

middle of it, Burns was set upon and kicked and cuffed most vigorously and unmercifully. His star, club, watch, keys and gun were all taken, and when he found his good young friend kicking also, he did not exclaim *et tu Brute*, but he yelled murder as loud as his vocal organs would admit. He was saved. The plausible young man was subsequently arrested and identified as one of Chicago's toughest toughs. After the occurrence Mr. Burns did not feel like claiming kinship with the great London labor agitator, or with the bard of Ayr. As they say in secret society circles this is the way the Chicago young men make the new policemen ride the goat, and it is a most effectual method of opening the eyes of a green peeler.

Last Sunday was a most exciting day in religious circles. We had the Rev. Dr. Foster here from Boston to preach on "Papacy in the Schools." Dr. Goodwin introduced the Boston divine to the audience. Goodwin is a person who figured prominently in Utah affairs a few years ago. In introducing Dr. Foster, Mr. Goodwin said: "There will be great things to be dealt with before long in this community, and they won't all be in the line of the Haymarket effort." What did he mean by this, but that dynamite would be introduced into our next religious warfare?

Dr. Foster is fresh from the fight in Boston about school books. He has blood in his eye, and his tongue has no equivocation or uncertainty about it. Yesterday it was polygamy, today it is celibacy. Here is a sentence from his discourse: "Fearful of interference with religious liberty we have refrained from warding off these blows just as we allowed Mormonism to flourish." He then goes on to show how Rome contemplates the destruction of this government, and dwells on the necessity of legislation against Romanism as in the case of Utah. Dr. Goodwin, by way of indorsement, spoke after Foster. Goodwin said that in Mexico, the priests watched so closely over the people, that if a peddler wanted to sell goods in a parish he had to go and make the priest drunk, and while the reverend gentleman was sleeping off his debauch the peddler was out selling his wares in true commercial fashion.

As far as this religious warfare between Protestant and Catholic is concerned I have nothing to say on either side. I believe that both were good in their day, and that both have accomplished much, but I believe that their day of usefulness is past, and that in our present condition both are obsolete. However on this school question I cannot but admit that the priests have reason to swear against public schools. So far as my observation goes I find that gamblers, saloon-keepers, dishonest politicians, murderers, thugs, Clan-na-Gael men and others are largely graduates of public schools. Take the Cronin factions; all but three or four are graduates of American public schools. They are all nominally Catholics, and as such their depravity

is charged to the Roman Church, while that church charges it to the public schools. Now I know they are public schools fruit, and that is why I can hardly blame the priests if they try to stop Croninism.

The Rev. Mr. Meley preached on "Clan-na-Gaelism." Bad as this society is, it is no worse than the hundreds of others of the kind in the country. Where is the use in denouncing this society for killing Cronin, when Freemasonry and other societies are trying to shield his murderers, and that is just what they are doing. Freemasonry was at the bottom of the Jungbrileug business a few weeks ago. The architect of Clan-na-Gaelism is also a Freemason, and Freemasonry now keeps him from the scaffold as it did once before, when he committed absolute murder. There is no use in discriminating about societies. There is only one way of treating them, and that is their ostracism from society, absolutely and categorically.

The great event of this last Sunday in Chicago was the reading of the Pope's allocution in all the Roman Catholic churches and at every service. The allocution had reference to the statue of Bruno recently erected in Rome. First, it will be asked what is an allocution? Literally it is an address, sometimes of a consolatory nature. Formerly it was an address from a Roman general to his soldiers. Now it is specially used to designate an address from the Pope to the college of cardinals, but intended for the whole world. It is both ecclesiastical and political, or it may be either. It is something in the nature of a Presidential message, or perhaps it comes nearer to the explanation which a Constitutional minister gives when asked a question. The present allocution has a peculiar significance, and Bruno is a subject that the Papacy ought to avoid.

Last June the Pope convened his high council, the College of Cardinals, to tell the world through it what the erection of a statue to Bruno meant. He says it is an affliction on good men, and an outrage more infernal than the Victor Emmanuel usurpation of Rome, that it contemplates converting the chief city of Catholicity into the capital of depravity and impiety; and that is a challenge of war to the death against all religion. The Pope says that Bruno was twice an apostate, that he was judicially convicted of heresy, and a rebel to his last breath; that he had no talent from a scientific view, and his writings were a mere jumble of error, inconsistency, pantheism and materialism. His moral character was bad as unrestrained passion could make it. His personal characteristics were hypocrisy, falsehood, selfishness, flattery, and deceit. The glorifying of such a memory means a condemnation of Christ and His teachings. The infidel processions attending the unveiling ceremony, in which was borne aloft an image of the evil one himself—these give an idea of what is intended. The pamphlets, speeches and general literature promulgated at the dedication aim at

the foundations of all law and of all civil society as well as at those of Christian morality. The perpetration of such a crime in the city of Rome is the abomination of desolation in the holy place, and it is right to denounce it to the whole Christian world as a sacrilege and a blasphemy.

The Pope further adds that it is now clear his enemies are not content with stripping him of his temporal wealth, but also are seeking his spiritual power to subvert, and that by reason of plot and faction his very life is in danger. Very skilfully the Pope attacks all modern infidelity, and in this he hopes to gain the sympathy of conservatism all the world over, but especially in Europe and America. And if, as we see, Freemasonry takes the place of the Pope, how much better off will the Italians be. The Pope's power was taken away nineteen years ago, and Protestantism has not even gained a foothold in Italy. Infidelity and anarchy obtain there. Will the world be better with these than even with Romanism? Let the Fosters and Goodwins decide.

Giordano Bruno was born in the kingdom of Naples. At an early age he was ordained a Dominican priest. Shortly after ordination he doubted the doctrine of transubstantiation, later on he doubted the doctrine of the immaculate conception. Then he was expelled from his convent. He visited Geneva in 1580, and ran foul of the Calvinists. He visited Paris 1582, and succeeded in rousing the Paris University to run him out of France. He visited England, and found a friend in Sir Philip Sidney, but the clergy here could not stand him. Finally he wandered back again to Italy, and lived in Padua. At Venice he was arrested by the officers of the inquisition and in 1598 carried to Rome. Here he was imprisoned for two years. He would not recant and was burned at the stake on February 17th, 1600. This year a statue was erected to his memory on the spot where he was executed. He could not be the bad man which the Pope paints him. He died bravely for his belief. That nullifies the charge of hypocrisy and cowardice. It is true the Calvinists would certainly burn him if he remained in Geneva, but that doesn't acquit Rome. He is the precursor of the modern school of pantheists, ethical reformers, secularists, and some sects of socialists.

JUNIUS.

CHICAGO, Nov. 4, 1889.

LIBERAL MISREPRESENTATION.

My attention has been called to a paper issued by the "Liberal City Committee" dated October 26, 1889, and entitled "Campaign Document No. 3. Address of the Liberal Committee, Reviewing the People's Party's Declaration of Principles." It is a somewhat lengthy document and has received a wide-spread circulation amongst all classes. The portion I desire to say a word about occurs on page 6 of the little pamphlet under the heading "Records Compared." The