The Sentiment in Religion.

MAN is a born worshiper. He admires, loves, adores as naturally as he breathes. He is rarely without some realization of his own short-comings. He senses a power somewhere and somehow superior to his own. In hours of real triumph, the sensitive nature feels the universe of truth and justice at its back, and in hours of failure and defeat, impressed and oppressed by its seeming unworthiness, it leans for comfort upon the rod and the staff of something which the human eye cannot see, and the human voice cannot describe. We often appear as mere animals, to the superficial vision,—simply well-proportioned bodies; but I believe that in all great efforts of the human mind there is an honest desire to seek the truth, and that men at their best incline toward the good, grasp at realities, and despise shams. I think there is something within us which longs for proof that man is a spiritual being, here and now, if not forever. Modern Spiritualism, whatever else it may mean, and however much it may be involved in that which is unworthy and false, holds, philosophically considered, to this great central idea of the reality, aye, the supremacy of the soul. Nor is this idea the exclusive property of Spiritualists, so called. You will find it at times with all classes of men, not always taking precisely the same form, but always an ever-growing sense in the sober moments of life, that after all it is what we see, or think we see with the physical eye, which is superficial and fleeting; it is what we cannot or do not see that is deep and eternal. I tremble, look within, and re-examine my own status, when someone says to me, "You are so positive, you belong to a school of thinkers who deal so exclusively with the practical facts of existence, that you are incapable of realizing the world of sentiment, of ideals, of spirit."

I hold in my hand a morning glory seed. It seems a lifeless thing. There is not much to be said about it aside from what experience with other seeds has taught us cannot see any latent power there. It has substance; it is rather hard; it has color; it is spherical. But, taught by experience with other seeds, I drop it into the ground, and by and by the earth opens a little, and a tiny shoot appears; presently I find the seed leaves spreading themselves out in the air, then another little shoot, pushing higher still, to bear more leaves, and finally to open its blossoms at the beck of the rising sun. Now I may dissect the flower, I may know it every part, from calyx to pistil; I may be able to give the structure of the other parts of the plant—the root, stem, and leaves; I may succeed in chemically analyzing the seed; and yet when I have done it all, I have not seen the vital process itself. I had a seed, I have a plant; I had a cause, I have a result. If, with childlike curiosity, I had pushed away the earth before the plant was ready to do it for itself, I should probably have so interfered with Nature as to have destroyed the growth. But whence came the principle of life in that seed, what is the nature of the power hidden within it, what does growth mean, even in that morning glory?

Well, in precisely the same manner, we may trace the results of life and growth through all the wonders of creation until we reach the cradles in our own houses, only to be profoundly impressed with the thought that the mystery of all mysteries always eludes us, that we stand after all only on the boundary line of knowledge, and that the unknown overshadows, and at times almost eclipses the known.

Now this sense of the immensity of the unknown (I will not say unknowable, because that implies an assumption on our part that some things are absolutely unknowable), but this sense of the immensity of the unknown, here and now, as well as an even more than hereafter, is, it seems to me, an attribute of all thinking beings. Not to make any wider sweep, I can but think that wherever mind exists, this sense of unfathomed knowledge concerning the deepest qualities of man and his environment exists; and just in proportion to the normal development of the mind is the ever-growing intensity of this realization of the universal. The fool may think he knows everything; the wise man feels that he knows nothing.

Now wherever this sense of the unknown prevails, worship is natural. Worship is our attitude toward that which we feel to be beyond us and above us. And since this sense is universal to all thinking beings, I believe worship must be universal also. So when we grow big enough to tolerate differences of method, to see through the special to the universal in history, we shall discover the truth of the statement that man may always be said to be, at heart, on the side of beauty and goodness. The Old Egyptian kneeling before the Sphinx, the Greek worshiping his statue of Venus or Apollo, the Brahmin and the Buddhist bowing at the feet of a metallic Brahma or Buddha, the Catholic with his statue or painting of the Virgin Mary, and the Protestant Christian with his Christ Jesus—are each and all worshiping; and worshiping what? Not so much the great figure, silent as the grave, not the beautiful marble seemingly instinct with life, not the gold, the silver, or the bronze, not the
painting, not even the historic man of Nazareth, but simply their own highest ideals for the time being represented in these material forms. I said worship is the attitude we hold toward that "which we feel to be beyond and above us. Let me say now, it is the homage we pay to our highest ideals. This definition is entirely consistent with the view generally entertained, that religion is the homage of the soul to its god. For what is the god of any soul but its highest ideal? The highest power conceivable to any one of us is the infinite or the universal; or, if you choose, God What his attributes are, whether he be personal or impersonal to the human soul, depends entirely upon that soul's ideal of him. Hence, I think, we reach the conclusion, that while the forms, the ceremonies, the instrumentalities of worship are constantly changing, worship itself is native to the human soul. It grows out of human nature, it is fostered by human experience, it has a controlling influence upon human growth and development. It is ministered unto in various ways. In the calm quiet of one's innermost being, when he seems alone with the universe; in the complications of social and industrial life; in the gathering of kindred minds to seek and know the truth; comes the still, small voice of the spirit, to whose winsome pleading the earnest soul responds. It may be with or without a word or a gesture, but the understanding is complete. The heart says, "Take me, O Divine Ideal! I am weak and thou art strong, I tremble and fall but thou standest erect, I am a slave to my passions but thou art blessed with the freedom of virtue,—lift me out of the mire of my own animalism and make me wholly thine; strong as thou art, true as thou art, pure as thou art." It is the lower self appealing to the higher self; it is the devil of bad inheritance or bad education within us reaching forth to the god of strength and virtue also within us, and saying, save me, miserable sinner that I am, by thy eternal truth and beauty.

"Angels of Growth, of old in that surprise
Of your first vision, wild and sweet,
I poured in passionate sighs
My wish unwise,
That ye descend my heart to meet,—
My heart so slow to rise!

Weak, yet, in weakness I no more complain
Of your abiding in your places;
Oh, still, how e'er my pain
Wild prayers may rain,
Keep pure on high the perfect graces,
That stooping could but stain.

Not to content our lowness, but to lure
And lift us to your angelhood,
Do your surprises pure,
Dawn far and sure
Above the tumult of young blood,
And star like there endure.

Wait there, wait and invite me while I climb,
For see, I come!—but slow, but slow!
Yet ever as your chime,
Soft and sublime,
Lifts at my feet, they move, they go
Up the great stair of time."

We all see such visions as that, and all long to realize them in our lives. And so, it seems to me, that the protest which Free Religion has always made and must continue to make, is not a protest against worship but against certain forms of worship. Not that some form may not be necessary to expression of any kind, even the
highest, but that it is objectionable the moment it becomes mere form. It was against ceremonialism, it was in the name of simplicity and naturalness that the dissent from the church service was made. I hope we did not think that beneath all that formalism hearts might not be as true as ours, and souls aspire for some higher good, even as our souls aspire. I think what we need to recognize now is the fact that in the most precious moments of existence the Catholic, the Evangelical Protestant, the Liberal Christian and ourselves, are all drawn toward the divine, and so all become, for the time being, more divine. We are all worshipers, each expressing his adoration by such methods as commend themselves to his mental and spiritual nature, but all responding to the inward call.

If I am correct thus far, we are now brought naturally to the question, what shall be the worship of the immediate future for us? We shall all agree at once that it must be such as shall commend itself to the human reason. In the past, that has not been essential. Men have recognized the authority of supposed infallible leaders and books, and little encouragement has been given to the exercise of the reasoning faculty. But now the case is reversed. The fallibility of all books, and of the best of leaders has been clearly shown, and the rightful supremacy of the individual mind established. We cannot, we need not surrender one jot of what has been won in that great battle. On the contrary, worship for us depends absolutely upon its maintenance without amendment or qualification.

Now with these two points in view—the universality of the worshipful spirit and the adoption of only those expressions of worship which meet the approval of the enlightened reason—let us see how we must needs stand toward recognized forms of worship at the present time. Of course I need not stop to consider the Catholic's attitude before the crucifix, or the Evangelical's use of the rite of baptism, or the Liberal's participation in the Lord's Supper. These are all condemned by our individual reasons as superstitious and corrupting pieces of formalism. That is our judgment of them, though we do not say, at least, I do not say, that they may not be helps to some in whom as yet the reason has not assumed its rightful sway. I incline to think they sometimes are helps to such. But we can have no part in them. So I pass them by without more extended comment, to treat of a phase of this question which is of more immediate interest to us, and concerning which there is greater difference of opinion.

I listened, recently, to a discourse on the subject of Prayer, by an Evangelical clergyman of independence and prominence. His idea may be briefly summarized, thus: Prayer implies, first, faith in a personal God; second, it is real only as it is the definite, verbal expression of a conscious need; third, thus indulged in, it promotes sympathy between man and God; fourth, it creates submission to his will. This idea of prayer is greatly in advance of that possessed by the inhabitants of Thibet, who are said to use written prayers, placed within a huge leathern cylinder which stands upright in a frame. The cylinder is set in motion by pulling a string, and a little bell rings as often as the prayer is repeated. But look for a moment at this modern, somewhat advanced Evangelical idea of prayer. It assumes that God is a personal being; that he will not give everything it is desirable for us to have without the asking; that he will give us many things simply because we ask him for them; and still further, that these many things include material as well as spiritual blessings. This, it will be observed, settles at once a question which every scientific mind knows to be unsettled, viz.: the character of God. It also assumes as settled that God's method of working is one of constant interference with, and suspension of his own laws. For if all results are the inevitable effects of certain causes, if the like causes always produce the like results, why should we ask God to make any exceptions, bow can he make any exceptiions? And yet the learned Doctor has seen more clearly than many liberals have seen that he has the only basis for prayer as addressed to God in the expectation of a direct and practical reply. If God be a person, if his laws are constantly undergoing change and revision, then it is certainly in order to petition him, but not otherwise. To say "Our Father who art in Heaven," assumes the question of personality settled. To say, "Give us this day our daily bread," assumes the question of law settled. And prayer in the ordinary sense has, and can have, no other justification. Go with me to-day into the more liberal Unitarian churches, and you will find most of their ministers assenting mentally to the proposition that the personality of God is not known, and yet you will find them all addressing him as a person in their prayers. Nothing shows more plainly how we each of us construct a God for ourselves than the phrase "Our Father in Heaven," so prevalent in Christianity. That belongs to an age when women were subordinated and enslaved to men. Theodore Parker held a far higher conception, and said, "Our Father and our Mother, God." But the most radical thought of to-day cannot find proof of personality, even now, and so remands the whole question to the realm of the unknown. While it remains there the thoughtful mind will protest against any assumption of definition, even in our prayers. There is far less uncertainty among liberals concerning the method of God's working than concerning his character. It is the general view of all liberal bodies, in as well as outside the church, that this universe is subject to constant, unchanging, omnipresent law.

Freaks are out of order, miracles are out of order, superhuman beings are out of order. There are two methods in vogue of explaining the miracles of Jesus and other of the world's religious leaders, as there are two
methods of explaining the phenomena of modern Spiritualism. One is to deny the accuracy of the record; the other to admit the fact, but to claim that it is in accordance with some natural law which we do not understand. It is not my present purpose to inquire which is right and which wrong, or whether both may not be partially right and both partially wrong, but simply to call attention to the fact that both deny any suspension of, or interference with, natural law. The learned Evangelical to whom I have alluded said, in his sermon on Prayer, "Bread will not come from the field or fruit from the trees without the asking. God can and does give both in response to human prayer." Now, I do not believe, and I do not believe the Doctor believes, that prayer, in the sense in which he uses the word, has anything whatsoever to do with raising grain and making bread, or with setting out the tree and plucking the fruit. No argument could induce a dozen men in our city to go out into some open field and pray for bread and fruit, in the expectation of getting them in that way; and why? Simply because it is scientifically known that the way to get bread is to have the mind of man select the soil, the hand of man sow the field, reap the crop, convert it to flour, and thence to bread by a well established process of scientific procedure. Underneath all this operation are certain natural laws. Obedience to these brings bread without prayer, without even a thought of God, and it will not come in any other way,—we all know that. Every intelligent person knows it, whatever may be his theology. If bread would come simply for the asking, all these natural laws would be broken, but we know, or may know, they never have been broken, and we believe, many churches believe, God would not be God if he could break his own laws. Very well then, why ask him to break them. Why should I, like some spoiled child, ask to be relieved of the natural consequences of my own action or inaction? I find myself in a world full of beauty and opportunity. It invites my study. It promises me certain rewards if I conform to its laws. "Don't stand there," it seems to say, "don't stand there, Micawber-like, waiting for something to turn up; don't expect some higher power to do your work for you; be a man, put your shoulders to the wheel and do a man's work." There is something robust in the way in which Mother Earth deals with her children. She asks no pretentions, no professions, she will tolerate no shilly-shallying, she wants real allegiance, and will be satisfied with nothing less. This superficial idea that the outward attitude, the word of prayer is of any consequence whatever, save as it commends itself to the individual reason, gives rise to superficiality throughout all religious life. Indeed, it helps to make religion a garment which can be put on and off at will, instead of an essential element of the life-blood without which the soul could not for a moment exist. It has been said, that some persons set up religion in their day of distress, as a man holds an umbrella over his head in a summer shower, but the storm passes by, and religion is cast aside as the umbrella, to lie with rubbish in a corner till the next storm comes.

"The Lord and the doctor we alike adore, 
Just on the brink of danger, not before; 
When the danger is past, both alike are requited—
The Lord is forgotten, and the doctor slighted."

So with the growth of free thought has come a broad ening of religious ideas, and everything limiting religious sentiment to stated forms and times of expression has been condemned. Free thought has rebelled against and undermined this, as very many other of the old conceptions.

Now, in so doing, it has quite naturally been misunderstood. Perhaps there are not more than five or six congregations in this country before whom I could safely make the statement that I cannot conscientiously repeat the Lord's prayer. The Lord's prayer, says some one; why, around that for ages has been entwined the unselfish love and reverence of millions. I know it, and side by side with such sincere and earnest souls and enveloped with something of their own pure aspirations, I can sometimes stand and worship, but I must be silent. The spirit, at its best, commends itself to my heart, but the words do not commend themselves to my mind. Love may accept the one, but reason must reject the other. Do you not then believe in prayer? Have you no spirituality? Can it be that your religious nature has become so utterly" dwarfed as that? Ah! friends, we know not what we do when we condemn thus those who do not accept just what we accept. Saying, "Our Father who art in Heaven" never made a man spiritual; failing, or even declining to say it, never made him material. It is the attitude of the body and the words upon the lips which make prayer in the old conception,—that conception we reject. It is the attitude of the soul which makes prayer in the new faith,—that faith we accept. But I think I hear someone say, you do not state the church position fairly. You say that to it prayer is simply the attitude of the body and the words upon the lips. Very well, let me explain what I mean by that. Take one example of it. At a given hour on every Sunday morning, the minister is to offer up a prayer and the congregation to follow him in it with the spirit, making it practically their own. At the appointed time, therefore, it becomes the duty of the one to pray, and of the other to join in spirit in the prayer. If the minister should omit the prayer, he would, in nearly all churches, be charged with a neglect of duty. The burden of the
argument, in all save the most liberal denominations, and, I think, to a large extent, even with them, is, prayer is a duty. Now, in my conception of prayer it can never be a duty; nay, the moment it becomes a duty, it is no longer prayer. Physical hunger is a good thing, it leads us to supply for the body at stated times nourishing food, but who ever heard that it was a man's duty to be hungry. Spiritual hunger is an infinitely good thing, but it must be, spite of all we can do and say the real thing will be, spontaneous. When the soul feels its own needs it longs for help, and then takes the attitude of true prayer.

Now see the difference between the old and the new idea. The individual who has not been trained to and accepted the idea that prayer must be made to a personal God, who in answer thereto will extend special favors, in violation, or at least suspension of his own laws, sits with others with whom he is cooperating in some religious work. Before he and they can work successfully together they must have some bond of thought and purpose. On the one side, we will say they desire to study truth; on the other, they desire to apply it to practical, every-day life. Whatever may be their intellectual differences, they have this desire in common. Now the old idea of prayer comes in and says: “Our Father who art in Heaven,” and by the time the end of that line is reached, the unity of this desire is broken, and the thought has been diverted to the attitude of the body, to the char acter of God, and to the place or condition which men call Heaven. In such case this formal prayer has not only not helped, it has absolutely defeated true prayer. Now observe the approach of the new idea of prayer. Here is this two-fold desire to learn the truth and do good. Let that desire be evolved. Naturally—when its possessor sees he cannot accomplish all he would like to, he becomes impressed with his own weakness, then he feels the need of strength greater than his own, and then he feels how necessary it is that he should place himself in line with nature's laws. To him

"Prayer is the soul's sincere desire
Unuttered or expressed,
The motion of a hidden fire
That trembles in the breast.

True prayer is not seeing, it is feeling. It is not a process related to the mind, it is a process related to the heart. The thing which in all churches bears its name involves mental conceptions, and is not therefore, in my judgment, consistent with the purest worship.

Can we then never express our soul prayers? Most certainty we can. The protest we make is against form and ceremony, against word worship which is tinctured with theological notions. But whatever expresses "the soul's sincere desire," whatever helps our feeling after the true, the beautiful, and the good, that is legitimate prayer. It is sometimes said we do not have prayer here. We do not in the old sense, we do emphatically in the new. Most of our hymns are prayers, not because addressed to any one, but because they minister to the longing common to all our hearts for a better, a truer, a purer life. Such prayer leads to effort. The ideal seen, the desire to attain it felt,—these give the impulse to all noble action; and every great step taken in personal progress, every unselfish act performed for the social good, is, in this sense, the result of prayer.

"Devoutly look, and naught
But wonders shall pass by thee;
Devoutly read, and then.
All books shall edify thee;
Devoutly speak, and men
Devoutly listen to thee;
Devoutly act, and then
The strength of God acts through thee."

Now let me apply these views to two or three events which occur, sooner or later, to nearly all of us. First let me say a word about their application to the marriage service. I hardly know from which idea I shrink most, that involved in the old unmeaning and untrue forms of the church, or that of some liberals which would make marriage a mere commercial transaction. If there is ever an occasion when two hearts are likely to be in a religious mood, it is when they are about to enter this relation. If they are not cherishing high desires for the future, if they are not resolving that they will make their union one of souls, as well as and more than of bodies, if all that is best in them is not at this supreme moment of happiness enjoying unquestioned control, then it seems to me their marriage is on too low a plane to be blessed either to them or to the world. Well, in this aspiring, this deeply worshipful mood, nothing expresses the mutual sentiment so well as simple, natural
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ceremony, that which makes woman an appendage and thing of convenience to man; I must protest also against
hypocrisy and falsehood engrafted upon it, as, for instance, where the, man is made to say, "With all my
worldly goods I thee endow," which is, in nine cases out of ten, a lie; but most of all, I protest against the
formalism, which, in the liberal as in the conservative church, drowns the sentiment of the hour in the repetition
of words which have lost all freshness and beauty, if, indeed, they ever had them. This on the one hand. But I
protest also against what seems to me a most materialistic idea, that of making the service a simple, legal
recognition of a legal contract. It is wise, it is necessary, I believe, in the present condition of the world, that the
state should recognize the institution of marriage, and make certain regulations for its accomplishment,
provided these regulations never violate the principle of equal rights under the law, but that is all the state can
do. Its function is a clerical one. It knows nothing, in the nature of the case it can know nothing of sentiment.
Now, the real authority for a marriage is in the two hearts which have been drawn together in mutual love. It is
a sentiment, guided by the reason truly, but primarily a sentiment still; and the only power on earth which can
meet that sentiment is religion, not church religion, not theology, but the religion of pure aspiration and
disinterested service. So, when two human beings stand in the presence of near and clear friends, to publicly
acknowledge the affection which has drawn them together, and in obedience to which they are about to become
husband and wife, I would have the religion of the heart preside. Not with superstitious forms (there is no
superstition in true religion), but to express, or to try to express, in warm, simple, direct language, the
aspirations common at such a moment to all true lovers. I do believe that we should hold high in the realm of
ideals, in the realm of spirit, here and now, all these sacred experiences of life, among which stands preeminent
to the lofty soul that relation which brings two sympathetic beings into life-long cooperative service and
growth.

There is another experience, from which none of us are exempt, where the sentiment in religion is the only
fit presiding genius. If ever the heart should speak, and nothing but the heart, it is when we are looking for the
last time upon the form no longer instinct with life, and kissing the lips which can no longer return our heart's
greeting. And jet, just here as nowhere else, the customs and superstitions of the past remain, to jar and grate
with unmerciful materialism upon the sensitive nature. Of all harsh, irreligious, inhuman things, I know of
nothing equal to a funeral given to the observance of forms, or to worldly display. I hope that when I die there
may be no unmeaning words said over my body. If there be anywhere a man or a woman of any race, condition,
or color, of any position in life, in or out of the professions, who has known my heart, and feels a pang of regret
because I am gone, let him or her be heard. Let the simple, heartfelt language of friends be my only eulogy. The
true minister, as it seems to me, will speak on such occasions not as an official, but as a friend. He will appeal,
as well as he may, directly to the heart. He will recognize that in such hours of trial, theology must give way to
sentiment, and even the reason soften its attitude toward the affectional nature. The real comfort for the stricken
soul, if I mistake not, is not to be found in any appeal or argument addressed to the mind, but rather to leading
the heart to a sense of the blessing the lost companionship has been to it; to how much less, life would have
been without it; how precious is the memory it has left; how satisfactory the hope that some day the dear one
may be seen again; and how certain, certain whether seen again or not, that all is well with him, and will be
well with us forever. All this, as it seems to me, belongs first and chiefly to the realm of sentiment. It belongs to
that class of questions too great to be scientifically solved in the present condition of the world, but which no
one can say are not therefore realities, possibly deeper and broader and higher than science can ever grasp. In
the simple faith of the spirit why may we not eliminate theology and metaphysics from our thoughts of the
dead, and minister more fully to that religion of the heart, after all, the only religion which at the hour of parting
is not a mockery and a sham?

But I beg you will not think because I have mentioned these special experiences, that I hold the sentiment
in religion to be an occasional thing only. It ought to fill the whole of life with its pervading sense of the
unseen. Our community has been twice startled within a year by the downfall of two of its citizens,—one a high
official in the government service, whose life unfortunately has not been all that could be wished; the other a
merchant, enjoying a large share of the esteem and good will which supposed integrity is sure, sooner or later,
to win. Nor are these the first instances in our loved New England, or even in our own city, of the moral failure
of men who had gained public confidence, and some of whom had been held above all reproach. It is not our
province to pry our way into homes desolated by a visitation worse than death; by no possible effort can we or
ought we to gaze upon the anguish of near and dear friends, crushed to the very earth; least of all can we know
the innermost secrets of the thief and the forger, and how infinite justice and mercy would deal with them; but
there is a lesson from all these sad events which it belongs to me in this discourse to draw. In the long line of
defaulters and forgers, for the past eight or ten years, you will find nearly every shade of religious belief
represented. No acceptance of an Evangelical creed, no assent to the doctrines of Spiritual-ism, has been proof
against temptation, when it has come. And I am here to-day to say that in my judgment, no merely intellectual
process of any kind can ever be such proof. Orthodox deacon and radical come-outer are both likely to fall in some moment of great temptation, should such ever come to them, unless their hearts get into religion, and religion gets into their hearts. Unless, in other words, they come to a realizing sense that the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal; that the worldly prizes we sell our highest selves to gain, are short-lived and deceitful, but the character which grows out of a pure and worshipful life of the spirit is surely immortal!

And so if you ask me what man then is safe, I answer that man, and that man only, who feels the superiority of the unknown to the known, and so spends his whole life in what we may call the worship of the pure heart. He has placed himself in line with Nature, and all her laws are on his side.

"The wind ahead, the billows high,
A whited wave, but sable sky,
And many a league of tossing sea
Between the hearts I love and me.

The wind ahead! day after day
These weary words the sailors say;
To weeks the days are lengthened now,—
Still mounts the surge to meet our prow.

Through longing day and lingering night,
I still accuse Time's lagging flight,
Or gaze out o'er the envious sea,
That keeps the hearts I love from me.

Yet, ah! how shallow is all grief!
How instant is the deep relief!
And what a hypocrite am I,
To feign forlorn, to 'plain and sigh!

The wind ahead? The wind is free!
Forevermore it favoreth me,—
To shores of God still blowing fair,
O'er seas of God my bark doth bear.

This surging brine I do not sail;
This blast adverse is not my gale;
'Tis here I only seem to be,
But really sail another sea,—

Another sea, pure sky its waves,
Whoso beauty hides no heaving graves;
A sea all haven, whereupon
No helpless bark to wreck hath gone.
The winds that o'er my ocean run,
Reach through all worlds, beyond the sun;
Through life and death, through fate, through time,
Grand breaths of God, they sweep sublime.

Eternal trades, they cannot veer,
And, blowing, teach us how to steer;
And well for him whose joy, whose care,
Is but to keep before them fair.

O, thou God's mariner, heart of mine!
Spread canvas to the airs divine!
Spread sail! and let-thy Fortune be
Forgotten in thy Destiny.

Would earth's dark ocean suck thee down?
Earth's ocean thou, O Life! shalt drown;
Shalt flood it with thy finer wave,
And, sepulchred, entomb thy grave!

Life loveth life and good; then trust
What most the spirit would, it must;
Deep wishes in the heart that be,
Are blossoms of necessity.

A thread of law runs through thy prayer,
Stronger than iron cables are;
And Love and Longing toward her goal
Are pilots sweet to guide the soul.

So life must live, and soul must sail,
And Unseen over Seen prevail;
And all God's argosies come to shore,
Let ocean smile, or rage, or roar."

I heard the other day of a minister who had been trying to give his little child an idea of God. Selecting from time to time some good quality in various people whom she knew, he would say, that is a part of God. One day a certain good man, who is nearly all spirit, rang at the door, and the little girl seeing him ran to her father with beaming face, exclaiming, "Oh, papa, papa, the whole of God has come." Friends! It matters comparatively little what we believe or do. not believe, but when our souls bow in reverence at the shrine of Truth and Beauty, when our every act and word and thought becomes a true prayer, lifting us to the highest ideals of purity and love—then, and then only, the whole of God has come.
The Index,

A Radical Journal,

Which aims to present the best thoughts of the day on all subjects relating to human welfare. It is the foe of superstition and the advocate of the religion of Reason and Humanity.

WILLIAM J. POTTER, Editor
B. F. UNDERWOOD, Editor


Terms, $3.00 per annum. To new subscribers, $1.00 for six months. Specimen copies sent gratis.

Address
The Index,
No. 3 Tremont Place, Boston, Mass.

The Religion of the Heart. Discourses 1ST SERIES. No. 2.
December 25, 1882.
By Frederic A. Hinckley,
Minister of the Free Religious Society, Providence, R. I.
Published Fortnightly. Price, $1 for Series, orten cts. single copy.

The Religion of the Heart.

This day, friends, is sacred to the expression of human love. For weeks past old and young have been anticipating it as a season of special joy. Deft fingers have been busy making little tokens of affection, and the inventive mind has plied its vocation in devising ways and means of surprising others and making them happy. Non-Christian in its early origin, never exclusively Christian in the manner of its use, Christmas always was, and is still, a day of good cheer, of kindly remembrances, of smiling faces and overflowing hearts. It is a sort of Sun day at large for no small portion of the world. Among ourselves we find the regard for it all but universal. The rich celebrate it, the poor celebrate it. Boys and girls have a mortgage upon it, but so also have men and women. It annihilates differences of age, making us all children. It brings our families into the closest and most sympathetic relations. It causes an ever new recognition of human brotherhood as it blends the desires of all classes and conditions in the harmonizing atmosphere of a common purpose. Around the Yule Log, at the foot of the Christmas Tree, and in the search for the contents of stockings which fabulous old Santa Claus has filled, Love reigns with an undisputed sway, blessing us, even when we know it not, with such spiritual treasures as far excel all the material prizes she brings. Melly Tismas! shouts the little voice just able to make articulate sounds. Merry Christmas! answer the blessed and blessing papa and mamma. Merry Christmas! ring forth and back the vigorous shouts of childhood and youth. Merry Christmas is the cry borne along in more sober cadence upon the wishes of older but still tender and loving relatives and friends. Gradgrind softens a little in his call for the hard facts of life, and Old Scrooge goes home to dream and to come forth on the morrow a wiser and a better man. God bless you, all holy influences, past, present and future, attend you and yours, is the message speeding from lip to lip and from heart to heart. Even poor little Tiny Tim, whose lot seems so hard, is cheered by some kind thought or word or deed, and sends up his little aspiration, enough to allow any day, "God bless us every one."

There are hours and seasons when this platform stands for the Free Religion of the mind; there are other hours and seasons when it stands for the Practical Religion of the hand; to-day, it seems to me, it inhales the spirit of which the air is full, and stands for the Natural Religion of the Heart. And I am inexpressibly glad that it does so stand. That the mistaken notion that our movement admits of 110 exercise of the affectional nature, that it is purely intellectual and metaphysical, receives no support here; that in our best moments we sense a something higher and deeper and broader than mere logic, a mysterious power which none can describe, but whose action all feel and whose fruits all see. And so among those to-day singing peace on earth and good-will
to men, we take our place. Under no vaulted roof, before no Catholic altar, in no Protestant Christian pulpit, can the Heart's spontaneous worship be more fitly rendered than right here in this hall, consecrated for the time being to liberty. Because we are free, and all the more strongly in proportion as we are free, we sing the redeeming power of love in the human soul.

Some people seem to think the heart an element of weakness in the genus man; it belittles him; it is something for him to be ashamed of; it must be subjected to his reason. The poet Saxe has written,

"The head erect, serene and cool,  
Endowed with Reason's art,  
Was set aloft to guide and rule  
The throbbing, wayward heart."

Now I do not believe the head was set aloft to do any such thing. I do not believe there is any rightful relation of master and subject between these organs. And I do not believe the throbbing heart is any more likely to be wayward than the cool, calculating head. History is full of facts showing how often the instincts of the heart have been wiser than the logic of the head. I am no advocate of the subjection of the reason. That must be free, vigorous and strong; but science has not yet sounded the depths, it has not yet reached the limit of its great work. It cannot ignore any fact of life, and no man in this universe where accidents are unknown, has a right to say that the instinctive premonitions of the heart, the intuitions, if you please, of the soul, are accidental, and therefore unworthy a sober second thought. The fact that in our Civil War the negro's heart was nearer right than the white man's head means something. The fact that women and womanly men, representing heart, are so often on the side of Truth when there is nothing to share but its wretched crust, and the majority of men, representing intellect, are so often on the side of error, strengthening it and making it popular, means something. They indicate at least, what the most philosophical and radical are inclined to accept as true, that the relative places of the functions of Thought and Love are not to be determined by any exclusive claim on the side of either. That they are in reality co-equal partners, together winning life's victories; together sharing its defeats.

Emerson sings the inspired philosophy when he shows their inter-dependence and inter-marriage in and for all time.

"Two well assorted travelers use  
The highway, Eros and the Muse.  
From the twins is nothing hidden,  
To the pair is naught forbidden;  
Hand in hand the comrades go  
Every nook of nature through;  
Each for other they were born,  
Each can other best adorn;  
They know one only mortal grief  
Past all balsam or relief,  
When by false companions crossed,  
The pilgrims have each other lost."

And how often these life pilgrims are crossed by false friends. Science itself, aiming as it does at exact truth in the physical world, and adopting a method therein all but faultless, frequently makes serious mistakes in dealing with the finer sides of human nature. The mind of man is hardly conscious yet of a spiritual science. Certainly it does not comprehend, science in the realm of spirit. We are living in an intellectual age. Physics have planted their standard on the outer wall. There is no question which is beyond the reach of keen investigation. The hunger for material facts is unprecedented. And it is well. It is a step forward, though only a step. First the natural or earthly, and afterward that which is spiritual. Elizabeth Pea-body, referring to the pleasure children take in playing in the sand and making mud-pies, says in somewhat transcendental phrase, childhood has a tendency to the earth. This remark applies very pertinently to the present condition of our investigations into the mysteries of things. Science, if I may venture to say it, is in the mud-pie period. It has a tendency to the earthy. It is dealing almost wholly with the more elemental facts of physical existence. By and by it will lift itself to a higher work. It will do for the spiritual what it is now doing for the material; and then the qualities now underrated, which make the affectional nature, the qualities by which we are drawn in
irresistible attraction to the high and noble in persons and in ideals, will receive new emphasis.

High thanks, I owe you, excellent lovers, says Emerson again, who carry out the world for me to new and noble depths, and enlarge the meaning of all my thoughts. These are new poetry of the first Bard,—poetry without stop,—hymn, ode, and epic, poetry still flowing, Apollo and the Muses chanting still.

"O friend, my bosom said,
Through thee alone the sky is arched,
Through thee the rose is red,
All things through thee take nobler form;
And look beyond the earth,
And is the mill-round of our fate
A sun-path in thy worth.
Me, too, thy nobleness has taught
To master my despair;
The fountains of my hidden life
Are, through thy friendship, fair."

What blessing in all this wide universe can be richer than to have a friend or to be one; to hold a relation with other hearts, healthy and helpful, free from suspicion and free from guile. It has been said that all mankind love a lover, but love is often impatient of logical analysis and beyond it. When you ask for reasons why you are drawn to this person and indifferent to that person, you can find no very satisfactory answer always applicable. Sometimes it is people who agree most nearly in matters of intellectual belief who are the strongest friends, but not always. Sometimes people who agree very nearly are not and cannot be intimate friends. Sometimes, spite of very great disagreement, there exists an intimate companionship of heart and soul. I do not say that the reason can be ignored in such matters. It has a rightful voice always and everywhere, but let it not try to usurp the place of love. Let it not arrogate to itself her high functions.

When two human souls are drawn into the closest of relations and become one in a divine marriage, how cheap logic seems. Could it hold unquestioned sway it would destroy all the romance, all the idealism, all the divinity of life. I once knew a lady who was never married until long after middle age. When the courtship began she said to her intended, "Now, John, we are too old to indulge in sentiment. Let us show a little common sense." Well, that inclines us to smile, but when we think of it, what a sad thing it was. As if one ever could be too old to indulge in sentiment. To be a lover, to allow the sentiment that free play which a healthy falling in love prompts, is like discovering a new world. How much wiser would my friend have been had she said, "We are old, John, but let us keep our hearts young, let us never permit the hard facts of life to grind the sentiment out of us."

I think sometimes, friends, in the hurry and bustle of the world we forget or ignore what we may call the little amenities of life. We must keep our business up to the average standard, we must do just about so much charitable or reformatory work, we must agitate public opinion, and all that. True, we must do so, we must earn our livings, we must help the unfortunate over there, we must demand justice for all, but let us not underrate (and I apply this criticism as much to myself and my own class as to any other), let us not underrate the smaller, perchance, but not less weighty matters nearer our own firesides. Let us resist the tendency which all business and all reform life generates, of swamping the little thoughts and words and acts of love in the great demands of the industrial and social world. What was so inexpressibly tender, what struck so deep a chord in the sensitive nature, amid all the habiliments of mourning with which our streets were lined when Garfield died, as the dirty and ragged shreds of black and white hanging from the little ten-foot hovel door, and the little boot-black's stand draped from his own earnings, in attestation of the general sorrow. It is not the quantity, it is the quality; it is not the act itself so much as the spirit prompting it, that tells. I have a dear friend, a great soul in a little body, who has done and is doing in this world more good than can be estimated. She said to me once, the most satisfactory response to anything I ever undertake comes not from the rich and the well-to-do, but from the poor and the ill-to-do whom I have tried to help. Their simpler and less pretentious returns have for me a real and lasting value. The simple offerings of the heart, warm in spite of poverty and suffering and sin, they are dearer, friends, than untold wealth to one who has ever received and appreciated them. They may not be the appeal for the spirit of equity, but they are the deed which does very much toward cultivating the spirit of love. They may not be like the sermon from the desk, but they are like the flowers, which when they come here to greet us, often preach a better sermon than human thought can conceive or human lips can articulate.

There seems a certain relationship between the great demand for justice and the little deed of love. Justice grows out of consideration for others. At least that is an element which enters largely into its composition. The
little thought or word or deed of love has the same basis. It hardly seems possible that one can demand justice—this consideration for others in the mass—in an unselfish spirit, unless at the same time he is showing love—the consideration for others individually. I sometimes wonder, as a reformer and radical, if the charge of coldness and disregard of the little things of life, so often made against us, can be true? Do we ever tread unnecessarily upon personal feelings, are we ever unnecessarily severe, are we guilty, in the small circle, of the same lack of fine feeling for others, which we condemn in the great one? If we are, we ought to begin at once the reformation of ourselves. This day ought to summon us to a new and closer attention to the little deeds of kindness and the little words of love, which for old as well as for young are essential to introduce the heavenly kingdom upon earth. I feel my hole nature protesting against the idea that love needs to be curbed, and that its expression is especially unmanly. I affirm that when a man is ashamed to kiss his friend in the depot, or to wheel his baby in its carriage on the public street, it is not a sign of strength, it is a sign of weakness. I affirm that when, immediately after his inauguration as President, Rutherford B. Hayes kissed his wife, and on a similar occasion James A. Garfield kissed his mother, it was because both were great men, and that, great as they were, both were ennobled by the act. Such things are criticised by small minds as weak sentimentalism. They are only the cropping out, under most appropriate circumstances, of the Religion of the Heart. It is by no means the smallest claim of a man to an assured immortality that, amid all the influences of his public career, he keeps that simplicity of natural affection which causes him, in the supreme moment of his life, to forget that the eyes of the whole people are upon him, in his desire to kiss his wife or his mother.

Our ideas of the proprieties are exceedingly conventional. We are apt to think most of all that the important thing is to have the head right. It is a great mistake. It is far more important to have the heart right. Father Taylor, of whom Dr. Bartol said two hundred millions of miles measure the diameter of the earth's orbit for the yard-stick of astronomy; the circuit of his revolution was a parallax for the race—Father Taylor once remarked of a great Rationalist with whom, of course, he could not agree intellectually, "There is a screw loose in him somewhere; but I have laid my ear close to his heart, and have never been able to detect any jar in the machinery. He must go to heaven, for Satan would not know what to do with him if he got him. Give the devil his rations, it will change the climate, and the emigration will be that way." And the big-hearted Bethel preacher always scorned the superficial distinctions of belief, planting himself on the realities. No man could interest a more varied congregation, from Jenny Lind and Charles Dickens to the most ignorant tar. The reason was not far to seek. It was because he preached a religion all had in common, the Religion of the Heart. Like Confucius he seemed to say—My doctrine is easy to understand. It consists only in having the heart right, and in loving one's neighbor as one's self.

In the old anti-slavery struggle, when the men of intellect, from Daniel Webster down, turned against the cause of the slave, the abolitionists used to fall back in sublime faith upon the natural instincts of the heart. Take the mines, take the Harwich fishing-skiffs, take the Lowell mills, take all the coin and the cotton, said Mr. Phillips, still the day must be ours, thank God, for the hearts—the hearts are on our side! It is just so with every good thing. The great idea, the profound principle, the new Messiah, always comes to us saying, give me thy heart, knowing well that where the heart is, there is victory. Who shall gauge the power of the affectional nature in man? Who shall assume to subject it to the reasoning faculty? The heart goes everywhere, carrying with it the sunshine of constant and divine blessing.

What is a home without love? What may it not be with love? There has been formed recently an Institute of Heredity, whose central thought is that child-bearing is a science. So it is, but not, as is sometimes claimed, like the rearing of animals, a physical science only. It is my profound belief that all the physical science the head has discovered or may ever discover, great as may be its importance as a factor, will be powerless to produce beautiful and healthy children, unless love issues the summons, welcomes them to its arms, and surrounds them through every hour of development with its unpolluted and un-chilled atmosphere. It is not alone wise understanding of physical and mental conditions before and after birth, though these I hope I need not say are of vital importance, but it is deep, pure, unselfish affection;—it is the holiness of the heart relation between the parents; it is the good-night kiss with all that it implies in the children,—it is the real love and the inevitable expression of it, which a man feels and remembers in all after years.

