. The result is, that my religious sentiments are widely known throughout the place. On last Saturday evening I was told by a gentleman, he never thought he should be so bold and outspoken on the subject, before I came here. Therefore, I say with Judge Tabor, "Stand Firm!" and fear not. Fear has no place, of right, in a freeman's bosom. All it wants to remove the stigma that now rests upon Infidels, is for some one, however lowly his estate, to stand out as a breaker for the shelter of the timid; and finally, like an infant's first endeavor to walk, their tottering knees will strengthen, and erect and fearlessly step out, ready to assist in the glorious struggle for the emancipation of mankind from the bondage of priestcraft.

I yesterday went twenty miles to hear a lecture by Mr. Joseph Treat, in Philadelphia, and felt repaid. He is well able to fill the vacant place of our Joseph Barker, and do worthily battle against the arrogance that would soon appear among our opponents, the priests, if they had not a salutary fear of being called to account. Mr. Treat is a man of evident talent, and well posted. His enunciation is rapid, yet distinct, enabling him to travel over much ground in the course of an evening. A good logician, he brings home his argument with a damaging precision; energetic and enthusiastic, he has a magnetic influence which is not impaired by a certain boldness of expression that in itself would go far to carry conviction of the truths he seeks to impress. He reasons closely, and his arguments are convincing. He stated that he had been quite unwell, and had not in consequence been able to do the subject (the Bible and Civilization) due justice; but such as it was, it will be sufficient to compel another twenty mile pilgrimage next Sunday, to sit again "under the droppings of the sanctuary."

I would give you a synopsis of his address, only I fear I have already too far trespassed on your good nature, and would end by saying if any of our friends want to hear "the Word," they cannot fail, if they give him "a call," to insure a "treat" of no ordinary character.

I would here notice the fact that at the lectures of Mr. Barker, of which I had the partial control, the old Investigator was always remembered in the notices from the desk,—a part of the services that ought not to be omitted.

Respectfully,
F. L. TAYLOR.
Burlington, (N. J.), Feb. 25, 1861.

For the Boston Investigator.

The "Nameless Hero."

Mr. Editor.—I think there is a call for further consolation. I was amused with the account, in the Investigator of the 20th, of your correspondent's attempt to lure "them asses" into going honor to his "Nameless Hero." I think him a fit subject for some of my consolation.

I learn from a foreign source, that even the "Nameless Hero" (to whose portrait bigoted legislators deny its appropriate place in the Halls of the Nation,) is duly appreciated by those who are considered as "having authority." In the lectures of William Smyth, Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge, (Eng.) edited by Jared Sparks, I find the following passage:—

"The pamphlet of Paine, whatever may be justly thought of the coarseness and fury of such terms as I have mentioned, was universally read and admired in America, and is said to have contributed most materially to the vote of Independence passed by Congress in 1776."

There's a bit of "coincidence," as Byron hath it, that recurs again and again to my mind. I must write it to make it "lie down." In Whittier's "Reformer" is the following stanza:—

"So wisely taught the Indian seer,
Destroying Seva, forming Brahm,
Who wake by turns Barth's love and fear,
Are ours, the same."

It strikes me as a comical coincidence that destroying Seva should be associated with Mendam. According to this theory where's the use of a Mendam? In-coincidence there was a more accurate term here—but that is not what I want. It makes me feel tongued when the right word won't come. If I know how, I'd sketch "Glorious old Kit's well;" but you see I don't know how to sketch a straight line.

Charlestown, Feb. 28th, 1861.

NOR MICH.—The contributions of O. S. Presbyterians for religious purposes last year did not exceed two dollars each!

For the Boston Investigator.

Habits of Thomas Paine.

Mr. Editor:—To those who are so virulent respecting the alleged, but properly disputed, habits of Thomas Paine we recommend the following:—
Apollonius represents Socrates as sitting vagabond-like, in the streets, in a tattered cloak, nearly naked, so dirty that he was compassionately picked up, conducted to a bath, scrubbed and anointed, and the coat of filth which defiled him was laboriously rubbed off, by Aristomenes.—[The Golden Ass, Book I.

