

break up my meetings and force me to leave the city. The collector-elect, not satisfied with owing me money, began to write over the country to find something that he might use against me here. He busied himself visiting my friends in the city and circulating rumors derogatory to my character. He kept this up until I had to send East and obtain a statement from friends denying his allegations. When I read his affidavit in the *Tribune* the other day I could not but think of the old adage of the chickens coming home to roost and of the other saying of the ancients that the mills of God grind slowly, but they get their just the same, or words to that effect.

To show you how much prejudice and how little judgment those "Secularists" showed in condemning that lecture I will quote from a letter written to me next day by a lady who was in the audience. She was a Liberal then and is so now, but she was bright and fair—fair-minded, I mean, although I might let the first stand and do honor to my own judgment.

She said:

Mr. Ellis:—I attended your lecture last evening and enjoyed it more than I can tell you. It was the expression of perfect moderation and justice combined with perfect fearlessness. \* \* \* I am very, very glad you are writing up this vexed question. \* \* \* I regretted as I looked over your audience that so few seemed capable of appreciating the wealth you so lavishly poured out to them. It seemed to me to be casting pearls before"—I need not quote farther. The lady evidently knew the "Secular Society" portion of my audience better than I did.

That lecture was delivered in the Federal court room on the evening of Sunday, March 31, 1889. The treatment I received on account of it convinced me that my opinion of the Liberal party was correct and from that time dates my open and unceasing hostility to Utah Liberalism.

I have said that the men who employed me to give those lectures were "atheists" and "infidels." They were then and are now members of the Liberal party. I, being outside of all churches, believed then as I do now, that the true liberal is a man or woman who is willing to extend to all the rights he or she claims for themselves. The greatest men of the world have been men of that character. The men who founded our government were men of that character. Prominent among them was Thomas Paine. The majority of the men in this Utah "Liberal" party are fellows who swear by Paine.

The Mormon Church says to all men: "Accept the Gospel or reject it, as you please. That is your freedom, but in the resurrection you will have to be judged. We will have nothing to say about that." The anti-Mormon churches say: "Believe as we do or be damned!" They not only send the atheist and infidel to hell in a future life, but they have murdered them by the thousand in their mad haste to get them into hell. They have been working for years to get control of our government and have repeatedly said that when they do the atheist and infidel must go. Here in Utah

those churches are in perfect control of this Liberal party. They cunningly drop out of sight their war against atheists and infidels and attack only the Mormons. Why? Because they would use the former to aid them in getting rid of the latter, and, that done, they would then turn upon the atheists and infidels and drive or murder them also.

That, and precisely that, is the situation in Utah today. I saw it at once and set about trying to show the unchurched people, these "Secular Society" folks, who are now running an atheistic Christian (?) church with a \$3000 pastor while they owe me \$267 for honest work than he can do while he occupies his present position, the absurdity of their fight against the Mormons. What I got for my pains has been incessant lying and blackguarding by a lot of people so mean and vicious that I long ago came to the conclusion that the little woman who heard the lecture referred to above and wrote the letter quoted from, was perfectly correct when she said I was casting pearls before swine.

I write it down as an incontrovertible proposition that the Utah man who votes with the Utah Liberal party is either an alleged "Christian" or an ignoramus—and he may easily be both.

No man who knows anything of Thomas Paine will ever vote with the Utah Liberal party. If any admirer of Paine thinks he can justify himself for voting with that party I will give him opportunity to do so in public debate.

In leaving the subject I only want to say that the collector-elect is a man who hankers after atheism and yet professes to love the principles that actuated Paine. Paine scorned gamblers and hated liars. Paine was never for an hour an atheist. God reached far into the future to get Paine that he might prepare the way for a free government on this continent. Paine was too great a man to be measured by any petty creed on earth. He had a telephone connection himself with the Soul of the Universe. He had no use for any "scheme of salvation," but he recognized the right of men and women to act in accordance with the dictates of conscience. He was the first man, he, the "Infidel," was the first man in this country to demand protection for all sects. Here are his words: "AS TO RELIGION I HOLD IT TO BE THE INDISPENSIBLE DUTY OF GOVERNMENT TO PROTECT ALL CONSCIENTIOUS PROFESSORS THEREOF, AND I KNOW OF NO OTHER BUSINESS WHICH GOVERNMENT HATH TO DO THEREWITH."

Read that, O ye Liberals of the Utah pearl-scoring party! Read that, O ye bogus admirers of Paine! Read that, O ye who would drive out the Mormons in the misused name of liberty; read it, all of ye, and then if ye are MEN ye will take my hand and stand with me for fair play and equal rights unto all; if not ye will return like the sow of holy writ to wallow in the mire of your Liberal party political! Choose ye this day whether ye shall be men or swine!

CHARLES ELLIS.

Malte Brun, the noted geographer, was born in Jutland August 12, 1775. He died in Paris in 1826.

## THE JEWISH ETHICS.

"The Talmud, Its History, Ethics, and Literary Beauty" was the rather comprehensive subject of Rabbi Browne's lecture, August 11th, at the Assembly Hall. There was a fair audience present. The lecturer was introduced by Mr. C. W. Penrose, who stated, that owing to a mistake, by which it was announced in Sunday papers that the lecture would be delivered in the Episcopal church, the public were misled, and that probably many had gone to that place.

Dr. Browne on coming to the rostrum began his lecture by stating that although a foreigner according to flesh, he was a native American according to the spirit. On his landing on American soil he was born again, and was prouder of his second birth than of his first, which latter as he said took place in Hungary.

He stated that the duty of the lecturer is, rather to instruct, than to entertain, to tell something that his audience does not already know. For this reason his subject was well suited, because the Talmud was not a universally known work. He had dived into the treasures of that ancient record, and would now draw forth the gems and pearls which it contained, and lay them before his audience.

The lecturer then gave an historic synopsis of the Talmud, showing that when the Hebrews came into Canaan they had only the five books of Moses. The various interpretations given to some of the texts in the Pentateuch led to the compilation of an uninspired code by church authorities for the guidance and government of the orthodox. These commentaries were not reduced to writing, because it was against the law, and the whole collection comprises what is now called the Talmud. In fact it was the *Congressional Globe* of the Hebrews. It was subdivided into two parts, the Mishna and the Gemara, the former the text and the latter the commentary.

About 180 A. D., a learned Rabbi made a careful compilation of the whole post-Mosaic oral code, and it was shortly after reduced to writing. Though the ancient Jews worshipped the Talmud, and believed everything it contained a *lid* fact, yet the modern Jew does not regard it in this light. He studies it for what it contains of value ethically and historically. He knows that it contains many things not worthy of reverence, the same as the *Globe* might contain the jokes or sarcasms of members of Congress.

The lecturer dwelt on the various developments of the Talmud as it passed through Babylonian, Chaldean, Aramaic, Greek and Roman situations. He also dwelt on the attempts made to destroy it both in ancient and medieval times. So little was known of it by those who ordered it burnt, that one potentate supposed it was a rabbi or preacher. There was no liberty for it until after Luther's reformation, when it was printed and published in Venice about 1523. Ever since, the learned and wise of all nations have been seeking treasures in the Talmud.

The lecturer next gave an analysis of the Talmud according to the ethics which it indoctrinates. These he divided into four cardinal points. The first was reverence to parents, the sec-