What is our dealing with the unfortunate, the erring, the criminal even, without love? For long ages harsh treatment, iron bars, the scaffold, have been trying to do the impossible. Wherever, under a higher philosophy, the heart has had an opportunity, it has achieved, with rare exceptions, most remarkable success. The cure of pauperism, the cure of crime, is love; love in cooperation with reason as unquestioned benefactor and friend. Love, says one, is a fire that, kindling its first embers in the narrow nook of a private bosom, caught from a wandering spark out of another private heart, glows and enlarges until it warms and beams upon multitudes of men and women, upon the universal heart of all, and so lights up the whole world and all nature with its generous flames. It is well that we should use every instrumentality to fan these little sparks. Thrice holy is the day whose influence is to keep alive this generous flame. We can well afford to have more such. We cannot
Of course I am not blind to the fact that, like most good things, this day is subject to seeming abuse. The ostentation of gifts of great money value, but with no other significance, and the tendency to extravagance, these are bad beyond dispute. But after all, may it not be that people act themselves concerning this as concerning all things else. The ostentatious will be ostentatious. The extravagant will be extravagant. There is, however, a philosophy of gifts and giving which these evils cannot overcome, and which it is well for us to understand. The best thing thou canst give another is a part of thyself. Thus it happens that the work of the hand is so much prized. It represents the labor of the giver, and may represent the thoughtful interest of the giver in the recipient. Thus it happens that a book standing for ideas held in common by two persons is a most fitting expression of their mutual regard. Thus it happens that a painting or any other work of art or usefulness, appealing to common sympathies, is always in order. Whatever the gift may be, it should, if I mistake not, speak of the giver. It should be an expression of the giver's love. It will be seen at once that this criterion of judgment leaves out, or may leave out, entirely the value of the thing given in dollars and cents. It is not what is used as a means, it is what the means is used for; it is not the vehicle of expression, it is what is expressed, which is the vital thing. Christmas gifts, looked upon as articles of merchandise simply, though fashioned in purest gold and costliest jewels, are cheap and beneath contempt. I do not so regard them. They are to me a means for taking us out of ourselves, out of the supreme selfishness of much of our living, and opening our hearts to an occasional consideration of somebody else. They touch, somehow, a fine chord of feeling, they recall to us sacred memories of the past, they leave with us impressions which extend far into the future. They are a blessing to the receiver, they are a far greater blessing to the giver. I fancy someone may say this is a pretty picture, but it is not true to the facts. The picture is idealized; the facts are cheap and of the earth, earthy. Well, when you have condemned idealism, I should like to know what there is left which is not earthy. The ideal is of all things the most real. It is the only real, and, strange as it may seem, he plants his feet upon the most solid and enduring foundations, who idealizes most and best. Wherever love is there is the ideal. Lovers idealize each other, the parent idealizes his child, and the child its parent, peoples idealize their leaders, the world idealizes its martyrs, guides, benefactors and redeemers. If there is anything which speaks of infinite possibilities for the human race it is its worship of the ideal. Forever blessed are the smallest tokens of remembrance idealized into divine messengers bearing from friend to friend the warm, unstinted greetings of the human heart.

There is another side of the Religion of the Heart, friends, which ought not to be omitted on this day. This is the closing season of the year, and I have said that the expressions of love which this Christmas festival brings recall to us sacred memories of the past. It is a day of joy, but to many of us a day of chastened joy. Some voices that rang out Merry Christmas on our ears in the days that are gone, do not speak to us now. Some hands that once worked to make us happy, do not work for us now. Some hearts that once responded beat to beat to ours, do not visibly respond now. We have laid away all that was earthly of the aged wife and mother, the beloved companion and guide of long and pleasant years; we have said good-bye to revered husband and father; we have tried, oh! so hard and all in vain, to hold on this side the dear children, strong in the vigor of youth, but succumbing before the tread of sudden or of slow and wasting disease; we have seen the fading of mental as well as physical power in those near and dear to us, until death itself seemed to the reason, though never to the heart, a blessing; even little budding babyhood has vanished from our sight almost before it had learned to look into our eyes and to nestle in our arms,—the memory of all these experiences comes thronging upon us now. Somehow it makes Christmas a day reaching into the infinite, its boundary lines beyond our vision. We cannot send our material gifts there, but our hearts go out in streams of love into the great unknown. And if we cannot see and know the dear ones still, we can at least keep their memory green.

"They passed away from sight and hand,
A slow, successive train;
To memory's heart, a gathered band,
Our lost ones come again.

Not back to earth, a second time,
The mortal path to tread;
They walk in their appointed clime,
The dead, but not the dead.
Beyond all we can know or think
Beyond the earth and sky,
Beyond Time's lone and dreaded brink,
Their deathless dwellings lie.

Dear thoughts that once our union made.
Death does not disallow:
In spirit one, while here they stayed,
We're one in spirit now."

And so we have suggested to us by this most tender of all experiences that immortal unity for which
Natural Religion stands. While the intellect is measuring the shape of the cranium, considering the character of
the features, and emphasizing differences, the heart finds itself in an ever-widening circle which reaches
beyond known history in the past and forward into history yet to be. Back it travels from present
companionship, from near and dear to remote friend, thence to the great and good whose record has won its
homage, until it takes in, what the mind cannot conceive, still less describe, the universal love and power. Here
it finds a man taking his life in his hand in order to show that his country is the world and his countrymen are
all mankind; there a woman carrying the light of truth and love into prison-cells and into prisoners' lives. Here
it sees a scaffold for one who dared in the nineteenth century remember those in bonds as bound with them;
there it sees a cross bearing the crucified body of one who said in the first century, all things whatsoever ye
would that men should do unto you, ye should do even so unto them. Enlarging the scope of its view as time
flows on, it is no longer satisfied to linger in Palestine and on the banks of the Jordan. It penetrates Greece to
find Socrates drinking the fatal hemlock; it wanders back to Kapilavastu, among the mountains of India, to
exchange greetings with the Hindu saint; it seeks and finds the great Chinese Teacher of Equity and the Persian
Prophet of Justice. The circle of its affections extends around them all at last. And then, with all the divinity of
the past pouring in its flood of inspiration, it returns to the present, saying, of a truth I perceive that all nations
of men have been created of one blood; that mankind are only one great family in whom nature has implanted
mutual love. Tell me there is no heart here! Tell me Radical Religion cannot join in the celebration of
Christmas I Tell me the day of all others most sacred to a general expression of love does not belong to us!

It belongs to the children, yours and mine, as well as those of more conservative parentage. They will not
surrender it, and I will set the natural instincts of their little hearts against all the sophistry of logic in older
heads. Learning wisdom from them, I can but think that if there be any influence in this world, which tends to
soften, warm, and make more loving, human relations, we should encourage it. There are such influences
coming from the life of Jesus, from the lives of all the great and good. Independent of him there certainty are
such influences connected with this day. Well may seen and unseen powers sing peace on earth and good will
to men, for here and now, as once in old Judea, is born a spirit of universal brotherhood and love, cradled no
longer in a manger, but in the deep recesses of the aspiring soul. Let us surrender ourselves to its sway. Let it
win us to the holy order of humanity. So shall we enjoy a very Merry Christmas and a very happy and useful
New Year.
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First Principles.

Some things are special, some universal; some artificial, some natural; some speculative, some practical. The special belongs to an individual, a family or a race; the universal belongs to all men. The artificial is acquired, the natural inheres in humanity. The speculative relates to something beyond our reach, the practical to that immediately about us, and over which we may, if we will, exert an influence. The house we live in, the church we attend, the nation which is our fatherland, the religious system within which we are born and brought up—these belong to the special; that is to say, all mankind do not possess the same house, the same form of worship, the same country, the same manifestation of religion: but houses of some sort are universal, worship is universal, patriotism is universal, religion is universal; because all acquire shelter, all worship in some way, all recognize citizenship, all seek a better than they have realized for themselves and their fellows. So forms of belief which we accept from our ancestors without questioning, customs we take on because our fathers had them before us, and things we do from mere force of habit—these are artificial; but that which we grow into by the laws of our own beings, that which enters into our life-blood and becomes a part of us, so that we may say it belongs to us, as the leaves belong to the tree—that is natural. So what may happen next year, what may be taking place on the distant planets, where the human soul comes from and where it goes to, is there a first cause, and if so, what is the character of the same—these are speculative problems which we are at present in no condition to solve; but how to make the circumstances of life on this planet and in this era of our existence favorable to growth in holiness and love, how to establish the kingdom of heaven right here in America—these are practical problems, plainly within finite comprehension, and subject to finite action. The special, the artificial, the speculative, may be good beyond criticism in their respective places, but they are always secondary to the universal, the natural, the practical, which cover all space, include all time, and constitute the work which our hands find to do.

Now, religion in the past has been based on the secondary elements; it has been special, it has been artificial, it has been speculative. But religion in the future is to be based on the fundamental elements; it is to be universal, it is to be natural, it is to be practical. Let me try to demonstrate the correctness of this statement by proposing and answering, as well as I may, three questions. First—What is the difference between a special and a universal religion; second—What is the difference between an artificial and a natural religion; and third—What is the difference between a speculative and a practical religion.

It is found upon examination that some characteristics are common to all religions and some peculiar to each of them. A special religion then, we may say, is one which thinks its peculiarity a vital prerequisite to the highest human welfare; and a universal religion is one which thinks those the most vital principles which are held in common. The Roman Catholic Church has a long line of priestly authority tracing directly back to an ecclesiastical head-centre. With the edicts of this succession the individual reason has nothing to do. They are to be accepted without question as infallible dogmas. If the church says the priest can forgive sins, no matter how unreasonable it may appear, he can do it, because the authority regarded as infallible says so. The unqualified rule of this church means the subjection of the human mind. Its peculiarity in our day is its bold denial of the right of free thought. The Protestant Church, though opposed to Rome, has never quite accepted the unlimited sway of Reason. It set out with its face Zionward, but it has lingered by the way. Rejecting one authority, it has established another, at each advance conceding a little more to the spirit of liberty. For this reason we find the Protestantism of our own time accepting not one, but many degrees of authority. Conservative Orthodoxy clings to its old creeds. It demands belief in the Trinity; in Adam as the original father of the human race and the cause of its downfall; in total depravity, eternal punishment and the atonement. When a man becomes a professor in one of its institutions, or even joins one of its churches, he is expected to subscribe to all this as the vital part of his belief. Progressive Orthodoxy rejects some of these principles, but
holds up the Bible as an infallible guide specially inspired by the Creator. Conservative Unitarianism recognizes defects in the Bible, but proclaims Jesus to be the Lord and Saviour of mankind, less than God but more than man. While Liberal Unitarianism simply insists upon wearing the Christian label and recognizing in the Unknown a power whom it can justly call "Our Father."

Now Constructive Radicalism, if I understand it, has no desire to find fault with these different manifestations of the religious nature. It is disposed to hold that the most mistaken of them may have contained some kernel of truth, and may still be doing a good work in the world. Certainly it has no quarrel with Christianity. Its protest is against the exclusiveness of sects and systems. So far as Jesus is concerned, it not only admits, it earnestly affirms, the exceptional beauty of his teachings; but it cannot forget that probably two-thirds of the human race have never heard his name. It regards the Bible as a series of books of great import to humanity, to be studied as such and to be revered as such; but it cannot forget that only the minority of the world's inhabitants know there is such a volume, and only the smallest fraction of this minority are acquainted with its teachings. It recognizes in the Christian system a mighty force for good, but it cannot forget that it has a past of only about two thousand years. Covering but a small portion of space and a smaller portion of time, it belongs to the special precisely as do the denominations within itself. And the only reason why they or it were ever regarded as universal is found in the ignorance of their devotees. Progress always undermines narrowness, and every new fact discovered helps to batter down old error. The change in the conception of religion which has followed the study of the old religious systems is as marvelous as the last fifty years' advance in physical science. By means of this study we have already learned that the Unknown is not without a witness in any human soul; that the disciples of Confucius, of Buddha, of Zoroaster, of Mahomet, may be just as near the central Light and Life as if they had been reared under Christian institutions and had become what are called followers of Christ. In other words the one Saviour of mankind was not born in Palestine any more than in India or China. The one sacred book is not the Christian any more than it is the Persian or the Hindu Bible. The one channel for the in flowing of the Eternal Spirit is neither here nor there, for all holy men, and all holy books, and all holy influences carry it by divine commission to human hearts and lives. The value of the golden rule does not lie in the fact that it fell from the lips of Jesus in Judea, and before him from the lips of Confucius in China, but in the degree of truth it contains. It is its greatness not its which is derived from their expression of it. The beauty of overcoming evil with good is neither greater nor less because Jesus and before him Gautama advocated it. Their advocacy of it made their characters more beautiful, it could not gild what was already refined gold; it could not by painting improve what was already one of nature's pure white lilies! The idea of human brotherhood,—who will dare to-day credit it exclusively to Christianity, which has carried the fire of persecution among its enemies, when he reflects that it has adorned nearly every system of religion now known to man, a dream in them all, not yet a fact in one. Jesus said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Zoroaster said, "Do as you would be done by." Confucius said, "The good man loves all men. All within the four seas are his brothers." Buddha said, "My doctrine makes no distinction between high and low, rich and poor. It is like water, which washes and purifies all alike. It is like the sky, for it has room for all." And Marcus Aurelius, and Seneca, and Menander, and Cicero, and all the great souls of ancient and of modern times have uttered similar sentiments. What does it indicate that without pre-arrangement a great principle finds expression under all forms and shines serene in all skies? What but the universality of the principle? And which, pray tell me, is the more important, the thing universal which is expressed, or the system, limited and special, which is the medium of its expression? Therefore, I say Truth is not great because Christianity expresses it; Christianity is great in so far as it expresses Truth. Thus we reach the conclusion that any truth which is universal must have existed before, and independently of, the special system which brings it to us. In other words we get down to one of the fundamental principles of religion and accept as our supreme leader not the head of a system, but that spirit of Truth which underlies all systems. Now we exclaim with Lucretia Mott, "Truth for Authority, not Authority for Truth."

I wonder if we all realize, friends, just how much that means? When one says, Nothing shall come between me and truth, he has reached the logical antithesis of Rome. He has abolished all adjectives, even the Christian. Henceforth, absolute freedom of thought is his method, the discovery of unqualified truth his ideal aim. To him, now, Christianity becomes one of many religious systems, not less honored because standing side by side with itsfellows; the Bible becomes one of many sacred books, each more valuable for the truths all express in common; and Jesus is seen to be one of a brotherhood of great souls, together guiding, blessing, redeeming mankind. Such is the difference between a special and a universal religion, or the special and the universal in religion. One is a part, the other is the whole; one is a segment, the other is the sphere.

Turn we now to our second question—What is the difference between an artificial and a natural religion? Let me say that in using these terms, I do not mean to imply that they every where signify the same things. What is artificial to-day may not have been artificial always. Men in early ages of extreme ignorance and superstition, grew naturally into the observance of certain forms and ceremonies which are no longer
admissible. They prayed in fear and trembling to the awful power whose voice was the thunder, and whose flaming wrath was the lightning. Possibly the mutilations of the body practiced among the Brahmins and some of our Indian tribes may not be as artificial as they seem. But I am not referring to barbarous ages and nations, I am speaking of our own people and time, of a condition of things where knowledge is general, if not universal; of a civilization wherein Science is accorded an honorable place. The child of to-day does not take to the forms of the church as a duck does to the water. It has to acquire a taste for ecclesiastical diet. One hundred years ago, our fathers taught in the New England Primer a theology at which we smile now. There was no smiling about it then. It was a constant warfare on human nature.

"In Adam's fall  
We sinned all,"

was its lugubrious song, but somehow the little folks would reflect the sunshine in their faces, even on Sunday. They knew nothing about sin, and less about the fall, and it was Natural Religion in their hearts which made them shout and laugh in response to Nature's greeting through her buttercups and daisies. You must not act thus on the Sabbath day, came the stern reproof. You must remain in the house, you must read the Bible, you must keep a sober face. That was Artificial Religion driving out Natural Religion. How often in history the same contest has been waged with the same result. Do you suppose that without a suggestion outside its own consciousness any child ever knelt before getting into bed and said understandingly:

"Now I lay me down to sleep,  
I pray the Lord my soul to keep;  
If I should die before I wake,  
I pray the Lord my soul to take?"

Many people can remember the time when they were taught as children that it was their duty thus to pray. They can remember how hard they tried to perform this duty and to make it seem real. But somehow the active mind of childhood which asks why before the hardest problem and expects an answer, would not be quieted. Who is the Lord to whom I am talking? What have I to do with him and he with me? Why is it that I cannot see him? Who was ever able to answer such queries in a way to satisfy the mind of a little child? You know that sort of thing is an artificial form to-day. You know the creative force does not mock the children of men by speaking something to their reason which will damn their souls? You know the solicitations contained in prayers of that character have as little effect upon the Eternal Administration as upon the solid rock of our Granite Hills. John Weiss says, "The only ground for an act of faith is furnished gradually by discovering how this world is constructed, for it is the stem on which our souls blossom." I think child and man alike want facts. Neither courts deception. The little ones still enjoy a Santa Claus, but they know all the same that he does not ride through the air with his tiny reindeer. They may sit entranced over Arabian Nights stories, but they are not deceived by wonderful lamps, they know there is no "truly" fairy-land. What they accept is what they grow into and up to naturally. If you want to find religion for a child, help him to find it for himself; not in your way but in his. You will not need to send him out, he will go out of his own desire to the garden, the fields, the woods, and by the sea. "Oh, sec this pretty flower," he exclaims, as he revels in the clover patch. "Oh, hear this funny noise," he says, as the sea-shell sings its song in his ear. He is at home everywhere in the great temple of Nature—this little autocrat. He is experiencing religion all the while without knowing it. Every new object of wonder and beauty is a new Messiah, which makes his blessed little heart throb closer to the Infinite Heart and his sunny face reflect more directly, the Infinite Smile.

And how is it with us older children? Why, we maintain religious institutions so-called, just as we maintain systems of etiquette—for respectability. They are a kind of thin veneering, a sweet frosting, to the substance of our lives, but quite distinct therefrom in character. People do not believe one-half they say they do in their creeds, nor one-half the forms in which they participate imply. I read the other day in one of our papers, and the article containing it has been widely circulated, this: "It is a necessity that religious creeds be reconstructed, or the churches will lose their hold upon the people more and more every year." What is that but a confession that the church is to-day offering mankind a forced, foreign, artificial thing. To accept such a commodity is not worship. When one is struggling to overcome some bad habit, when he recognizes his own weaknesses, when he is doing his best to reach what for the moment seems the unattainable, then it is that he is worshiping. The longing in your heart for the True, the Beautiful, the Good,—that is prayer. The tender solicitude with which you look at your children's faces in sleep the last thing before you go to your own night's rest,—that is prayer.
The aspiration of your soul that you may exert an influence in the world for sober, refined, holy character,—that is prayer. It is the only kind of prayer to which we have any right to expect an answer,—this natural desire of the man nerving him to renewed and successful struggle toward an ever-advancing ideal. In the presence of such worship as this the formal lip-service of the sects shrinks to a subordinate place in human estimation until in good time it shall be sloughed off as the relic of a bygone age.

Artificial religion then, is that in which profession is one thing and life another thing. Natural religion is that in which profession and life are one. In artificial religion we pray to an external authority who, it is claimed, will hear and answer our supplications from without. In natural religion we pray to an internal authority, the godlike within us, whose summons at times all feel and own. In the one the soul is out on a journey, a stranger in a strange land. In the other it is at home, breathing its native air and drinking the elixir of life from its own mountain streams. In the one the outward appearance, the compliance with custom is what tells. In the other it is the inward attitude of the spiritual nature, the orderly growth toward the perfect and divine. Thus we find the second fundamental principle of religion in the natural gravitation of humanity toward the ideal.

And now we are brought face to face with our last question—What is the difference between a speculative and a practical religion? The Andover creed says, among other things:—I believe there is one and but one living and true God; that in the Godhead are three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and that these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory; that Adam, the federal head and representative of the human race, was placed in a state of probation, and that in consequence of his disobedience, all his descendants were constituted sinners; that the only Redeemer of the elect is the eternal Son of God, who, for the purpose of delivering man out of his sin and misery, became man, and continues to be God and man, in two distinct natures and one person forever; that the souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory; and that the wicked will wake to shame and everlasting contempt, and with devils be plunged into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone forever and ever. Well, that, if I mistake not, is rather speculative. You say they qualify it somewhat now. That is true, but the point is that every one of the clauses I have quoted treats of something about which men never knew anything, do not know anything to-day, and, so far as we can see, are not likely to know anything in this world. It is a good thing, perhaps, to speculate concerning the character of the Unseen; it certainly is a wise thing to speculate concerning the origin of man; speculation is often the way to discovery. But to make guesses and assumptions take the place of verified truth; to say this and that matter of pure speculation is vital, and that our particular interpretation of the theories involved must be accepted; that is indeed the height of absurdity.

Somehow men have been possessed with the idea that religion means other worldliness. So for a long time they did not give that attention to affairs on this planet which is necessary to a recognition of the relations of cause and effect within human control. That is a suggestive fact to which Hawthorne calls attention in the Scarlet Letter, that the founders of a new colony, whatever Utopia of human virtue and happiness they might originally project, have invariably recognized it among their earliest practical necessities to allot a portion of the virgin soil as a cemetery and another portion as the site of a prison. Add to the burial of the dead, and the shutting up of the sinners, the saving of souls for a hereafter, and you have nearly covered what was once the whole range of human duties. Gradually ideas of untheological education have crept in; gradually the reform of social and industrial conditions has become an object of thought; until at length a larger amount of time, energy and money than ever before is given to ennobling human life here and now. In the church on Sunday you will still hear the old ideas preached and see the old forms more or less closely adhered to, but men of all persuasions are thinking more and more of the duty which lies at their doors. The homes of poverty and filth, the suffering and crime caused by intemperance and prostitution, the growing tyranny of accumulated wealth, the degradation of woman, the strength and weakness of universal suffrage,—why there is scarcely a limit to the long list of subjects of this nature challenging our attention. The discussion of such themes in the home, on the street, in the counting-room and the public gathering, is an indication of the tendency of the hour toward practical religion. It is difficult for us to appreciate the change in this respect which has taken place within our own life-times.

How sharply drawn once was the line between what was called the religious and the secular, but what was really the speculative and the practical. We had religious books and secular books, religious music and secular music, religious days and secular days. Of course traces of such distinctions still exist. You can find in these times, as formerly, grave inconsistencies between creed and deed. But when you get down to the underlying motives of human action, you discover, if I am correct, a pretty general recognition of the idea that a religion which can be divorced from daily conduct is not worth talking about. Every good book is now a religious book; every inspiring strain of music is a religious strain; every day which bears witness to a pure thought or an unselfish act is a religious day.

The backbone of nearly all the creeds, from the most conservative to the most liberal, is an assent to certain
unproven mental propositions. The backbone of the real moving religion of mankind is personal faithfulness, according to the light one possesses, in practical every-day affairs. Morality is coming to the front. Who cares to-day what Washington and Jefferson, Sumner and Lincoln believed concerning the character of God and a future existence. They lived high, aspiring, religious lives, every one of them; they were faithful to great principles; they left the world better for their sojourn in it; that is all we need to know; on that basis, so long as conscious being shall endure, they will be enshrined in our love and veneration. "I had rather have one great act of social justice," said Wendell Phillips once, "I had rather have one great act of social justice, acceptable and intelligible to the workingmen and women of New England, than a million of pulpits preaching the Sermon on the Mount." Not because the Sermon on the Mount is not a sublime instruction, not that a million pulpits is not a necessary auxiliary, he added, but because they are inadequate; because they do not reach the difficulty of the time. So I say to-day, as long as religion, in or out of the church, fails to exert an influence for practical ethics and universal equity; so long as it can seal its lips in the presence of social indulgence, business trickery, political injustice, and industrial serfdom; it is inadequate to the work to be done; it is sacrificing the practical to the speculative. But when, in the church or out of it, putting itself in the place of the drunkard in the gutter, the prostitute in the house of shame, the unwary in trade, the ignorant and unfortunate at the loom, it says, I cannot preserve my self-respect, I cannot discharge my duty to my clients if I accept the proffered wine cup, if I "turn from dirty stockings" and bow to "vice, married to ribbons and a little gay attire," if I wink at commercial dishonesty and shut my eyes to the slavery of poverty and sin, then it is equal to all emergencies, then it is practical in the sublimest sense, reaching down to the lowest of the needy, and up to the immortal stars. And this practical character of religion is the third element in our trinity of fundamentals.

We may sum up this brief and imperfect study by saying that while as late as a century ago our fathers cherished a religion which was special and speculative, and which seems to us at this day to have been artificial in its character, the tendency of development has been away from that to a religion which recognizes the universality, the naturalness, and the practicability of virtue. Truth, Justice, and Love, we say now, are universal—that is, they belong to all men. They are natural—that is, they are the ideal leading all men. They are practical—that is, they can and should be applied to all men. These are our First Principles, the acceptance of which constitutes all that is absolutely essential to make the religious life. Other things may be important in their places, but these we believe are the vital and supreme conditions of personal salvation in this world, if not in every other.

Dost thou believe then in a Heavenly Father? No matter. Dost thou believe in the immortality of the soul? No matter. Dost thou believe in Jesus Christ as the Redeemer of men? No matter. But stand up, look me in the eye, and answer these questions: Art thou as honest as thou knowest how to be? Art thou as loving as thou knowest how to be? Art thou as pure as thou knowest how to be? If thou canst say Yes, I am, then thou needest not to wait for the "Well done, good and faithful servant"; thou hast already entered into the joy of thy Lord. The Eternal Order has won thy heart, and the "still, sad music of humanity" as it strikes gently thy simple faith, is transformed into the prolonged aspiration of the soul for the realization of its Divine Ideals.

"Tis not the wide phylactery,  
Nor stubborn fast, or stated prayers,  
That make us saints; we judge the tree  
By what it bears.

And when a man can live apart  
From work, on theologic trust,  
We know the blood about his heart  
Is dry as dust.

We hold that saving grace abounds  
Where charity is seen; that when  
We climb to heaven, 'tis on the rounds  
Of love to men."
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The Mission of Science.

The first man who burned his fingers did a very natural thing, and suffered for the benefit of humanity. He did not, however, establish the fact that all fire burns. He simply demonstrated the burning qualities of the particular fire with which he had to do. By and by a second, third, fourth, fifth man went through similar experiences, until sufficient evidence had been accumulated from special instances to verify the general truth. So that now not only a burnt child, but a child with burnt ancestors avoids the fire. That is to say, the experience of the past in this respect is a part of the stock of knowledge with which every child may set up in the business of life.

The first man who was drowned did an equally natural thing, and also suffered for human benefit. It took more than one, however, to establish the fact, now so well known, that whoso falls into the water must either sink or swim. Once it would have been folly to have affirmed such a thing. Now it is suicide not to recognize it and govern one's self accordingly.

It would be nothing strange if a man who had never heard of a locomotive, and was utterly ignorant of the power of steam, should think he could stop the train by a rail fence, or perchance his own body. But after he and some others equally ignorant had splintered a few rails and broken as many bones, the survivors would know that steam is a powerful agent, and that he is a wise man who looks out for the engine while the bell rings.

The first impression of this earth received through personal observation is that of a great circular plane, surmounted by a dome of substantial azure, studded with stars. Every morning, runs the familiar phrase—fittingly telling what seems the fact—every morning the sun rises, every evening it sets. All its movements, all the movements of the lights of night, to the unsophisticated, are ordered with reference to this little plane on which man lives his day and is then transported to an eternal home beyond the sky. How does it happen, that notwithstanding this appearance of things, so clear and unmistakable, every school-boy denies the old idea of the ancient philosophers that the earth is a flat disc swimming on the waters, and asserts that it is round like a ball or orange? How does it happen that while retaining the language of their forefathers, the youngest children now know that the sun does not rise and set in a revolution round the earth, but the earth itself revolves on an imaginary axis of its own, causing the alternation of day and night, and moves through its orbit round the sun, causing the steady succession of the seasons? How does it happen that the apparent fact of the earth's centrality in the planetary system is universally regarded as an illusion, it being held that the sun is
the real centre and the earth but one of several members, and one of the smallest members too, of a company of
spheres? "Knowledge is power," said Lord Bacon. It was because the knowledge of the ancients was
exceedingly limited; it is because the first glance at things is extremely superficial, that such mistakes have
been made. It is because, with increasing age in our own lives and in the life of the world, we learn to go
beneath the surface to the foundations of knowledge, that we approximate ever nearer to the truth. When, in due
course of time, it was discovered that the tops of towers, mountains, masts of ships, come into view first as we
approach them, and that a man starting from a given point and traveling in a straight line would in time come
round to the same point again; it was seen that the theory of a flat surface did not agree with the facts, and the
truth of the earth's rotundity, which had long before dawned upon individual minds, was verified. By a similar
process of experience the little idea of the earth as the one thing of creation to which all things else were made
to minister, has given way to the great idea of the solar system, and hints to-day of a myriad of systems in
which perchance many of our stars may be suns.

The same beginnings in abject ignorance, the same gradual improvement, may be observed in the progress
of civilization, as shown in forms of government. Indeed, as Guizot has expressed it, the idea of progress, of
development, appears the fundamental idea contained in the word civilization. Now, the first attempts at human
government were, of course, crude and bungling. Two men discovering each other, the stronger subdued and
enslaved, if he did not eat the weaker. Physical force was, for ages, the only method of control, and
unfortunately is often the only method still. That is the primitive form of social order—the rule of muscle,
producing despotism. And all barbarous forms—from chattel-slavery, up or down, as you may prefer—have
grown out of the attempts of man to establish society. If the form has been bad, it has been because the men
creating it have been but slightly developed from brutish conditions. Spencer says of the early history of
government, "the one universal despotism was but a manifestation of the extreme necessity of restraint.
Feudalism, serfdom, slavery—all tyrannical institutions, are merely the most vigorous kinds of rule, springing
out of, and necessary to, a bad state of man. Restraint is for the savage, the rapacious, the violent; not for the
just, the gentle, the benevolent. Dungeons for the felon; a straight-jacket for the maniac; crutches for the lame;
stays for the weak-backed; for the infirm of purpose, a master; for the foolish, a guide; but for the sound mind,
in a sound body, none of these." We have here a fair statement of the course of evolution in government to this
date. Men at first so animal in their natures that nothing but physical power could command their respect.
Farther on, the mind asserting itself and the idea of governing only the felon and the maniac by force
prevailing. Later still, the recognition of the highest standard yet reached—that of supplementing weakness
with strength, and overcoming vice and crime with love. But here again ob serve it is a growth in knowledge.
The difference between a Roman Emperor or a Russian Czar and the President of the United States, and the
difference between Roman and Russian subjects and citizens of the United States, is one of knowledge in the
art of government. We know better how to govern ourselves than did the victims of Caligula and Nero. We
know better how to govern ourselves than do the victims of the reign of Nicholas III. That is the reason why we
have neither Emperor nor Czar, but only a President at Washington. Not that we individually have had much to
say about it, but simply that in the progress of events we are the fruit of a long line of causes, such as have not
gone before our less fortunate brothers; and hence are endowed at the start with a wealth of knowledge such as
they do not possess.

If this course of thought suggests anything; if it leads us to any wise conclusion; it seems to me to be
nothing less radical than this, viz.: That the evil in this world, whether material or spiritual, individual or social,
is not a concrete, absolute fact over which man has no control, but is simply a condition through which all
things pass from a lower to a higher life. In other words, evil is but good in the making. Or still otherwise
stated, evil is the result of the bungling attempts of mankind to find and apply truth. The early Britons, many
of whose villages were circles of huts hollowed out of side-hills, had very crude ideas of houses and cities
compared with those which now prevail. Indeed, one only need remember the homes of a hundred years ago,
and the log cabins in some places still extant, to realize the change which has taken place in architecture and
carpentry within our own time. But the intention in constructing huts and cabins and old-fashioned New
England houses was just as good, I may say precisely the same, as that which to-day builds our modern
dwelling with all its conveniences. They were all steps toward a something better. And, investigate in
whatever, realm you may, you will, I think, find this thought universally true. We are prone to think of some
men and classes of men, as inherently bad, full of original and incurable sin. It is the ghost of the total
depavity-devil. We say of the supporters of what we conceive to be barbarous institutions and laws, they are
wicked and designing men, who ought to be morally, if not physically, condemned to prison and gibbet. Well, it
is all natural, all true enough, perhaps, and yet we must not forget that our view is usually the near one, too near
sometimes to see the conditions of our own period in their right relations. Chattel slavery was bad, any
distinction in the law on account of race or sex is odious; always to be condemned; finally to be overcome; but
for all that, it is true that these very distinctions are results of attempts at progress, and invariably in the large
view of history to be so regarded. After admitting, if you please, the bad passions which govern men, doubtless many and grievous, it is still true that a vast majority of the race are doing on the whole about as well as they know how to do. In other words, what they need is not so much hanging by the neck until they be dead; not even moral condemnation until each of them feels as Warren Hastings did under the overwhelming invective of Burke, that he was the most culpable man on earth;—not that, but more light, more knowledge, more really deep insight into life and all its conditions. It is my belief that a close scrutiny of some of the various phases of our practical, every-day living will show this to be true.

Take for example the vices of trade,—and they are very generally admitted in as well as outside the counting-room,—what is the real truth concerning them at this very moment? I apprehend the average trader is about as honest as he can be, that is, as he knows how to be, in the present state of the world. He is one of many. He does not make the conditions which environ him, and cannot often, perhaps never entirely, control them. Failures are more than frequent in mercantile life, but no man wants to fail. Dealers in the same articles are constantly' underbidding each other, but no man wants to ruin his fellow,—it is only to the end that each may live and support his family. If our whole system of trade is one calculated to encourage fraud in prices and qualities, it is not because men are bad and enjoy such things, not because some men do not know better, but because the average intelligence has not evolved itself from what may be called the crude period. You may, if you choose, demand of a man that he shall make a martyr of himself and sacrifice his family rather than tell a lie or cheat his neighbor, but the radical difficulty is that it is impossible, or he honestly thinks it is, which amounts to the same thing, for him to avoid the one without doing the other. This only goes to show that we are in a crude condition concerning this matter of trade. Enough fingers have not yet been burned in the fire of competition to teach us the better way. What is needed, I say again, therefore, is not so much better intentions, as a greater degree of knowledge of how to deal with each other on a basis of integrity and justice.

Our recent history is full of illustrations of the truth I am trying to establish. Look for a moment at our courts. Can one conceive of a more bungling method of determining causes than that they often exemplify? A set of men suspected of some great crime are arrested and brought to trial. A jury of twelve men is impaneled, men not necessarily versed in law; not necessarily possessed of judicial minds; not necessarily above susceptibility to bribes. Before this jury appear two lawyers, or two sets of lawyers, whose business it is not to discover and defend the truth, but to do their level best, the one to prove the prisoner at the bar guilty, the other to prove him innocent, regardless of the truth. I have frequently said to legal friends, pray tell me how you justify this system of making the worse appear the better reason? They always answer that on general principles, it is right that both sides should have the best possible showing, and that the verdict following such showing is more likely to be just than that reached in any other way. Well, there is something in it, no doubt, but one cannot help feeling that it is a very crude effort to do a good thing. And we know how often an orator, with a bad cause, can move the twelfth juryman, thus defeating the ends of justice. Now the difficulty is not that our people are anxious that rogues should go free. They were not satisfied with the trial of the Malleys in New Haven; they were not satisfied with the first trial of the star-route thieves in Washington; but as yet they see no way of bettering their judicial system. They are beginning to realize its defects, and discussing most wisely, as it seems to me, some amendments to our jury laws; but what they want is more light. They want to know how to secure more fully a judiciary which shall decree substantial equity.

The same evil of ignorance is observable in legislation. The River and Harbor Bill passed at the last session of Congress has been made the text for a good many clerical and lay sermons. Many criticisms of its supporters have been wise and just. It comes in the line of my present thought to speak of one which was neither wise nor just. It has been said that no man was justified in supporting the bill if he recognized that there was even five per cent, of steal in it—by which is meant that ninety-five per cent, of honest, many of them immediately necessary, appropriations, should be defeated, rather than pass with them an appropriation amounting to five per cent, which is dishonest, and of course, unnecessary. As an abstract proposition that is sound, but as a practical proposition it is simply an absurdity. Its adoption would signify the suspension of all our public works for the want of legislation. The fact is, we have not yet learned how to legislate without the introduction of the trading element. No system of government has yet been established in which the honest men in politics and the honest men in halls of legislation are not in some small degree at the mercy of the rogues. Honest men voted for the bill in question as honest men repeatedly vote at the polls on a choice of evils, knowing that it contained bad appropriations, but believing them to constitute a smaller percentage of the whole bill than has usually been the case. I do not mention this to apologize for them, if indeed apology be needed, but simply to show one of the at present necessary evils of legislation. We may condemn it as much as we please—it ought to be condemned; but we shall not rid ourselves of it until we grow wiser in the art of making and administering law.

There is one other example of this evil of ignorance which comes so near home that I must not omit to mention it here. I refer to our caucus system and home politics. That there is an alarming rule of professional politicians in this country to-day, all admit. That political slave-drivers are a nuisance, and at times danger to
free institutions, none will deny. The great body of our honest, well-intentioned voters—and they constitute the majority—condemn machine politics, and would like to abolish it, but how to do it—that is the question. And, speaking as one who has taken part, at various times, in some practical attempts in this direction, I am bound to say it is a great question. It is not enough to condemn the good men who stay away from the caucus and the polls. You must show them how they can accomplish something by going to the caucus and the polls. We are not half so near self-government as we think. We have the theory. We have the inclination. We see that the force of events is driving us relentlessly—to some it may seem hopelessly—on, but as a people, we do not yet know how to govern ourselves successfully. What we need is not more critics, fault-finders, and prophets of evil; we need more teachers. We need to learn more in the art of administering upon our own affairs.

Clear, accurate knowledge then, is the great desideratum in all departments of life. It seems as if the constant, prolonged appeal of humanity went up without one dissenting voice—show us the way and we will walk in it. And it is the sublime mission of Science to do just that thing.

In the past this has been considered a universe of accidents, governed by a capricious God; but a new day has dawned. With the conception of law as universal and invariable, comes a new era in human history. The mighty summons has gone forth—Man, study thyself, study thy surroundings, fit them to thyself, fit thyself to them. Thou art no longer an ignorant, irresponsible victim: thou art an intelligent, moving will. Thou art lifted from the valley of humiliation and despair to the peaks of power and hope. Grovel no longer a suppliant at the feet of Jehovah; stand erect in wise cooperation with the unseen forces of the world.

From such an altitude we look forth to-day upon the duties and opportunities of life, and Science, which implies penetrating and comprehensive knowledge, is the teacher of teachers for which we wait. What it has already gained in its hitherto somewhat limited sphere pales before the vision of what it is yet to accomplish in new realms of human activity. We have a science of Astronomy, a science of Geology, a science of Mathematics, but we need most of all a science of Society. We have wandered off among the stars; we have gone deep into the bowels of the earth; no obstacle in the natural world has been too great for us to overcome. Shall we understand the character of the sun, ninety-five million miles away, shall we watch the planets in their courses, shall we calculate with perfect accuracy the coming of comets, and yet know nothing accurately of the laws which govern ourselves and the conditions under which we keep in our orbits? Shall we understand the materials of which the earth's crust is made, shall we analyze them, make them tell us history, and yet know nothing accurately of what is going on every day upon its surface? In all our relations we are much like boys playing games. It is so largely guess-work with us, even in the most serious matters. But there are laws underlying our smallest actions not less omnipotent than those which govern the formation of minerals and the march of planets. It is the business of Science to discover these laws and to intelligently apply them.