The wisest of the ancients believed occasional debauches to be commendable.—[Brace's Class Portraits—Socrates.

Montaigne thought hard drinking absolutely necessary for great statesmen.—[Ibid.

The Emperor Julian's beard was not only shaggy, but *populous*; and he prided himself on his filthiness.—[Ibid.—Julian.

All contemporaries of Mr. Paine, both in England and France, as well as in America, deemed a person mean who had not his sideboard of liquor, or its equivalent, according to his circumstances. A house without it was considered inhospitable, and felt cheertless.

Let these strictures on Socrates and Julian, and on hundreds of other great men, be compared with those launched so ruthlessly against the magnanimous Paine.

And of his cited inclination to ridicule what to him seemed really ludicrous in the Jewish writings, and yet so fortified from ordinary assault by the thick canopy and shield of ecclesiasticism, let us quote Socrates himself, and the poet Horace.

"Without the aid of ridicule," says the former, "one cannot in serious matters arrive at the truth."—[Plato Legg. VII.] Bishop Watson should not have ignored this.

"Ridiculum acri

Fortius ac melius plerumque acri res —"
says, Horace.

Translation:—

A knotty point of ridicule assails
Strongest and best, where reason nought prevails.

At the apostolic lottery which supplied the vacant place of Judas Iscariot, Mithridates of Pontus would have been a formidable competitor for Matthias. Bruce says he could speak fluently twenty-two different languages, and swallow with impunity any ordinary poison.—[Bruce's Charlemagne.

ANTIQUARIAN.

For the Boston Investigator.

Dr. G. A. Hammett's Notions.

Mr. Editor:—I don't see how you can stomach to print so much stuff from G. A. Hammett. I was like Mr. Brown; I thought he was "fooling," but he says now that he is not. I still think that he is "fooling,"—either jokingly, ignorantly, or villainously. I have too good an opinion of him to think he is ignorant enough to think that there is any reason in his trying to rationalize any part of Christianity.

He says, (in Investigator, No. 39,) that when he uses the term God or Deity, to signify a non-intelligent first cause, he uses a metaphor justifiable. I can't see any more reason in these words to signify non-intelligent, than intelligent causes; and then I never saw any sense in saying "first cause." We know there is not and never was such a thing as a "first cause." To admit a first cause is as wicked as a Methodist.

Then he tells us what Jesus says, as if such a man ever lived, thus making himself a pure Christian. I challenge him or any other to show any reason for believing that such a person as Christ or Jesus, or any person of the kind, ever lived in any shape or character whatever. He speaks as if the early Christians used deception for a good purpose. I can't see any good purposes or effects from anything peculiarly Christian.

Dr. Hammett pretends to see "the genius and philosophical spirit displayed in the moral precepts of the New Testament." Now, Sir, there is no such spirit displayed in the New nor Old Testament, but both are filled with absurdities. Nor did the early Christians throw off the superstitious rites of their Jewish ancestors; nor did they show any moral character to lead one to the conclusion that they had the least Theism in their heads or hearts.

All of that stuff about Jesus being God, and sent by God, is beyond my capacity to see any sense to reply to. He says that Nature in many respects operates like an intelligent governor; but I can see no signs of any governing at all. I see things in motion, and nothing to stop them, therefore they go on. Of course, when so many things are in motion as we see in Nature, and all moving in different directions, we see some things meet; but in this meeting, it looks more like disorder than intelligent government.

I hope, if Dr. Hammett says anything more about his Christian Atheism, that Mrs. Rose, Joseph Treat, "Philo-Spinoza," or some other that is competent, will give him *quantum suff.*

I would like to pitch into those that are trying to get our Infidel Association to widen their platform and

open their doors to admit Christians and all, so that they can come in and rule. But I see that I am not competent, therefore I will be content to trust to some person that is.

Yours, for the spread of knowledge, virtue, and freedom,
JOSEPH LEEB.
San Jose, (Cal.) Dec. 17, 1860.

Liberal Principles and Views.

For the Boston Investigator.

Free Speech, Mobs, &c.