I know many people think this is done to-day, and to a certain limited extent it is. Every reformer thinks, and not without some show of reason, that his particular reform is the radical one, sure to accomplish the desired end. Granting that all reforms have a wise basis, why is it that we do not secure more readily the objects at which they aim? Governor Oglesby, of Illinois, went down to Joliet one day to inspect the state prison. Why, said he, this is as fine-looking a body of men as you can see anywhere. But there they were felons; doomed to years of exile and degrading servitude; branded by the state as unsafe citizens; marked men for the rest of life. Go into the great penitentiary in Philadelphia, run on the solitary theory; go to our own prison at Cranston, you will be disappointed. The walls will look white, the floors scrupulously clean, the food healthy and abundant of its kind, the officers often as gentlemanly and attentive as could be wished. What then, asks the superficial observer, is the trouble? What have you to criticise? The trouble is that the whole system is unscientific. There is no relation of cause and effect in it. It is the practical application of the old Orthodox theology. It sets out with a mere opinion, rarely warranted by the facts, that there is an inherent difference between the men inside and those outside of jail; it has an opinion, nothing more or less, that an austere ruler presides over the destinies of men, making the way of the transgressor hard, and so it imitates this ruler in its dealings with crime. Let us see what Science would do under the same circumstances. The moment it obtained possession of the liberty of a man, it would ask, how can I fit him to regain at the earliest possible period that which he has forfeited? It is naturally his. Nothing but the protection of society warrants any interference with it. The first business then, is to restore it to him as soon as the safety of society will permit. To make this unsafe into a safe citizen—that is my object, says Science. In order to accomplish this supreme end I must seek the causes which have induced him to sin, and must always suit my treatment to the work to be done. But that is not the way most of us talk to-day. We say practically, these men of whom Governor Oglesby testifies they are as fine-looking as any body of men you can see anywhere; these men you may see for yourselves at any of the...
great prisons, and wonder they look so much like the rest of us; we say of them practically, they are failures; we
know not what to do with them, and so we shut them up, though the figures prove what a moment's thought
suggests, that this process of simply shutting men up unfits, rather than fits them for social relations and duties.
Now, is it not a lamentable thing, when you think of it, amid all our advances in this nineteenth century of
civilization, that instead of trying to reform our criminals, instead even of reforming the conditions which
produce vice and crime, we are everywhere maintaining, at great expense, stone and iron cages for men, women
and children, who look after all as if they had brains, and hearts, and consciences, very much like their more
fortunate fellows? No thoughtful person can study our penal and correctional system without feeling how much
it has been the outgrowth of passion, or at best, of the desire for temporary protection, rather than of deep
philosophical thought, looking to ultimate safety and reform. Of course I do not mean to say it is not at times
necessary to deprive men of their freedom. Society must protect itself—there can be no question about that. But
this I do say—the scientific method of protection implies not only the suppression of the evil, it implies the
removal of the causes of the evil. And this brings us to the thought that Science in dealing with criminality
would scarcely stop in our prisons at all. In seeking causes it would go right out upon the street. It would go
into the school-houses; into the homes alike of wealth and of poverty; it would ascertain how these victims of
passion were educated; how they lived as little boys and girls; aye, back of that, how they were born. Science is
thorough. It will not stop in its investigations until it has probed the bottom facts. We talk about exact sciences.
I tell you, friends, living is to be an exact science, some day. If men want to produce certain qualities in cattle,
they know how to get them. The breeding of beasts is no longer a thing of accident. It has a basis of knowledge.
Shall we study how to make strong, vigorous oxen, and not how to make strong, vigorous children? Shall we
fathom the effects of food, habits, climate, upon the dispositions of horses and cows, and remain in ignorance
of their effects upon the dispositions of men and women? I look upon the struggles of the ages—the overthrow
of tyrannies, the abolition of slavery in our own country and elsewhere, the wresting of power from the hands
of the few and placing it in the hands of the many—I look upon all of these struggles as the preliminary steps to
the great scientific study of how to live. The first were negative, though necessary and admirable; the last is
affirmative, outshining in its glory all that has gone before. How to bring the little child into the world under
such conditions that he shall command good physical, mental and moral health; how to properly educate him
from childhood to manhood; how to make honesty, justice, equity, natural and easy; and dishonesty, injustice,
and iniquity, unnatural and hard—that is the mighty problem which Science now proposes to solve. She
summons us as her instruments to set out on voyages of discovery—the truth in all things the continent we
seek, the spirit of impartial investigation and the courage to apply results, our jewels in the locker and our
Columbus at the helm. But we shall have rough seas and despairing days. There is no royal road to learning,
says one. Certainly there is no royal road in social evolution. How hard it is for us to learn that! How impatient
we are at the slowness of human progress, and yet how little time and energy we give to that study which is a
necessary condition of human progress. The methods of work in all branches of activity, industrial, social,
political, in school, in church, in reform;—how superficial they often are; how little of real understanding of
fundamental principles enters into them. The greatest things in this world are not clone on snap judgments. Men
will become free about as fast as they are fit for freedom; men and women will together make a true state, as
they together make a true home, about as soon as they are fit to make it; and people will find their heaven in
something better than the smoke of tobacco and the fumes of liquor about as soon as they are fit for something
better. We must learn the basic truths of justice before we can have just society. We must educate public
opinion before legislative enactments are worth the paper on which they are written. In a word, we must enter
into the scientific spirit, pursue scientific methods, command success before we can attain it. The situation that
has not this duty is not to-day occupied by man. "Yes here," as Carlyle says, "in this poor, miserable, hampered,
despicable Actual, wherein thou even now standest, here or nowhere is thy duty; here or nowhere is thy ideal;
work it out therefrom, and working, believe, live, be free. Fool! the ideal is in thyself, the impediment too is in
thyself: thy condition is but the stuff thou art to shape that same ideal out of. O thou that pinest in the
imprisonment of the Actual, and criest bitterly to the gods for a kingdom wherein to rule and create, know this
of a truth: the thing thou seekest is already with thee, here or nowhere, couldst thou only see! But it is with
man's soul as it was with Nature: the beginning of Creation is—Light. Till the eye have vision, the whole
members are in bonds. Divine moment, when over the tempest-tost soul, as once over the wild-weltering
Chaos, it is spoken: Let there be light! The mad primeval discord is hushed; the rudely jumbled conflicting
elements bind themselves into separate firmaments; deep silent rock foundations are built beneath; and the
skyey vault with its everlasting luminaries above: instead of a dark, wasteful Chaos, we have a blooming,
 fertile, heaven-encompassed World."

Thinkest thou then, good friend, the greatest achievements of Science are in the Past? Oh no! grander than
all it has yet accomplished in physics—will be its conversion of life, mentally, morally, spiritually, from the
flat, barren plane of superstition to the spherical forms of Beauty and of Truth.
Come then, shrewd and cautious trader, come skillful mechanic, come lawyer and jurist, come school-teacher and minister, come intelligent mothers and fathers,—witnesses all to the suffering born of ignorance,—come and sound forth anew the decree, "Let there be Light!" For not as of old shall the edict go forth from some divine King sitting upon his throne in the heavens. It shall come rather from the heads, the hearts, the hands of divine men, engaged in the hard though worshipful labor of Earth.

So may we hope in time for the reign of a Science of Life, building upon a basis of universal knowledge the temple of universal harmony and joy.
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There is an old motto which runs, "Whatever is worth doing at all is worth doing well." It seems to me to be universally true and to need universal application. If you are sweeping a room, do it well. If you are making a garment, do it well. If you are teaching a school, do it well. For one, therefore, I recognize no logic in the position of those who set about some undertaking, little or great, and then expect to lie back in their easy chairs and witness its fulfillment. The world suffers as much to-day from half-done work as from any other cause. When you have made up your mind to begin a task you assume an obligation to "put it through," as the street phrase goes, in the best possible manner. In no other way can you command the respect of your fellows or keep your own. This means a careful consideration of every venture before embarking on it, and it means energy, pluck, perseverance, in pushing it after it is begun. It means, in a word, that anything worth beginning or maintaining is worth our unqualified, self-sacrificing service and loyalty.

If this thought, so vital everywhere, has greater force in one realm than in another, it is in that which we include in the term Religion. Religion is a binding, not back but fast, to something which is never quite attainable, but which always lures us on,—the ideal integrity, the ideal justice, the ideal love. It is a sense of obligation to grow toward these, to embody them in our own persons, to mould them into social and industrial institutions and laws. Certainly, if there is anything we are bound by the very nature of our beings to undertake, and having undertaken, to faithfully pursue, it is, first, this perfecting of ourselves, and second, the perfecting of the societal organism in which we live. It has been natural, therefore, strange as it may seem at first thought, it has been creditable to the human race, that religious wars have been the most savage of all wars. That fact only shows that men have been willing to fight hardest for what they have considered most vital. In other words, it shows, in all ages, how devoted men can be to the religious faith they espouse.

Now in the year 1867, in Boston, a large and clearly defined organization was effected in the name of Free
Religion, and our society, perhaps more truly than any other in the country, is a direct outgrowth of the movement which then and there took visible form. I do not particularly like the name Free Religion. I should not select it now. But I can wear it easily, because among people who choose to inform themselves upon the subject it has come to stand for certain things. It signifies universal, natural, practical religion. It means that those things are fundamental which all men may possess, to which all may aspire, and in the spirit of which all may live. That many were at first drawn to these new organizations out of curiosity is not to be denied; that many attended, and perhaps still attend, their meetings for the intellectual treat they furnish, or are supposed at their best to furnish, is doubtless true. I speak not to such to-day. I speak to those who believe this movement of constructive radicalism in religion is the custodian of such principles as are destined, in its hands or some others, to benefit and ennable mankind. Just how much do I mean by that? Nothing less than this. We say morality should be taught in our schools. What morality? A great majority of our people answer Christian morality. We answer no, natural morality, or morality divorced from theology. Well the fact is, and I neither shrink from recognizing nor maintaining it, the fact is that moral teaching uncontaminated by theological bias can never be introduced into any system of public education until the philosophy we represent, or ought to represent, prevails in its management.

We hold that the aim of penal and correctional institutions should be not punishment, but reformation; that the only efficient way to save the falling and the fallen, is to extend to them a brotherly sympathy; and to excite in them a sense of the dignity of human nature. Where is the philosophy equal to in-venting and maintaining methods suited to this purpose? In its fullness, nowhere so truly as in our own movement.

We believe, in general, that what society needs is not charity, but justice, and to this end we would institute a scientific study of human conditions. Whence shall come the impulse to such work as this? Largely from the ranks of reform, but each reform speaks only for a class. Ours is the inheritance, ours the task, which points to the elevation of all humanity, through the spread of knowledge and equity.

In a word, we believe this world can be made a paradise by concentrating human study and enterprise upon its history, conditions, and possibilities; and the only movement, so far as we know, which makes this its first and unqualified aim, is that represented by the organizations bearing the name of Free Religion.

I take it for granted, therefore, that we mean business in coming here, and that the mainspring of our action is this faith in the efficacy of our philosophy of things. You do not contribute of your presence and means merely for the sake of contributing. I do not come here merely to earn a living. If that were all I would lay down my commission this hour, and you would adjourn and abandon your work. That we have not done so, that we do not propose to do so, is because we believe we have something to say which needs to be said, and an influence to exert which needs to be exerted. We have a mission. We believe in it. To some of us it is an inspiration. It is too good to die for. It is sublime enough to live for and labor for.

Well, if this be the case, it is the common sense course, as it seems to me, for those of us connected with this great religious growth, whether locally, or nationally, or both, to ask ourselves wherein, if in anything, is it weak and what can be done to strengthen it. I think we have some of the weaknesses which always attend protesting movements. Not too strong intellectually, our work is perhaps too exclusively intellectual. Not too strong individually, it is perhaps too exclusively individual. The tendency among all Radicals to worship the naked truth has been at once their strength and their weakness. It has sometimes amounted to asceticism. As in the name of Religion the old Brahmins mutilated themselves; as the life of the monk has been a species of martyrdom; so we—and by we I mean our movement everywhere—have seemed to glory in the sacrifice of the esthetic sense. I do not think, as some do, that we are beyond reform in this respect, if I did I would not take your time to talk about it now, but I feel, and feel strongly, as the era of protesting gradually goes out and the era of constructive work begins, that we may naturally invite, ought logically to invite, the cooperation of the beautiful and poetic in all their forms. Just how this is to be done is of course the question, and I bring it to you at this time, not so much to state my own individual needs, or to ask you to listen with a view to your needs, as for the purpose of considering with you the larger requirements of our movement and what we may do to promote its efficiency.

To state the point differently, the church in the past has represented the deepest, highest, holiest longings of the human soul. In the course of time it fell behind in thought and the come-outer became a necessary factor of progress. The real questions which I am trying now to discuss are: first, has human nature so far changed that it no longer possesses those elements to which the church-service appealed, and those wants which the church organization supplied, or is something else to take the place of the church in ministering to them; and, second, if something else is to take its place, is it to be evolved from the church itself or from societies like ours, entirely outside ecclesiastical lines.

Now in my judgment, the forms of the church were originally an expression of the faith of its devotees; and the reason why we reject them to-day—those of us who do intelligently reject them—is because they do not hold the same relation to us which they held to our fathers—they are not a natural expression of our faith. But
we are still human. We have the sense of beauty, we have reverence, we have the same virtues which our ancestors had, and we have the same necessity for expressing ourselves—what to us is deepest and true—in forms of beauty and aspiration. Worship is not to be abolished; forms of worship are not to be unknown in the future. Our problem is to find forms which shall be helpful to us. There must be the relation of cause and effect between faith and worship, else the worship is a pretence and a sham. I know there are some of us who would like to eliminate from our service here everything but the discourse. To such this question will not seem so vital as it does to me. To my mind, in its broadest significance it is one phase of the question whether we can be satisfied in our deepest, innermost experiences with attending, from Sunday to Sunday, an intellectual entertainment as spectators and listeners, or are ourselves a vital part of what we deem a vital thing.

At the Episcopal Congress in this city two years ago, the audience joined with those on the platform in music and responsive readings. The words were not an expression of our faith, but they were in the main the expression of the faith of those who used them, and added, as it seemed to me, very greatly to the value of the sessions. I confess I should enjoy our National Conventions more if we could recognize in them something besides brains. With rare exceptions, I believe Free Religious people, if they could only for a moment lose sight of their early prejudices and could find hymns and readings to delight their souls, would consider them a great addition to the effectiveness of their religious gatherings. The truth is, we are in a transitional stage in this matter. The poetry of our movement is exceedingly limited, for the most part it has not yet been written. But it will be written and it will be sung. I appreciate as fully as any one can, that not less than half the hymns we sing contain words, if not phrases, mentally objectionable. We have to accept them for their general spirit rather than for what they say. But I have also noticed that occasionally when the discourse has won your hearts, and the closing hymn takes up the strain, the very opportunity to express ourselves in unison seems to help us to a more perfect unity. I expect I am a good deal of a Methodist in spirit, for somehow it does seem to me that about the easiest way to bliss is to sing myself there. Of course we may spoil it all by being too critical. There must be some yielding to the mood of the hour. My ideal singing for religious purposes would be a trained congregation, using hymns written to express radical faith, and set to music fitted to the sentiment of the poetry. I think we feel the need of both music and poetry. I am quite sure the church of the future will have both.

So in regard to a responsive service—we do not like such things now because we associate them with the sentiments of Christian Theology, which, in the church, such services have always expressed. But what is a responsive service? Simply one in which the minister or leader reads a sentence or paragraph and then the congregation reads or the choir sings another. It seems to me that it depends entirely upon how the service is made up whether it is harmful or advantageous. Of course for our use all theology would necessarily be excluded from our selections, and we should be limited by neither sect nor system in choosing them. Now what is more desirable than that we should become familiar with the fine sentiments of the different religions of the world? And what better way of becoming thus familiar than by reading choice bits from them each Sunday. Such services, although not already in existence, could be prepared easily from books like Mrs. Child's *Aspirations of the World*, Conway's *Sacred Anthology*, Stebbins' Bible of the Ages, and Mill's Gems of the Orient. Once in use, they would serve to keep our principles constantly in our own minds and in the minds of strangers. They would be a constant exemplification of the spirit of Universal Religion. Nor need we stop with the recognized bibles. We should find much to draw upon in the great dramatic genius, who wrote:

"To thine ownself be true,
And it must follow as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man."

We should want to keep frequent company with the poet who lost his eyes in liberty's defence and sang:

"They also serve who only stand and wait."

Gleaning our harvest of precious thoughts through all ages and countries, we should not omit our own age and land.

"The saving of the world
Is in its nameless saints.
Each separate star Seems nothing; but a myriad scattered stars
Break up the night and make it beautiful."

That is worthy of any sacred book, if it did spring from the land of William Penn in this 19th century. And never in Christian or any other scripture was found more fitting benediction, than this from the lips of a Massachusetts bard:

"Pure love doth ever elevate
Into a holy bond of brotherhood
All earthly things, making them pure and good."

I am sure we should be surprised to find what a flood of inspiration is coming in upon us in all directions, if we would only open our minds and hearts to its influence. The world has always been full of prophets. It is full of prophets still. They speak to us in the prose, the poetry, the music of all peoples. We have only to use these sympathetically, and they will be our more than willing allies, often going where the discourse will not go.

Wm. C. Gannett, to whom you used to listen often, and always gladly', says "To hear a sermon is the small part of church-going. To make the service beautiful, first by friendship and second by the earnest grace of all that the people say and do together, that is what makes the Sunday meeting dear and helpful. The people at worship, that is what moves." You may say in reply to this that Mr. Gannett is too exclusively a poet. Grant it without argument, if you please, still does it not remain true that there is much wisdom in what he says? You and I have so accustomed ourselves to think of the appeal from the desk as the only thing, that I fear we are in danger of underestimating the other and just as legitimate influences of religious association. I am quite sure that these other things—especially this element of doing things together—would win to our side some, young and old, whom we do not now see. It is hard to say anything satisfactory about these fine influences of lofty sentiments, of poetry and of music, because they are of a nature which can only be appreciated when felt. But unless I am greatly mistaken, those who have had this experience will regard them as an essential part of the worship of the future. Futhermore, I believe we are quite as likely to grow into this kind of worship as the most liberal of the churches are to grow out of their theological bias. Be that as it may, whichever overcomes its defects soonest, whichever marries first the universal, the natural, and the practical to the reverent, the aspiring, the refining, will thereby constitute the coming church, and will deserve radical sympathy and cooperation. Ruskin says: "Ideas of beauty are among the noblest which can be presented to the human mind, invariably exalting and purifying it according to their degree." It is just this exaltation and purification of the human mind that religion seeks. Certainly she is wise in selecting the beauty of art in all its forms as her handmaid in this most sublime of tasks.

But this lack of recognition of the sense of beauty is not the only danger to Radicalism. I incline to think that its dislike of organization is carried to an extreme which amounts to weakness. Not a few are opposed to even what little of organic life we have here. It does not seem to me that what we have is very excessive. We may well ask ourselves if we are organized enough to show any permanently large development of the coöperative spirit. In direct connection with Mr. Gannett's church in St. Paul, there are upwards of twenty committees, each of which has something to do. In addition to the Board of Trustees and usual Finance Committee, there is the Committee of the church Temperance Society, the Social, Hospitality, Discussion, Dramatic and Music Committees of the church Unity Club, and so on,—I will not stop to mention them all. Of course anything so extensive as this would be inconsistent with our eastern ideas and conditions. I have never advocated it and do not advocate it now. But on the other hand, is not this true—that with us, naturally enough and without any fault on our part, the tendency in a marked degree is to hold aloof from so much of direction as may be necessary, and to leave everything to be done by a few. I speak not particularly of our own society, but of our entire movement. If what I say be true it is a very serious defect. I confess it is among my hopes for the future that we shall be able here in our own little company to introduce more of the methods of cooperation. I feel that it is one of my own delinquencies that we have not today in some way connected with our work more that engages general participation. For example, among the committees which we might organize to very great advantage, I should mention one on Hospitality. Members of such a committee would need great wisdom, perhaps you will say. Quite likely. The thing may be overdone,—so much so as to interfere with personal freedom. But what we ought to do at our Sunday meetings, what we ought to do at our Socials, is to become acquainted with each other. Friends can greet friends, but that is not enough. The stranger, without being rendered uncomfortable, should be made to feel that he is taken into our sympathies, and welcomed to our fellowship. Personally, I feel such a welcome for everybody, and have, so far as I could reach people, tried to
express it, but it is physically impossible for any one person to do the work as it needs to be done, and I doubt not that such a committee, constituted in the right spirit, would prove an exceedingly beneficial thing. A committee on Sunday School work, more committees, and such as we have larger in numbers, for our Socials, might under some circumstances be advisable. Of course I understand as you do that these cannot come artificially and be of and value; that to be effective they must be a natural growth. It is that natural growth which I think we should try to cultivate,—the lack of which in our movement, locally and nationally, is certainly a radical defect.

Another work of unquestionable wisdom, as it seems to me, in a religious society, is the fostering of an interest in those who fall from the ranks through poverty or sickness, or other and worse misfortune. Should we not know the facts about such, that we may always be able to act advisedly as each case may require? I saw the other day an intelligent gentleman, one of the early, I think original, members of our Society. He is now an inmate of a charitable institution, one side entirely paralysed, so that he cannot move about; but his head is still clear, and his interest in all that pertains to Free Religion is still strong. It is a hard thing for such a person to be dependent upon friends for the satisfaction alike of his physical and spiritual hunger. And the point to which I now wish to call your attention is that he has spiritual hunger. He yearns for contact with radical minds, and wants to see all that he can obtain of radical literature. I have been thinking what a sweet and natural charity it would be for us to constitute a Committee of Fellowship to look after such cases, to call upon them, keep us posted as to their condition and needs, and to be the means of communicating to them our sympathy and practical help.

I heard a few nights since, concerning one who has recently passed from this life, and who did not always while here preserve a manly self-control, that when asked within a year why he did not attend our meetings he replied, because he was afraid he should disgrace us. I would have liked so much an opportunity to have said to that man, that however much he might stumble, so long as he was struggling for a better, I should have esteemed his company an honor, and that our society, so far from being ashamed of him, ought to sympathize with him and strengthen him in his efforts, and I believed on a clear understanding of the case would do so. But I never heard of his former connection with us until he was in his grave; probably many of you do not know of whom I am speaking now. When such cases come to my attention I confess I feel self-condemned, I think we may well feel self-condemned, all of us, that we have not shown more of the spirit of brotherly sympathy and love. A word, a handshake, a sign of interest from us, might in some instances be worth more to one of our own way of thinking than any professional charity or reform could be. Ought we not to think of this defect on our part, if such it be, and see that it does not exist in the future? I think so. I feel quite sure when your attention is once called to the matter you will think so too.

Then there is always the question of practical work for the world at large. I have no sympathy whatever with Professor Adler's idea that religion is nothing but practical work, or that practical work is the major part of religion. I should think it the defeat of the Free Religious Movement if it were turned into an association for the purpose of doing even so good a thing as building free kindergartens and working-men's schools; but nevertheless I do hold that a practical interest in all movements tending to improve human life, here and now, is a vital part of religion; that the disposition to watch such movements, and help them on when practicable, is a vital part of religion. If the time should ever come when we could conduct in some way, an industrial education class or classes, or when we could exert an influence, a direct influence, upon and in behalf of homeless children and fallen women, I shall esteem it a good thing for them, and a far better thing for ourselves. A Committee on Practical Reform, whose business it should be to visit once a year all our private and public charitable and correctional institutions, to post themselves as to the conditions of life in the degraded localities of our city, to note their observations in these and other similar respects and report the same to us, would at least be an inexpensive and a practical manifestation of religious life.

You will have concluded by this time, friends, that I think the ideal religious society quite an institution. In this you will not be mistaken. I do not say that it will always and everywhere do just what I have mentioned. I have not suggested these points now with a view to urging you to adopt them. They are worse than nothing, let me say again, if they be not the natural outgrowth of the spirit. Neither would I be understood as reflecting in the least upon your past or present scope as an organization. We are quite like the whole movement, of which we form a part. It is because I believe so much in that, and in our own efforts here as a worthy phase of it, that I would fain see both laying a broader foundation for future success and taking a more exalted view of their own high mission.

Personally, then, I reach these conclusions:

First—To associate for the highest and holiest purposes they know, has ever been natural to mankind.
Second—In its day the church of the past was the representative of, and leader in, this tendency.
Third—The instinct of association in human nature has not changed, but the fundamental objects for which men associate have changed.
Fourth—Therefore, while the old institutions will not serve the new objects, the necessity for some organization that will serve them still remains.

Fifth—Such organization must embody the Universal, Natural, Practical principles we represent in the abstract, with the worshipful spirit and the disposition to cooperative effort which, at its best, the church represents.

Sixth—Our movement is quite as likely to grow into worship and cooperation, as the church is to grow out of its emphasis of the special, the artificial, and the speculative.

Seventh—Whichever overcomes its fundamental defects first, will constitute the church of the future. And

Eighth—In the interest of true religion our first duty is to strive to overcome the defects which lie at our own doors, the lack of appeal to the beautiful in Art, Literature, and Music, and of practical realization of cooperative religious life.

Perhaps, friends, no periods of our lives are so productive of good as those in which they are subjected to rigid self-examination. I rejoice that we can so subject our united life here. I rejoice that in searching for the truth, as best we may, we expect to be at least as frank in speaking of our own faults as we are in speaking of the faults of others. If there is any truth in what has been said to-day, may it sink deep into our hearts. May it incite us to new energy in devoting our best efforts to the building of the Church Universal, Natural, and Practical; within whose walls the worship of thought, love, and aspiration shall combine; from whose companionship shall flow a stream of sweet charity and practical justice to bless and to redeem the world.

April 2, 1883.
By Frederic A. Hinckley,
Minister of the Free Religious Society, Providence, R. I.
Published Fortnightly. Price, $1 for Series, or ten cts. single copy.

A Divine Man.

The world has been looking through all the ages for a [unclear: divi] man. It sought him first in special providences and [unclear: miracl] It predicted, it prayed for, the coming of Eastern Saint [unclear: a] Judean Saviour. But somehow neither has seemed to satisfy Neither has enabled it to find the truth and the way, and [unclear: so] last it has set to work in dead earnest to create by its own [unclear: e] eritions, that which the gods have not granted. It has at thrown off the old superstitions, and experienced a [unclear: Religi] whose creed is simply and forever the sacredness of the [unclear: indivi] soul.

It has not reached this sublime faith in a moment, it does not always act upon it now, but from out the struggles and [unclear: t] martyrdoms of the past it has come with its face Zionward [unclear: :] journey's from now on, sometimes with hesitating and [unclear: reluct] steps, but nevertheless up and on, toward the light of day. [unclear: If] not long, taking into consideration only the known history of [unclear: t] human race, since man was held to be the victim of strange [unclear: a] diabolical powers. In the night of ignorance [unclear: everywhere] brooding over the earth, the prophets of the times, the [unclear: scholl] of the times, made some very serious mistakes. As an [unclear: exam] of these errors, Mr. Lecky, in his Rise and Influence of the [unclear: Spi] of nationalism in Europe, speaking of Magic and [unclear: Witchera]; quotes one of the ablest writers of the thirteenth century, saying that diseases and tempests are the direct acts of [unclear: t] devil; that the devil can transport men at his pleasure [unclear: throu] the air; and can transform them into any shape. Such [unclear: lif] seems to us to-day at once ridiculous and barbarous, but [unclear: he] record shows that it was entertained, not only by the weak id ignorant, but by the able minds of that era. It is [unclear: impossi] to conceive of the number of lives sacrificed for the supposed [unclear: n] of witchcraft. For more than fifteen hundred years this [unclear: fision] was considered a fact established on Bible authority, [unclear: urin] the Inquisition multitudes of victims perished in agony id torment. In Germany and France, in England and [unclear: Scotnd], in Italy and Sweden, there was a continual harvest of [unclear: lood]. Here we find a judge boasting that he has put to death [unclear: ght] hundred witches in sixteen years; there a priest exerting [unclear: l] his influence to multiply the victims. Luther, at the head of [unclear: c] Reformation said, "I would have no compassion on these [unclear: itches;] I would burn them all! "And several persons in assachusetts were condemned and executed, and many more [unclear: town] into prison, as late as 1692, on charges of entering lambers through key-holes, and pricking and pinching women id children until the air was full of their shrieking and bewail[unclear: g], though the tormentors were nowhere to be seen.

How did it come about that people were so marvelously edulous and so easily and basely deceived. Mr. Lecky finds [unclear: c] explanation in the mental limitations of the times. "The [unclear: uth] is," he says,
"that in those ages, ability was no guarantee [unclear: ainst] error, because the single employment of the reason was develop and expand premises that were furnished by the [unclear: urch]. There was no such thing as an uncompromising and [unclear: reserved] criticism of the first principles of teaching; there [unclear: is] no such thing as a revolt of the reason against conclusions [unclear: at] were strictly drawn from the premises of authority." That is the unmitigated tyranny of Rome, no small portion of the [unclear: rit] of which, in some things, Protestantism inherited. While [unclear: ch] conditions remained, it was simply impossible for any [unclear: wer], known or unknown, to find the man for whom humanity [unclear: is] longing. To pass from Rome to Reason, from the spirit of [unclear: thority] to complete individual freedom, that was the task to accomplished before the divine being sought should come.

How little the nature of that struggle has been realized [unclear: unit:] these modern times, and bow little in all its significance [unclear: v] realize [unclear: un] it now ! At first the individual was of no account. [unclear: H] had no disposition to demand rights. He had no reason expect mercy. His interests were not worth considering, [unclear: a] he himself was more than willing to be a sacrifice to the [unclear: tyrant] of kingly and priestly power, as the devout worshipers of [unclear: Jul] gernaut are said to have thrown themselves upon the ground be crushed by the wheels of his moving tower. Later on, [unclear: son!] consideration was paid him as a mere animal. Finally an [unclear: effort] was made to conciliate him, to conquer him through [unclear: diplomacy] by force of brains instead of force of arms. The motto of [unclear: rule] found expression in the words of Richelieu: "Use all means [unclear: l] persuade; failing of that to crush." And now it has [unclear: bee] hinted in this nineteenth century that each individual [unclear: shou] stand on the pedestal of his own independence, summon [unclear: at] things without exception to the bar of his reason, take [unclear: Tru] for his authority, and no authority whatsoever for Truth. It the glory of these times that the thinking world accepts [unclear: th] latter position as its ideal, though it is still far from realizing if It is true that no tyranny asserts itself as boldly now as [unclear: i] past times; we do not believe in witches—if we did we [unclear: probably] should not hang them; but there are certain [unclear: manifestation] of public opinion which still exercise an iron sway over [unclear: ma] kind, still retard the growth of a high order of manhood [unclear: an] womanhood. Nor are these manifestations less dangerous [unclear: b] cause exceedingly subtle and plausible. How many [unclear: custom] live now, precisely as witchcraft did, because certain [unclear: premise] are given to man which he is not to question, or—what [unclear: amount] to the same thing—which he does not question. I do not [unclear: sa] the exercise of his reason on any given subject is absolutely [unclear: prohibited:] I do not say he deliberately abdicates its exercise; [unclear: t] real difficulty is, that it does not occur to him to exercise it. [unclear: H] acquiesces, accepts, as he would say, a thousand things [unclear: witho] ever submitting them to the mental faculty, and becomes a [unclear: me] machine without knowing it. Hence it has been repeatedly [unclear: sa] [unclear: ith] perfect truth, that if people can only be made to think for [unclear: emselves] the whole battle is won. So important is this [unclear: ele] ent in the make-up of character. Thought means a healthy [unclear: If-assertion]; to stifle thought is to crush the individual; to [unclear: ush] the individual is to overthrow society and undermine civilization. We look back through history and say Louis XVI. was [unclear: tyrant]. The African slave-trade, American slavery, Russian [unclear: rdom],—these were all forms of tyranny. And we say truly, [unclear: t] we must not think, because these have been abolished, that [unclear: e] highway to unfettered progress is cleared. There are some [unclear: gers] to a sound individualism which lie very near our own [unclear: rs].

One of the most threatening of these is a frequent oppressive perverting influence in our homes. To call a child into the [unclear: orld], and to superintend its early growth, is one of the greatest [unclear: ivileges] of this life. So great a privilege is it, that it is only [unclear: operly] exercised by those who truly love. But the privilege [unclear: not] one whit greater than the responsibility. The parent is [unclear: t] the owner of the child as he may own a house, or a [unclear: jack-jifc], but he is its guide and helper through the formative [unclear: riol] of its career. He has no right to compel it to grow other-[unclear: ise] than nature inclines it—he cannot do that if he tries; [unclear: ithar] has he any right to leave it to grow up by itself, as Topsy [unclear: d]. It is his business, the most vital and sacred business he [unclear: n] have on hand, to study the character which he is to [unclear: assist] unfolding, and to impress, in natural and legitimate ways, his [unclear: n] best self upon it. Not by direct acts so much as by the [unclear: stable] influence of pure motive and unselfish living. It is the [unclear: d] barbaric idea that physical force is the most potent power. [unclear: ou] shall and you must, are its offspring, but the wise parent and [unclear: acher] knows perfectly well that in the long run these are the [unclear: eakest] of masters. He knows that they would often be absolutely superfluous, if there had existed at the very foundation of [unclear: e] family, and been maintained through all its history, a profound [unclear: d] childlike reverence for the individual. By that I do not [unclear: ean] the let-alone indifference which so often exists between fathers and mothers, and must be seen and felt by their sons and daughters. That is the lowest form of individualism, and unworthy the name it bears. What I mean is such an intimate acquaintance between husband and wife, between parents and children, as shall lead to knowledge of and respect for, all individual
characteristics, and an intelligent cooperation in assisting their growth. Such knowledge and such cooperation are the foundation stones of a successful home, and it would seem as if they ought not to be hard to find. Depend upon it, my friend, if you think the members of your family ought to grow just as you want them to, and you feel dissatisfied because they do not meet your expectations in this respect,—depend upon it the trouble is not with them, it is with you. Why should you not rejoice in every strong trait of character they develop, and make yourself its friend? How strange it seems that men who will do almost anything and everything just because they feel inclined to, will frequently make themselves the embodiments of the concentrated prohibition of all time in the presence of their wives, who want to think just as they are inclined to, and to put their thoughts into deeds just as they are inclined to. Freedom for bad habits, for doubtful practices, for general license; prohibition of individual growth, that is about what it amounts to in many such cases. The greatness of all true philosophy of living lies in this respect for the individual; and the place of all others where it should exist, and should be most carefully cultivated, if it does not already exist, is the home. When all parents hold such a fine and exalted relation with each other, when together they hold such a fine and exalted relation with their children, the nursery for the Divine Man will have been constructed. Born into its atmosphere, his home influence will be such as to lift him towards the stars. In that

"Mingling of affection
Where one can tell
Another all his mind,"

a heart that has no guile will grow until it shall be impossible to tell where the human ends and the divine begins.

But the Divine Man not only needs a nursery, he needs a school. Because he is not to come of miraculous conception, [unclear: he] is not to jump into the arena of life a perfect being—that [unclear: allacy] is exploded now. He is to be a product of natural laws. His career is to be an evolution. So we find the thinking world to-day looking about for an education fit to go with the nursery we have pictured, and to carry on the work which it begins. And it does not find it in our present appliances. All thoughtful people are the friends of our public school system, they [unclear: are] glad to have it with us even as it is, but they are profoundly [unclear: anxious] that it should evolve into something more adequate to [unclear: human] needs. It is hardly necessary to argue the point that [unclear: the] human stomach is not simply a cavity into which, at [unclear: stated] times, a given amount of food should be emptied. Everybody [unclear: nows] something of the laws of digestion. Everybody knows [unclear: that] food should be properly selected, varied with the tastes and [unclear: eats] of the individual, and taken at proper times and in proper [unclear: quantities]; the ultimate end being not to fill an empty vessel, [unclear: but] to absorb into the blood and to convert into bone and tissue [unclear: what] is eaten. This is the way in which the body lives and [unclear: grows]. Now supposing intellectual education to be all that [unclear: needs] attention at the hands of the state, the great fault of our [unclear: public] school is that it treats the mind, an infinitely more complex and subtle organ than the stomach, as if all it needed was [unclear: to] be filled up. A diet has been prescribed, suited or supposed [unclear: to be] suited to all, as if all minds were built after the same [unclear: model], possessed the same tendencies, and worked by the same [unclear: methods]. But intellectual education is not all that is needed. [unclear: Why] the process of development which goes on in the nursery, [unclear: and] the results of which are all needed in adult life, should not [unclear: be] ministered to in its entirety in the public school, it is a little [unclear: difficult] to understand. And the tendency now, in searching [unclear: for] a system which shall produce a divine man by natural processes, is to emphasize some of the features which have been [unclear: itted]. A complete human being, and that is and must allays be our ideal, a complete human being needs an educated conscience and educated hands, just as much as he needs an educated mind; and he needs also a harmonious development of these different organs. I need not at this late day catalogue the deficiencies in our educational work concerning these. I simply refer to them in general terms now, that I may point out the reason for their existence and suggest the way in which they are to be removed. The present scope and methods of popular education are not the outgrowth of study of, and respect for, the individual. They are the result of an attempt to deal with men in the mass. It has been the need of society and the need of the state, rather than the need of the man, which has been uppermost in our educational philosophy. The safety of society requires that all men should know how to read, how to write, how to cipher, therefore society, through its representative, the state, must see that all men are taught reading, writing, and arithmetic. But under the new inspiration society has discovered that its safety requires that every individual shall know the difference between right and wrong, and shall know how to earn an honest living, quite as clearly as it requires that he shall know how to read the Bible, write his name, and add a column of dollars and cents. In other words, the natural logic of events has carried us from the contemplation of
the masses to the contemplation of the individual, and to-day we are trying, wisely trying, to focus all our educational glasses upon him. Under the lead of such thinkers as Pestalozzi and Froebel, the world is gradually putting itself at school to the children, as the only sure method of learning how to treat a growing mind. Now what has this study of the child-nature already shown? In my judgment several things, but nothing more plainly than this—that the power of observation and the desire to do are among the very earliest facts of its evolution. The child, the mere baby, uses its eyes and hands, long before it shows any hunger for the alphabet or the multiplication table. I affirm without any hesitation that, as a rule, children from three to twelve years of age can be given, with infinite advantage, elemen-tary instruction in Natural History and Industrial Occupation. Aye, more than that, if they have an opportunity they will surely suggest in some way to a thoughtful mind that this is what they specially need. I defy any one to produce a boy who, when he picks up a kitten by the tail, will not be interested to learn about its backbone. I have yet to see the child who is not pleased to learn for the first time that the lion is a big cat; that the monkey has no feet but is the fortunate possessor of four hands; that his little dog is a quadruped because it has four feet, and he himself is a biped because he has two. Go with me into any Kindergarten and I will show you children, three, four, five years of age, so happy in sewing or pricking, in folding or cutting papers, or in moulding little clay balls and cubes, that you will mistakenly call it only aimless play. Well, what do such facts as these mean? They are the promulgation to our minds of the Almighty Laws of human evolution, if we can only see and grasp them. Education, they say, is not a getting from without; it is a growth from within. If your boy shows a taste for the use of tools, buy him an amateur tool-chest in precisely the same spirit that you would buy him a mental arithmetic or a geographical reader. If your girl has a keen eye for form and a disposition to make mud and snow huts, give her an opportunity to work in clay or plaster in precisely the same spirit that you buy her a spelling-book and secure for her a music teacher. And above all things else, make the lives of both a miniature world in which Practical Ethics may be taught as easily and naturally as the flowers blossom and the birds sing. In a word, do not say beforehand just what every child shall have, do not measure out so many quarts of arithmetic and so many yards of spelling for each; but study each individual case and help each to develop, according to the laws of its own being, into spherical beauty and wholeness. Each child has the power to see, the power to do, the power to think. Education means enabling him to see correctly, to do wisely, to think freely and independently. And the system which does not thus adapt itself to the development of the child in its natural way; which does not aim at evolution instead of involution, is weak at the very foundations, and sure to result in an unsymmetrical product. There is a time for everything good, there is a place for everything good in education. If we study human character and respect the individual, we shall learn when that time and that place are; and so shall be able at length to construct an educational system capable of doing its part toward the making of A Divine Man.

But evolution does not run in streaks. It includes all facts. The process has no beginning of which we may be certain. We cannot say that it ever has reached, or ever will reach an end. So the growth from the worthlessness to the sacredness of the individual goes on, not only in the nursery and the school, but in the whole of life, which is, after all, but a larger nursery and a larger school. As might be expected, the child who has not enjoyed an atmosphere of complete individual freedom, grows up a conformist. He respects a great many things more than he respects his own thought. Indeed, the foundations of his character are so weak, that, as already suggested, it does not occur to him to have any thought which can justly be called his own. Hence we get four dangerous and often unrecognized forms of authority; each of which is a constant menace to strong character. I refer to the power of social custom, the power of the church, the power of the press, and the power of the state. These are all, in a sense, forms of what we may call the tyranny of the majority. I do not say they are unmitigated evils and ought to be abolished. I am not an anarchist But I say they all exert certain subtle influences which must be recognized and largely overcome, before we can have a race of self-reliant men.

Of the customs of society, it may be said, that no one is obliged to conform to them; that to be out of the fashion is not to invite the penalty of the law. But we must remember that public opinion is law in this country, and to withstand that is a difficult task. How many of the forgeries, the thefts, the irregularities, among otherwise upright citizens, are due to an attempt to conform to a condition of society beyond their means. How often a social standard is set—as rigorously as if enacted into law—to be below which costs something, to be above which is a passport to the esteem of one’s fellows. The difficulty is not so much in dishonesty, as in a universal lack of respect for the individual in all that makes him most a man. He does not respect himself so much as he respects the opinions of others. Others do not respect him as they respect the combined influence of the majority. All this tends to confirm that apish conformity which early training has encouraged. Everybody wants to have something like everybody else. Everybody wants to be like everybody else. This creates, in time, not only a fashion in clothes and food and dwellings, but a fashion in reading and study. I have heard it said of Carlyle that if he would only have used common language it would have been so much the pleasanter to read him, and his work in the world would have been so much the greater. I think there is a fallacy in this criticism. Carlyle's style was his own. To have compelled him to write in the majestic simplicity of Emerson, would have
been to infringe upon his individuality, and consequently to rob him of half his power. We must respect the individual. We must throw off this nightmare of conformity. Mill says, "Where not the persons own character, but the traditions or customs of other people are the rule of conduct, there is wanting one of the principal ingredients of human happiness, and quite the chief ingredient of individual and social progress." This is the danger incurred in subordinating the individual to the crowd, and in substituting artificial for natural relations. The great evil of protection is that it begets in the protector an overbearing disposition, and in the protected a servile disposition. Alms-giving encourages dependence. Justice helps to opportunities for self-maintenance, and so promotes self-reliance. It matters little to what phase of social life we turn,—to the centre of fashion, to the private club, to the public charity, to the radical re-form, the first thing to be done is not to win public esteem, not to provide places for paupers, not to count votes,—it is to call out individual characteristics, and to strengthen the springs of individual thought and action. At a time when Senator Sum-ner was subjected to rebukes from many quarters for his public attitude on certain questions, Mr. Emerson wrote him, "Your course is particularly admirable, because self-appointed and self-sustained." It seems to me that nothing is so much needed at this hour as that we should all learn to see with our own eyes, to do with our own hands, and to think with our own minds.

This self-reliance is also needed in Religion. The number of people who do not question the authority of the church is still by no means small. They get up Sunday morning, they answer the summons of the bell, they take their accustomed seats, they repeat the creed, they listen to the discourse, and scarcely think for a moment of the belief to which they are formally assenting. So tremendous has been the authority of the church, that even now many of its devotees accept without thought the premises it furnishes. The children are taught in Sunday schools of the existence and character of God as a thing to be taken on trust; theological views are instilled into their minds concerning immortality and the mission of Jesus; the origin, nature, and des-tiny of man are treated as things about which there is no difference of opinion; and so the young grow up in a sort of tacit acceptance of the doctrines of the church, without for once being taught to reason about them, as they may about what are regarded as purely secular things. As they become old enough to enter the church itself, the attitude of the ministry helps to confirm this early teaching, for there is scarcely a pulpit,—the exceptions are only enough to prove the rule,—there is scarcely a pulpit where there is not a line of limitation drawn. The existence of the Roman Catholic Church depends upon the sup-pressure of free thought. The existence of a large portion of the Protestant Church depends upon limiting thought by the boundary lines of its creeds. The word of the one to the individual is, do not think at all about these things. The word of the other is, think freely up to this point, but stop here. So, if the truth is told, you find the great majority of people who attend church to-day pretending to hold opinions which have been emptied into their minds, but which never have undergone, and never will undergo, any process of intellectual absorption and assimilation. That, you see, in one of the most important of all spheres of thought is taking Authority for Truth, instead of Truth for Authority.

So in relation to the Press, one of the most powerful of forces, perhaps the most powerful force in public life to day. It is not like a book made up upon some one line of thought. It aims to furnish in its way what all the people want, and at the earliest possible moment. These two characteristics, multiplicity of subjects and speed in treatment of them, tend to make the work of the newspaper as a thinking power superficial, extremely so. And yet thousands of people, consciously or unconsciously, allow the editor, with his party bias, or his church bias, or his social bias, to do their thinking for them. I state what every one who has studied the matter knows, when I say that more than almost any other agency in existence, the value of the press depends upon the ability of its individual readers to judge critically of the reasonableness of its reports and the soundness of its opinions.

And finally, the State itself, while claiming with us to represent the people, may hold a relation to the individual citizen which is essentially one of tyranny. That is what the constant discussion of the character and limitation of human government, so largely participated in by some of the ablest minds of all ages, means. With us, students of political institutions have long been interested to discover some wise method of minority representation, with a view to perfecting the representative basis of our political structure. Spencer and others have remarked, that while in this country we boast of our great individual liberty, there is really no more despotic power on earth than the tyranny of the majority may sometimes be. "The freest form of government," says Mr. Spencer, in Social Statics, "is only the least objectionable form. The rule of the many by the few, we call tyranny; the rule of the few by the many is tyranny also. You shall do as we will, and not as you will, is in either case the declaration; and if the hundred make it to the ninety-nine, instead of the ninety-nine to the hundred, it is only a fraction less immoral." This observation of Mr. Spencer is a radical, and I think, rightly understood, a profound one. It indicates the necessity for reducing the amount of legislation, and the number of subjects legislated upon, to the minimum. It is an expression of the ever growing conviction that, as a whole, the powers of government need to be very much lessened.

Still there is danger of misunderstanding in this argument, against which I would like to guard myself. Many people know no difference between criticising a thing and condemning it. If there are those who think
our public schools, our social life, our churches, our newspapers, our government, doubtful blessings, I am not of them. My only aim is to claim that in the last analysis the unit of measure which cannot be divided is the individual. And that all institutions are worthy just in proportion as they minister to the highest development of the individual. As between him and the eternities nothing can interfere. Neither "law, nor constitution is final—Truth alone is final. In its service Man is more than Constitutions, and owes a higher than human allegiance." As Ruskin says, the essence of Light is in his eyes, the centre of Force in his soul,—the pertinence of Action in his deeds.

Perhaps all I have tried to express may be summed up in the thought that man is the slave of his environment, and always will be so long as he is only half-equipped to meet its conditions and overcome them. To send him forth, then, to the struggles of life fully armed,—physical, mentally, morally,—that should be the aim of home, of school, of all social and political forms.

Having finished our chase after mediators, we now turn our attention to the more heavenly work of studying the relative influences of heredity, and circumstances, and in trying to control both for the highest good. In the mean time, the world moves nearer to its ideal, exclaiming more earnestly than ever,

"Give me that man
Who is not passion's slave and I will wear him
In my heart's core."

At length the new Messiah appears. "He asks heaven for the day's business, worships when he transacts it nobly," and climbs to the Eternal on the ladder of his aspirations. We wonder where he has been so long, as we see him multiplied into a million hearts, and rejoice that neither in old India nor old Judea, but right here in new America, amid conditions of larger truthfulness, purity, and love, the hour and the man have come.
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A Divine Humanity.

The dream of a whole or divine humanity is the equal partner of the dream of a whole or divine man. Both are [unclear: god] Like ideals, though neither is complete without the other. [unclear: Together] they cover the sphere of Truth. The sacredness of [unclear: the] individual implies ultimately the unity of the human race, [unclear: and] the doctrine of the survival of the fittest will always be [unclear: obnoxious] until it is seen that every individual has something in him which is fit to survive. From Kant, who could say; "Two [unclear: things] fill me with perpetual awe, the moral law and the starry heavens," [unclear: to] the idiot, who knows nothing of law, and perhaps receives no impression from a star, is a long distance. From Guiteau [unclear: to] Garfield, from Wilkes Booth to Lincoln, from Judas to [unclear: Jesus], what mental and moral gulfs! Vile assassins, say we of [unclear: the] one class. Benefactors of mankind, of the other. And [unclear: in] course of time we condemn the one to everlasting infamy, [unclear: even] as we raise the other to everlasting glory. But how [unclear: superficial] all our judgments are, how little we can probe to the [unclear: depths] human motives. We feel a relationship with the great [unclear: and] good. They touch the finer chords of our natures, and what [unclear: is] noble in us responds to their nobility. Are [unclear: we] quite sure we do not hold as intimate a relation with the evil and [unclear: unfortunate] ones? The worst man who ever trod this earth was not [unclear: less] than a man; the best man who ever won our admiration [unclear: was] not more than a man. What infinite gradations between [unclear: the] two! It may be easy to gauge the extremes, but who is [unclear: wise] enough to detect the line which separates the one from the [unclear: other]?

In its effort to find that, theology has made itself ridiculous. It [unclear: has] invented hells and purgatories; at one time it has made [unclear: profession] of belief the turning point; at another it has said [unclear: the] form of baptism is the decisive factor; at still another it has [unclear: proclaimed] that joining the church would solve the whole [unclear: problem] and give man a through ticket with accident policy attached [unclear: for] the heavenly kingdom. Many a man has gone down to [unclear: death] in the past, in the full expectation that he would be [unclear: eternally] engaged in the useful and invigorating occupation of [unclear: playing] on a golden harp as he looked from his celestial [unclear: verandah] upon the torment of his life-long friend in a
lake of [unclear: burning] brimstone. Well, that sort of thing has not proved very [unclear: acceptable] to man's moral digestion. Somehow a good many men [unclear: feel] to-day, as if they would rather be suffering in hell with the [unclear: unfortunate] than to dwell in heaven with a soul so small and [unclear: mean] that it could be happy while contemplating the torture of [unclear: its] fellows. So the old idea of a local heaven and hell hereafter, without a qualification. You cannot get anybody to assent [unclear: to] that doctrine now, Without a qualification. As men have [unclear: been] evolving from barbaric periods they have gradually [unclear: outgrown] barbaric conceptions; they have become less animal and [unclear: more] spiritual; they have antagonized each other less, they have [unclear: loved] each other more. Hence they have at last conceived the idea that heaven and hell are not places but conditions, and the sensitive nature has begun to realize that both these conditions exist in this world, all about us, encouraging our hopes and demanding our sympathies. "Dr. Howe's achievement," said John Weiss, referring to the case of Laura Bridgman, "is to me a guarantee that the Creator will not let one of his little ones perish." When asked once if he believed in the immortality of the soul, Abraham Lincoln replied, "All or none." And I think our ever-increasing sense of brotherhood would not quite allow us to respect a supreme power which should save one soul and destroy another.

"Hand in hand with angels
Tis a twisted chain,
Reaching heavenward, earthward,
Linking joy and pain.
There's a mournful jarring,
There's a clank of doubt,
When a heart grows heavy
Or a hand's left out.

Hand in hand with angels,
Some are fallen, alas!
Soiled wings trail pollution
Whereasoe'er they pass.
Lift them into sunshine,
Bid them seek the sky;
Weaker are our soarings
When they cease to fly."

And so to-day, when the sensitive soul sees a man or a [unclear: woman] in the gutter, or the house of shame, in the asylum for the [unclear: in] sane, or the prison, it sees and recognizes its own [unclear: kindred] It does not say, "Die, miserable being, die, the sooner the [unclear: better] you are not fit to survive"; but it has compassion, it [unclear: stoops] down and binds the spiritual wounds with the compress of love it never despairs; it is satisfied that somewhere within this [unclear: rough] lump of humanity is the gem it seeks. This is the kind [unclear: o] faith by which the world is saved; the faith without which [unclear: Samuel] G. Howe's and Elizabeth Frye's would be impossible. [unclear: Persian] Zoroaster had a glimpse of it when he said, "To refuse [unclear: hospitality] and not to succor the poor, are sins." The leader of [unclear: the] movement against the caste-spirit of Brahminism had it [unclear: where], he said, "Hatred does not cease by [unclear: hatred] at any time, [unclear: hatred] ceases by love." The Chinese Sage had it when he said, "[unclear: Reciprocity] is the word which may serve as a rule for all life." [unclear: Jesus] had it when he told the story of the Good Samaritan. [unclear: Pau] had it when he said, "God hath made of one blood all nations [unclear: o] men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." The [unclear: prophets] and benefactors of all time have had it, as they have seen [unclear: how]

"through the ages one increasing purpose runs, And the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns."

Now, I think I hear some one exclaiming, perhaps a little [unclear: impatiently], this is all very good as speculation; it is true that [unclear: then] have been seeing such visions for a long time; but in this [unclear: scientific] age we have a right to demand something more than [unclear: reaming]. Yes, my friend, and something more than dreaming [unclear: you] shall have. The Unity of the Human Race is not entirely [unclear: vision]. It is fast coming to be a scientific verity. Why do assert that? Let me tell you.
The first impulse of barbarism is to quarrel. The necessity [unclear: or] social order and human government began in the hitting of [unclear: elbows] and the rise of angry passions. Antagonisms, parade [unclear: f] differences—these were among the earliest manifestations. [unclear: so], when men of varying nationality, color, or structure met in former times, and among uncivilized peoples when they meet [unclear: now], the first thought was or is—you are black and I am [unclear: white]; you are an Irishman. I am an Englishman; you are [unclear: mall], I am large, and so on. That is the way in which [unclear: emphasis] has been placed almost exclusively in the scientific realm [unclear: upon] what is called differentiation—the divergencies of growth [unclear: and] character. Most of the really scientific attempts to classify [unclear: mankind] for the last two or three centuries have been of this [unclear: nature]. The division adopted by Blumenbach, the one with [unclear: which] most of us as children were made familiar, was based [unclear: on] the color of the skin, the character of the hair, and the [unclear: shape] of the skull. Three facts, sure to win attention, sure [unclear: to] be deemed the most vital facts by crude peoples, but after [unclear: all], three superficial, and, as we shall see presently, minor [unclear: acts]. In this system the inhabitants of Europe and Western [unclear: Asia] became known as the Caucasian or White Race; those of? [unclear: artary], China and Japan as the Mongolian or Yellow Race; [unclear: Those] of the larger part of Africa as Ethiopians or Negroes; [unclear: The] Indians of North and South America as the American or [unclear: red] Race; and the inhabitants of the islands of the Indian [unclear: Archipelago] as the Malayan or Brown Race. White, yellow, [unclear: plack], red, brown—that was supposed at one time to [unclear: be] scientific classification of humanity. Before Blumenbach, a [unclear: Dutch] anatomist attempted a system based on the shape of the skull and the size of the facial angle. Another system centred around the measurement of the cubic contents of each cranium. Another assumed three general classes with sub-divisions, the first being the races with smooth straight hair peculiar to the old world; the second those with the same characteristics peculiar to the new world, and the third the negro races. Dr. Pritchard, taking the form of the skull for his criterion, refers mankind to seven original stocks. Dr. Pickering, on the basis of color, finds eleven races. While Professor Agassiz, with another method, reaches still another conclusion. He adopted a zoological division. There is, he claimed, a certain natural relation between the races of men and plants and animals occupying the same regions. So he divided the earth into eight such regions, containing each its peculiar varieties of plant and animal life, and its peculiar type of man.

Now you will observe in every one of these instances what is inevitable in all study, that at first the student deals with secondary facts. He does not get back and clown to primary facts. And out of this superficial dealing has grown what real or supposed basis in Science the idea of caste has. Basis in Science, I say. Of course at an early period conquest and blood were the only authorities for tyranny. The strong had no desire to go back of their own animal passions, and the weak could not go back of them. But in more recent times the tendency has been to find a scientific basis for everything—that is, a basis which can be subjected to reason and receive its approval. Whatever may be said of other nationalities, this is certainly the tendency of our English-speaking peoples. The government of Gladstone cannot afford to hold a race in subjection simply because it is strong enough to do so. It cannot afford to carry even so great a boon as the rule of Great Britain to a distant people simply on the ground that might makes right. It must have a reason for its course which will command public sympathy. How does it find such reason? Why, by appealing to race distinctions—the idea that the Irish are not capable of self-government; that the only way to promote progress in Egyptian domains is to carry Christian civilization there at the mouth of English cannon. The superior the rightful guardian of the inferior—that is the central thought in British policy. In our own country we had an example of the same thing in pro-slavery days. The peculiar institution was maintained by Bible authority and by constitutional authority, but many came to feel the need of the authority of Science. Then it was said, the negro cannot be one of us because his facial angle is more acute than ours. On this account, though we may protect him by lifting him from barbarism to civilization there at the mouth of English cannon. The superior the rightful guardian of the inferior—that is the central thought in British policy. In our own country we had an example of the same thing in pro-slavery days. The peculiar institution was maintained by Bible authority and by constitutional authority, but many came to feel the need of the authority of Science. Then it was said, the negro cannot be one of us because his facial angle is more acute than ours. On this account, though we may protect him by lifting him from barbarism to civilization there at the mouth of English cannon. The superior the rightful guardian of the inferior—that is the central thought in British policy. In our own country we had an example of the same thing in pro-slavery days. The peculiar institution was maintained by Bible authority and by constitutional authority, but many came to feel the need of the authority of Science. Then it was said, the negro cannot be one of us because his facial angle is more acute than ours. On this account, though we may protect him by lifting him from barbarism to civilization there at the mouth of English cannon. The superior the rightful guardian of the inferior—that is the central thought in British policy. In our own country we had an example of the same thing in pro-slavery days. The peculiar institution was maintained by Bible authority and by constitutional authority, but many came to feel the need of the authority of Science. Then it was said, the negro cannot be one of us because his facial angle is more acute than ours. On this account, though we may protect him by lifting him from barbarism to civilization there at the mouth of English cannon. The superior the rightful guardian of the inferior—that is the central thought in British policy. In our own country we had an example of the same thing in pro-slavery days. The peculiar institution was maintained by Bible authority and by constitutional authority, but many came to feel the need of the authority of Science. Then it was said, the negro cannot be one of us because his facial angle is more acute than ours. On this account, though we may protect him by lifting him from barbarism to civilization there at the mouth of English cannon. The superior the rightful guardian of the inferior—that is the central thought in British policy. In our own country we had an example of the same thing in pro-slavery days. The peculiar institution was maintained by Bible authority and by constitutional authority, but many came to feel the need of the authority of Science. Then it was said, the negro cannot be one of us because his facial angle is more acute than ours. On this account, though we may protect him by lifting him from barbarism to civilization there at the mouth of English cannon. The superior the rightful guardian of the inferior—that is the central thought in British policy. In our own country we had an example of the same thing in pro-slavery days. The peculiar institution was maintained by Bible authority and by constitutional authority, but many came to feel the need of the authority of Science. Then it was said, the negro cannot be one of us because his facial angle is more acute than ours. On this account, though we may protect him by lifting him from barbarism to civilization there at the mouth of English cannon. The superior the rightful guardian of the inferior—that is the central thought in British policy. In our own country we had an example of the same thing in pro-slavery days. The peculiar institution was maintained by Bible authority and by constitutional authority, but many came to feel the need of the authority of Science. Then it was said, the negro cannot be one of us because his facial angle is more acute than ours. On this account, though we may protect him by lifting him from barbarism to civilization there at the mouth of English cannon. The superior the rightful guardian of the inferior—that is the central thought in British policy. In our own country we had an example of the same thing in pro-slavery days. The peculiar institution was maintained by Bible authority and by constitutional authority, but many came to feel the need of the authority of Science. Then it was said, the negro cannot be one of us because his facial angle is more acute than ours. On this account, though we may protect him by lifting him from barbarism to civilization there at the mouth of English cannon. The superior the rightful guardian of the inferior—that is the central thought in British policy. In our own country we had an example of the same thing in pro-slavery days. The peculiar institution was maintained by Bible authority and by constitutional authority, but many came to feel the need of the authority of Science. Then it was said, the negro cannot be one of us because his facial angle is more acute than ours. On this account, though we may protect him by lifting him from barbarism to civilization there at the mouth of English cannon. The superior the rightful guardian of the inferior—that is the central thought in British policy.
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facts. But all men must be able to communicate with their fellows, all have speech in common, however certain facts. All men are not of one color, their heads are not of one shape, their hair varies. These are external facts. All men must be able to communicate with their fellows, all have speech in common, however rudimentary it may be in form. That is an internal fact, directly connected with the human mind. Is it not easy to see that it will make an immense difference in the character and results, of our study, which of the two classes of facts we make the fundamental ones? That is just what scholars have concluded, and they have decided very largely in favor of the method of Comparative Philology on that account. It is a radical change in the way of treating the race question—this attempt to look for the unities. It has already largely reduced the number of great divisions. Where men have been regarded as aliens it has shown a common ancestry. It has shown how much divergencies of color, contour, etc., are due to environment. No matter when or how the disintegration began, it is the surface facts which have diverged. The skin has grown light or dark, the facial angle has become larger or smaller, the hair has varied, but the lungs, the heart, the stomach, have remained; the nervous and muscular systems, the arteries and veins, these are still possessed in common; and, most wonderful and significant of all, the power of thinking and expressing thought is everywhere present, the link which binds all peoples in a common fraternity.

Well, we have not been able to get back to the garden of Eden or down to the hard pan of the Darwinian hypothesis. But the indications are that the farther we go the more of unity we find, and the deeper we go the more of unity we find. We cannot be certain, perhaps, as to just who our ancestors were, but we may feel reasonably sure that if one mortal was descended from a monkey, all were; and if one mortal has in him
something of the old Adam, all have. Unity of origin, that is the fact toward which Science points, and toward which she is fast traveling.

Oh, how the prophetic words of those old dreamers have come down to us through the centuries. Confucius, Buddha, Seneca, Jesus,—all saw visions of the brotherhood of man. Most of the great souls in all time have received the same inspiration. It has fired the prophet's voice, it has guided the essayist's pen; it has been the poet's muse. In our own time and country what various visions of the brotherhood of man, what are connected with it. Emerson in philosophy, Sumner in statesmanship, Garrison in reform, John Brown on the scaffold, Parker and Channing in the pulpit, Longfellow in poetry,—these have been seers foretelling a time when "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore." And to-day Science verifies the dream, saying, Of a truth I perceive that the Eternal Order is no respecter of persons; that all mankind are members of one great family, in whom Nature has implanted mutual love. It is not mere speculation now, therefore, to talk of human unity. It is the substantial food and drink of the ideal life.

I heard one of our clergymen say in a public meeting sometime since, that he did not believe much in enthusiasm for humanity in the abstract. The only enthusiasm for humanity he thought much of was that which applies itself in Christian Charity to the individual needing help. Enthusiasm for humanity in the abstract! Not believe in that! Why that is just what I do believe in. It is not my own achievements which make me feel strong. If I regard only them, I am impressed with a sense of my own infinite littleness. Crushed by the thought of duties unperformed, of passions unconquered, of short-comings innumerable, I can only exclaim with the poet,

"What am I?  
An infant crying in the night:  
An infant crying for the light:  
And with no language but a cry."

But when I contemplate my possibilities, when I feel within me something summoning me to forget what is accomplished in the thought of some grander thing which I am yet to do; when I hear the call to climb higher;—then it is that I feel strong; then it is that Nature's trust in her child fills him with a sense of his divinity. It is just so with the race. I do not warm so much on what it has done; the charitable buildings it has erected; the schools it 'maintains; the churches which are its pride;—it is the possibilities which lie before it; it is its sublime impulse to progress which stirs my enthusiasm. And when I remember that all men, without exception, have some opportunity for progress, that all men have a something to which the genius of progress may appeal, then it is that my soul bows in worship at the shrine of a divine humanity. Then it is that I hear the angelic song floating as from the unseen world to my willing ears: "Mankind are one in spirit," it seems to say,—

"Mankind are one in spirit, and an instinct bears along,  
Round the earth's electric circle, the swift flash of right or wrong;  
Whether conscious or unconscious, yet Humanity's vast frame  
Through its ocean-sundered fibres feels the gush of joy or shame;—  
In the gain or loss of one race all the rest have equal claim."

To experience such a Religion as that is worth living for and dying for. It makes one feel that he is not a nonentity in a great sea of nonentities, but a spiritual force cooperating with other spiritual forces to make a world. That is the final significance of a divine man; that, the final significance of a divine humanity.

And now what are we doing in our own individual lives toward the realization of this sublime ideal? Are we so strong in the maintenance of freedom for ourselves that we are prepared to maintain it for others? Are we conscious of this tendency to unity? Do we fully realize this

"far off, divine intent,  
To which the whole Creation moves ?"

Or are we setting ourselves against the coming king; are we cherishing this day some feeling that retards his progress? How easy it is, if we set out in a fault-finding spirit, to impute bad motives to friends and to criticise, for lack of conformity, or lack of something which we think essential, the people whom we meet upon the street. I suppose that in about ninety-nine cases out of every hundred where bad motives are imputed wrong is
done. And what a rebuke it is to us, when beneath an exterior which we have picked to pieces with merciless sarcasm and ridicule, we find an honest purpose and a warm heart.

A lady of intelligence recently talking with another lady, a stranger, of her immediate ancestry, learned that they were persons of some note,—what is vulgarly termed of good blood. As this point became apparent she exhibited new emotions of interest, exclaiming with a sense of surprised curiosity, "Then you came of good stock, didn't you?" We have all heard of the man who refused to rescue a drowning fellow-mortal because he had not been introduced to him. Probably most of us have felt at some time the gaze of critical eyes, looking us up and down to see if we would do. We do not admire that sort of thing when it comes to the serious business of life. We rightly think it all wrong. Intellectually, it is superficial; affectionally, it is cold and unfeeling.

Those of us who do common work in some association for the promotion of education, of reform, or of religion, are not all of one degree of taste, of belief, of culture, but the purpose which brings us together is of infinitely greater moment than these external things. It creates a certain sense of unity which could not exist without it. In similar manner, there is a common purpose underlying all human nature, a purpose to grow toward the godlike, which ought to prove the strongest of bonds. We do not all possess this purpose in the same degree, but we all possess somewhat of it. This thought of unity in growth is the sunshine which clears away the mists of prejudice, and melts the icy forms of the spirit of caste;

Are you drawing about you a family? Harmonize its individualities; never antagonize them. Are you interested in some social or religious organization? Conciliate its forces in an honorable devotion to what all affirm. Are you seeking a just state? Demand intelligence if you will in its citizens, but do not emphasize the locality of birth or the condition of the purse. Subordinate the points of difference; recognize the points of unity; and you will be surprised to find how much of good there is in every human form; how divine, notwithstanding its short-comings, humanity is. "Show me a creature," said Mr. Sumner, "with erect countenance looking to heaven, made in the image of God, and I show you a Man, who of whatever country or race, whether darkened by equatorial sun or blanched by northern cold, is with you a child of the Heavenly Father, and equal with you in title to all the rights of Human Nature."
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Radicalism: The False and the True.

The North Wind and the Sun, runs the old fable, disputed as to which was the more powerful. They agreed finally that he should be declared the victor, who could most quickly strip a wayfaring man of his clothes. The North Wind first tried his power, and blew with all his might; but the keener became his blasts, the closer the traveler wrapped his cloak around him, till, at last, resigning all hope of victory, the Wind called upon the Sun to see what he could do. The Sun suddenly shone out with all his warmth. The traveler no sooner felt his genial rays than he took off one garment after another, and at last, fairly overcome with heat, undressed, and bathed in a stream that lay in his path.

I observe that Radicalism, so-called, is a very variable commodity. Sometimes it blows like the North Wind. It says, I will and thou must. It attacks, it destroys, it exterminates. Sometimes it comes as quietly as the Sun's rays, conquering by the persuasive force of attraction and the warmth of love. Lord George Gordon at the head of his Anti-Catholic mob, defying Parliament, burning chapels and private houses, destroying Newgate prison, and causing for the time being a general reign of disorder, possessed undoubtedly many of the characteristics which some people, in some ages of the world, have associated with Radicalism. His method was very plain. It began in intimidation. It ended in destruction. It is this element of destruction which makes
the radical in the superficial estimate. The English revolution of the seventeenth, and the French revolution of
the eighteenth centuries were full of characteristics which excite admiration in crude minds, and have been
taken as examples by oppressed classes. Unquestionably, Marston Moor and Naseby, and the subsequent
execution of Charles, were events of great significance in English history. They were the outgrowth of real
grievances. And Cromwell, whose appearance upon his entrance into Parliament was not altogether
prepossessing, is a figure in the record which could not be spared. As a contemporary said of him, he appeared
in a plain cloth suit, evidently made by an ill country tailor; his linen plain and not very clean; his hat without a
hat band; his stature of good size; his sword close at his side; his countenance swollen and reddish; his voice
sharp and un-tunable; and his eloquence full of fervor. The very picture of a revolutionist, and to those who
look upon radicalism and revolution as identical, the ideal of a radical. In the French revolution, characterized
by Carlyle as "a huge explosion, bursting through all formulas and customs, and confounding into wreck and
chaos the ordered arrangements of earthly life," we see illustrated the same thought. "To the Bastille," was a
radical cry. The beheading of Louis XVI. was a radical deed. Danton and Robespierre, condemning multitudes
to the guillotine, were the ministers of Radicalism. That long reign of blood and terror was the triumph of
Radicalism. Such has been and is the judgment of not a few who carry uppermost in their minds the theory that
Radicalism means revolution and destruction. Our own war for independence furnishes another example. The
spilling of the tea in Boston Harbor—that was a radical thing. The battles of Lexington, Concord, and Bunker
Hill—they were radical things. The hanging of Andre—that was a radical thing. Destroy the tyrant, crush the tyrant:
to some minds these are always radical cries, and always essential to the radical spirit.

Now, of course, I am not condemning the revolutionary movements of the world. In some emergencies a
noble cause does enoble fight. There are times when just about in pro portion to the manhood within him, one
feels impelled to resist, at whatever cost, the powers that be. I doubt not that many of us would have followed
Cromwell; many of us have sympathized, in greater or less degree, with the French revolutionists; and that
many of us to-day, if in Russia, would be Nihilists. But that is not the question I am now discussing. All honor
to the Iconoclasts; all honor to the warriors; all honor to the revolutionists of freedom. Far be it from me to seek
to cool the ardor of admiration in which they are justly held. I only say their work of destruction, while it may
be incidental to, is never part and parcel of, Radicalism. Nay, more than that, I claim that in many cases to
regard such men as only destructive is to do them the greatest injustice. "Oh, what a glorious morning is this,"
said Sam Adams to John Hancock, as he heard the rattle of musketry on Lexington Green. Glorious, why? Not
because somebody was to be killed; but simply because, from that moment, the fundamental idea for which the
colonies stood was to join issue with the fundamental idea for which the mother country stood. Simply because
from that moment there could be no turning back, no staying the struggle until the issue should be settled, and
settled right.

There have been two very distinct views of human history. The first makes it largely a series of battles, a
change of rulers, and a clash of selfish interests, in which the heaviest muscles and the most cunning brains win
the victories. This has been the dominant view up to this time. But it is a view belonging to a low state of
civilization. The advances of Science in our own time have demonstrated that progress is not a fitful process;
that however much the ripples may seem to move up stream, the undercurrent, the great volume of waters, is
moving steadily on to the sea. Orderly growth, underlying all events and bearing them upon its surface—this is
now the recognized law. Well, just in proportion as we go deep enough to see this growth, we discover that the
startling events and the great men we have been worshiping are less important factors than we thought them.
They serve their day, they deserve our homage, but there was something back of and beneath them, which
serves all days and is an object of infinitely greater reverence, viz.: the power and growth of ideas. The
superficial history of the world may be what many historians have made it, a record of battles. It may be what
Carlyle calls it, the history of its great men. But the real history, that which lives and grows, and moves all ages,
is the history of the rise and progress of the idea of liberty. It pertains to the world of thought, rather than to the
world of action. Everything is a thought, says one, before it is a thing, and the growth of the idea of universal
liberty in the mind of man, that is the power which speaks and develops under all circumstances, sometimes in
war, sometimes in peace, but develops still.

Now what follows from this view of the evolution of thought bearing fruit in the evolution of things? That
everything which exists to day has its roots in the past. That progress is not destructive in spirit but
constructive. It is the passage from the old to the new by an orderly process of growth. It is a recognition of the
fact that the Past and the Future are equally essential to the Present; that whoso belittles the conditions out of
which he has come will be very likely to belittle the conditions which await him. What, then, does it mean to be
a Radical? To tear things up by the roots? Most certainly not. The word radical signifies pertaining to the root;
proceeding directly from the root. In English politics, says Macaulay, the Independents were, to use the phrase
of their own time, Root-and-Branch men, or to use the kindred phrase of our own, Radicals. Radicalism, I
should say, means root-work, and he is the true Radical who seeks to go to the root of things, when there to
eliminate the false from the true, and to preserve the true.

"There is some soul of goodness in things evil, 
Would men observingly distil it out."

he says, and it is just that I am after, that with it I may help to build an ever brightening future. The genuine Radical is not destructive, he is constructive. He is not a revolutionist, ' he is an evolutionist. His construction may include the death of the false, his evolution may include resistance of tyranny; but what I mean to say is this: he is not looking chiefly for the evil, he does not make it the business of his life to hold that up and shake it and slay it; but he seeks the good, and holds that before the vision of men, that they may be drawn by its loveliness and conform their lives to its purity. It is the difference between looking down and looking up the field of human thought and life. There has been too much loitering, says one, over the magnificent periods of criticism, and not enough anxiety to feed the great human soul with a diviner food. That is always likely to be the tendency. It is so much easier to criticise than to create. But the wholesome, sweet-scented Radical, whether in education, politics, or religion, is always a creator. The elimination of the True from the False, the affirmation of the one, the consigning to neglect and oblivion of the other, that is creation, that is what makes order out of chaos. Ruskin says all plants are composed essentially of two parts, the leaf and the root; one loving light, the other darkness; one liking to be clean, the other to be dirty; one liking to grow for the most part up, the other for the most part down. In this respect are we not all much like the plants? There are tendencies in the individual, there are tendencies in society, toward the light, aspirations for the cleanly and the beautiful; there are also tendencies toward darkness, a disposition to grovel in the vile and ugly. These latter hang about men like the traveler's cloak. False and destructive Radicalism blows, and they are wrapped the closer to the person and resist all its efforts. Then comes the true and the constructive, and shines and warms with the light and heat of affirmative virtue, and lo! the garments of evil fall in the dust, and the subject rises into a new sense of manhood.

It is evident that this view of what makes a true Radical is diametrically opposed to the idea somewhat prevalent that Radicalism means an earnestness of conviction so strong that it can see no truth in what others profess. Radicalism which believes only in some one idea and makes the individual feel that he must have his own way, is in reality no Radicalism at all. It is superficial instead of root-work. The moment we deal with fundamental causes we discover that a sect never existed, nay a human being never was born, but had a place to fill and a work to do. Of all the dogmatism that ever cursed the world, that is the most dogmatic, whether in the church or out of it, whether wearing the badge of religion or of science, which thinks it knows everything and claims to have a philosophy which owns an exclusive right to all truth. If I may borrow a figure, some people seem to think, and they are not all inside the old faiths, some people seem to think they have a monopoly of the Infinite. They possess, if we may fairly interpret their pretensions, a channel of the Divine within their houses, on tap, where they can turn it on, like gas or water. They have apparently no conception of the fact that it takes all the people who live and have lived or may yet live, every one of them, to hold the divine life. As John Weiss said, "Thousands of years deep is the plank of which the radical platform is built; hundreds of thousands of years, with their rings of daily pleasure and of daily sweetness, and the presence of the Divine mind, and the smiles and tears of all the men and women who have ever lived, have gone into it." Underneath it is the whole of past time. Underneath it is the Rock of Ages.

In First Principles, Mr. Spencer says, that in some respects Religion has been irreligious and Science has been unscientific. I am frequently impressed with the thought that our Radicalism is not always radical. A brief examination will show what I mean. Whatever definition we may give Religion, all will agree it is a something which has relations to the Past, the Present, and the Future. Hence, Radicalism in Religion means a certain attitude of mind toward the Past, the Present, and the Future.

1st. Let me ask what should that attitude be toward the Past. I heard a gentleman say the other day, "You have got to give up the Bible, the sooner the better. You have got to make up your mind that no such man as Jesus ever lived." Now I really cannot see why it should be so vital, even were the Bible a myth and Jesus a creature of the imagination, that I should give them up. I am by no means certain that myths are a bad thing for the world. But what I want to notice particularly now, is that spirit manifested in some quarters of special dislike to the Christian system and its leader. To my mind this attitude of antagonism grows out of the crude conception of what Radicalism is. To deliberately shock those who love Christian associations produces a sensation. A shallow man can ride
into notoriety on the condemnation of the creed of his fathers, but that proves nothing save the shallowness of his followers. To underestimate the character of Jesus is just as irrational as to overestimate it. To say he never had an existence just as foolish as to say that he was God. To charge Christianity with all the vices is, for aught I can see, just as dogmatic as to credit it with all the virtues. The Radical must regard the past as a connected whole. He must deal with its every element in the truth-seeking spirit. He must learn to grasp its fundamental facts. He must bring all histories to the bar, not of prejudice but of reason. I know of a company, varying from one to two hundred people, who devote themselves quite largely in a regular Sunday meeting to picking Christianity to pieces, and denouncing all toleration of the Christian faith. They call themselves liberals, they think themselves radicals, but they are really dogmatists feeding on husks. They have yet to learn that the stream of truth flows through many channels to the souls of men. They have yet to learn that respect for the past which is the constant companion of all reasonable hope for the future. They are utterly blind to the good which has come through each of the great religious systems and has been emphasized by each of the great religious leaders. It does not occur to them to look for the affirmations of Brahmanism, Buddhism, Christianity, and all the rest, and to fortify the life of the present with the materials thus gained; they are just like the most bigoted of sectarianists, they go their little circumscribed round, "thrice routing all the foes, and thrice slaying all the slain."

Quite recently I listened to an able paper whose object was to prove that the ethics of Jesus were far inferior to our own: ethics. But it is no disgrace to him if they were. With: eighteen hundred years rolling between his day and ours, it would be a disgrace to us if they were not. All that time counts for something. We ought to be better than Jesus, in order to be as good as he. But is there not, after all, a better way than this of proving by texts, many of them of doubtful authenticity, the merits and demerits of men who lived from eighteen hundred to three thousand years ago? The important thing, the radical thing, is not the character of the men; it is the ideas for which the men stand. The doctrine of universal love and brotherhood, for example; that gains in authority by the fact that it is found in several scriptures unknown to each other, and has meant so much to many different peoples, living independently of each other. The true radical method, as it seems to me, is not to undermine the influence of the world's great teachers by emphasizing their supposed, or even their verified shortcomings, so much as it is to affirn that which was strong and noble and sublime in them, and make that the point about which to cluster the mind's keen appreciation and the heart's tender love. All that the genuine Radical asks concerning Jesus and Christianity is, that they be recognized for what they were. It must protest against giving them the place' which belongs to the universal, for the simple and obvious reason that they were not universal, but limited. But when it comes to saying that Christianity has been built upon a myth, and that the man whose name it bears never had an existence, I think the scientific spirit is violated and the regard for the good and holy associations of the past rightly shocked. We inherit all that has gone before us, and any temple too small to have a place for the Judean saviour, the Chinese sage, and the Hindu saint, is too small for the constructive and philosophical Radical.

Not exclusive and superficial, but inclusive and fundamental, is the attitude of genuine Radicalism toward the Past. And now,

2d. What is its attitude toward the Present. Equally inclusive and equally fundamental. Its fellowship is large enough to include all sects and systems to-day. It respects the devotion of the Catholic; it responds to the appeal of the artistic sense in the Episcopalian; it admires the moral enthusiasm of the Methodist; it feels drawn by the culture of the Unitarian. For myself, I hold that we cannot spare one of the sects, and our own movement, differing widely on some points from them all, never seems to me more truly great than when, acknowledging its own limitations, it seeks to gain from each the good it brings. So, while occasionally it seems wise to draw the distinctions plainly in the interests of perfect truth and with profound respect for all, the healthy Radical, if I mistake not, will rejoice with unspeakable joy, at every occasion in the name of education and reform, which places the holders of all beliefs side by side upon the same platform, a lasting testimony to the fact that before they were professors of creeds and systems, they were, are, and ever will be men. Every temperance or woman- suffrage meeting where ministers of different faiths stand together; every convention, such as those held by the National Free Religious Association, where Orthodox, Universalist and Unitarian, Materialist and Spiritualist, Christian and Jew join lands in the name of Natural, Practical, Free Religion, is proof of the radical spirit, going down beneath creeds, dogmas, and ceremonies, to the great underlying and outreachin9 roots of Religious Life. They speak of a better time coming, when nonessentials shall stand aside for essentials, and when all shall worship in the Church Universal; its membership as comprehensive as humanity; its altar the warm, unselfish heart; its ever-burning incense the pure life.

But Radicalism in its relations to the present is not simply a certain spirit of fellowship, underlying all beliefs; it is a method of dealing with the problem of evil underlying all partial and temporizing measures. Take for example that most dire of all political ills, discontent among a portion of the people, arising out of an infringement of natural rights by another, portion. As we look about the world what do we see? In one quarter assassination so wide spread that the recognized ruler; dare not go through the long-delayed ceremony of
coronation. In another quarter ambushed representatives of a well organized scheme slay unsuspecting officials, and dynamite plots to blow up government offices fill the air. In our own country, the provocation is less, the people on the whole are wiser, there, is greater opportunity for gaining a redress of grievances, and so this evil is less threatening. But it is by no means small here. Our large cities contain material for almost any emergency. In Massachusetts at the last election, with a population; as enlightened as any in the Union, the most distinguished representative of bad politics and personal government was elected chief magistrate. And in Rhode Island the discontented elements recently marshaled their forces under leadership not calculated to inspire respect, and in a spirit which swamped vital principles in a bitter personal struggle. These things, bad enough in the degree they have reached with us, doubly lamentable in the degree they have reached abroad, are the natural outgrowths of the exercise of respectable tyranny on the one side and a dangerous and growing dissatisfaction on the other. It is useless to say the fault is all here or all there. The fault is divided. In every one of these cases the ruling powers have with more on less of obtuseness invited the storm which has come. They have claimed to be looking for radical cure. But they have tried the destructive method. Crush the people; imprison their leaders deny them the privileges which others enjoy. Manage their industrial and political affairs for them. Make them feel that they are of little account, strangers and visitors in a strange land. This has been the spirit, this the sap, in the political tree which has borne its fruit of discontent all round the world.

Now the constructive Radical knows history well enough to know that burying gunpowder and friction matches together never yet prevented an explosion. His aim is to induce content. Sooth the passionate with justice, he says. Undermine growing anger with a reasonable trust. The trouble with England, to-day, as it ever has been, in all her dealings with the Irish question, is that the theory upon which she has proceeded has not been radical, it has not meant root-work. It has been a policy of yielding only what she was compelled to yield, it has been a temporizing policy, at times an uprooting policy, but never a kindly guiding influence, never an attempt to reconcile elements which must be reconciled, if the problem on her hands is to reach a peaceful solution. There is nothing so dangerous as discontent, whether under monarchical forms or in American states. The true Radical understands that, and seeks to build upon a foundation of exact justice; to educate all to an enlightened sense of responsibility; and to open equal opportunities in the pathway of all the children of the people.

Now I hope I am not misunderstood. I accept the principle of prohibition. When a man puts the knife to his brother's throat he becomes a murderer. He ought to be arrested and confined until some properly constituted authority thinks it safe that he should regain his freedom. There is no excuse sufficient, for Phoenix Park murders and dynamite plots,—none. They should be condemned and punished with all the rigor of the law. But I am talking about Radicalism now, and prohibition, however necessary it may be, is not radical cure. The real Radicalism, the Radicalism which, as I understand it, Free Religion tries to represent, is not affirmative. It does not wear the badge of the policeman, it holds the key of the school-house. It does not shoulder the musket, it wields the ballot. It does not suppress, it aims to develop. It does not sneer, it counsels and befriends.