Mr. Editor:—I don't know whether you know that I have been in Albany at two conventions—Anti-Slavery and Woman's Rights, and that Mrs. Mott, Mrs. Stanton, and myself had a hearing before the Judiciary Committee on the Divorce Bill, now before the House. The first afternoon of the Anti-Slavery Convention, we had to contend against the mob spirit ever ready to crush free speech; but the Mayor of Albany, unlike those of other cities, took a noble stand against mob law, and conquered the evil spirit that says, "You shall not speak what I don't wish to hear." I spoke that afternoon on the laws that regulate steamboats, hotels, and public meetings—the tacit agreement entered into by a speaker and those who choose to come and hear him speak. The effect seemed to be good, for we had no more disturbance that afternoon, nor evening; but upon coming out in the evening, it seemed as though all Bedlam was let loose, and were it not for the energetic action of the Mayor and about sixty efficient policemen, who escorted us home, the mob demon would have done his work. But finding they could not vent their malice on us, the mob burned the Mayor in effigy. It will be an unfading crown of glory to him to have been made a martyr for vindicating the right of free speech. Enclosed you will find a copy of his letter. I hope you will give it a place in the Investigator, for I am sorry to see that some of the readers and contributors of your paper don't yet understand the A, B, and C, of the right of free speech.

ERNESTINE L. ROSE.

New York, Feb. 21, 1861.

CITY OF ALBANY, MAYOR'S OFFICE, }

February 1st, 1861.
To D. V. King and 100 others, Petitioners:—
Gentlemen:—I have received from you a petition, of which the following is a copy:—

"To His Honor, George H. Thacher, Mayor of Albany:—

"It having been publicly announced that the Anti-Slavery Convention will be held in this city early in February, the undersigned, citizens of Albany, earnestly entreat your interposition, as the Chief Magistrate of the city, to prevent the gathering of an association of individuals, whose well-known sentiments, expressed at this time, while the country is in such a distracted condition, we fear would lead to disorderly demonstrations, tending to disturb the public peace and cast discredit upon our city." While we recognize the right of Free Speech, and would not in the least circumscribe it, we feel that everything tending to disturb the public mind, or calculated to embitter public feeling, should be studiously avoided; and deeming that a meeting of this kind would result in disorder, we trust you will exercise your authority, by taking immediate steps to prevent its being held.

"Albany, January, 1861."
You do not inform me who the parties are by whom the "disorderly demonstrations" are likely to be made. My long acquaintance with the people of Albany, and their proverbial reputation as order-loving and law-abiding citizens, preclude the idea that they, or any portion of them, would so far forget themselves and their duties to their country, as to originate or participate in any "disorderly demonstrations, tending to disturb the public peace, or to cast discredit upon the city." They surely cannot be the disturbers of the public peace to whom you refer. I have a right, therefore, to suppose that you apprehend disorderly conduct on the part of the members of the proposed convention. You may rest assured that should those persons commit any act of a disorderly nature, should they violate any of the laws of the city, during the holding of their convention, they will be promptly arrested by the authorities, and punished as they shall deserve. If, however, I have misapprehended the purpose of your communication, if you intend to invoke my interposition to prevent the assembling of a convention in our city, and a free discussion and expression of the views of those who participate in its proceedings, I most respectfully but decidedly decline to comply with your request.

When I assumed my present position as Mayor of the city, I took the following official oath:—"I do solemnly swear that I will support the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of the State of New York, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the office of Mayor of the city of Albany, to the best of my ability."

The Constitution of the United States prohibits Congress from passing any law "abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the government for a redress of grievances." The Constitution of the State of New York declares that "every citizen may speak, write, and publish his sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that right." Under these two Constitutions the people of the State of New York have reserved and secured the most perfect individual liberty to speak, write, and publish their sentiments on all subjects. They have jealously guarded themselves against interference on the part of Congress, the Legislature, or any subor-

Original Communications.

Joseph Lee.

Boston Investigator (Boston, Massachusetts, Wednesday, March 13, 1861; Issue 47. (7119 words)

Category: Letter to the editor

Gale Document Number:GT3015815355