Perhaps some one will ask: Well, what can we do here in America? What is radical cure for the discontent which every man, with his industrial and political eyes open, knows is increasing in volume with us every year? I answer in two words: Establish justice. But what does justice mean. It means that every child born or residing in this country shall have the benefit of a common-school education. It means that no invidious distinctions shall be made between our citizens in their rights under the Constitution and Laws. It means that honesty and good moral character shall never be insulted, politically speaking, because found in a man of foreign birth. It means an intelligent ballot in the hands of all who can read and write and keep out of the jail, the almshouse and the insane asylum, irrespective of nativity or sex. It means all this, and it means something more than all this. It means a comparatively new method of fighting those great ulcers upon our social organism, intemperance and prostitution. One wing of the Temperance Army says: Stop dancing and playing cards, oh, young men and women, for in them are the beginnings of evil. And then, here and there, perhaps in half a dozen localities in a great city, are set up reading-rooms and libraries, where one can read the daily paper or a magazine article in profound silence. Well, that is all over the heads of the people who are drawn to dance-houses and liquor-saloons by the desire for recreation. When you have convinced the street gamin and the over-worked, ignorant and despairing adult that the jovial good time, the laugh, the free flow of animal spirit is not in your reading-rooms but in your grog-shops, you have thrown your influence on the side of the grog-shops as sure a fate. Now the radical method, according to my way of thinking, is not to suppress the devil, it is to undermine him. Where he sets up a dance-hall where virtue reigns, suppose we set up a dance-hall where virtue reigns. When he sets up a grog-shop suppose we set up a coffee-room, not in the third story, no where you have to use a telescope to find it, but where it will stare you in the face, invite you in, and make you feel at home. The Radical, if I represent him justly, says the poor and ignorant drink largely, not exclusively but largely, because it is the only way they know of having a good time, and my business is to show them a better
way. My business is to lead the community in furnishing the means by which this poverty and ignorance, with all their attendant ills, may be overcome. It is a slow process, but it means radical cure. It means every possible effort made to educate the masses, to place in their hands the ability to achieve individual careers, and in the meantime to line our streets with opportunities for growth as thickly as they are now lined with dens of infamy and vice.

I doubt not the North Wind method will for a long time prevail. I doubt not it will long be necessary, as it is now necessary, to say occasionally you shall and you shall not, but let us remember that that sort of thing is not cure. It may pave the way for reform, it may give the required opportunity, but it is not the thing itself. It holds precisely the same relation to true living, that the lake of burning brimstone did in the old theology. When truth, holiness, and love approach the individual, as the Sun does, pouring kindly but persistently, their gentle rays upon him, then it is be feels their efficacy, then it is he yields to their power, until at last he throws off his old garments of indulgence and hypocrisy and stands erect, a brave and self-respecting man.

And this seems to me the two-fold attitude of philosophical Radicalism toward the Present—the broadest human fellowship and the application of scientific methods of cure to the great social evils of life.

3d. One word now, and only a word, of its attitude toward the Future. That there is to be a future seems a natural deduction from the law of progress. That mankind are to be of a higher type in that future than they now are, seems a not unreasonable inference from the fact that they are now of a higher type than in the distant past. That the same beneficent laws which have made the past a blessing will make the future a blessing, seems likely; and that what exists to-day will continue to exist in some form is hardly open to question. That the Radical can say he is certain of his own personal immortality is hardly possible, though nearly all human hopes and aspirations seem to indicate it. That in the presence of these, and without any positive proof, he can say he knows there is no such thing as personal immortality, seems to savor of a dogmatism hardly consistent with the true radical spirit. Sure of his own spiritual life here, hoping for a reunion beyond the grave with the dear ones gone before, and resting in the assurance that however it may be, all is for the best, he will trust for the future as he labors in the present,

"Heart within, and God o'orhead."

Like university graduation, like organic evolution, says Dr. Bartol, Free Religion is an unfolding of previous forms, and is not that bolting from them affected by some, ending like the side path I took in the woods,—in a swamp and a squirrel track. A good man humorously expressed the development in his case by saying, I spell my God with two o's, and my devi without a d. Step by step : that title of the story is the tale of mankind.

The false, the destructive Radical may be a pestilent fellow, a stirrer up of strife; but the true, the constructive Radical, he affirms all the past, all the present, all the future. He is humble, sweet-tempered, worshipful. He is at home everywhere in the universe. He loves the rocks, the flowers, the trees. He loves all men. He loves the Eternal Order, under which he and they, and all things live. He is the man who wants to face facts, to hold up an ideal standard, and so long as he is helping humanity upward he goes on his way with a happy heart. Then is nothing disagreeable, repellant, dangerous about him. He would not harm a hair of your heads. He comes to bring justice, peace, good-will. To lift up those that be cast down. To win the world by sunshine to the beautiful and good. To sweet with his voice the everlasting yea. And now, friends, are we Radicals of this type, broad, philosophical, sweet? If so we shall prove it by always speaking the truth in patience and in love.
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The Epistles

Phonographically reported by Isabel C. Barrows.

As WE come from the Old Testament to the New, we notice that there are four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles that lead the list of those books that have come to be regarded as canonical. It is worthy your note, in passing, that the Acts of the Apostles does not treat in any general way of the doings of the twelve apostles, but only concerns itself with certain passages in the life chiefly of Peter and Paul. The significance of that I shall refer to later.

As I wish to treat of the New Testament in a general way, in the order of time, rather than the order in which the publishers have happened to place the books, I pass by the Gospels and the Acts and come to the Epistles; for you are probably aware of the fact that nearly all the Epistles, the principal ones most certainly, were written some time before any of the Gospels were brought into their present condition.

When the First Epistle was written, which was probably the first Epistle of Paul to the Church in Thessalonica, Jesus had been dead but about twenty years. That is, the people were then about as far away from his time as we are from the time of Abraham Lincoln, and, of course, there would be a great many persons alive who had either seen Jesus, or who had seen somebody that had seen him,—enough to keep alive and fresh the traditions of the principal events in his life, the principal phases of his doctrine, and the generally believed account of his death. We must bear in mind, however, all the way through, that these early churches did not believe that Jesus was really dead, but only that he had been withdrawn into the heavens for a little time, whence he was to return again in the clouds, accompanied by an innumerable retinue of angels, to raise the dead, to judge the world, and to usher in the new kingdom of God which he was to establish here upon earth. I refer to this only to show you the general intellectual and religious atmosphere of the time when these Epistles were written.

There is another point to be noted. You will find that these letters are written to the Church in Philippi, to the Church in Ephesus, to the Church in Galatia, to the Church in Rome, etc. That is, and this is the point, the first churches, as we should naturally expect, were organized in the great cities scattered over the Roman Empire, the principal centres of intellectual life and thought. I refer to this, so as to bring you into sympathy with the natural growth of these churches, that you may see how, under ordinary human laws, they happened to be what they were.

In process of time, those who rejected the claims of Christianity came to be called pagans and heathen. Did you ever think why? The word "pagan" is from a Latin word *paganus*, which means a villager. The word "heathen" is simply heath-men, men who lived out on the heath, peasants. This suggestion is mainly interesting, as I think, because it lets us into the secret, which is true to-day just as it was then, that any new movement always finds its first footing in the town, where thought is most active, where opinions are most fluent, where it is easier to get a hearing for a new idea, and where a new thought first finds lodgement in the minds and activities of men. However sturdy and noble and grand the country may be in the make-up of its moral fibre, yet it is always a little behind the town. Just as last year's fashions are this year's fashions in the country, so the intellectual and religious fashions follow this same law: they start in the centre of intellectual activity, and then spread slowly toward the country.

These churches, then, these new organizations, were dotted here and there over the Roman Empire in the great centres of commercial and intellectual activity. They were not, as yet, between 50 and 60 A.D., when the
first Epistles were written, very numerous, very large, or very powerful.

These little Churches were simply made up of the few men who had accepted the claims of the new Messiah, and who, while they were waiting for his immediate return,—for both Jesus and Paul taught explicitly that he was to come back before that generation had entirely passed away,—would naturally place little emphasis on the affairs of this world. It is not strange, therefore, that they established practical communism, selling their houses and lands, just as in modern times Millerites have done, believing that the world was coming to an end in three, five, or ten years. What was the use of laying out schemes of business, plans for the regeneration of this world, social or political improvements? What was the use of being troubled, if Caesar was a tyrant and was ruling the world? What was the use of mourning about these things? So Paul tells them not to be troubled, for the time is short, and the end is at hand. Therefore, they sold their property, and tried to make one another as comfortable as possible, establishing these little brotherhoods in the great centres of activity, and then, laboring and doing their daily duty as best they could, awaited the coming of the kingdom of God with its heavenly magnificence and glory. In the face of a belief like that, of course it would not occur to any one to write any Gospels. What did they want of Gospels? The people who were living already knew about Jesus, and some of them were to live until he came again. So they did not take the trouble to make any record of his life and teachings at that time.

But you will see how naturally the Epistles arose. Here were these churches, perplexed on every hand by practical questions. They had just come out of heathenism. In those days, if you were to dine with a heathen, the chances were that he would go through some religious ceremony preceding the feast, to consecrate the animal that he was to have for his dinner. It was a very vital question, then, whether the new churches were to be permitted to attend such feasts, and eat the meat that had been offered to idols; whether in so doing they became accomplices in idolatry. You remember how often Paul refers to this. They questioned, also, whether it was necessary to keep the Mosaic law, and they looked to their leaders for answers. Those who had seen, Jesus, or who had received traditions of him from others' lips, could have him for guidance in this matter; but others did not know just what they were required to believe, and all sorts of practical questions would naturally spring up while they were waiting for his second coming. It was to answer these difficulties and to solve these practical problems that the Epistles came to be written.

We must remember another thing. It is absurd for anybody to suppose that Paul or Peter or James, or any of the writers of the Epistles, ever had the slightest idea that these letters would become a part of a book, to be referred to as a standard of belief and doctrine eighteen hundred years after that time. And this absurdity appears in what I have already stated, that they expected the world to come to an end before the people who wrote the letters were dead. They expected Jesus to come again to earth, and reign again as their king, for at least a thousand years. This idea is still thrilling and throbbing through parts of the New Testament, especially the Apocalypse, or the Book of Revelation. It is all on tiptoe with this upward and onward looking for the coming of the Lord. When Jesus should come, there would be no reason, and almost no need, of any book to announce his will; for he himself would be the living king, dispensing his own law and executing his own judgments.

These letters, then, were simply temporary and local expedients to meet the exigencies of that time. If you read them carefully in the light of that idea, you will find nearly all your perplexities solved. It is not my purpose to go into minute criticism of one Epistle after another. Instead of any textual criticism, I wish to give some general ideas for which they stand; but it is worth my while to point out first one or two significant facts concerning a few of them.

Take the little Epistle of Jude; Jude says that he was the brother of James. He was not himself an apostle, but, perhaps, the brother of an apostle. There is one thing in that little letter which of itself is sufficient to forever render absurd any claim for the entire infallibility of the Bible. I have spoken to a great many orthodox ministers concerning it, who had never had their attention called to it. I spoke to you last Sunday concerning the Book of Enoch,—a wild, crude, unreliable, apocalyptic book, written within a hundred years of the time of Christ. Jude quotes it as being the work of the old patriarch, "the seventh from Adam." Here is a palpable blunder.

The Epistle of James was written apparently to offset Paul's doctrine of the justification by faith. James evidently thought Paul was pushing that too far. He said it was well enough to have faith, but you must supplement faith and manifest the reality of that faith by works, or it becomes dead and fruitless. This was the first general contribution to the seething discussion of the age.

There is no occasion for me to say anything concerning the three Epistles of John, except that there is no reason to suppose John the Apostle wrote them. Neither need I detain you with a special reference to the epistles known as the Epistles of Peter. The second certainly was not written by him, and it is doubtful about the first; but it makes little difference to us.

Concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews, ordinarily called the work of Paul, there is hardly a scholar in the
world who thinks that Paul wrote it. It devotes itself to an endeavor to justify Christianity to those who had come out from the Jewish Church. It shows how the old dispensation was preparatory to Christianity; that every thing prefigured it; that it represented the symbol and shadow of which Christianity is the substance and reality. This, you will see, must have met a very pressing need or want at that time, when one of the most important and practical questions of the Jew was whether, when he became a Christian, he was false to the old and divine dispensation which had been given to his fathers.

I wish now to confine myself entirely to the attitude and work of Paul. Paul is the great name in historic Christianity, second only in rank and dignity to that of Jesus, and not even second to him in the power which he has exerted over thought. Instead, however, of going into a general examination of the Epistles, I want, in some general, graphic way, to give you Paul's attitude toward the universe, to set forth the scheme which he held, and which he made a vital power in the development of civilization. There is no man in all the past ages more alive to-day than Paul, or who is having more to do with men that have never thought very much about it, and who have least appreciated the significance of the work which he wrought.

It is not necessary for my purpose that I should discuss all the questions that have been mooted by the critics as to whether he wrote all the Epistles that have passed under his name. It does not make any special difference to our consideration, for those doctrines which he did hold are taught in the Epistles which are undoubtedly his.

In the first place, then, in order to understand this Pauline doctrine, you must remember that he was a grand, sturdy, unflinching believer in predestination of the most cast-iron sort. No man who ever lived has taught it more explicitly and clearly than he. God is the absolute sovereign, and he has a right through all the eternities to do whatever he will; and puny, short-sighted man has no right to question it. This is the attitude of Paul. God has a perfect right, to use his figure, to take one lump of clay, and make a vase to hold flowers in the parlor: he has a right to take another lump, and make a coarse, crude pot for use in the kitchen; and neither lump has a right to say anything about it one way or the other. He has a right to make one man for one use, and another for another,—to predestinate one to sue-cess and glory, to predestinate another to failure and disaster; and these have no right to question either the wisdom or justice of the dispensation. But, in justice to Paul; I wish you to note that the outcome of his doctrine is quite different from that of Calvin and modern Orthodoxy.

The next great doctrine of Paul is his uncompromising, unhesitating acceptance of the legend that teaches the fall of man. Adam, the first man, stood as the earthly head of humanity up to his time. The doctrine of the "federal headship," as it has come to be called in theology, is undoubtedly a Pauline doctrine. Man, with Adam at the head up to the time of the birth of Christ, had been simply a disastrous failure. In Adam, all died; through Adam came sin; through Adam came sorrow; through Adam came all the disasters that have ever afflicted poor, suffering humanity. Paul, of course, had none of the means of knowledge at the disposal of any intelligent man in the modern world. He did not know, therefore, that death had reigned not only since Adam and over all his descendants, but for some thousands and millions of years before Adam was ever thought of. He did not know that suffering and pain had been in existence, not only among men, but in the animal world for millions of years. If he had, he would have had no more faith in the doctrine of the fall than I have. But Paul believed in the federal headship of Adam; that he was the representative and leader of the world up to that time, and that, under his headship, the world had been a failure. Naturally, then, he turned to some scheme of recovery. He desired to find some way in which this long failure could be turned into success. He desired to find some method, a part of the secret council and fore-knowledge of God,—for not only the fall, but the redemption was part of the predestination of Paul,—by which a new order of things could be instituted, and the world be ultimately crowned with success.

Here, then, we are led to consider Paul's view of Christ. There is another thing also, at the outset, to which I wish to call your careful attention; for people seem to read the Bible in a blindfold and sleepy way, if they read it at all,—never taming of comparing part with part, or treating it as they would treat any other book, or as they should, if they wish to learn anything from it. I was taught in this way myself. I was taught to read so many verses as so much religious duty accomplished, so many square inches of Bible, so much goodness. Thus, people read the Bible, never using their brains and common sense about it.

We need now to consider Paul's attitude toward Christ,—toward Christ, not toward Jesus; for it is hardly too much to say that Paul made no account of the personal Jesus whatever. I want to make that distinction clear. Paul does not have anything to say about Jesus. The only time he quotes his words is when he gives the story of the Last Supper, and, in another place, where he quotes a saying from Jesus that does not appear in the Gospels. He does not anywhere say anything about what Jesus did. He has not a hint anywhere of any miraculous conception. He speaks of no miracles in the modern sense of that word. He only refers in a general way to signs and wonders. But he believed that "speaking with tongues," that incoherent gibberish and babbling, was a miracle, so you can understand what he meant when he spoke of signs and wonders. He says nothing about his raising people from the dead or feeding the multitude. Yet you must remember that he stood nearest to Jesus of
all who wrote of him in the New Testament. It is strange that he should not allude to these things in all of his Epistles. There is not a trace of his having any personal love for Jesus, the man. He says, frankly and distinctly, that he never saw him, except in a vision; and he makes so little account of these things that, when he comes up to Jerusalem and talks over the condition of the early Church with the apostles, he says they had nothing to tell him that he cared anything about,—to use his own phrase, they added nothing to him. He refers to the apostles very slightly, "those who seemed to be somewhat," to be pillars. He speaks of them with hardly dis guised antagonism and irony, and he was in antagonism with them the most of his life. You see how little account he makes of the historic Jesus. What does he make account of? Of the theologic Christ as standing for a part of the scheme of the divine economy in the salvation of the world.

There are three distinct stages of progress very perceptible in Paul's writings, as illustrating three stages of growth in his mind concerning the doctrine of Christ. In the first place, he is converted to the belief that Jesus is the Messiah. But he does not stop there. We find at the last that he had risen to the belief that Jesus was a pre-existent being; that he was the angel Messiah; that he was the first-born of every creature; that he was the beginning of the creation of God, and only less than God himself. But the great thing that he believed, whether he called him Messiah or pre-existent angel or head of the Church, was that Jesus was the head of a new and rejuvenated humanity.

I have told you what Paul believed about Adam, that he was the head of the race that was a failure. Over against Adam, the old man, he sets Christ, the new man, revealed from heaven as the new head of the new humanity. This is the most significant thing in the whole belief of Paul, so far as his doctrine of Christ is concerned. He was the head of the new order of humanity. Those who became engrafted into the Church, those who became followers and disciples of Christ, put off the old idea of Adam, sloughed off their whole association with the old and false order of humanity, and became members of this new race,—the redeemed and renovated Church of God. This is the doctrine of Paul concerning Christ.

I said, a little while ago, that the predestination taught by Paul had a far different outcome for the history of this world from that taught by Calvin and the orthodox churches of the day. He teaches that the fall of man and the redemption are parts of the one divine plan of him who, as a sovereign, works his eternal will. But he held so grand a conception of God that he believed it is a part of this sovereign will that the world ultimately, this whole groaning, travailing, weeping, and crying creation, shall be redeemed. So he teaches that the Jews were rejected and outcast only as a temporary thing, only as the occasion of the bringing in of the Gentiles. He teaches that, when by and by the Gentiles are all brought in, then the Jews also are to be reclaimed; and then, under Christ, there is no longer to be any Jew or Greek, any civilized or barbarian. They are all to be one as parts of, this new humanity. Christ is to be the head of it, and all the world is to be brought into one under his headship. Then, at the last, Christ is to deliver up the kingdom to the Father, and God is to be all and in all.

Ultimately, then, Paul was both a Universalist and a Unitarian; for, although he teaches the pre-existence of this Christ, he teaches plainly his subordination to God, and, as the final outcome of everything, that he is to give up the kingdom to the one God, and all men are to be part of this kingdom. This is the outcome of Paul's doctrine of predestination.

I have left to the last that which is the grandest work that Paul wrought,—a work as grand as that which almost any man has ever wrought in the history of humanity.

I said in the beginning that there were two factions in the early churches. It was inevitable that there should be. Here were these Jews who had been taught and trained for ages into the belief that the Mosaic dispensation was not only divine, but eternal; that, on the basis of this, a new kingdom, after the type of the kingdom of David, was to be established, and the Jews were to rule over the world forever. But here comes in a new claimant, a new Messiah, as those who accepted the Messianic doctrine believed. And here comes Paul, organizing churches all over the Roman Empire, and saying that this divine dispensation of Judaism is obsolete and outgrown. It is very natural that it should require some time to accept so strange a doctrine as that. James, it is true, the old first church at Jerusalem said, all the apostles said, You must also keep the law of Moses, or you cannot be saved. They sent their emissaries after Paul all over the Roman Empire, because they regarded him as the most dangerous heretic of the age. They felt that he was trying to do good, but that he was teaching false doctrine in saying that it was not necessary to keep the law of Moses. After a while, they found that they had to compromise, and they said, You do not have to keep all, but there are certain things you must keep; and, for a long time, they still clung to the idea of the shadow after they had given up the substance. It was ages before they gave up the notion that a Jewish Christian was not better than a Gentile one. They believed that there was an advantage in having been born in the Jewish religion. This was the origin of the great division in the Church, with Peter at the head on the one hand, and Paul at the head on the other. For a great many years, this discussion rent the Church in twain and almost threatened its existence. You find traces of it throughout the New Testament, one party hitting at the other, and that in turn striking back; Paul striking hard blows on one side, and Peter returning them on the other.
The Acts of the Apostles is a very late book. It was written after this warfare between the two churches had practically died out. It was a sort of compromise, written by somebody who wanted to unite these two factions. You will notice a strange parallelism between the sayings and doings of Paul and Peter in this book. If, in one chapter, Paul is represented as doing something wonderful, you will find Peter doing as strange a thing in the next. This book is evidently written for the express purpose of healing over this division in the Church and doing justice to both sides.

But, now, what is the point of the grand work that Paul did? If it had not been for Paul, we might not have had an historic Christianity. We should certainly have had a very different one, and not so good a one as that which we have had. It would have been impossible for the early apostles to have forced upon the Roman Empire not only a belief in Jesus and a belief in Christ, but also the practice of all the ritual of the Jews. If they had attempted that, the whole effort would have broken down, and Christianity would have been merely a new sect of Judaism confined to a few followers. But Paul, with his views, felt that the hour of the Mosaic ritual had struck. The past had been a failure, or at most only a type, a shadow leading on to Christ, the head of the new humanity. And so he said: The works of the law, that neither you nor your fathers could keep, are dead rubbish, to be swept away. So he dispensed with sacrifices and the Jewish Sabbath, and it may be noted he did not say anything about any other. You need not pay any attention to the laws of Moses, he said. They are all gone by. They are only a shadow leading to Christ; and, now that Christ has come, everything is summed up in faith in him. And so arose Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. He became the liberator of the world, and we are to rank him as hardly second among the great men who have snapped the shackles that have bound the freedom of the human race. Paul broke off this enclosing shell of Moses, and set civilization free. This doctrine of justification by faith was the weapon with which he did it; for he said: Whether you are Jew or Gentile, it does not make any difference. Only appropriate and incorporate into your own life the life of this new Christ. Do it by faith. If you believe and accept, you are a part of this new dispensation of God. And so Jew and Gentile, Egyptian, Greek, Roman, no matter who, any man who accepted Christ, became a part of this new kingdom of heaven; and thus all the petty, worrying, wearing, exacting, ritualistic ceremonies of the Jews were abolished at one stroke. Paul's belief in salvation by faith was not a mere petty intellectual assent to an idea. It was with him a believing in something all over, in such dead earnest that you are ready to give your life for it, just as you business men believe in a thing so that you are ready to risk a fortune on it. Faith is not merely saying yes when somebody announces a proposition. It is a belief that drags a whole train of character and consequences after it. That is Paul's belief in justification by faith.

How broad that was, and what power of freedom it had in it, was proved again in the sixteenth century. The Christian Church, under the Catholic power, had become nothing more nor less than a worse Judaism, with ritual and ceremonial,—everything except character, manliness, and force,—when Luther rose; and the weapon with which he broke the chains of modern Europe was Paul's old grand doctrine. I am not sure that we are done with that weapon yet. It does not belong by any patent right to Orthodoxy. Paul forged the weapon. Paul tried its temper and proved its power. Then, it lay rusting and waiting for a thousand years, until Luther proved strong enough to wield it, and once more to fight again the battle for human freedom. And, though it be put away in its armory, it will be called for again and again. For this doctrine means simply going right deep down to the heart of humanity, and saying that which you believe with your whole heart, and are willing to put your life into, it is that which makes you what you are.

This, then, is the service which Paul rendered to the world; and it is hints of this service which are scattered all through these Epistles, and which will make them in all coming time, whatever theory of the Bible may go up or down, of inestimable value to those who care to know the history of humanity.
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Hopes:

A Sermon for the New Year.

"We are saved by hope."—ROMANS viii., 24.

As we study the religions of the world, we cannot fail to be struck by one fact, which is not peculiar to any one of them, but which is common, I might almost say, to humanity,—the fact that man has created for himself, in imagination, two Edens, an Eden in the past and an Eden in the future. A beautiful, perfect place, a beautiful, perfect condition, where there is no sin, no sorrow, no pain,—such, men have dreamed of as the starting-point of history. Another perfect condition, another beautiful place, where there is no sin, no sorrow, no pain, they have equally imagined as the goal of history. That is the thing to be attained as the outcome of human life. This, it seems to me, we may rightly take as a parable of life,—something, whether true or not of the race, true in a certain, very profound sense of the individual. These two Edens are the creation respectively of memory and hope.

Each individual has an Eden in his past; for it is one peculiarity of this wondrous faculty that we call memory that it is able to transmute and transform even the hard, harsh, disagreeable things of the past in such a way as to leave behind us, in the main, only a beautiful country.

I remember, for example, that I once passed through a terrific storm. We were in imminent danger of shipwreck,—waiting, weary, fearful, hour after hour, almost holding our breath as we heard the wind howling overhead and the big waves striking the sides of our trembling ship, wondering what would happen, hardly expecting we should see the land. It was torture while it lasted, although there might have been no great fear of death. But now all this experience is simply a pleasant excitement in the memory. The pain, the sorrow, the sadness, have all passed away; and it remains as something that we gladly remember. Something akin to this is true of all our experience. No matter what our childhood may have been, or the experience of youth, a large part of our disappointments has been trans-formed by the magic touch of memory, that, Midas-like, is able to turn even the basest metals to gold.

So, on the other hand, we picture to ourselves a beautiful country in the future. No matter how many times we may be disappointed, still the ardor of this hope is not quite chilled; still imagination flies on with fresh, untiring wing, and hovers over a country lying in the mild sunlight of a better day. We imagine a life with the evils of the present outgrown, and think that we shall certainly attain to this better state.

Our actual life is passed on a very narrow neck of time. An infinite or boundless ocean called the past is behind us, another infinite or boundless ocean called the future is before us. We live only by the instant.’ The present is so fleeting that, before we can say it is, it is gone. We live only in this flitting, fleeting moment; and yet a large part of our conscious existence is spent either in the past or the future.

But what are we doing in this present passing moment? We are creating what shall be our memories. We are also creating either the possibility of realizing or the certainty of destroying our richest and noblest hopes. This very minute, the thought that we cherish, the decision we make, the kind or unkind word we speak, create for us the kind of memory that must be ours; and it is also determining whether we shall realize or fail in realizing our far-off hopes.

As we stand here this morning and look back over the past, calling to mind things that we hoped at the beginning of the year that is gone, candor will compel us to confess to ourselves, if we do not to others, that a
very large number of those hopes have not been realized. Perhaps we have been disappointed oftener than we have attained the things that we have desired. We expected, some of us, to have been in a little easier condition financially than we are to-day. We expected to have made money during the past year, while, as a matter of fact,—at least of some of us it is true,—our property has shrunk. Some of it has slipped through our fingers. And we stand here with that hope blasted, holding only the blighted stalk in our hand; while the leaves that made the brilliant flower, instead of developing into fruit, have withered and fallen off.

Some of us have stood as watchers by the side of sickbeds. We have looked upon pale and wan faces,—faces indicating pain and weariness and long waiting,—and we have hoped that the days and weeks and months, as they went by, would bring life and fresh vigor to the cheeks; but these hopes have been disappointed, for these friends have not recovered. And we see them gradually slipping down and down, nearer to the edge of the cloud that, we know, will receive them out of our sight.

Some of us have been worried with care concerning our friends, concerning property, or concerning the welfare, moral or spiritual, of our children; and we have hoped for an outcome better than has been realized. And we are disappointed, wondering whether this new year is going to do for us that which the old failed to accomplish.

So concerning almost all the hopes of our past,—perhaps it is true that a large number, nay, even the larger number, have not been realized. They have been beautiful, flitting forms, that have receded as we have advanced. As we have stretched out longing hands to clasp them, they have eluded us, fading into nothing.

What is the lesson of it? What is this wonderful thing we call hope? Is it, after all, a lie, a cheat? Is it a mirage, making beautiful pictures on the air of something that does not exist in fact, of something that we, at any rate, shall never see? Is it a will-o’-the-wisp, leading us on, flitting ever before us until we find ourselves lost in the bog? Is it an illusion, something that does not represent a reality, something we should be better without? I hear older people sometimes saying to the young: "It is all very well for you to cherish these grand hopes for the future, but you will learn better by and by. I know it is very bright,—this dawn, this prediction of the morning sky before the sun is quite up; but you will soon find yourself plodding and trudging along the highway in the dust, with this same sun beating down upon you, a burden instead of a blessing." I do not like this way of chilling the enthusiasm of youth by those who, as they say, have experienced life and found that there was nothing in it. If you have indeed found that there is nothing in it, you have only found that there is nothing in you. The illusion of the world, if it be an illusion, only reflects the hollowness of your own hearts, your own lives, your own achievements, your own characters.

I do not believe, then, that this hope is a lie, a cheat, an illusion. I believe rather that it lies at the root of all that is best in human character.

Let us consider it for a moment, and see if we can find out what it is. I do not undertake to explain it, in the ultimate sense of that word; for I have never found anything in this universe that I could explain. When I can explain a grass-blade, I shall know God. Nothing can be explained in that sense. Yet I believe we can find out that hope bears so important a relation to this human life that we may say without any exaggeration, in the words of the apostle, "We are saved by hope." It is the salvation of the individual life and the salvation of the race, and without it we are nothing.

If I spoke as a man of science, I should say that hope is that mysterious, inexplicable, and yet universal and eternal evolutionary impulse that lies at the heart of all life. It is the power that works in and works through, lifts up and leads on, develops and creates, all things. Hope, as it comes up into our consciousness, is only the outflowering, in con-sciousness, of this central power of life and growth.

To illustrate by something that is not alive, in the sense in which we are,—not consciously alive, but which is yet brother and kin to us in literalness,—take a tree and study it. As the winter passes away and the spring is coming on, we know that there begins in it a stir, a thrill of new life, as the sun rides higher in the heavens, as there is a new warmth in the air. If this tree were only conscious, as we are, it would feel the thrill of the eternal and universal life in it, lifting it up, pressing at every point of its surface; that tendency which pushes out the bud on the bough, which unfolds the leaves, and makes them swing green and beautiful in the spring-like breeze, and play with the patter of the April rain. It is this same power of forefeeling and prophecy in the tree of leafage, of blossom and fruit, which is the touch in the tree of the evolutional life and growth of the world. It is this which is the life, the impulse, the spirit of promise, of potency of the future in every man, woman, and child,—a touch of the same infinite life. And hope is only the consciousness of this, a recognition of this forefeeling, a promise of some grander development not yet attained. That is the scientific explanation, based on the profoundest study of human life not only, but of all life, from highest to lowest.

When I speak as a religious teacher and thinker, I mean this power, this force; but I call it the God in us, the divine life, the impulse that lifts up and leads on the race to the fulfilment of its destiny. Hope, I say, is only the outblossoming of this into power and life. Do you not see, then, how important a part it plays in this humanity of ours? Do you not see that it is so important that we are justified in saying that the loss of hope is the very
worst calamity that can possibly befall a human being, because it means the decay of life? It means the lack and loss of that power out of which everything comes.

Suppose, for example, I stand by a steam-engine. The steam-gauge is an indicator of the power shut up and held in reserve within the measure of its capacity; and, if that tells me that there is no steam there, the engine, for the time being, is practically dead and powerless. So hope, we may say, is the gauge of the individual and the race. It is an indicator of how much capacity and power there is in a human heart and life. And here is justification for the statement I have sometimes made, without stopping to explain it, that there is only one thing in any human life that is finally fatal; and that one thing is despair. There is no crime so crimson, there is no sin so dark, but that, if hope remains, the man may outlive it, outgrow it, even climb by means of it to something higher and better. But, if hope be gone, life and the impulse to do anything noble is gone. And so despair means death. You remember that marvellous parable of human life in so many of its phases, Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress?* You will recall how Pilgrim, on his way to the Eternal City, falls into the custody of Giant Despair, who shuts him up in Doubting Castle; and he feels that all things are at an end. No more for him the sunny roadway of a morning, and pleasant conversations with his friends; no more for him songs in the night; no more for him the victory of achievement, of reaching out a helping hand to a brother; no more for him glimpses and gleams of the Eternal City. He is helplessly, hopelessly sitting in despair. It is only when, after a little while, he plucks from his bosom the key of hope that he finds he has within his grasp the means of escape. With that he opens the door, and goes out into the free air, and pursues his way, glad and rejoicing.

It is despair, hopelessness, which lies at the heart of all the evil of this world. Take a drunkard, for example, whom you say you cannot reclaim. That means there is no spring of hope in him; he himself has given up hope. He says there is no use in his trying longer; that appetite is stronger than he is, and there is no impulse that can back up any effort on his part. So you find in the criminal classes that, in ninety cases out of a hundred, the only thing needed to make any better future for them is to give them the hope of it. Take the pauper class, too, that live from hand to mouth. They say: It is no use. We can only earn enough to keep soul and body together. There is no hope for any better social condition for us.

It is because of these things that I said what I did a moment ago about the evil of chilling this hope. Rather would I encourage it. We sometimes talk about a young man as sophomoric, and blame him as extravagant in his expectations. I would not give a cent for any young man who is not sophomoric, who does not look forward with extravagant expectation, who is not bubbling over with hope. I do not care how impossible is that which he expects. He will tame down soon enough. He will get over his magnificent expectations all too soon. He will find the reality of this life is not equal to his dream. Still, I would say, "Dream on." I would encourage even the building of air-castles. Build your castles in the air. Create a foundation, deep and strong, of the most brilliant imagining. Make it as fine, if you will, as the city of the New Jerusalem. Lift up your pinnacles. Let your flags fly from each one. Ring your bells of promise and of hope.

I believe that there is no harm in this castle-building for any one of us, so long as calm reason is at the helm, and so long as, day by day, we deal with the practical realities of life. Not only do we fly into that wonderland of memory for rest, but we actually enjoy many a sweet and noble hour as we sit in these castles in Spain that our fancies have built. Many times do we escape from the barrenness, the drudgery of the common world around us, and rest for an hour in this country of our dreams. Is it an evil? Nay, it is a blessed refuge and place of peace.

Take the watcher by the sick-bed. Let her dream, while the sick one sleeps, of a future in which he shall be well. Will that make her less tender, less watchful, less helpful to the invalid that may never share the realization of such a dream?

Suppose you have been disappointed in business. Is there any harm in resting your head upon your hand over the books in which the balance has come out on the wrong side, and dreaming that you will have something better by and by? No. Do you not rather go back refreshed, and with a new spring of vigor and power with which to attack the problems of life, and so make more certain the realization of your dreams?

Dream, then, of your future: only keep reason ever at the helm, and remember that not out of the dream, but by practical handling of the real problems of life, is to come the nearest approximation to the realization of your dreams.

We stand here this morning facing a new year, a new outlook, new opportunities; and we find ourselves, I trust, still hopeful. I should feel exceedingly sad if any one of you should tell me that you to-day have nothing fine and high and sweet for which you hope during the coming year. You hope to make money this year, although you last year lost. You hope that your sick friend will recover; and I hope so, too, with all my heart. You hope that you will win for yourselves a little easier life; that you can shake off some of the cares and troubles of the past, lay down some of the burdens you have been bearing for many a weary month and year. You hope to pass out from the cloud into the sunlight, and take some step toward the realization of that practical freedom that comes with the accumulation of money,—ability to travel, to buy books, to help your friends, to assist in
the development of all things fine and noble among men. I do hope myself that you will not be disappointed.

But I wish to offer two or three considerations that should moderate the feeling of your disappointment, if your hopes should fail, and help you to believe that hope is not a delusion and a snare.

Consider then, in the first place, that, although I have just hoped fine things for you, I cannot candidly say that I believe that you will realize one-half the hopes of to-day, just as you are figuring them to yourself. The outcome of a very large part of our lives is well illustrated in that half-humorous, half-pathetic saying of Thackeray,—that, when he was a boy, he wanted some taffy; but it cost a sixpence, and he did not have the sixpence. After he grew up, he had the sixpence, but he did not want the taffy. He gives this illustration of the way the outcome of life often disappoints the expectations. We want something that we cannot get. By and by, we could get it, but we no longer want it. Our tastes have changed. Yet, though Thackeray did not care anything about the taffy after he had the sixpence, his life was not a disappointment, and his hopes did not deceive him. He may not have gained the precise thing he wanted when he was a boy, but he gained something unspeakably finer and better. You may not, then, gain just the thing you hope for to-day; but, if you read your experience with anything like intelligence, you should have learned this lesson,—that, though you gain not the precise thing for which you hope, you may reasonably expect to gain something a great deal better.

When Columbus set sail from Palos, he hoped, by sailing ever westerly over this unknown sea, to reach the eastern coast of India. And when, after these weary months of mutiny and alternate hope and despair, with hope still dominant over all, he came in sight of land, he thought his hope was realized; and he died without learning his mistake. He did not reach that for which he hoped, he never found the eastern coast of India; but he did a better thing. He gave a new world to Europe,—a continent so much finer and better than India that here, we may reasonably expect, shall be the finest and highest development of man on this planet.

Take the father of Martin Luther. He hoped, and bent all his energies in that direction, that this brave, strong boy of his would enter the law, and become a respected citizen, attaining wealth, distinction, and power. All these hopes were dashed and blighted when, by the perversity of his religious imaginings, as his father must have regarded them, Martin Luther decided, in the freshness and vigor of his youth, to enter a monastery, and become a monk. His father's hope was blighted in this direction; but out of the monastery flashed a light to illuminate England, America, and give religious freedom to the world.

I was talking the other day with a lady from Brooklyn, who used to be wealthy. Through sudden reverses and through the ill health of her husband, she is now not poor, but cramped and narrowed in her circumstances; compelled to live carefully, and think how she will spend a dollar, where a few years ago she would not have considered the spending of a hundred. But yet she told me, while the mist gathered in her eyes, that she was glad beyond expression for the experience that had come to her. Her hopes had been crushed; but out of this withered blossom sprang a new flower of character, of experience of human life, of sympathy with all men's want and sorrow, of knowledge of human nature,—things that she felt were worth unspeakably more than the riches she had lost. So I take it that many and many a time, if we read our experiences carefully, we shall be compelled to confess that, though the special hope was not realized, something better came in its place.

Then there is one thought more, and that is, if we will only be rational in looking toward the future, if we will only read the lessons that memory's page holds out before our gaze, we need not be so often disappointed as we are. Nine out of ten of our disappointments come because we expected something we had no right to expect. A little child is disappointed because his nurse will not give him the moon; but that is a very childish and silly disappointment, because it is something impossible to realize, and undesirable, if it were possible. So, I take it, a large part of the hopes we cherish are things that, taking our characters, our conditions, our circumstances, our ability, into consideration, we have no right to expect, and that, perhaps, if we had a right to expect, would not be good for us; and so we have no right to hope for them and no right to be disappointed. If we will only be reasonable and learn the lessons of the past, and hope only for those things that we can rationally expect to attain, and lend our energies toward that realization, many more of our hopes would blossom and bear fruit than actually do.

There is another thought that is of the first importance. Though many of our hopes wither, still there is something that may come out of the experience of life ministered to by false hopes, by disappointment, by enjoyment, and experiences of every kind, much richer, fairer, finer than all else. We may have very little control over the matter, whether our hopes shall be realized or not; but over this one capital thing we do have control.

"My boyhood chased the butterfly,
Or, when the shower was gone,
Sought treasures at the rainbow's end,"
That lured me, wandering on,
I caught nor bow nor butterfly,
Though eagerly I ran;
But in the chase I found myself,
And grew to be a man.

"In later years, I've chased the good,
The beautiful, and true,—
Mirage-like forms which take not shape,
They flit as I pursue.
But, while the endless chase I run,
I grow in life divine :
I miss the ideals that I seek,
But God himself is mine."

This, then, is the lesson. No matter how many hopes fail, we have it in our power, from the experience of life, of joy and of sorrow, to develop ourselves into manliness and womanliness. I may not be able to ward off a sorrow, but I can bear it like a man. I may have sinned, but I can fight myself above and beyond the sin. I may lose property, but I can be honest in the loss. I can be true through it all, and stand at the last clothed in the nobility of a character wrought out of all those experiences. You have it in your power, then, not to control the accidents of life, but to create manhood and womanhood as the result of them. And, when the last day of this year comes, if you are compelled to say, The thing I looked for did not come, but something else I feared did come, you know perfectly well that it will not be those things that will make up the sadness of your memories. Looking further still, when you stand on the last day of your life and look back, the great thing then will be what you are, what you have become. How much of patience, of tenderness, of purity, of nobility, of unselfishness you have extracted from the experience of life, as a bee gathers honey from flowers; how much of these you have wrought into your character,—this will be what will make memory a blessing, this will be the root through which shall spring up and blossom out the noblest flowers of hope. ' And that alone, if there be another life, is the sole capital with which you can start business there. This then will blossom, this magnificent hope of the future, so that even death cannot chill or quench it. When I try to look deeply into the meaning of life, this seems to me the most wonderful thing of all. I cannot think this glorious hope, this divine impulse leading on all the way from the beginning to to-day, is a lie. It has not proved a lie in the past. I do not believe it is a lie when it still flourishes vigorously on the very edge of the grave. It is hope that makes that daring leap in the dark, and believes that it shall light on a city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God. Hope, looking down into a grave,' declares that that is not the end. It looks through it, and, catching a gleam of light from the other side, dares to assert that even death's ashes strew the way that leads to an eternal sunrise. This seems to me the most magnificent development of this faculty divine of which we can conceive. This character that you are capable of working out in the midst of the decay of all present hopes,—this shall fit you for that grand future, if it be; and, if it be not, it is that which shall make you look back with gladness upon your past. But I dare to trust, listening to the whisper of this hope, that it must be true. I dare to trust in that outlook pictured so beautifully by Campbell, in the last words of his great poem :-

"Eternal Hope I when yonder spheres sublime
Pealed their first notes to sound the march of Time,
Thy joyous youth began; but not to fade.
When all the sister planets have decayed;
When, wrapt in fire, the realms of ether glow,
And Heaven's last thunder shakes the world below,—
Thou, undismayed, shalt o'er the ruins smile,
And light thy torch at Nature's funeral pile."
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The Survival of the Fittest.

"For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath."
—MATTHEW xiii., 12.

The scientific theory of evolution is now universally accepted on the part of those who have given it adequate study, who are unbiassed and free to accept the truth, and who are competent to weigh evidence, and see which side of a disputed subject is proved. It is not necessarily accepted as set forth in its completeness in any one writer or theorizer, but in its general outlines. The central doctrine of this theory of evolution is summed up in the familiar words, "the struggle for life, and the survival of the fittest"; not necessarily a struggle for physical existence only, because it applies to institutions, to theories, to philosophies, to ideas, as well as to individuals either animal or human.

The struggle for life, the survival of the fittest,—a universal truth; and yet there are many to whom it seems a hard saying. It appears to them to be a summing-up of that theory, which they indignantly reject, that "might makes right,"—the theory of the strong hand and the hard heart. It appears, I say, at the first blush, to be this, only expressed in other words. There are many in the scientific world, who regard it as such, who nevertheless accept it stoically, and say, Since it is the truth, we must perforce take it for what it is, and make the best of it. There are others, in large numbers, religiously inclined, who think it perhaps true, so far as the natural world is concerned, the method of the mechanism of nature; but who yet feel that, in order to meet the demands of the human heart, the desire for sympathy, for tenderness, for love, something more is needed. As a scientific theory, it is good enough in the department of nature; but it must be supplemented by a supernatural revelation of divine love, by a gospel,—good news, such news as nature has not to give. They say we must have mercy, grace, tenderness, pity, love from some source; for these are in man, and are a part of the demand of human nature. Finding themselves in this attitude toward the scientific theory of evolution, they demand that it shall be pieced out and completed by something else, reaching into what they regard as a higher realm of thought and influence. Yet, if this be so, is it not a little strange? Bishop Butler, many years ago, wrote the most famous book of evidences that the world has ever seen,—a book attempting to establish Christianity by showing how the constitution and course of nature were analogous to the teachings of Christianity, corresponding to it, and parallel with it. They were two views of one complete whole. Must we in this clay reverse that line of argument? Must we admit that there is a duality in the universe, that God with one hand rules nature as a hard and fast merciless mechanism, and with the other hand dispenses mercy, tenderness, and grace? Is God divided? Is he one thing in religion, and another thing in the kingdom of nature? Let us beware, before we accept this theory, lest we lay ourselves liable to the statement of Jesus when confronted by the Pharisees, when he declared that a house divided against itself could not stand. So I believe a universe divided against itself cannot stand. Therefore, I do not believe that it is divided against itself. If, then, we shall find this to be a law in nature, we shall probably find it also the law in ethics, in religion, in this world, in all worlds.

Here, curiously enough, comes in this remarkable saying of Jesus,—a saying that I used to stumble over, not being able to understand it,—"For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath." This seems to be a curious
foregleam, a premonition of truth, uttered before the world was wise enough to understand it. For is not here, in these words of Jesus, a terse, graphic summing-up of this very principle of which I am speaking?

Let us see then, in the first place, whether this universal battle is going on, and whether, indeed, it is the fittest that survive. In other words, is this doctrine true? This is our first point.

It will not be long now, as the nights are growing shorter and the sun has already begun his journey homeward from the South, before, along the sides of the streets and under the fences in sheltered nooks, here and there, the grasses will begin to spring. You who are fortunate enough to have yards about your houses or to live in the country can see this process of nature going on,—the very old but ever new wonder of a reviving world. Picture yourselves then, on some beautiful morning, standing and looking over one of these freshly growing grass-plots about your house or in the field, and it will seem to you, as you think of it, that it is the very image of rural peace. Yet do you know that that is a battle-field, in which an inexorable warfare is being carried on,—a contest as merciless, as relentless, as was ever fought on the most crimson field of human warfare? A thousand blades spring up, and push their way through the sod. Then begins a competition for soil, a struggle for sunlight, for air, for dew and rain, for all the conditions of growth. Those that are in stony places, those by the wayside, those where the conditions are not favorable, will be defeated, and will die, going back again to the original dust, perhaps to have another opportunity granted them, when they may-achieve success, when they may win the life that they fail of attaining to-day. Meantime, this relentless warfare is going on. Those that survive will be the fittest to survive,—those properly circumstanced, those that secure sufficient food and sunshine and rain. Not only here, but among the roses, the lilies, among all things beautiful, the same competitive struggle is going on, and has been going on from the beginning of life on this planet till to-day.

The same thing is true in forests, among the trees. The fittest survive: the rest must perish. So is it in every department of nature and of human life. The fishes in the sea, the beasts in the woods, and the fowls of the air,—among them all, this competition for life, this struggle for continued existence, for growth, is going on; and it is the fittest that survive. Thus it is, as the result of this conflict, that we have the pine tree in Maine, the palmetto in the Carolinas, and all the beautiful growths of the tropics, the edelweiss close up to the snow line of the Alps, and the richest productions of the most sheltered valleys.

This conflict is not only going on in the midst of what we call the natural growths of the world, but also amid nations, races, institutions, languages, forms of government, social organizations, among all the trades and occupations of the world,—a competition, peaceful it may be, and yet inexorable, on the part of all the business men in Boston. It is so between Boston and New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis, and all the cities of the world. It is the same everywhere.

But is it true only here? No: it is true also in the realm of religion. How else does it happen that the few great religions that are dominant to-day over the world have sprung up, and have prevailed? Let us glance for a moment at the method of religious progress.

In the first place, the lowest tribes were fetish worshippers. Sticks, stones,—anything to which superstitious reverence became accidentally attached was to them a god. Ther, they worshipped the shades of their ancestors; and there came to be a multiplicity of gods, more gods almost than people. But this condition was not a permanent one; for, as we come along the line of human growth, we find, among the ancient Hebrews for example, not our modern monotheism by any means, although that is the popular idea, but Jehovah grown to supremacy over the other deities, so that the Psalmist speaks of him as King of kings and Lord of lords. Not that the other gods did not exist, not that the other lords were nonentities, but that he was supreme above them all. It was the same among the Greeks. Zeus, among the Hellenic gods, was the greatest at the Olympian court. Under the influence of these forces and according to the working of this law, someone of these ideals, or conceptions of divinity, came to be, as the people advanced, the one which satisfied them intellectually and morally. After this unconscious election, or selection, the rest of the deities were relegated to secondary places. Finally, monotheism became supreme, because the people had learned to recognize unity in the heavens above them and the earth beneath them,—one law, one life, one force; and, naturally, they could not endure the thought of two supremes. The idea of duality or multiplicity was not fitted to the intellectual stage at which man had arrived in the course of his development.

According to the working of this same law, there comes ever to be an elevation and purification of this ideal of the one God; and the harder, the less merciful, less tender, less moral conceptions of God die out, and fade away. The humane, the loving, the tender, the merciful, come to the front, and supersede all the rest. Why? For the simple reason that man himself has become humane, tender and merciful, forgiving, and morally superior to what he had been. The old ideals of God were not fitted to survive in these struggles between the different ideals. Trace this law anywhere you will,—in God, in human life, in government, in ethics, in religion,—this one eternal force is at work; and it is at work according to this one eternal method.

I wish here to interject one thought, that I may be perfectly clear. The survival of the fittest does not always mean, in the usual sense of that word, the survival of the best. It means the survival of that which is best
adapted to the circumstances and the time, that which fits the place where it appears and grows.

This doctrine then is true, true everywhere. If true, what then? If true, we cannot afford to do otherwise than to accept it; to recognize it as the method of nature and life, and adapt ourselves to it. It seems to me very strange—and yet I find illustrations of it everywhere—that people should attempt to fight the inevitable, to pit themselves against the universe. I remember last summer, when I was crossing the Atlantic, there was at first an instinctive tendency on my part to resist the action of the waves and the movement of the great ship. I found myself unconsciously bracing against it, as though I could overbalance the storm. But I found only that it disturbed my brain, disordered my nerves, and made me intensely uncomfortable, while producing no effect on the universe. I learned how puerile and foolish it was, and gave myself up at last to this mighty movement on which I was tossed as a little thing, and then I found the great ship was my friend, and the storm itself took me in its arms and rocked me quietly to sleep.

The wisdom of adapting ourselves to the eternal truth in practical affairs was never more forcibly and tersely set forth than in that familiar story of Abraham Lincoln; and I know of no more wisdom concentrated in fewer words. Near the opening of the war, some of those who were a good deal troubled as to which side might win in the conflict came to Mr. Lincoln, and said, "Mr. President, Stonewall Jackson is a Christian, and he is praying for the success of his side; and so thousands of the people in the South are devout Christians, worshippers of the same God, and they, too, are praying with all their might for the success of the cause to which they have given themselves. Now, Mr. President, why do you feel sure, or do you feel sure, that God is on our side in the great struggle?" And Mr. Lincoln replied, with that quiet, homely smile of wisdom that so frequently played about his lips: "It has never occurred to me to be troubled at all as to how I can get God on my side in the war. The only thing I am anxious about is to find out where God is, and get on his side." There is the wisdom that we need to learn, not only in war, but in social life, in ethics, in religion. Find out where the Infinite Power is, and get that at your back and you are invincible. Stand up for some little pet notion or idea of your own against the universe, and you can only be tossed about like an eggshell, even if you are not dashed to pieces. This, then, is true, as I believe,—the law of the universe in all its range, in its whole infinite breadth, in its boundless depth, its measureless height.

Let us now see if it is this heartless, cruel, merciless, unfeeling, inhuman thing that it is so commonly assumed to be.

I want to ask you then to mark with me three great stages of human advance, and see how this principle works along these stages or transformations, and the results it produces.

There was a time when this earth first became the abode of life, when mere physical, muscular power was king, when the supreme forces on the planet were the gigantic forms of earthly and aquatic life,—those dragons, scaly and reptilian, that flew heavy-winged through the air. Those were the mightiest beings on the planet. Then, it was true, as Tennyson pictures it so graphically in "In Memoriam" that the "dragons of the prime tore each other in their slime." Then, it was true that nature was "red in tooth and claw with ravin." It was a battle between these gigantic animals and birds, and the battle went on for supremacy; and this muscular power was supreme.

But let us consider one or two things that should modify our view of this condition of affairs. It is sometimes assumed, and Mr. Tennyson in "In Memoriam" assumes it, that the gift of life, unless it is indefinitely prolonged, is not worth having. I do not agree with him. I long for the future life. I have an intense curiosity that I wish satisfied. I want to visit some other worlds. I want to see how things are going to look and see if this be not accorded me, still I am glad every moment that I have had a glimpse of this marvellous scene.

The gift of life, then, is a possible gift of good, whether it be greatly prolonged or not. So I believe that the gift of life to the tiny insect that flutters for a day in the air, and goes out at night, is so much good conferred. And, if it is to be taken away, it may be done without any injustice; for we have no claim on the universe for things that have not been bestowed on us. But I believe that, in the lower planes of the animal world, there is no more merciful way for life to be taken than through this mutual struggle and conflict. I believe that the animals and birds that prey upon each other actually suffer less in going out of the world by this method than they would by old age or starvation. So we are not to look on this scene as one of cruelty, as it would be in our range of life.

Once more, we greatly err, when we assume that the animal world below us suffers in such a conflict as we would suffer in like circumstances. We cannot conceive of any organized creature as thinking until a brain is developed: therefore, we do not imagine an oyster as thinking. So it is unwise of us to imagine the animal world as capable of suffering until there is a nervous system developed. There may be a dim sentient germ; but there is a large part of this lower world where there is no possibility of such keenness of pleasure and pain as we are capable of feeling.

What is the result of the survival of the fittest? First, animal strength has been produced as the outcome of
this long contest. Would it have been better for the weakest to survive? Surely, a lower type would have been the result. The swiftest have also been the victors in this contest. Therefore, the swiftest have propagated of their kind. So, too, the beautiful has been developed. This is wrought not only by the choosing of the fairest in mating in the animal kingdom, but it has been brought about even in the vegetable world. It is the most fragrant and most brilliant flowers that have been sought out by the bees and insects, and in this way the fructifying pollen has been carried here and there from flower to flower; and so the most beautiful and most fragrant kinds have been developed, while the others have been left behind in the struggle. And so, as a result of this in the animal and vegetable world, strength and speed, beauty and fragrance, have been progressively developed.

But this is only the first step. There came a time when there was born into the midst of this internecine muscular struggle a mightier power, a larger development of brain, more mind, more thought. At first merely as cunning, that could more easily outwit or escape an enemy; and then, as thought, as foresight, as planning grew, a looking toward a controlling of the future, an organizing of separate forms and forces into unity, and so a controlling of the world. Muscular power was then discrowned, and took its place at the foot of the throne, while brain grasped the sceptre, and ruled the world. This, in its ultimate working, has wrought out as a result the brilliant stars of mind that stud the firmament,—such names as Homer and Virgil and Dante, and Shakspere and Milton, and Socrates and Plato and Bruno, and Newton and Darwin and Spencer. These men, selected in the struggle for life, have won the highest places, and been made kings of the world.

But brain even was not to be ultimate ruler of human destiny. And so there came a time when physical power was placed still lower, at the very foot of the throne, when brain stepped down and stood on the higher steps as prime minister, and when the moral ideal of the world mounted the throne and placed the crown upon its own head and seized the emblem of power. And to-day, mightier than all brute force, mightier than all cunning, mightier than all foresight of intellect, is the moral ideal of man. Under the working of this same law called heartless, merciless, cruel, inhuman, all the tenderness, all the love, all the pity, all the mutual helpfulness of man toward man, have become supreme,—supreme not because weaker, not because, in Bible phrase, God has chosen the weak things of the world to confound the mighty, the foolish things to overthrow the wise, but because the moral ideal is actually mightier than any other force in the world; mightier, because it is in the heart of men and rules there; mightier, because having its throne in the heart it rules the brain and the thought of man.

Consider for a moment. What was it, on the field of Runnymede, that enabled those old barons to wrest from King John their Magna Charta, the foundation of English freedom? It was the ideal of freedom, mightier than the king. What was it in the days of Cromwell, that faced King Charles the First in the person of Cromwell and his Ironsides? It was not simply the strongest battalions, physically considered: it was the moral sense of England behind and in Cromwell, mightier than all the traditions of the throne. What was it that stirred like the rumbling of an earthquake under the ancient dynasty of France, until it tumbled into ruins and the French Revolution startled Europe? It was only the moral sense of France, outraged by centuries of oppression, lust, cruelty, and wrong, rising in its might, overthrowing the age-long despotism, that was only dust and chaff before it. What is it today that drives the Czar of Russia into his inner palace, and locks the doors and surrounds him with triple and quadruple guards, and makes him tremble at every noise for his own life? It is the moral sense of the people uprising, and demanding liberty, truth, freedom in their government, national reformation,—a power mightier than all his police, a power that laughs at his guards, that will yet prove stronger than his cannon. I do not contradict that famous saying of Napoleon, for I believe it is true, that Providence is on the side of the strongest battalion. Providence is on the side of the strongest battalion: only Napoleon, to his cost, failed to learn one part of his lesson, and that was that the strongest battalion is not always the one that has the largest and most numerous guns; that it is not always the one that counts the most men with bayonets over their shoulders; not the one disciplined by the most experienced officers. It is the one—many a battle-field has proved it—in which the moral sense of man is incarnated, so that one man is mightier than ten, so that the words of the old Scripture become true,—that one man sometimes chases a thousand and two put ten thousand to flight.

It is no contradiction to this law that the weak and poor and down-trodden, even the vanquished, sometimes prove themselves to be the victors of those who had overthrown them. It is rather in accordance with the very workings of this law. There comes in here this grand truth: that the spiritual, the moral, the emotional, the tender, the merciful, many a time become supreme. Take the case of Jesus, outraged, overthrown, crucified; or the martyrs of the Church, smitten down by pagans; or take again, on the other hand, the victims of the Church itself, like Bruno, or the victims of the orthodox, like Servetus,—those that have been trodden down by the onward march of the physical and the intellectual forces of their age. Again and again has it proved true that these have conquered, that they have risen in their spiritual might, and been greater than those who crushed them. So that the vanquished many a time have proved victors; and those that were supposed to be slain have been more alive than their slayers. As summing up this, let me give you a few lines from Mr. W. W. Story:
"Speak, History! Who are Life's victors?
Unroll thy long annals, and say,
Are they those whom the world called the victors,—
Who won the success of a day?
The martyrs or Nero? The Spartans, who fell at Thermopylae's tryst, Or the Persians and Xerxes? His judges or Socrates? Pilate or Christ?"

This principle, then, is true,—and, indeed, it would seem to be so true that anybody out of an asylum could understand it, if he stopped to think a moment,—that the stronger must win in the conflict. When two forces come into conflict, must not the weaker always give way? And, if one force does give way, is not that demonstration that it was the weaker? That the moral and spiritual do really conquer the physical and the intellectual, is not that in itself proof that they are the mightier in the conflict of life, and that their survival is the survival of the fittest? Not only is this true, then, as I have partly shown you,—and as I could show in every case, had I the time,—but, as the result of the working of this force and according to this law, the strong, the swift, the beautiful, the high, the fine, the lovely, the tender, the true, have been survivors in the battle of life. It is in accordance with this principle that all social organizations have been judged in the past, and must be judged to-day and in the future. It is in accordance with this that governments are judged, approved or rejected. It, is in accordance with this that all religions are tested. It is in accordance with this that all ethical ideas are tried. It is in accordance with this that this church must stand or fall; that you and I as individuals must be proved. If the church can fill its place and do its work, it will live. If not, it will die, and it ought to. If you and I can fill some worthy place in the world, serve our time and race individually, physically, morally, then we shall live and grow strong. If not, we shall give place to someone worthier than we, and we ought to. Who then dares to say that there is anything unjust, untender, unmerciful in this saying of Jesus,—"To him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath"? In this, we read that incompetence of every kind, physical, mental, moral, shall be outgrown, and that the good shall ultimately triumph.

When Kepler read in the stars his three famous laws of planetary motion, he said in sublime, though familiar, words, "O God, I think over again thy thoughts after thee! " And so Darwin and Spencer of this modern world have only been more broadly and more deeply thinking over again the thoughts and methods and ways of this Infinite and Eternal Power that unfolds itself age after age, and under the uplifting influence of which all fine, sweet, true, noble things have come to be.

The one life thrilled the star-dust through,
In nebulous masses whirled,
Until, globed like a drop of dew,
Shone out a new-made world.

The one life on the ocean shore,
Through primal ooze and slime,
Crept slowly on from less to more
Along the ways of time.

The one life in the jungles old,
From lowly, creeping things,
Did ever some new form unfold,—
Swift feet or soaring wings.

The one life all the ages through
Pursued its wondrous plan,
Till, as the tree of promise grew,
It blossomed into man.

The one life reacheth onward still:
As yet, no eye may see
The far-off fact man's dream fulfil,—
The glory yet to be.
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The Goal of the Reformation.

"Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him."—ACTS X., 34, 35.

It is probably true of nearly all great historic movements that they tend ultimately toward some goal unforeseen by those men who were most largely associated with the original impulse. Not only are these results unforeseen, but often, had they been seen, they would not have been desired.

It is a serious question, for instance, in my mind, whether, if Martin Luther could have seen the results which have been attained during the last four hundred years of Protestantism, he would not have hesitated before laying his hand to the work. I am not quite sure that he would not have preferred to have left certain things as they were, rather than to have been an instrument in the production of such results as have, even so far, flowed from this great reformation movement. Most certainly, Luther would have stood aghast, had he seen with clear and open eye what we can see to-day as the direction in which these forces are moving and what is to be their probable goal.

We claim ourselves to be one of the legitimate, logical fruits of the Reformation. But there is hardly anything in our church polity or church creed that would not have horrified Martin Luther, could he have foreseen it. Yet, when we study this universe a little deeply concerning the relation in which we stand to it, when we study through the long reaches of the past development of religious life and the unfolding of religious ideas, we see how naturally all these re-suits have come about. We see how inevitable it is that men who start great movements of reform should not be able either to control their direction or their ultimate results. I am one of those who believe so thoroughly in the great power that controls and guides the affairs of men that, however things may seem to be going, I should count it irreverent, I should count it practical infidelity, to question as to the ultimate outcome. I believe that the soul, the essence of religion, always has been healthy and right, is healthy and right to-day, and always must be healthy and right. Not only that: I believe that this essence, this soul of religion, is the same in all ages, all nations, under all names, through all forms, in every phase of religious development.

Let us consider for a moment what it is that men are after, when they are engaging in what they call the religious life? What is the thing they are seeking? Is it not this,—reconciliation with God, to use a religious phrase? To translate it into scientific terms, without at all changing its meaning, is it not an effort on the part of man to attain a right adjustment between his spiritual life and his moral and spiritual environment? To get into right relations with the power that lives in and works through the universe,—that is what men are after in all religion. But it is of course perfectly plain and apparent that, while the soul of religion remains the same, the body, in which it successively reincarnates itself, age after age, must be continually developing and changing, provided the intellectual life of man makes any advance.

If man is seeking reconciliation with God, he is seeking to get into right relations with this power that he recognizes as above and beneath and all around him. This is the soul, the essence of religion; this is the object
of man's search; but the precise form that this search will take on, the intellectual creed in which it will embody itself, will depend entirely upon man's enlightenment, the degree of his thinking, the truth of his thinking concerning this great universe in the midst of which he moves and of which he is a part. So that, while the soul of religion remains the same, we must expect the body of it to change and change forever. We should have a very poor conception of this infinite universe, if we supposed that we, or that even the most advanced thinkers of the world,—those who are advanced in the true sense of the word,—have attained that which is to be ultimate and final.

Consider for a moment how true this is, when we put it into concrete illustrations. Take a man who worships a fetish, a senseless stick or stone; or take one who worships a frog or snake; or one who has arrived at some higher religious thought,—who worships a tree, a cloud, the wind, the sun, any external object of nature. What is he doing? He only recognizes these things as the outward manifestation of some spirit or life, some power that is above him, beyond him, that in some way controls his destiny, that can work him good or evil. The object of his worship, his sacrifices, his ceremonials and rituals, is simply to get into right relations with this invisible spiritual power. That is the one thing he is after.

Rising above these nature-worshippers or idolaters, come to the old Jewish high-priest in the temple; or let us come to Jesus himself, the highest and finest development of the past religion of the world,—and we find that they are also seeking right relations with God, seeking a perfect adjustment between the spiritual life and the life of the universe. We find that the body of religion is perpetually changing, taking on new forms, according to the advancing intellectual conception of the time.

It does not make any difference how far you carry the illustration. Bring it down to ourselves to-day. Consider it in relation to the finest scientific minds of the world. What are they after? Although they call it science, though they may doubt the existence of a personal God and have no faith in a future life, yet they are after essentially the same thing that we are. They are seeking after the relation in which they stand to this infinite power outside and above and beneath them; and they are seeking to get into right relations to this power. Of course, then, there must be perpetual change in the external conceptions of the creeds, the rituals, the ceremonials, the whole body of the religious life, if men advance in the knowledge of the world, if they get a newer, wider, broader, deeper conception of the universe.

This leads me to notice the next step along this line of the movement which Martin Luther led. Luther, as I have had occasion to say in preceding sermons, broke down the authority of the Church. That is, in the light of a larger knowledge of the world, in the light of a grander conceptions of the universe, in the light of a truer thought of God, a truer thought of human nature, a truer conception of the right relation existing between man and God, he broke down that exclusive claim of the Church to be the only foundation of the religious life of man. He declared that there was at least one other, and that a better one; and so he substituted for the Church the Bible. He did not go so far as we must to-day; but he went far enough to set the human soul free,—free, at least, within certain grand limits. And the human soul, having learned this freedom, having tasted the sweets of thinking for itself, was not going to stop when Martin Luther became tired. And so, in order to take one step more toward the ultimate goal of the Reformation, we need,—not we here in this church simply, but we as united Christendom,—we need, I say, to take the step of declaring that, as the Church is not the eternal foundation of religion, so neither is the Bible the eternal foundation of religion.

I have intimated to you how natural it is for men to hold religious conceptions which are in accord with their scientific conception of the universe. You will find a certain grand, general parallelism running all through the ages, if you look carefully for it; and you will see that these scientific conceptions of the universe are really the external framework of religious thought and life. In the ages before Luther, the world was supposed to have material foundations that held it up. It was the centre of everything; the sky was a dome over it; the sun, moon, and stars existed to give light to it. We find the writer of the 104th Psalm speaking of God's having laid its foundations, so that they should not be removed forever. Go back far enough, and you find that people supposed that a tortoise supported the earth, and that under the tortoise was something else, and under that again something else, and so on all the way down to the inconceivable bottom. There must be, they thought, a solid foundation before the world could rest in safety. And just as they believed that there must be a fixed foundation for the world, so they thought there must be a fixed foundation for their religion.

After deposing the Church, Luther put the Bible in its place. We have found out that our earth does not need any foundation, or, if it does, it does not possess it. It is only one orb of a grand system, and this system is only one of a galaxy, and this galaxy only one of a system of galaxies,—all in eternal movement under the impulse of some infinite power; and they are held in their places by their mutual relationship to each other, by their mutual bulk and attraction, and are moving through space that has neither sides nor bottom nor top,—infinite movement under the influence of an infinite life.

This is the truth concerning the material system of things of which we are a part; and we need to declare the complementary truth, that religion needs no infallible, fixed foundation either of church or book. Religion is a
part of the eternal life of God and of men, a part of the nature of things; and, poised in its own orb, it can sweep and swing through space forever, held in its position by the mutual bulk and attraction of the infinite God and the soul of man, and the other parts of the great system of things. It needs no foundation.

This attempt to find a foundation is shown to be futile and foolish, when we consider one fact more: neither Church nor Bible created religion. On the contrary, religion created both the Bible and the Church. Were both Church and Bible blotted out of existence to-day, the eternal power and life of religion would simply go on, and create a new Church and new Bibles without end.

We have reversed the truth of things in our conception; and, when we tremble for the life of religion because the Church and the Bible are touched or criticised, we are no wiser than we should be if we should fear on behalf of the trees and shrubs and flowers and grasses, because, forsooth, somebody should declare that Gray's *Botany* is not infallible. It is not a book on botany that creates flowers and grasses and shrubs and trees. The botany simply tells us about them, so far as the author of the book has learned. There will be new works on botany just as often as there is new knowledge concerning the flora of the earth.

So, precisely, the Bible did not create religion; and criticising the Bible cannot destroy religion. The Bible simply tell us about religion up to the point to which its authority had advanced. But there will be new religious writings just as fast and as far as there are new conceptions of the religious life.

There is one other reason which I must notice, why, for the interest of religion itself, this idea of the Bible being the infallible foundation needs to be taken away. Infallibility assumed in any department of thought is of course death to progress in that department. If, for example, there was some master organ-builder in America who should declare that organs must be built in a certain way, in accordance with certain ideas, and that that was the only infallible way, and should threaten to punish anyone who should depart from it, of course there never could be any better organs, so long as that law was enforced. Since the days of Luther, the Bible has lain right across the path of every attempt to make new intellectual advance in any direction.

When men attempted to teach the truth about the constitution of this globe, the Church said, "No, it is not true; and to say it is a sin." Why? Because the writers of this Bible declared that the world was made so and so; and, no matter what telescopes or astronomical investigations might demonstrate, no one might find out any truth that was inconsistent with the Bible. And so, if they have attempted to teach any new idea about God or about man, the infallibility of the Bible has been placed as a bar across the path of human progress.

This is simply because they have gone on the assumption that the Bible was the infallible, final, ultimate declaration of God to the world; that is really declaring that God is dead, that he has nothing further to say to man, that man can make no further progress, that nothing higher or grander can be found than was discovered two thousand years ago. We need then, as our next step toward the goal of the Reformation, to declare that this substitute for the Church which Luther posited for religion is not needed; that religion is God's child and can take care of itself.

Does this preclude the use of the Bible? By no means. We will study it, read it, reverently, tenderly, lovingly. We will make it our servant, our helper; but we will not have it for a master. Neither Church nor Bible shall be despots, but handmaids and servants of the religious life of man. This is the goal of the Reformation in this direction.

But one or two more steps must be taken. Just as we have revised our intellectual conception of the relationship between religion and the Bible, so we need to go to work and reverse the ordinary conception of the relation between the externals of religion and the religious life itself. We need, in other words, a new idea of what salvation means.

What is it to be saved? You know the old conception has been that the man who had partaken of the sacraments, and thus become a member of the Church, who had declared his submission to the hierarchy of priests, the man who had had certain emotions and feelings, who had passed through certain experiences, the man who was faithful to the observances of times and seasons, the man who prayed,—the man who did all these things was thereby proved to be a saved man. We need to reverse all that. Let us first go to the man himself, and find out whether he is saved or not. Then, we will find out the process by which he became saved, whether through Church or ritual or sacrament or the Bible or what not. Then, we will value this means of salvation just precisely in accordance with its practical power for working good in the human heart and life.

When is a man saved? Let us take a very simple illustration by which to approach this subject.

We have a word, "health," indicating a certain condition of the physical being. This word "health" is derived from the same word as "whole"; so that, when the New Testament speaks of one who had been sick as being made whole, it means that he has been made complete and whole in his physical relations. If we take another step, we see that the word "holy" is derived from the same word; and we stand face to face with the grand truth, so simple, so sensible, and yet so rarely recognized, that holiness is nothing more nor less than spiritual health. When a man is well in body, he is in health. When he is holy in soul, he is in spiritual health. That is the root and eternal idea underlying the word.
Now, then, a man is healthy physically when all the functions and powers of the system are right,—when they are, as they ought to be, in right relations to each other, and when the whole physical system is in right relations to the world outside. Sickness means maladjustment of some parts of the body, or the maladjustment of the whole body to the external conditions of life. Sickness of soul is maladjustment of the spiritual or religious nature. It is out of right relations to other religious natures, out of right relations to the personal duties which it owes to its fellows, out of right relations to the infinite life out of which we have come and of which we are a part. A man is saved, then, when he is righteous, when he is right, when he is well, when he is in health of soul,—holy; and it does not make any difference how he became so. You do not decide whether a man is in physical health by asking him who his doctor is, or what school of medicine he believes in,—homeopathy, allopathy, hydropathy, or any other. You do not find out the external physical creed and ritual of his life, and then decide whether he has lived according to that creed or not. You find out whether he is healthy or not by an examination of his person, his real condition of body. You do not care how he became healthy, through what process, under the guidance of what doctor, in the belief of what school of medicine.

So, precisely, we need to reverse our ideas of whether a man is saved or not. He only is saved who is in spiritual health, when, in the words of the text, he fears God and works righteousness. Fearing God means no slavish subjection, no trembling in his presence, but a serious regard for the right and the true, a reverent, devout recognition of the great laws and forces of the universe, and an attempt to be in right relations with these. A man is saved when he is all that; and it does not make any difference,—Peter said so, although the Church called after Peter very soon forgot his lesson—it does not make any difference, I repeat, whether a man is called a Jew, a Christian, a Unitarian, a Free Religionist, a Baptist, a Buddhist, or a Mohammedan, in all nations, in every religion, in every sect, it is he that feareth God and worketh righteousness that is saved, and nobody else. There is no heaven, just as there is no happiness, for you personally, except on this condition. You enjoy physical happiness just in so far as you are well, happiness accruing from the natural play of these functions that are in health. So there is no heaven for you in this world or in any other, except as you have the happiness, the peace, the rest, the joy which result from this spiritual right relationship, this health of the whole man. We need, then, to learn this lesson, and to learn it completely: not to question whether a man agrees with us, holds the same ideas that we do, but to find out whether he is devout, earnest, sincere, truth-seeking, trying to do God's will. If so, we count him saved and a brother, whatever name he bears.

Just one step more we need to take before we reach the ultimate and final goal. When we have found out that religion does not need a fixed foundation, and when we have learned that it is the righteous, and they only, that are saved, then we need to reconstruct all our ideas of the Church, and look for the true Church in the direction indicated by these two steps.

There has been on the part of all men everywhere an instinctive search for unity, for the oneness of things, for some sort of principle that should bind all apparently heterogeneous elements and movements together. Men believed in the unity of the universe before they could demonstrate it; and so men everywhere have believed in a unity of religion, and have looked forward to the time when all the world would be of one faith and one baptism,—worshippers of one God. Just before the time of Luther especially, they thought they had almost realized this conception of unity; and it was in their frantic endeavors to realize it that they perpetrated many of their cruelties and a large part of the injustice which they inflicted on men. There was first the great Roman Empire,—the unity of public affairs; and then there was the Holy Catholic Church,—the unity of religious and spiritual affairs. Luther broke this unity; and, from that day to this, we have apparently been breaking up into a wider and wider diversity in every direction, until men have wondered whether there could be any possible unity after all. But the one unity we need to seek, the one unity that we ought to seek and look for everywhere, underneath the surface of apparent diversity, is this unity indicated in our text. Who is a member of the one Church of God on the whole round earth? Why, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness. We must get over the idea, for it is petty, it is unscholarly, it is out of accord with the lessons of history, that we shall ever be able to convert the world to just our peculiar ways of thinking and doing. We ought not even to desire it. We must cease looking for the one universal Church of God under any name.

If you today are reverent, serious, and earnest in trying to find the truth, and are doing the best you can to work that truth out into practical living in the way of righteousness,—living in right relations to your fellow-men and to God,—then you are one of this eternal universal Church. And not only you: over beyond the fence that some sect outside of us is building around itself are men, sometimes by the dozens, or the hundreds or the thousands, we will hope, who are trying to find out God's truth and to work it out in their lives. They also are brother members with us, whether you are willing to own it so far as they are concerned, or whether they are willing to own it so far as you are concerned. Here is this grand underlying unity, and all are children of God. We must not expect to find unity even in Christendom. I do not believe that the whole world is going to be called by any one existing religious name. At any rate, if that day is to come, it is so far away that it is impossible for us to conceive of it. But there is to be made daily, hourly, yearly progress along the line of its
What the Church of the Unity Stands For.

"We also believe."—II. Cor. iv., 13.

It has been common in all ages for the members of religious communions to refer to those who have dared to dissent from their fundamental doctrines as "unbelievers." They are "the kingdom of heaven"; and, if one is not of their number, he must be in the "outer darkness." They quietly assume that they have all the truth there is; and, if one does not believe as they do, they take it for granted that he does not believe anything. And, sometimes, one hardly knows whether he ought to resent the supercilious impudence as an insult, to pity the narrowness of the ignorance thus displayed, or to smile at the Pharisaic self-conceit.

Because Unitarians have not been willing to tie themselves to a creed, to pledge themselves never to discover a new truth, or, if they did, not to accept it, they are commonly charged with having no creed at all. Perhaps this kind of misrepresentation is not to be wondered at. It seems particularly hard for a self-satisfied Christian to do any sort of justice to one who does not agree with him. But what is really sad about it to me is to see liberals themselves help on this sort of misunderstanding. In his witty "Fable for Critics," Lowell hits off the Unitarians of his day as they stood related to Theodore Parker; and, concerning their creed, he says,—

"They believed—faith, I'm puzzled—I think I may call
Their belief a believing in nothing at all,
Or something of that sort; I know they all went
For a general union of total dissent."?

And Parker he speaks of as having gone a step farther yet. But, at the same time, he speaks of Parker in terms of unqualified praise, and contradicts his own pleasantry by saying,—

"Every word that he speaks has been fierily furnaced
In the blast of a life that has struggled in earnest."

Now, he who understands human nature knows right well that no sane man ever gets in red-hot earnest about—nothing. And Parker, like all great apostles of truth, moved his age as he did, not by his doubts alone, but because he believed more than any other man of his time.

Lowell's wit is good, as wit; and he meant it only as a "sly dig." If it be taken as anything more than that, if Unitarianism is capable of wearing any such definition, then I am not a Unitarian.

But there are those among us who thoughtlessly give countenance to this sort of folly. Not long ago, I heard of a young lady who, when asked her religious faith, said,—half jestingly, to be sure,—"Oh, I go where they don't believe anything in particular." Another one once remarked to me, "When people ask me what Unitarians believe, I really don't know what to tell them." And, quite recently, a lady said to me, "I fight a good many battles for you: people often tell me that Mr. Savage doesn't believe anything."

Now, if it be really possible that people hear me preach and go away thinking I do not believe anything, either I speak with very little clearness, or else they listen with very little reflection. For certain it is that I never in my whole life believed so much as I do to-day. I never held so large, so grand, so hopeful, so stimulating a faith. And if anybody goes through the form of listening to me, and thinks other-wise, I cannot think it is my fault. For I dare to say that no man in America, during the last ten years, has given utterance to a more detailed and more positive system of religious belief than is contained in my published books. If people have read these or even a part of them, and have not found it, I must believe that they read to little purpose.

And if they have not read, and still say, "Mr. Savage believes nothing," then they state what they ought to know is untrue. But, then, some people listen in such a curious fashion! And, on the other hand, those who are too much prejudiced either to hear or read are still very positive in their assertions, and quite ready to report their ignorant prejudices for facts.

An illustration of this sort of thing is worth giving. It shows a kind of charity and truth that, ever since the day when Jesus was popularly reported to be a glutton, a wine-bibber, and a companion of low people, have been too common among those who have claimed to be his followers. Not long since, a woman—disguised and

development; and men are to recognize that, under whatever name or of whatever religion he may be, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him, and so is a member of this one world-wide, universal Church.
dressed as a lady—was overheard, on a street-car, telling what dreadful things were preached in this church, and warning a young friend against being inveigled into attending such a place. But, when pressed with the innocent question as to whether she had ever read or heard me, she replied, with a sort of holy horror, that she never had. She had that kind of piety that enables its possessor heartily to despise those who do not belong to their synagogue, but which does not prevent one from lying about what one does not take the trouble to understand.

But now let us look a little more closely, and see what all this talk about not believing anything really means. From the stand-point of the bigot, it only means, "You don't believe as I do." With a great many young people, it is only careless, thoughtless talk. They do believe a great deal, only they have not taken the trouble to formulate it, and put it into definite statement. Or, allowing the creeds of others to define religion, they say, "Well, then, if that is religion, I suppose I haven't any." So they sit down quietly and wear the title of "unbeliever," when they ought to resent it as an insult,—no less insulting because it is the well-meaned, pious cant of those who arrogant to themselves the exclusive right to be called "the people of God." I, for one, do not propose to take quietly the arrogant compassion of those who mistake last year's ignorance for piety, and who think the dead branch of last fall has a right to pity the restless bud of spring.

It is not to be wondered at, if, in view of the vast expansion of the universe, the unsettling of old theories, the sudden uncovering of an infinite beyond in every direction that baffles imagination even, the painfully felt inadequacy of all the old schemes and systems,—it is not, I say, to be wondered at, if people do feel that they know very little, and for the time hardly know what to believe. All this, however, is not because the awakened modern mind believes less than was believed in former times; for, in fact, it believes a great deal more. It is only that what is known seems so very little as compared with the endless vistas of the unexplored. When Newton spoke of himself as a little child picking up now and then a brighter pebble than usual on the seashore while the infinite ocean of truth lay all unknown before him, it was not that the great scientist knew less than his predecessors: it was only because he knew so much that he could comprehend how much he did not know.

The liberal religionist has been called a "doubter" and "unbeliever" so long that he is half ready to admit that these titles really belong to him. And his opponents have so long and so loudly claimed to be "men of faith" that people are half persuaded to admit the claim. But I, for one, am not ready to confess that either of these positions is true. The Church of the Unity, so far as I have a right to represent it, believes more truth and grander truth than is contained in any one of the old creeds; and its faith is deeper and higher and more comprehensive than that of any one of the religions of the past.

This claim I wish now to substantiate as definitely as possible by outlining a series of contrasts between the main points of the orthodox creed and our own. When I am done, I trust you will see plainly that henceforth no enemy can honestly charge, and no friend can intelligently admit, that we do not believe as much and as positively and definitely as any church in existence. As the most effective way of making this apparent, I will state the points of the old faith that we do not believe, and then in sharp contrast will set down what we do believe, asking you meanwhile to consider whether our positions are not quite as positive and quite as religious as the others.

1. We do not believe that the world was created in six days six thousand years ago. Neither do we believe in the attempts to get over the difficulties of Genesis by making days mean long periods of time. But we do believe that the earth has been in existence for millions of years; and that, by slow and wondrous processes of growth, it has come to be what we see it to-day. And, instead of holding the pessimistic and despairing belief that it is accursed and blighted, we believe that the same marvellous processes of development and improvement that have been at work in the past are at work still. So we cherish the hope that man's wondrous dwelling-place is to be better and better still in the future.

2. We do not believe in "total depravity." Neither do we believe that man is an angel. We do not make an ideal man out of a preconceived theory of either goodness or badness. We simply go to the facts, and take him for what he is. And we find that, along with fearful capacities for evil, he has in him also limitless possibilities of good. And we find that the good is more
and stronger than the evil, as is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the world has been and is growing better. Thus, hope is ever stronger than despair; and we work with courage, having our Eden before us as the goal of our attainment, and not behind us as the object of perpetual regret.

Can the old statement be called belief and assertion, and the new one doubt and denial? Rather is it true that the canker of doubt and denial eats forever at the heart of the old, while ours is fresh and strong with courage and trust.

4. We do not believe that God was miraculously incarnated, once for all, in one man only, and that nearly two thousand years ago. But we do believe that he is eternally incarnated in all that is good and beautiful and true. All light, all love, all life, all beauty, are the present Deity. At every turn, God faces us. "He besets us behind-and before, and lays his hand upon us." He is nearer to us than our pulse-beats or than the most secret thoughts of our hearts. God was not simply at the beginning, when he breathed into Adam the breath of life, but in all life, ever reaching upward; not simply in the miraculous bush of Moses, but in every wayside shrub, the bursting of spring buds, and the woods of October all aflame with glory; not simply giving the stars their first impulse, but holding their poise and guiding their boundless orbits to-day; not speaking now and then to "holy men of old," but always speaking to him who "hath ears to hear," and always revealed to the "pure in heart."

Which of these positions is the more religious? The one is a pagan notion, shared by Christianity with half, at least, of the old crude and superstitious religions of the world's ignorant childhood. The other is the grandest and highest thought of the noblest, most reverent, most intelligent age of the world. The old is petty and dwarfed in the comparison; and it denies an unspeakably larger truth than that which it affirms.

5. Of course, it follows from our position concerning the doctrines of man and the incarnation that we do not believe in either the fact of or the necessity for the atonement. But we do believe in the infinitely more honorable and hopeful views that Jesus taught in the parable of "The Prodigal Son,"—that God is always ready to receive all who come to him, and the gateway of improvement is never shut. The theology that turns God's altar into a slaughter-house, and pictures him as demanding a victim before he can help his own children,—this, we regard as an appropriate product of barbarism, and only fit to be left in possession of the people whose cruelty and ignorance were capable of inventing it.

But to call the old view an affirmation and the other a denial is a travesty on all sensible uses of language. Every affirmation denies that which is inconsistent with it, and every denial affirms. But ours is unspeakably the larger, the more positive, the more hopefully religious view.

6. We do not believe in the old heaven and the old hell as the finished and permanent terminus of a brief probation here on earth, as places where fixed characters are to be forever happy or forever miserable. But we do believe in the law of cause and effect, that "as a man soweth so shall he also reap "; that this law holds in this world and in all worlds, that it has always held in the past and will always hold in the future. We believe that heaven is the music of well-ordered lives and of harmoniously developed characters, and that hell is the shadow of one's own deeds that forever follows and treads on the heels of wrong. But we also believe that always, before the feet of the farthest wanderer, is the lower end of a ladder that leads up to the highest possibilities of good. Nay, more, we believe that every soul is "doomed to be saved"; that wrong is always folly and sorrow; that the inexorable God will scourge with merciful punishment all the law-breakers of the universe, until they learn that only the right is the happy.

For any one, then, to characterize our doctrines of salvation and retribution as loose, or as savoring of doubt or denial or negation, is either culpable ignorance or culpable misstatement. They are as much more positive and grand than the old as light is grander than darkness, as love is higher than hate, as life is better than death.

7. We do not believe that the Bible is a perfect divine revelation of truth. But we do believe that man has a perfect revelation of all necessary truth, just as fast and as far as his experience discovers and verifies it. We reject the unworthy idea that God is partial, sending his light to only one little fragment of humanity and leaving all the rest to perish; and we believe that his light shines on all nations, and that its reception is only limited by human capacity.

Which doctrine is the more worthy of God and the more hopeful for man? We affirm the larger truth; and those who hold the old view, born of conceit and ignorance, are the ones who deny, in order to defend their narrower creed.

8. We do not believe that religion is essentially in any one set of statements, or in any one kind of church organization, or in any ritual or ceremony or priestly vestments. These seem to us to be even flippant impertinences, when, as is often the case, they are clung to and emphasized, while the real truth is scouted, and love and character and charity are put down into a secondary place. But we do believe that character is the very heart of religion, and that truth is her high priest. And we hold that all institutions and ordinances and vestments and ceremonials are to religion only what clothes and houses and external manners are to men. These outward things are well, if not substituted for life; but they were made for man, and not man for them. And there is constant danger that, intrenched in ordinances, decorated by vestments, and absorbed in rituals, people shall
fancy that they are very religious, while they treat with super cilius and self-righteous contempt persons so much more truly godlike than themselves that they are not worthy to unloose the latchets of their shoes.

Here, then, are the outlines of a definite, positive creed. It not only matches the old one at every point, but is larger and clearer. The old one is only traditional, and is largely discredited and disproved: the new one is in accord with the best knowledge of the world. The old is pessimistic and full of despair; the new is hopeful and brave. If you say that the new one is negative, in that it denies the old, you must also say that the old one is negative, in that it denies the new. Each affirms itself and denies the other; but, as the new is the larger, grander, and more hopeful of the two, it is only fair to say that the old one denies the most, and so is the most negative, and carries with it the least of positive affirmation.

I think then that I am fully justified in saying that there is to-day no church on earth that stands for a more definite, positive, hopeful, helpful religious creed than does this Church of the Unity. Of course, it takes some time for new ideas to become habitualized to the brain so that they feel at home, and for new sentiments to become domesticated in the heart. But this statement is no whit truer of the ideas we hold than it was of the old ideas when they were new. And, if the world is ever to grow any wiser and better, we must teach ourselves to be hospitable to new truth, to open wide our doors, give it cordial welcome, and make it a warm place by our firesides.

There remain two or three supplementary points that I must outline briefly, in order to complete the fitting treatment of my theme.

One curious error yet lingers, and, with a shadowy sort of sovereignty, still dominates the public mind. This is the general notion, that it is meritorious to believe, and that to doubt borders, at least, on the sinful. To the Church, the two words, unbeliever and sinner, mean about the same thing. It is no wonder that this notion is in the air, because for centuries the Church has regarded heresy as the blackest of all crimes. Murder, adultery, theft, lying,—these could be condoned and pardoned. But unbelief cut one off from both human and divine mercy. Of course, the Church, as an organized institution, was thus acting only in self defence. Doubt was treason to the power of the priesthood. The error lay in making herself the mistress instead of the servant of man. Thomas has always been held up to reprobation because he asked for evidence before he could believe. Always has the Church claimed to hold the keys, and to say, "Believe, and I will open for you the gates of heaven; doubt, and there waits for you only the outer darkness of hell." It is no wonder then, I say, that men have come to fear doubt and to commend faith, and to do both with little care or discrimination.

But, in the modern world, another spirit is abroad. We have come to think the discovery of truth the highest end of life. And we have learned that truth can be found only as the result of careful search, of trial and verification. Too ready credulity, then, is an evil. It accepts a guess or an unproved assertion, and so hinders that thorough investigation that penetrates to the heart of things and compels them to give up their secrets. We have therefore taken doubt out of the category of vices, and crowned it as one of the cardinal virtues. The whole matter hinges on the question of proof. It is a virtue to doubt what is not proven, as much as to believe what is. For truth is the end, and both doubt and belief are of value only as means toward its attainment.

Credulity has been one of the great curses of the world. For what age-long wastes of money and time and effort and tears and blood has it not been responsible! The one thing that humanity needs to-day, more than anything else, is a disposition to seek for the truth of things. An easy-going credulity, misnamed "faith," has done more harm to man than all the doubt and denial of all the ages.

There are, indeed, doubts and beliefs that spring out of moral dispositions and biases. Men believe because they want to, and doubt for no better reason. All this, of course, is wrong. But I dare affirm that to-day there is quite as much of this inside the churches as there is out. So that a recognition of it does not at all affect our general position.

I have not, then, throughout the body of my sermon, defended the quantity or quality of our belief, because I think it is wrong to doubt. An honest man, when he has put weights into both sides of a pair of scales, must doubt that the side which goes up is as heavy as the side which goes down. And the same principle holds when his scales are of the mind, and his weights are observations and impressions.

Prove all things then, and hold fast to that which stands the test and is demonstrated to be good. Doubt is no place for rest. Neither, for that matter, is mere belief. When, through the agency of both, you have found the truth, then act it and live it; for that is the one end that justifies all research.

One point more we need particularly to remember. Men talk about the "unsettling of beliefs," until they get the impression that there is really serious doubt concerning the great practical questions of conduct and human life. But we cannot be too often reminded that this is not true. The matters in dispute are not such as need to hinder a man in doing his duty. Grant that we can never know any more about any one of these things than we do to-day, still every field of noble human achievement lies open, and along every pathway spring the fragrant blossoms of joy.

Consider for just one moment. Suppose we should never find out what God was thinking about during the
eternity past, this doubt need not stand in the way of your being a good citizen. And you're doing this is much more important than the satisfaction of your curiosity about the infinite. Suppose the pulps should never agree as to the doctrine of inspiration, that need not hinder your being an honest business man. And the welfare of the world is much more concerned in your fair dealing than it is in your opinions about David. Suppose you continue to doubt whether the original home of man was in Eden or in the jungle, at least you can see to it that your own home is sweet and sunny and restful. A present Eden is a vast deal more important than any question about a past one. If you cannot settle, to your own satisfaction, where you will be and what you will be doing in a thousand years, you can see to it that you are in the right place and are doing the right thing to-day. When I see people worrying so much about being saved in the future, I sometimes wonder if they are not overlooking the somewhat more important matter of seeing to it that they make themselves worth saving.

By the long experience of the past, the human race has already wrought out a knowledge of right and wrong and the conditions of happiness. Of course, all these will be improved as the years go by. But we already know enough, so that we need not fold our hands and sit still, while theological doctors fight over what perhaps none of them know or ever will know. You can see enough to do right yourselves and to help your fellow-men to-day.

Here, then, the Church of the Unity stands. It holds that the great practical questions of duty are clear. It holds that an open and free search for truth, for the sake of human well-being and happiness, is a universal human obligation. To this end, it holds that doubt of the unproved is a duty equally with the acceptance of that which is known to be true. And it holds to a creed clear and definite and positive concerning all the great questions of human life. And this creed it stands ready to improve, to curtail, to enlarge, to modify just as fast and as far as newly discovered truth shall warrant it. And, above and beyond all, it holds that each man's first and last duty is to live as well as he can himself, and do what he can to make the world a little cleaner, brighter, easier, and happier for others. And, if anybody is lost in the future, we feel perfectly sure it will not be that kind of a man.
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Evolution and Religion.

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN,—The thought which you have uttered, sir, suggests so many and such fruitful themes of discussion that a whole evening would not suffice to enumerate them, while to illustrate them properly would seem to require an octavo volume rather than a talk of six or eight minutes, especially when such a talk comes just after dinner. The Amazulu saying which you have cited, that those who have "stuffed bodies" cannot see hidden things, seems peculiarly applicable to any attempt to discuss the mysteries of religion at the present moment; and, after the additional warning we have just had from our good friend Mr. Schurz, I hardly know whether I ought to venture to approach so vast a theme. There are one or two points of signal importance, however, to which I may at least call attention for a moment. It is a matter which has long since taken deep hold of my mind, and I am glad to have a chance to say something about it on so fitting an occasion.
We have met here this evening to do homage to a dear and noble teacher and friend, and it is well that we should choose this time to recall the various aspects of the immortal work by which he has earned the gratitude of a world. The work which Herbert Spencer has done in organizing the different departments of human knowledge, so as to present the widest generalizations of all the sciences in a new and wonderful light, as flowing out of still deeper and wider truths concerning the universe as a whole; the great number of profound generalizations which he has established incidentally to the pursuit of this main object; the endlessly rich and suggestive thoughts which he has thrown out in such profusion by the wayside all along the course of this great philosophical enterprise,—all this work is so manifest that none can fail to recognize it. It is work of the calibre of that which Aristotle and Newton did. Though coming in this latter age, it as far surpasses their work in its vastness of performance as the railway surpasses the sedan-chair, or as the telegraph surpasses the carrier-pigeon.

But it is not of this side of our teacher's work that I wish to speak, but of a side of it that has hitherto met with less general recognition. There are some people who seem to think that it is not enough that Mr. Spencer should have made all these priceless contributions to human knowledge, but actually complain of him for not giving us a complete and exhaustive system of theology into the bargain. What I wish, therefore, to point out is that Mr. Spencer's work on the side of religion will be seen to be no less important than his work on the side of science, when once its religious implications shall have been fully and consistently unfolded.

If we look at all the systems or forms of religion of which we have any knowledge, we shall find that they differ in many superficial features. They differ in many of the transcendental doctrines which they respectively preach, and in many of the rules of conduct which they respectively lay down for men's guidance. They assert different things about the universe, and they enjoin or prohibit different kinds of behavior on the part of their followers. The doctrine of the Trinity, which to many Christians is the most sacred of mysteries, is to all Mohammedans the foulest of blasphemies. The Brahman's conscience would be more troubled if he were to kill a cow by accident than if he were to swear to a lie or steal a purse. The Turk, who sees no wrong in bigamy, would shrink from the sin of eating pork. But, amid all such surface differences, we find throughout all known religions two points of substantial agreement. And these two points of agreement will be admitted by modern civilized men to be of far greater importance than the innumerable differences of detail. All religions agree in the two following assertions, one of which is of speculative and one of which is of ethical import. One of them serves to uphold us in our efforts to do each what we can to make human life more sweet, more full of goodness and beauty, than we find it. The first of these assertions is the proposition that the things and events of the world do not exist or occur blindly or irrelevantly, but that all, from the beginning to the end of time, and throughout the furthest sweep of illimitable space, are connected together as the orderly manifestations of a divine Power, and that this divine Power is something outside of ourselves, and upon it our own existence from moment to moment depends.

The second of these assertions is the proposition that men ought to do certain things, and ought to refrain from doing certain other things; and that the reason why some things are wrong to do and other things are right to do is in some mysterious but very real way connected with the existence and nature of this divine Power, which reveals itself in every great and every tiny thing, without which not a star courses in its mighty orbit, and not a sparrow falls to the ground. Matthew Arnold once summed up these two propositions very well, when he defined God as "an eternal Power, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness." This twofold assertion, that there is an eternal Power that is not ourselves, and that this Power makes for righteousness, is to be found, either in a rudimentary or in a highly developed state, in all known religions. In such religions as those of the Eskimos or of your friends, the Amazulus, Mr. President, this assertion is found in a rudimentary shape on each of its two sides,—the speculative side and the ethical side; in such religions as Buddhism or Judaism, it is found in a highly developed shape on both its sides. But the main point is that in all religions you find it in some shape or other.

I said, a moment ago, that modern civilized men will all acknowledge that this two-sided assertion in which all religions agree is of far greater importance than any of the superficial points in which religions differ. It is really of much more concern to us that there is an eternal Power, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness, than that such a Power is onefold or threefold in its metaphysical nature, or that we ought not to play cards on Sunday or to eat meat on Friday. No one, I believe, will deny so simple and clear a statement as this. But it is not only we modern men, who call ourselves enlightened, that will agree to this. I doubt not even the narrow-minded bigots of days now happily gone by would have been made to agree to it, if they could have had some doggedly persistent Socrates to cross-question them. Calvin was willing to burn Servetus for doubting the doctrine of the Trinity, but I do not suppose that even Calvin would have argued that the belief in God's threefold nature was more fundamental than the belief in his existence and his goodness. The philosophical error with him was that he could not dissociate the less important doctrine from the more important doctrine,
and the fate of the latter seemed to him wrapped up with the fate of the former. I cite this merely as a typical example. What men in past times have really valued in their religion has been the universal twofold assertion that there is a God who is pleased by the sight of the just man and is angry with the wicked every day; and when men have fought with one another, and murdered or calumniated one another for heresy about the Trinity or about eating meat on Friday, it has been because they have supposed belief in the non-essential doctrines to be inseparably connected with belief in the essential doctrine. In spite of all this, however, it is true that in the mind of the uncivilized man the great central truths of religion are so densely overlaid with hundreds of trivial notions respecting dogma and ritual that his perception of the great central truths is obscure. These great central truths, indeed, need to be clothed in a dress of little rites and superstitions, in order to take hold of his dull and untrained intelligence. But, in proportion as men become more civilized, and learn to think more accurately, and to take wider views of life, just so do they come to value the essential truths of religion more highly, while they attach less and less importance to superficial details.

Having thus seen what is meant by the essential truths of religion, it is very easy to see what the attitude of the doctrine of evolution is toward these essential truths. It asserts and reiterates them both; and it asserts them not as dogmas handed down to us by priestly tradition, not as mysterious intuitive convictions of which we can render no intelligible account to ourselves, but as scientific truths concerning the innermost constitution of the universe,—truths that have been disclosed by observation and reflection, like other scientific truths, and that accordingly harmonize naturally and easily with the whole body of our knowledge. The doctrine of evolution asserts, as the widest and deepest truth which the study of nature can disclose to us, that there exists a Power to which no limit in time or space is conceivable, and that all the phenomena of the universe, whether they be what we call material or what we call spiritual phenomena, are manifestations of this infinite and eternal Power. Now, this assertion, which Mr. Spencer has so elaborately set forth as a scientific truth,—nay, as the ultimate truth of science, as the truth upon which the whole structure of human knowledge philosophically rests,—this assertion is identical with the assertion of an eternal Power, not ourselves, that forms the speculative basis of all religions. When Carlyle speaks of the universe as in very truth the star-domed city of God, and reminds us that through every crystal and through every grass-blade, but most through every living soul, the glory of a present God still beams, he means pretty much the same thing that Mr. Spencer means, save that he speaks with the language of poetry, with language colored by emotion, and not with the precise, formal, and colorless language of science. By many critics who forget that names are but the counters rather than the hard money of thought, objections have been raised to the use of such a phrase as the Unknowable whereby to describe the power that is manifested in every event of the universe. Yet, when the Hebrew prophet declared that "by him were laid the foundations of the deep," but reminded us, "Who by searching can find him out?" he meant pretty much what Mr. Spencer means when he speaks of a Power that is inscrutable in itself, yet is revealed from moment to moment in every throb of the mighty rhythmic life of the universe.

And this brings me to the last and most important point of all. What says the doctrine of evolution with regard to the ethical side of this twofold assertion that lies at the bottom of all religion? Though we cannot fathom the nature of the inscrutable Power that animates the world, we know, nevertheless, a great many things that it does. Does this eternal Power, then, work for righteousness? Is there a divine sanction for holiness and a divine condemnation for sin? Are the principles of right living really connected with the intimate constitution of the universe? If the answer of science to these questions be affirmative, then the agreement with religion is complete, both on the speculative and on the practical sides; and that phantom which has been the abiding terror of timid and superficial minds—that phantom of the hostility between religion and science—is exorcised now and for ever.

Now, science began to return a decisively affirmative answer to such questions as these, when it began, with Mr. Spencer, to explain moral beliefs and moral sentiments as products of evolution. For clearly, when you say of a moral belief or a moral sentiment that it is a product of evolution, you imply that it is something which the universe through untold ages has been laboring to bring forth, and you ascribe to it a value proportionate to the enormous effort that it has cost to produce it. Still more, when with Mr. Spencer we study the principles of right living as part and parcel of the whole doctrine of the development of life upon the earth; when we see that, in an ultimate analysis, that is right which tends to enhance fulness of life, and that is wrong which tends to detract from fulness of life,—we then see that the distinction between right and wrong is rooted in the deepest foundations of the universe; we see that the very same forces, subtle and exquisite and profound, which brought upon the scene the primal germs of life and caused them to unfold, which through countless ages of struggle and death have cherished the life that could live more perfectly and destroyed the life that could only live less perfectly, until humanity, with all its hopes and fears and aspirations, has come into being as the crown of all this stupendous work,—we see that these very same subtle and exquisite forces have wrought into the very fibres of the universe those principles of right living which it is man's highest function to put into practice. The theoretical sanction thus given to right living is incomparably the most powerful that has ever
been assigned in any philosophy of ethics. Human responsibility is made more strict and solemn than ever, when the eternal Power that lives in every event of the universe is thus seen to be in the deepest possible sense the author of the moral law that should guide our lives, and in obedience to which lies our only guarantee of the happiness which is incorruptible,—which neither inevitable misfortune nor unmerited obloquy can ever take away.

I have here but barely touched upon a rich and suggestive topic. When this subject shall once have been expounded and illustrated with due thoroughness,—as I earnestly hope it will be within the next few years,—then I am sure it will be generally acknowledged that our great teacher's services to religion have been no less signal than his services to science, unparalleled as these have been in all the history of the world.
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On the Land as State Property.

By Emeritus Professor F. W. Newman.

*With Special View to the Scheme of Reclaiming it for the State, proposed by Alfred Russel Wallace, LL.D.*

The question which I have to treat is not one for Political Economists, it belongs to Morals, Politics, and History. To make this clear, I must compare our movement to that against slavery. Wherever slavery exists by
law, economists and lawyers regard slaves as chattels.

What articles shall be marketable, what not, the law decides, not economic science.

The abolitionists attack the law as unjust and immoral; if the economists reply that the slave is better off in slavery, we rejoin, let him judge of that.

The argument is one about moral right, not about market prices. So here, our question is on the right of accounting land an ordinary chattel. We allege that it ought not to be, that it cannot be without injustice, that great injustice, not to farmers only, but to the whole nation, results from existing land tenure: that cultivators ought to have duties imposed and rights guaranteed, but over them should rule impartial law, not a modern landowner. Now, when we claim a change of bad law, we are met as slaveowners met abolitionists.

Abolitionists said: "Let us have a compromise: let us buy you out." Slaveowners replied: "No thanks for the offer: we value power, we will not listen to you." Nothing was left but to preach the immorality of slavery; so now: landlords stick to their power. Land gives political influence, and makes the whole neighbourhood a virtual serfdom in many cases. While we see in the landlord class many whom we highly esteem, we are forced to make our first attack on their power as essentially unjust—nay, and in fact, acquired by an indefensible series of encroachments and misuse of the legislator's very important trust.

Among professed English economists, J. S. Mill was the earliest to proclaim a cardinal fact of our history, namely, that in old days the landlord's rent was fixed by custom not by competition; that he had no legal right of ejection while his legal dues were paid; that he was not a land-owner, but only the chief out of many who had joint interest in the land. It is wonderful how anyone can avoid seeing that our modern landlords claim more than Royal powers. No English King was ever the owner of the English soil, or ever dreamed that he had a legal right to drive the population into exile. A few economists have been our faithful instructors, but Ireland and Scotland have been to us far more forcible inculcators of truth.

When institutions violate justice, a nation has to learn not from economists, nor from moralists or preachers, but from most unwelcome and awful events.

Tenant-right was established by custom in Ulster, yet was vainly claimed in Parliament for the rest of Ireland forty years ago. Nevertheless, now the Prime Minister, with a decisive majority of the House of Commons, has avowed that a landlord ought not to be a huge sponge to absorb a tenant's vitals, and has no right to reap where he has not sown. So overwhelming to the conscience is this truth, that the House of Lords did not venture to resist the passing of a measure, which in hostile quarters is called confiscation. Public outcry and pressing danger teach the unteachable.

The landlord's power presses on the farmer directly; but by squeezing them hard it impoverishes the labourers, and drives rustics into the towns, which become the sink into which the rural misery drains. Thus their competition injures the townfolk. Beyond all this, the towns have to pay enormous sums for crude materials, which the landlords claim as their own, and for every square foot of space which for any reason is needed. The landlords, as a class, hold that for which, as a class, they never did anything except perhaps seize it by sword and spear, oftener by craft of law.

Naturally, everywhere chiefly the farmers are on the alert in all three kingdoms; but the townsfolk are awaking also.

The National Reform Society of Manchester last year put forth an ample address against the existing land-tenure. The remedy they propose seems to me quite inadequate; but they show in one sentence their distinct aim. They say to us: "Sweep away the iniquitous presumption of law, that whatever is put into the freehold belongs to the freeholder"—that is, the landlord. Here is the central position of Land Reformers. They deny that a landlord has any right to appropriate the fruit of his tenant's industry, or to cripple that industry by dictating its processes, or to enslave tenants by arbitrary rules of the estate.

To this, from the landlord's side, reply is made. "Then you wish to turn the landlords into mere annuitants?" Land tenure reformers are bound to avow, "Certainly we do." No other reply is logical. To talk about Free Trade in land is a weak attempt to make political capital out of the phrase, "Free Trade." Land, like air and water, is essential to human life, and, being extremely limited in quantity, even on that ground is not an article in which trade ought to be free.

I cannot claim our esteemed President, Alfred Russel Wallace, as on my side when I say that in my opinion the very first thing to be desired is a vote of the Commons that it is against the public interest for any one person to hold more than 500 acres—nay, I wish that no commercial society be allowed to hold more than 10,000 acres. But that those who wish to pass as Land Reformers should desire to facilitate the buying up of land by wealthy merchants, manufacturers, and lawyers, Mr. Wallace and all of his society regard with wonder and grave disapproval. We believe that Land Reformers in Manchester and Birmingham will ere long see the truth which J. S. Mill long since avowed to a Committee of the House of Commons. When asked what he thought to be the chief burden on the land, he replied: "Really, I am not aware of any burden on the land, except the landlord." In feudal times the landlord discharged needful duties to the State. He was a great political
officer, who, in payment for his services, received revenues and rights proportioned to them. His only special
duty to the State now remaining is to act as sheriff when his turn comes.

Politically, the class has annihilated its own functions; it ought simultaneously to have surrendered its
revenues. Commercially, it has no duties, no services; it is not only superfluous, but mischievous.

It is but the other day that a case of grievous iniquity from a landlord to an innocent, upright tenant was
pressed on the notice of Sir W. Vernon Harcourt, Home Secretary. The public Press reported his reply to be :
"He was sorry for the tenant, but the landlord had only used his extreme legal power." In other words, he
condemned the law for granting him such power. And remember, it is a law made by landlords in their own
interest, against tenants and against the nation. From the beginning of Parliaments landlords have had
overwhelming superiority in both Houses.

Those who wish to see the terrible facts even of this century, and many recent, should read Mr. Wallace's
treatise. The late Sir David Wedderburn, M.P., among his last words, I am told, declared that Mr. Wallace's
summary is an unanswerable condemnation of the landlord's power. That power, having no tendency whatever
to assist the production of food, has no commercial reason for existing at all. Nor is the landlord any longer an
officer of State. Therefore, his power ought to be not lowered, but annihilated. Once annihilated, it will never
trouble us again. Free-trade in Ireland has not mitigated the evil; if you try merely to reduce their power, but
leave the landlords in possession, with all the remembrances and habits of the past, you will find the mischief
perpetually growing up anew.

Allow me to digress for a moment in answer to an objection. A well-meaning friend said to me, "Of course,
you can make an apparently strong case by laying stress on the scandalous frauds of the past: but such
reasoning is fallacious. It will not do to rip up old histories. The past is awfully full of iniquity, but we cannot
heal old wounds by tearing open new ones. We must not go back longer than, say, sixty years, just as in
claiming an estate." I reply, Your argument is partly true and partly false, as is easily seen if you look below the
surface. Our question ought never to be, How many years old is an injustice, but simply, has lapse of time worn
out its evil? Each separate case must be looked at separately.?

Suppose that a hundred years ago a man fraudulently got possession of an estate, ejecting the rightful heir,
and left it to his own heirs. Three generations may since have grown up: on one side descendants who know
nothing of the wrong suffered by their ancestor, on the other an individual personally guiltless. To eject the
present holder of the estate and divide it among the descendants of the injured man would not be the pedantry of
justice, but a cruel and useless pedantry. If some person must hold an estate, a hundred years possession ought

But now take a different case. A man has a number of slaves, and pleads that "they are his rightful chattels,
because their ancestors were stolen from Africa more than sixty years ago—an old injustice which ought not
now to be recalled to memory." We reply for the slaves. "That old injustice has not died out; you keep it alive
month by month, in claiming the slave's labour and time as your own, and the free whip in your hand to terrify
and unman him. The longer each has served you, the greater is your debt to each."

Very similar in principle is the case where serfdom exists instead of slavery, or where, as in Ireland and old
England, conquerors, by stealing the land from the cultivators, compel them to buy the means of life under very
iniquitous conditions. The evil of the original robbery is in that case perpetuated to this day, as in the case of
inherited slavery.

I insist to my friend that in the case of a modern landlord's rent our first question must be whether the
original injustice has worn itself out, or, on the contrary, has perpetuated itself.

The theft of cattle, a murderous deed, damage by lire, nearly every separate crime vanishes by mere lapse
of time; but unjust law retains its vitality for ever. Age does not wear it out, does not make it sacred, but
intensifies the mischief.

Old laws are laws made in barbarous times by rude conquerors, reckless of justice, and scornful of any right
in the conquered. When institutions violently imposed continue active for injustice, the craft of evil
conservatism pretends that the injustice is sacred because it is old. Robbery of men's bodies, and robbery of a
nation's land have close analogies. The unjust origin of the claim, however ancient, absolutely needs to be
"ripped open."?

After thus justifying our right to deal with the landlord's power historically, I approach the history, and
accuse the class collectively of injustice under five main heads.

The first great encroachment can be discerned as a fact, but cannot be assigned to a definite era. It consists
in the enormous extension of claims for every lord of the manor. It is certain that wild land was not imagined to
be a property in old days. The moors and bogs, the hillrides and the sea-coast imposed on the baron the duty of
maintaining the King's peace against marauders, but yielded to him no revenue. Of course, being a public
officer, he took stone from the quarry, timber and fuel from the forest, gravel from the sea-beach, whenever the
public service needed it. Supplies open to all ought never to have been made private property, but to be
reserved to feed the local treasury, except where claimed for the Crown. I must leave to historians the question how far the Crusades, how far the French wars of Edward III. and Henry V., how far our intervening civil war facilitated inobservance of encroachment by lords of the manor. During or after the Wars of the Roses, many of these lords ceased to covet large bands of retainers, and tried to gather wealth instead, claiming for themselves all the minerals, the wild birds, the fish in the streams, the forests, except those which were royal, and every strip of neglected land. The King had something else to do than call them to account.

Now, as a simple illustration what comes from this at the present day, I will read a statement from a pamphlet by Mr. S. Wellington of Liscard concerning the docks of Liverpool, of which I have received an early copy.

Close to Liverpool was a barren waste on the edge of the sea, called the Sands of Bootle. No value had been found in them; no money had been spent in them until Liverpool wished to enlarge her docks. Hereupon the lord of the manor stepped in, and exacted, according to the writer, about £200,000 for leave to turn the area into service. The burden, he says, of, £8,000 a-year forever is laid on the ratepayers of Liverpool. He asks, What have the Earls of Derby done to justify their claim to the docks, thereby extorting a huge sum, making the Sands of Bootle a gold mine to themselves, merely because an industrious town needed them?

Surely this appropriating of public sources of revenue ought not to go on for ever. Payments made for leave to exercise industry, whether in mining or quarrying, in hunting or fishing, or in raising structures in empty places, can have no moral ground, except as dues for protection,—that is, as a tax to the protecting State. All such revenues belong either to the central or some local exchequer—never justly to a private person. Even if the present holders could cite a Parliamentary Statute which had bestowed such revenues upon them and their heirs for ever, this would be no justification, but would simply prove a corrupt and guilty abuse of law-making. One thing only forbids an instantaneous resumption of such revenues, viz., that they have been innocently bought for large sums, which it is cruel to confiscate. Whatever sum has been actually paid down within 100 years for the seignoriality of mines, quarries, or fisheries would (no doubt) be repaid in any tranquil and reasonable settlement.

A second and still worse usurpation we charge against the landlord class, perpetrated in the reign of Henry VIII. His father saw the beginning of it, and acted vigorously against it. Certain landlords began to eject their tenants in order to make great sheep-farms and raise wool for export. The King threatened to imprison a landlord in the Tower for this offence and (perhaps under his pressure) the Parliament enacted the Statutes of Tillage to prevent the turning of arable land into pasture. But under Henry VIII. the quarrel was literally fought out in local agrarian wars. I am told the Rolls of Parliament are not complete enough to make the detailed history certain. This defect cannot much concern us now, but it is probable that the Parliament sided with the landlords against the tenants and labourers, while the King was bent on keeping the great lords with him in his quarrel with the Pope. Foreign troops were called in to crush the insurgent farmers and peasants. In the words of Colonel Ouvery, of the Cobden Club, England was conquered a second time, not this time by a king, but by the landed aristocracy, which hereby established its claim to eject tenants at its own will, and change customary payments, which were of the nature of a publicly enacted tax, into a modern rent of competition, as in a local auction of private goods. This is the critical change, which enables the landlord to squeeze out by increase of rent, the life-earnings of the tenant.

The evil of this violent overthrow of the previous tenure has not at all worn itself out. It subsists in greater force than ever, by reason of our increase in population, and the greater scarcity of land, and the need of larger revenues for good government. For any practical reform we must deny the right of landlords to "compensation" in any mercantile interpretation of the word. We must not forget that, however unaware, they are holders of stolen property.

If justice could be wisely and rightly separated from mercy, they might be treated as rudely and curtly as their ancestors under Henry VIII. treated the farmers and peasants whom they massacred and hanged by the roadside. But Mr. Wallace and his society desire national harmony and universal welfare. While insisting on national rights, we wish to respect both the innocence of those who inherit a false position and their family affection. Even a Duke is aware that his great grandchildren may be poor plebeians. No one can tenderly love his children as they may select for their heirs, family affection is hereby tenderly considered. Only their family pride is sacrificed in the possible vanishing of a family name. I cannot believe that when the history is duly pondered, a wise nation will award to the landlord class anything beyond what merciful consideration dictates.

I proceed to a third scandalous act of the same party, under the evil of which we have been suffering for more than two centuries. It was a fraud on the nation, too gross to attribute to inadvertence. I refer to the settlement made by the aristocracy with Charles II. when welcoming him back to the Throne. No doubt they had been worried and harassed by the Royal power in all former reigns. The irregularity, arbitrary character, and vexatiousness of feudal demands, whether of the King from vassals, or of landlords from tenants, needed
systematic arrangement. During the Commonwealth, the King’s worst demands had vanished with the King. After 12 years of comparative freedom, besides the six of civil war, they were not disposed to put their necks under the yoke again. They had gradually shaken off the worst burdens from themselves. They now stipulated with the King for a sweeping annihilation of the old system, so far as concerned their own liabilities, while they retained as private property the revenues which had been granted to their predecessors, as State officers, solely for public services. It may be asked, "Why did the King agree to this?" First of all, he was not in a hurry to quarrel with the party that was helping him back into the Throne. Next, they held out to him a bribe, greater than any which his father had been able to get. You will find it (if I must quote some history) in Charles Knight’s "History of England," a writer who is never hard upon the powerful. "The Parliament (says he) made a bargain to relieve the landed proprietors, but made it at the expense of the commonalty," "Charles was rendered more independent of Parliament than his father or grandfather or Queen Elizabeth had been." But how so? They voted the subsidy of tonnage and poundage for the term of the King’s life. They also granted to him and his successors the excuse of beer and other liquors. "The two great sources of modern revenue (says C. Knight) were thus placed absolutely in the King’s hands." I suppose he means Customs and Excise. This landlord Parliament cannot have been unaware that they were shifting their own righteous liabilities on to the industrious commonalty for whom they (as legislators) were trustees.

A fourth scandalous fraud admits of obvious remedy as soon as a majority in the Commons resolves on it. The profligacy of Charles II., and the expenses of his war with the Dutch, next the wars with Ireland and with France consequent on the expulsion of James II., again and again emptied the Treasury. The total exemption for which the landlords had hoped, proved quite impossible. The State had largely rested on their payments and service. Excise was a new tax, customs in those days were not profitable as now. The landlords were forced either to tax themselves, or let all go to ruin. They tried smaller votes, but the crippled Exchequer could not recover itself, and was unequal to the public services. At last, in 1692, the landlords in Parliament consented to pay one-fifth part of their revenue to the State—a small fraction indeed, when they had got rid of their feudal duties. It ought to have been honourably carried out. A valuation of the total rent was made in that year. Nearly 200 years have passed, and no new valuation has been made. When Mr. Pitt was taxing the industrious without mercy, because they were helpless, he allowed the landlords to redeem their land-tax on the old valuation, which he must have known to be a great fraud; but they were too strong for him. The fraud is enormously greater now. I see it is believed by some who have inquired, that instead of bringing in eleven hundred thousand pounds, as the land tax does now on the valuation of 1692, a new valuation would raise it to thirty millions a year, some even think forty. Without danger of exaggeration, it seems that now, and for years past, the Chancellor of the Exchequer finds it prudent to wink at the landlords paying to the Treasury twenty-eight millions a year too little.

With such a fact in front of the nation—a fact so easy to understand—every prudent friend of the landlords ought to warn them how very dangerous is their position. Mr. A. R. Wallace (I take leave to say) comes to them as did the Roman Sibyl to King Tarquin. He proposes a mild and considerate compromise, which cherishes their family affection, and lets them off easily for the past. Behind this gentle voice louder and fiercer demands are made, that we must call on the landlord class "to pay up all of which they have cheated the nation," for an excited multitude does not accept the excuse that the fault has lain with the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The longer the payment to the Sibyl is deferred, the heavier it is likely to be made. When gentle counsels effect nothing, stern violence presently rides on the storm. Mr. Wallace does not overlook the case of those who have purchased land recently; and if we deal with mercy and equity as distinct from the market and Stock Exchange, allowance will be made for these cases, and I hope it will. But if the landlords assume the arguments which their unwise advocates make for them, the danger is grave of their provoking claims of justice severely painful and almost ruinous to them. Some calculate their fraud on the Treasury in 200 years to exceed the value of their estates.

A fifth accusation against the landlord class remains to be named, their voting of common land to themselves, besides manifold encroachment on roads and usurpation of public paths and lanes. Whatever was the benefit of commons to the poor was a benefit to each generation in turn. No poor man could claim to sell the inheritance of those who were to come after him. Even if the commons had been simply divided among the poor and made saleable, the measure would, as its chief result, have enabled the rich man to buy up all the little plots to the loss of the next generation; but, in fact, the poor have scarcely had a fraction of the land allowed them. The plea that the commons were wanted to raise food is hollow; they might have been cultivated as public land, and the rent have been made the due of some local treasury. In fact the landlords have taken nearly all. And what was the amount? I find it stated that in 1845 the Royal Commission estimated that since 1710 above seven million acres had been appropriated by private Acts of Parliament Also, it is estimated that since 1845, what are called public Acts (a skilful device to prevent alarm being taken in a special locality), they have got about 800 thousand acres more.
Thus far I have spoken of rural land, but town-land and building-land generally is also a very great subject. Landlords cannot be forced to sell land except by Act of Parliament; therefore they can always compel builders and the public to submit to building-leases, which not only reserve vexatious power in the hands of the landlord, but enable him to enforce that at the end of the lease the house shall be his absolute property. Leases of 99 years are thought liberal; sometimes I hear of building leases for 63 years. So enormous and irresistible is the power which this iniquitous institution of private property in land makes over to an individual; that the land over which our great cities are spread should not have been made the property of those cities while it remained unbuilt on, is a testimony to the excessive folly of the institutions under which this intelligent and industrious nation is doomed to live and toil.

I have thus set before you the malversation of the landlord class, because without it justice cannot be done to claims vital to the nation. Two questions must now be answered. First How are we to avoid the danger of jobbing, favouritism, nay, of despotism if the land be made the nation's property? Next, on what principle are our life annuities to the landlord class to be settled?

Mr. Wallace gives quite a list of names high in repute, who with us condemn and deplore the despotism which our law vests in landlords, yet dare not recommend nationalization. J. Stuart Mill was one of them. I confess that for long years back I looked on landlords as a deplorable necessity; for I thought we had to choose between despotism of the Executive (if not of the Crown, yet of a Bureaucracy) and the despotism of landlords. And looking to India, and perhaps old Egypt, I, on the whole, preferred a thousand petty despots under a Crown to a despotic Crown. I am surprized at the simple, natural, and (one might have thought) obvious suggestion by which Mr. Wallace has dissipated all my fears; and I think that J. Stuart Mill, if he were alive, would be among his converts. What then is his solution? He would not allow the Executive Government any particle of influence over the possession, management, or rent of land; but would have every practical detail settled by Local Land Courts, which, under the sacred engagements of justice, should decide every case brought before them according to principles previously laid down. I can invent in my own mind cases puzzling to a Law Court, and I cannot undertake on the spot to clear up imaginary difficulties. Inquiring minds must read Mr. Wallace's details, and think them over. Be the difficulties what they may, lawyers when once set to the task will solve them, if general principles are fitly laid down.

Next, as to the principle on which the State Annuities for landlords are to be assessed. Mr. Wallace maintains that every rent can be divided into two parts, first, that which is paid for the area and site, independently of what cultivation has added; next, what is due to buildings, fences, drains, private roads, and culture of the soil. We cannot reclaim for dead tenants what ought to have been theirs. His scheme leaves to the landlord all that tenants for eight hundred years have wrought into the soil. It claims as taxable only that value which neither landlords nor tenants have given. For myself, I wait with interest to see the separation of the two parts of rent made. I by no means say that it is ordinarily impossible, but I have never overcome misgivings. So much I freely confess; we are all learners. But this confession does not for a moment damp my conviction that our problem is feasible as well as just, for I hold nearly by the doctrine of my friend already alluded to, who forbids our estimate to go back more than (say) sixty years. Well, we may argue, the nation has a right to refuse to an expropriated landlord a higher annuity than the rent which was received on his fields in 1822, plus whatever he can prove that he or his predecessor since 1822 has spent on these fields and buildings. Whatever has been so spent in these years, it will, in general, be easy to prove; and we can fall back on this estimate if Mr. Wallace's method fails us.

I feel it important to have this alternative, because of the diverse theory of rent in different schools of economy. To discuss these I have no time now, yet I am tempted to a short statement. Opposite as are the two theories, English and American, they most curiously agree in representing the landlord to be a mere sponge, or a parasitical insect which fattens on other men's toil. According to Ricardo, no rent is possible until the soil has been improved. His scheme leaves to the landlord all that tenants for eight hundred years have wrought into the soil. It claims as taxable only that value which neither landlords nor tenants have given. For myself, I wait with interest to see the separation of the two parts of rent made. I by no means say that it is ordinarily impossible, but I have never overcome misgivings. So much I freely confess; we are all learners. But this confession does not for a moment damp my conviction that our problem is feasible as well as just, for I hold nearly by the doctrine of my friend already alluded to, who forbids our estimate to go back more than (say) sixty years. Well, we may argue, the nation has a right to refuse to an expropriated landlord a higher annuity than the rent which was received on his fields in 1822, plus whatever he can prove that he or his predecessor since 1822 has spent on these fields and buildings. Whatever has been so spent in these years, it will, in general, be easy to prove; and we can fall back on this estimate if Mr. Wallace's method fails us.

I feel it important to have this alternative, because of the diverse theory of rent in different schools of economy. To discuss these I have no time now, yet I am tempted to a short statement. Opposite as are the two theories, English and American, they most curiously agree in representing the landlord to be a mere sponge, or a parasitical insect which fattens on other men's toil. According to Ricardo, no rent is possible until the soil has been improved. His scheme leaves to the landlord all that tenants for eight hundred years have wrought into the soil. It claims as taxable only that value which neither landlords nor tenants have given. For myself, I wait with interest to see the separation of the two parts of rent made. I by no means say that it is ordinarily impossible, but I have never overcome misgivings. So much I freely confess; we are all learners. But this confession does not for a moment damp my conviction that our problem is feasible as well as just, for I hold nearly by the doctrine of my friend already alluded to, who forbids our estimate to go back more than (say) sixty years. Well, we may argue, the nation has a right to refuse to an expropriated landlord a higher annuity than the rent which was received on his fields in 1822, plus whatever he can prove that he or his predecessor since 1822 has spent on these fields and buildings. Whatever has been so spent in these years, it will, in general, be easy to prove; and we can fall back on this estimate if Mr. Wallace's method fails us.

I feel it important to have this alternative, because of the diverse theory of rent in different schools of economy. To discuss these I have no time now, yet I am tempted to a short statement. Opposite as are the two theories, English and American, they most curiously agree in representing the landlord to be a mere sponge, or a parasitical insect which fattens on other men's toil. According to Ricardo, no rent is possible until the soil has been improved. His scheme leaves to the landlord all that tenants for eight hundred years have wrought into the soil. It claims as taxable only that value which neither landlords nor tenants have given. For myself, I wait with interest to see the separation of the two parts of rent made. I by no means say that it is ordinarily impossible, but I have never overcome misgivings. So much I freely confess; we are all learners. But this confession does not for a moment damp my conviction that our problem is feasible as well as just, for I hold nearly by the doctrine of my friend already alluded to, who forbids our estimate to go back more than (say) sixty years. Well, we may argue, the nation has a right to refuse to an expropriated landlord a higher annuity than the rent which was received on his fields in 1822, plus whatever he can prove that he or his predecessor since 1822 has spent on these fields and buildings. Whatever has been so spent in these years, it will, in general, be easy to prove; and we can fall back on this estimate if Mr. Wallace's method fails us.
practically, this means they begin on thin and dry soils *generally poor*; and only after population has multiplied are they able to drain marshes, and clear forests, and make roads on which heavy materials of the soil can be transported, and thus to get at the better soils, and so to treat them with manures as to bring out their high fertility. The induction which the American economist Carey makes from the vast American experience appears to me to shatter to pieces Ricardo's theory, which has no basis of fact. But to say this, is not to deny that savage men *ever* alight on soil at once eminently fertile, and to him quite accessible. Such apparently now is the soil of Manitoba. Such were Podolia and the Ukraine to the agricultural Scythians of whom Herodotus tells us. Such is the great plain of Hungary. But these are exceptional. Ricardo has added to Adam Smith concerning rent, but the addition is not a clear improvement. In any case, no theory of rent affects the assertion of this lecture, that the class of English landlords has grievously abused its power of legislation, using that power to commit enormous fraud on the *nation*—fraud for which it is high time to call it to account.

In moving for the repeal of the Corn Laws we acted according to our best light on that day. But we did not then know that the admission of food from abroad would postpone for another generation the just and necessary move against landlord despotism: much less did we imagine that after the admittance of foreign corn, and after the Irish famine, rents would continue to rise for 30 years; such is the intensity of power which land-lord-supremacy in Parliament for six centuries has achieved. If landlords had been only a little less than angels, no other result could have been expected from so long a career of supremacy, unchecked by farmers or labourers, by merchants or manufacturers. But the last buttresses of their power are falling. The farmers are no longer deceivable. The penny newspapers make even rustics think; and all thoughtful friends of the landlords ought to see, that for a class which has misused high power a prompt and willing settlement is far wiser than proud contumacy and talk of its sacred rights.
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History of the Free Congregational Society
Of Florence, Mass. With its Articles Of Association And By-Laws.

**Free Congregational Society**

Of Florence, Mass.

This society may perhaps claim the honor of being the first religious body in the United States to organize on a platform of entire freedom of thought and speech. The story of its birth and infancy is brief.

About forty years ago a company of earnest, reformatory men and women, who had the courage of conviction,—some of whom had been driven from the church because of their pronounced anti-slavery sympathies,—tried in this place an experiment of a new form of social life somewhat after the "Brook Farm" experiment, made at about the same time, near Boston. But, like that more famous enterprise, the Florence social venture, for similar reasons, was given up after a few years. The spirit of free inquiry and brotherly helpfulness, however, which especially animated the prime movers of this social experiment, survived the dissolution of the organization and has embodied itself in other forms.

From the first it was the custom of the people, in what are called "The Community times," to hold Sunday meetings, not so much for the "worship of God" in any conventional sense, as for the instruction of man in everything that pertained to human welfare. One of the cardinal principles of these meetings was freedom of discussion. After the co-operative experiment was abandoned, those members of the association who remained in Florence, together with their friends, continued to hold Sunday meetings, though not regularly, down to the time of the formation of the "Free Congregational Society of Florence." In pursuance of the following call, signed by twenty-seven citizens of Florence who had been interested in these Sunday meetings, and who believed that the friends of religious freedom should avail themselves of the strength there is in union and organized effort, a meeting was held at the time and place therein named.
To the People of Florence and Vicinity:

All interested in the promotion of good morals, general education and liberal religious sentiment, whether Catholic or Protestant, or of whatever sect, creed or nationality, are invited to meet in the South School House, on Sunday, May 3, 1863, at 3 1/2 o'clock, P. M., to organize arrangements for the better attainment of the objects above-named.

At the meeting, a Society was organized by the adoption and signing of the following Articles of Agreement.

We, the undersigned, inhabitants of Florence, and its vicinity, in the town of Northampton, wishing to avail ourselves of the advantages of associate effort for our advancement in truth and goodness, and for the promotion of general intelligence, good morals and liberal religious sentiments, do hereby agree to form ourselves into a body corporate under the name of the FREE CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY OF FLORENCE.

Respecting in each other, and in all, the right of intellect and conscience to be free, and holding it to be the duty of every one to keep his mind and heart at all times open to receive the truth, and follows its guidance, we set up no theological condition of membership and neither demand nor expect uniformity of doctrinal belief; asking only unity of purpose to seek and accept the right and true, and an honest aim and effort to make these the rule of life. And, recognizing the brotherhood of the human race, and the equality of human rights, we make no distinction as to the conditions and rights of membership in this Society, on account of sex, or color, or nationality.

The officers of this Society shall be a Moderator, Clerk, and Treasurer, who shall be first chosen at the first business meeting of the Society, and afterwards at each annual meeting thereof, and shall perform the customary duties of their respective offices.

The Society shall hold its annual meeting on the first Monday in April, at such hour and place as the Moderator of the preceding year shall appoint.

By-Laws.

1st. All subscribers to the articles of association shall be considered members of the Society wherever they reside, so long as they manifest, by their lives, an honest purpose to promote its objects.

2d. The officers of the Society shall be chosen by ballot, unless at the meeting at which they are to be chosen, some other method shall be proposed through the presiding officer, and shall be adopted by unanimous vote, or by silent assent of all the members present.

3d. A majority of all the votes given shall be necessary to the choice of any officer, unless three attempts to obtain such majority shall have failed; in which case, at the fourth trial, the person having a larger number of votes than any other person, shall be considered chosen, though that number should not be a majority of the whole number given.

4th. Standing Committees shall be annually chosen which shall be:

First. An Executive Committee of three members, to make arrangements for carrying into effect the votes and resolutions of the Society.

Second. A Library Committee of three members, to take measures for establishing a Library and Reading Room, to select books and periodicals for the same and have the charge of them when established.

Third. A Committee of five members on Music, to provide for singing in our public meetings, and promote, as far as may be, improvement therein.

Fourth. A School Committee of three or more members to take measures for opening and keeping up Sunday Schools under the auspices of the Society.

Fifth. In case of the Moderator's absence from any meeting of the Society, the meeting shall be called to order by the Clerk, and a Moderator pro tem, shall be chosen by nomination and show of hands. Should the Moderator and Clerk be both absent, both offices shall be filled pro tem. in like manner, on call of the Treasurer, or, in his absence, of any other member.

Sixth. The Moderator may call a special meeting of the Society whenever he thinks it desirable; and it shall be his duty to call one, whenever five members shall request him in writing to do so.

Seventh. It shall be the duty of the Clerk to give public information of the hour and place of each Annual
meeting, and the day, hour and place of each special meeting, by posting written notices of the same in two or more conspicuous places, at least seven days before the meeting notified is to be held.

When it became necessary to build or provide a suitable house for its place of meeting it was found that the Society was not incorporated as the statute required in order to hold property. To secure this right a new or supplemental organization was formed on the 10th of April, 1872; the old Society continuing, on its original platform, to exercise all the educational and religious functions for which it was originally founded. The supplemental society was, at first called "The Free Congregational Society," the name differing from that of the original society only in the omission of the words "of Florence." This distinction being so slight, the new society, in order to avoid confusion, propose to adopt, and are taking steps toward it, the title of Cosmian Hall Association.

When the Society was first organized, its meetings were held in the District School House; but on Sunday, April 17th, 1864, it began to hold meetings in the new chapel and hall built for the purpose, in the then new building called Florence Hall. The use of the chapel, hall and library room, for ten years, was given to the Society, by its President. In 1874, a spacious and beautiful edifice, called Cosmian Hall, was completed, having been erected for the uses of the Society, by the subscriptions of members and others; the larger part being contributed by its generous-hearted President. Cosmian Hall cost about $40,000, and includes an attractive and richly decorated auditorium, capable of seating 700 persons, an organ and grand piano, and a spacious and amply furnished stage, upon which dramatic entertainments are frequently given during the winter. The basement contains "Lower Cosmian Hall," and a suite of rooms which constitute the parlors and culinary department of the "Ladies' Industrial Union," an auxiliary of the Society.

The hall last mentioned is occupied on Sundays by the Cosmian Sunday School, and on week days for occasions of social recreations. The Ladies' Parlors, on Sundays, are devoted to classes of the Sunday School; and on week days to the Ladies' Industrial Union, social and literary gatherings.

The Sunday School room is adorned with portraits of Charles C. Burleigh, Theodore D. Weld, John G. Whittier and other noble men, and with Mr. Hale's mottoes, "Look up, and not down," "Look out and not in," "Look forward and not back," "Lend a hand."

Charles C. Burleigh, who had been for a number of years prior to May 3, 1863, employed as Sunday lecturer at Florence, remained as resident speaker of the Society from that date until April 6, 1873, when he resigned, and went to Bloomington, Ill., for a year. After his return he was a constant attendant upon the services of the society and Sunday School until his death, on the 13th day of June, 1878.

Mr. Burleigh as is well known here, was struck by a railroad train in Florence, on the 3d of June, 1878, and sustained injuries which resulted in his death on the 13th of that month. The magnitude of this loss to the society, to the community, and to the whole country is immeasurable. As one of the founders of the society, as its steadfast and able defender, as the undaunted and eloquent champion and friend of the down-trodden slave, and of the oppressed everywhere, as a lofty example of purity and integrity, coupled with a matchless intellect, he will long live in the hearts of the members of the Free Congregational Society, and be enshrined in the dearest memories of thousands scattered over this broad continent.

It is fitting, in this connection, to speak of Mrs. Burleigh's labors in the society. In every department she was an earnest and efficient worker, fruitful in suggestions of ways and means. To use the words of one of her co-workers, "In her very presence was inspiration and incentive to every good word and work. The loving heart beat with warmest sympathy for all humanity, and her words of kindness and deeds of love, were balm to many saddened spirits. Blessed be her memory! Let us never forget her while our society has existence, for to her it owed so much in its earliest years."

In May, 1871, Miss Elizabeth M. Powell, now Mrs. Elizabeth Powell Bond, began to officiate as associate-resident speaker, and continued until May, 1872, when Rowland Connor took her place, and officiated in that capacity until the resignation of Mr. Burleigh, when Mr. Connor became resident speaker, and held the office until August 1, 1874. From this last mentioned date, the Society had no resident speaker until September 1, 1875, when David H. Clark took the office, and held the same until September 1, 1878. Mr. W. H. Spencer and Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer, late of Haverhill, Mass., who are at this date the resident speakers, were chosen in the summer of 1881, and began their labors on the first day of September of that year.

The resident speaker is not, like the minister or pastor of most religious societies, pledged to advocate and defend a formal statement of faith. He is under no intellectual bonds. He is at liberty to express freely his latest thought. It is understood that he speaks only for himself, and that his utterances, like those of any other member of the society, are at all times open to criticism. He is usually engaged to speak for a portion of the year, as it is the purpose, and has been the practice of the Society to have, during each year, a variety of speakers, so that every phase of thought may be fairly represented. The Society has been addressed by the representatives of Judaism, by orthodox and heretical Christians, by Spiritualists and Materialists, Theists and Agnostics, and those who could, perhaps, hardly be classed theologically anywhere, for the society believes that in this free
exchange of ideas, and the hospitality that is willing to listen to diverse religious theories is the surest promise of the Truth which maketh free, which Lord Bacon pronounces "the sovereign good of human nature."


Sunday School.

The members of the Society early saw the importance of establishing a Sunday School which should do for a liberal society what the Sunday Schools of the churches are doing for them. They felt that they ought not only to protect their children from the social attractions of these Sunday Schools, where they would become indoctrinated with theological notions which their parents believe are not only false, but morally mischievous, but that they should directly fortify their children against such influences, by teaching them the principles of free and rational religion, on which the Society was founded. To this end the Society, almost at the start, organized a Sunday School, which has been maintained to the present time, with a success that fully justifies the experiment. The following has been the usual order of exercises, of late:

The members of the Sunday School, numbering about a hundred, assemble in the Lower Hall at half past ten o'clock. At the stroke of the bell, the School comes to order, and joins in singing an opening song from "The Morning Stars," an admirable book for use in liberal Sunday Schools, as it is full of the song of birds, the fragrance of flowers, and Nature's beauty and melody, and almost destitute of objectionable theological features. Then the superintendent reads a lesson for the day, selected from any source, or superintendent and school join in alternate readings from the valuable service book of ethical sentiments, compiled by F. A. Hinckley of Providence, R. I. Next the classes separate, going to their respective rooms for their class work. The class exercises occupy three-quarters of an hour, the superintendent, meanwhile, visiting each class to take the record of attendance, and note the progress of the pupils. At half-past eleven the piano summons all to the hall for general exercises. These exercises usually consist of recitations by one or two of the pupils, singing, music or reading by the same, and remarks by the superintendent or some adult members of the Sunday School. It is desirable that this half-hour shall be especially devoted to moral instruction. For that purpose it is well to have some regular subject assigned for that day, and that the superintendent select the recitations and readings so far as possible with reference to the topic of the hour. The present superintendent, Mr. Spencer, is taking up in order the following circle of virtues:

1. Love; 2. Truthfulness; 3. Justice; 4. Self-Control; 5. Purity; 6. Order; 7. Industry; 8. Punctuality; 9. Usefulness. Then these subjects may be subdivided; the first general subject, for instance, may be subdivided into—

- Love of Home, (family affection);
- Love of Country, (patriotism);
- Love of Mankind, (brotherhood);
- Love of The weak, (charity);
- Love of Animals, (humanity);
- Love of The best, (reverence);

and so on. Other similar divisions will readily suggest themselves to the teacher. But the important tiling is that each of these virtues should be taught, not in the abstract, but in the concrete. The child can only see a principle vividly, when it is embodied.

Liberals must adopt not the subjects but the method of instruction which the churches find so effective. While we cannot point the child to any historical character now living or who has long ago passed from an earthly existence, as the exclusive embodiment of love and self-sacrifice, or who was the exemplification of all the circle of human virtues, yet we can excite the child's love and reverence by picturing before his mind the career of some noble man or woman who has beautifully illustrated some special virtue we wish to inculcate.
Thus we can take up any virtue, and by well-chosen examples to illustrate, we can impart, not simply historical information to our youth, but what should be the special function of the Sunday School, give moral aspiration to life.

The object of the lesson should be to win the pupil's love and admiration for the subject presented, and to quicken the conscience to imitation. The child cannot grow on denials of any sort. He must be served by affirmations. Nothing is so morally stimulating, next to the living example, as biography. Liberals should avail themselves of those means which history puts into their hands.

Thus the larger part of the half-hour time that every Sunday is devoted to the "general exercises," is employed in imparting the moral lessons which come from a study and discussion of the character and life of worthy men and women. After a final song by the school, and the recitation in concert of an appropriate sentiment written upon the blackboard, the session closes at 12 o'clock.

The special class work in a school like this must, of course, be determined by the capacities and needs of the pupils. There are classes in the study of language and literature; in political and physical science; in the study of ethical problems; in drawing and English composition, and classes of younger pupils in such simple moral instruction as is adapted to the mind of the child. All theological indoctrination, even of the most liberal Christian type, is excluded from the school. It is the opinion of the Society that the child should be protected from all theological bias. Fill it's mind with a love for truth, whatever it may be; with the spirit of fearless inquiry; with a knowledge of the results of scientific investigation, so far as they have been revealed, especially in the relation of man to man, and directly and indirectly seek to create in the child a desire to know the truth and to do the right. That we have not succeeded in this high aim as well as we had hoped, may readily be admitted, but we do think that this Sunday School has not only exerted an elevating effect on the members of it, but has radiated an influence which has raised the moral tone of the whole community. In a place like Florence, where many of the young people begin to work very early in life in the mills and factories, there is a constant tendency to stagnation of thought and depression of moral aims. A Sunday School like this, which invites the young to share its studies and enjoy its entertainments, cannot but stimulate to better life all those who come within the radius of its influence, and these are many. For, besides the regular Sunday exercises of the School at 10 1-2 o'clock, it has been the custom of the Society for several years to devote the lecture hour, 2 P. M., one Sunday afternoon in each month, to a concert by the choir and Sunday School. These occasions usually draw very large audiences. The exercises consist of readings, recitations, vocal and instrumental music, and frequently original essays have been read. Among the subjects of such essays, are the following: "Heroism;" "Services;" "Autumn;" "Ripeness;" "Our Work;" "Suggestions for the New Year;" "Richard II;" "Henry V;" "What may be done with Half-Hours;" "A Study of 'As You Like It;" "Objects and Methods of the Cosmian Sunday School;" "Negation and Affirmation in our Society;" "Lesson of the Leaves;" "Steps to a Noble Life;" "Enthusiasm among Liberals;" "Our Needs,—Unity of Spirit and Earnest Work;" "Retrospect and Prospect;" "Temperance."

During the last year the Superintendent has inaugurated the somewhat novel practice of making every concert a special lesson for the day. This is done by making the selections of recitations, readings, music and remarks appropriate to the selected topic. It is a new idea, and seems to be very attractive and popular with the people. In this way the Sunday School is doing missionary work.

During the three years that the Society was without a resident speaker, from September, '78, to September, '81, on 37 Sundays, in addition to the 32 Sundays occupied by the choir and Sunday School, the services were arranged by Miss E. C. Elder, the Superintendent of the Sunday School. About 30 different persons contributed to the exercises, which included lectures on "Public Opinion;" "Spirit and Methods of Primary Instruction;" "Moses and Christ, an Historical and Religious Comparison;" "Temptation;" and essays on "Evil Speaking;" "Socrates;" "Bayard Taylor;" "The Stoics;" and "Joan of Arc." Sometimes the exercises consisted of select readings upon a special subject, e.g., "Toleration;" "Buddha;" "Channing;" "Parker;" "L. M. Child;" "Needs of Free Religion;" "Reform in Politics;" etc. Also during the time numerous sermons were read, including several of the series on "Evolution of Morals;" by M. J. Savage, one or more by J. W. Chadwick, Prof. Felix Adler, and W. J. Potter. During this interregnum a series of Sunday evening meetings were held in the Lower Hall, under the auspices of the Society, and were well attended. The exercises were conducted by members of the Society in turn, it being a rule that no one should be called to serve twice during the same season. By this means a large number of the members of the Society were induced to participate in the exercises, which were of a musical and literary character.

The experience of the Society during these three years that they were without a resident speaker, shows what may be done by organization and cooperation of liberals, even in a village of two thousand inhabitants, without large expenditure of money. At the same time the Society fully appreciates the advantages of having a resident speaker; one who may represent the Society at all times, on public occasions; at weddings and funerals, and who may be a kind of social leader; one who may be educated for the special work, and may devote his
whole time to the interests of the Society and Sunday School, and by his teaching and example illustrate the
virtues which our rational religion, above all others, ought to exemplify.

Such liberal speakers, men and women, we believe, will be forthcoming when the call of the people is
heard. The demand will find its supply. No doubt we need a school, as Prof. Adler has advocated, for the
especial training of able leaders of ethical instruction. In the no distant day such a school, we hope, will be
founded. But in the meantime there bids fair to be a supply of radical teachers from the yearly exodus of
ministers from the ranks of the Church, to say nothing of the occasional geniuses which seem to spring up
spontaneously in unlooked-for nooks of society. Everywhere, within the Christian borders, even inside of
Unitarianism, there is an increasing number of young men, cultured, able, sincere, who are chafing under their
intellectual bonds and longing for some freer field of thought and labor. Large numbers of these are crowded
out of the Church by the force of their convictions, and finding no liberal organization ready to welcome them,
must abandon a line of labor for which they have, it may be, a special taste as well as training, and at the
eleventh hour seek to put their hand to some other plow. Many a man has thus deliberately sacrificed a brilliant
future on the altar of honesty. Can we wonder that many who have outgrown the old faiths, still retain their
hold on the Church benefits, long after they have lost hold of the church creeds? If liberals would do their
duty, how much easier would it be for the liberal preacher to be true to the truth as he sees it!

This Society, having now had a prosperous organized existence of nineteen years, sometimes with, and
sometimes without a settled leader, believes that it has worked out the problem of securing unity of effort with
diversity of belief, and it would therefore earnestly urge rationalists everywhere to organize on a basis similar to
its own. In scores of the towns and cities of the United States, this may be, and should be done. All that is
needed is for two or three generous, wise, determined men and women to lead in the movement. Once started in
the work, the enlistment of others is comparatively easy as the pleasure of developing the young mind and
leading it into paths where it can think for itself, untrammelled by the boundaries artificially formed by others, is
closely united with the kindred pleasure caused by the social interchange of thought of the more mature minds,
an interchange in which each person gets more than he gives, as his own thought grows many fold oftentimes
as he gives it to his neighbor.

Organizations should be effected not simply for the edification of the parents themselves, but especially for
the sake of the children. How many little ones are led in other and wrong directions by the social attractions
offered and the failure of their young minds to correctly interpret the truth and sift it from its false
surroundings. If the young mind is encouraged in its free growth it will take care of itself. It seems to us that
liberals are not guiltless in the thoughtlessness and indifference with which they view the indoctrination of the
minds of their children with theories they themselves have repudiated long ago. They do not realize the wrong
they are doing. Let them bestir themselves and organize Sunday Schools of their own, where rational
instruction with social pleasure may be afforded.

Liberals! Organize for the sake of furthering what you believe to be the truth, in the community. There
must be unity of effort to succeed. It is a mistake, however, to suppose that a Society cannot be organized
without a creedal basis. The time is coming, it is, indeed, almost here, when it will be impossible to base any
religious society upon a theological statement, however broad. The controversy that is now going on respecting
the election of Rev. Dr. Smyth to the Abbot Professorship of Andover Theological Seminary, which threatens
to split New England Congregational orthodoxy, shows the worse than folly of resting a progressive institution
upon an immovable creed. If the institution is saved it is at the sacrifice of the sincerity and intellectual
uprightness of those who save it. The basis of this Free Congregational Society is so broad that it needs not to
rest upon the hypocrisy of its members. All we ask is “unity of purpose to seek and accept the right and the true,
and an honest aim and effort to make these the rule of life.” It is upon this broad basis that the Society was
planted nearly twenty years ago, and it feels itself as enduring as the solid walls of its great temple of freedom.
The experience of this Society, we repeat, has established the fact that organization is compatible with the
utmost intellectual freedom. All that is needed is a clear comprehension of the work to be done, and an earnest
moral purpose to do it. We say work to be done. What is this? The same moral, educational, charitable and
reformatory work which the Churches, in a measure, perform. Liberals can do this labor far better than the
Churches, if they will, for they are not swathed by the winding sheet of a dead theology. Their heads and hands
are free to plan and rectify, to build and improve, untrammelled by what some other builder has done or what
some other theorist has said is an impossibility.

It is true that Liberals can do, and many do, much of this work as individuals. This is well, but how much
faster we can work and how much better by uniting our efforts. Let Liberals do this work so far as possible as a
Society, and then the honor goes to whom the honor is due. Then they speak as one having authority. Then they
are recognized as an established moral force in the community, and respected for what they are.

And again, Liberals should organize, not simply for the proper education of their children, nor for the
improvement of the relations of man to man, as individual beings, but also for the diffusion of correct ideas of
the true relation of the State to the individual, and the defense of our political and religious liberties.

When we find, in this age, men of culture, of position and wide influence, men looked up to as instructors of youth and leaders of thought, who while enjoying the right themselves to think as they please religiously, strive to hamper others by gravely advocating the right and duty of Christians to ingraft sectarianism into the United States Constitution, is it not evident that the lessons and examples of free thought in religion cannot be too numerous or too conspicuous? And this is being done at the very time when the people of the old world are struggling to throw off the yoke of church domination, which their long experience proves to be a curse and a snare. It is necessary, even at this late day, to teach what ought to be truisms in America, that religion must be voluntary, and that the State is playing the role of the tyrant when she undertakes to make any theological dogma a bar to civil rights. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," is an old proverb, indeed, but in view of the progress of Roman Imperialism, and the force of Protestant bigotry in this country, it may be a proverb that will need some modern applications. For the sake of our children, ourselves, and our country, let the Liberals of America awake to their duties!

We may perhaps close this History of the Free Congregational Society of Florence in no more tit-ting words than to quote the following from the Annual Report of the executive committee for the year ending April 3d, 1882:—

"And now, at this late day, in spite of all the positive work that Cosmians have done, we are told by the upholders of Church and creed limitations of thought and speech, that we are mere seekers and doubters, and that we cannot build a religious Society on denials. Now, we believe that there is one thing, if there is no other, that Cosmians have found out, settled and affirmed, and that one thing is a sufficient foundation for a religious Society to be built upon, namely,—Toleration,—the principle that character, not creed, shall be the ground of fellowship. Who can doubt that the horrible outrages now being inflicted on the Jews in Russia have their main root in religious hate and intolerance? The people of that so-called Christian nation, are, indeed, "letting their light shine," but it is a light that gleams from their murderous daggers and incendiary torches, casting its lurid glare on the affrighted victims of their brutality and lust."

"Is true freedom but to break
Fetters for our own dear sake,
And, with leathern hearts, forget
That we owe mankind a debt?
No! true freedom is to share
All the chains our brothers wear,
And, with heart and hand, to be
Earnest to make others free."

**Officers For 1882.**

* Moderator—Samuel L. Hill.  
* Cleric—A. G. Hill.  
* Treasurer—A. T. Lilly.  
* Executive Committee—Seth Hunt, A. T. Lilly, Joseph Marsh.  
* Committee on Music—L. F. Plympton, Mrs. M. J. Branch, Mrs. A. G. Hill, Samuel Porter, Miss Nannie Worth.  
* Committee on Hospitality—Mrs. A. G. Hill, Miss E. C. Elder, L. F. Plympton.  
* Soliciting Committee—Mrs. E. K. Sheffield, Mrs. F. Schadee, Mrs. L. J. Ranney, David Remington, Robert M. Branch, Dwight A. Ross, Dr. J. B. Learned, Joseph Marsh, L. F. Plympton.  
* Committee to seat Strangers—D. A. Ross, M. C. Howard.  
* Committee on Charity—The Ladies of the Industrial Union.  
* Superintendent of Sunday School—W. H. Spencer.  
* Treasurer and Librarian—Harry Townend.  
* Organist—Fred Atkins.  

**How Shall We Keep Sunday?**  
An Answer in Four Parts:
Prefatory.

During the year just closed the American people have had their thoughts turned with new interest to the meaning and value of the institution of Sunday. The action of the Centennial Commissioners in keeping the International Exhibition, at Philadelphia, closed to the public on the first day of the week (though opening it to a few select guests), has awakened the inquiry in many minds that never before harbored it, whether the Sabbath was made for man or man for the Sabbath. Most visitors at the great Exhibition, compelled to admire the excellent order that always prevailed, and comparing the moral opportunities within the enclosure with those along the streets outside, must have been led to ask, Wherein would have consisted the wrong in opening such a place on that day? Education, morality, justice, humanity, alike would seem to plead for the opening. What kept the gates shut? This is a question that brings under review the whole subject of Sunday-observance. What are the grounds of the traditional belief and custom, so powerful in our country, with regard to the first day of the week? and are there not rational and beneficent uses to which the day is not now given?

The essays here printed were delivered in a recent convention of the Free Religious Association, called specially to consider the question, "How shall we keep Sunday?" and are believed to be an important contribution towards the solution of this question. They were prepared by different authors, yet take the subject up in a sequence that is both historical and logical, as will be seen by their respective topics, and present a connected argument.

Should the essays be criticised as presenting only one side of the question, it may be said in reply, that earnest effort was made to have different views of the subject represented at the above-mentioned convention. Eminent persons, who, from their theological connections, it was supposed would hold a different view of Sunday observance than that given in these essays, were invited to address the meeting, but excused themselves from the service on account of other engagements. In the free discussion that followed the essays, one or two speakers appeared in behalf of the common orthodox belief concerning Sunday; and for the sake of their statements it was at first contemplated to put the entire discussion as well as the essays into a pamphlet. But the meagreness of the statements, though honest and manly, and the size and expense of the required pamphlet, finally prevailed against such a purpose. It may be here said, however, that the entire proceedings of the convention have been published verbatim in "The Index," and all readers of these essays, who desire to see the whole, are referred to Nos. 362 to 366 (inclusive) of that publication, No. 231 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.

Certain persons object to any effort to liberalize public sentiment on the Sunday question that it is a superfluous work. They say, that, whatever unjust Sunday laws still stand on the statute books, they are a dead letter, and that practically everybody has all the liberty on Sunday that he wishes. A strange allegation in view of the frequently occurring arrests for violating Sunday laws, and of the fact that thousands and scores of thousands of moral people were prevented at Philadelphia, within the last few months, from doing on that day as their own reason and conscience would have dictated! Moreover, if ecclesiastical public opinion concerning Sunday-observance has lost much of its authority, and the day has lost much of its old authority, and the day has become one of practical freedom compared with the old restraints that surrounded it, none the less, but all the more, presses the question, How shall we use the day to the best advantage? How shall we now reclaim from indolence and demoralizing license this seventh part of life which has been rescued from the power of superstition, and make it serve, in the highest sense, individual and social welfare? In this grave, practical question the argument of these essays culminates. May we not ask, therefore, of all who feel the importance of this question, that they will make some special effort to aid in the circulation of this pamphlet? It is hardly necessary to add, that, according to a well-established principle of the Free Religious Association, both on its platform and in its publications, each of the essayists speaks for himself alone, and commits no one else.

W.J.P.

Part I.
Scripture Evidence

In Regard to the Obligation of Sabbatical Observance.

Scripture Evidence in Regard to the Obligation of Sabbatical Observance.

By Charles K. Whipple.

Of the theological assumptions made by professional teachers of the popular forms of Protestantism, many are found, on examination, to have no sufficient evidence; but the group of assumptions implied in one of the stock phrases of those teachers, namely, "The Christian Sabbath," is specially noteworthy as being contradicted by the very documents quoted by those teachers in support of it. The book appealed to by Sabatarians as the "inspired, sufficient, and infallible rule of life for Christians," not only gives no warrant for their claim of the scriptural appointment of a Sunday Sabbath, but proves that claim to be fraudulent as well as unfounded, it being in direct opposition to both parts of the Bible. This will plainly appear from an unprejudiced examination of the book in question.

There is a well-known institution called the Jewish Sabbath. The Hebrew people hold themselves religiously bound to observe it; and the Hebrew Scriptures not only distinctly set forth the law requiring such observance, and accurately describe in what it consists, but give us also its origin and history.

If you ask a Jew why he observes the Sabbath, he will probably refer you to the fourth of the "Ten Commandments" formerly enjoined upon his nation by Moses, at Mount Sinai, and now recorded in the twentieth chapter of Exodus. It is as follows:—

"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all they work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work; thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." (Ex. xx. 8—II.)

The word "remember," above used in regard to Sabbatical observance of the seventh day, indicates that the Hebrews had already some acquaintance with it; and, tracing back the narrative in Exodus, we find the institution of such observance recorded in the sixteenth chapter. In verse 22d of that chapter, speaking to the Hebrews "on the sixth day," Moses said to them, "Tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord."

On the morrow, the seventh day, Moses said (speaking of the manna which they had previously gathered), "Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord; to-day ye shall not find it in the field; six days ye shall gather it; but on the Seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none."

But the people, having evidently known nothing of Sabbath observance before, did not put perfect confidence in this statement; and the narrative proceeds:—

"And it came to pass that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days. Abide ye every man in his place; let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day."

Observe that the rest of the Sabbath was here expressly fixed for a definite day. On that day travel and one kind of labor were expressly forbidden. The Hebrews were not to gather manna, and were not to go out of their place on a certain fixed day, the seventh. And the record proceeds to say that they did rest on that day.

Now when, four chapters after (about one month after; compare Exodus xvi. 1-29, and xix. 1; xx. 8), the solemn command is given to these same people, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," (that is, to keep it separate from other days in the manner prescribed), is it not in the highest degree probable that the Sabbath here spoken of is the same that they had been observing for a month past? And does not this probability become certainty when it is immediately added, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is..."
The day is here proved to be not merely a seventh part of time, to be chosen by each according to his pleasure, but a particular day of the week, which the Hebrews were already getting accustomed to observe. That day they still observe; and the name of that day is Saturday, alike by their usage and ours. There is no more doubt that the "seven day" of the fourth commandment Sabbath is Saturday, than that "the first day of the week," spoken of in the New Testament, is Sunday.

The fourth commandment has a wider scope than the direction given a month earlier, and recorded in the sixteenth chapter. That one, the earlier (addressed to the Hebrews and to them only, since no other nation depended on manna for food), forbade them to gather manna, and also to leave their appointed places on Saturday, the seventh day of the week. This one, the later, addressed to the same people, required them to "remember" that same Saturday Sabbath, and to observe it by "not doing any work."

It would seem plain, even from the first aspect of the case, that the two injunctions for sabbatical observance, one given to the Hebrew people while wandering in the wilderness, and the other to the same persons assembled before Mount Sinai, were appointed and intended for that people only. But there is positive additional evidence to that effect. In many of the sabbatical commands subsequently recorded in the Old Testament Scriptures, the limitation of them to the Hebrews is distinctly expressed, declaring Sabbath observance to have been given them as a mark of distinction between them and other nations. Here is some of the evidence:

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily, my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is A SIGN BETWEEN ME AND YOU throughout your generations." (Ex. xxxi. 12, 13.)

"Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever." (Ex. xxxi. 16, 17.)

"And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm: Therefore, the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." (Deut. v. 15.)

"I gave them my Sabbaths to be a sign between me and them." (Ezek. xx. 12.)

Thus it appears by the Old Testament Scriptures that the Sabbath was not only an important part, but a peculiar and distinctive part, of the Jewish system. Nobody supposes that the Philistines and Amalekites were required to observe the Sabbath. That observance was devised expressly as a mark of distinction between Jews and Gentiles. But the term Gentiles includes all who are not Jews; and thus Christians, unless Sabbatism is commanded in the Christian Scriptures, have no more to do with that observance than the Philistines or the Amalekites had. It was never intended for any but Jews, according to the Old Testament. To discover whether there is any such thing as a Christian Sabbath, we must go to the Christian Scriptures, the New Testament.

Looking first at the NEGATIVE evidence supplied by the New Testament, we find that neither Jesus nor any apostle enjoins Sabbath-keeping. Not a single writer in the New Testament commands or recommends the observance either of Saturday or of any other day as a Sabbath. We find there no requisition for the observance of any day as peculiar or sacred, or as to be specially devoted to rest or worship. The Christian law being silent on this subject, the times of rest and worship are left free to be decided by Christians, and by all other Gentiles, for themselves. Those who wish to set aside a particular day for their own religious observance, have an undoubted right to do so; but they have no right to impose such observance as a duty on other people, and no ground for declaring that God requires such observance.

The second item of negative evidence in the New Testament is that neither Jesus nor any apostle forbids Sabbath-breaking. There is need of making the statement in this form, since so many persons who call and think themselves "followers of Jesus" cry out against what they call "Sabbath-breaking." But in fact, it necessarily follows from the statement next before this—the fact that neither Jesus nor any apostle, nor any New Testament writer, enjoins Sabbath keeping,—that in the Christian system there is no such thing as Sabbath-breaking. Where no Sabbath is commanded there is no Sabbath to be violated. Of course, then, to Christians, there is no such thing as Sabbath-breaking. If an Episcopal clergyman should stigmatize dissenters as Lent-breakers, or Christ masbreakers, he would be no more absurd than those who, claiming to be Christians, cry out against Sabbath-breaking. The Christian system, judged by the New Testament, gives no injunction respecting either Lent or Christmas, or a weekly Sabbath. The extra-Christian rules of particular sects or churches bind only the members of those bodies, and bind even them only while they choose to remain members.

It is proper to insist here upon the fact that extra-Christian rules and customs exist in all the great sects, Catholic and Protestant. They all call themselves Christian, and all claim to adopt the New Testament as their authority in religion and their rule of life; but, as each sect differs from the others in its apprehension of the meaning and the relative importance of some parts of that book, and as each naturally emphasizes the
particulars wherein it seems to itself to follow the acknowledged rule more closely than others, customs and regulations peculiar to itself are gradually formed in each, which, being supposed by its members illustrations of the eminent faithfulness of their own body, are assumed by them to be undoubtedly Christian. Their Church, in their view, the best representative of Christianity, its rules are taken for granted to be Christian rules; and thus Mariolatry and penance are reckoned Christian by the Roman Catholic, observance of Lent and Christmas by the Episcopalians, and infant baptism and Sunday Sabbatism by the Presbyterian and the Orthodox Congregationalists, though not one of these observances finds any warrant in the New Testament. Nevertheless, if all the churches in the world should unite for that purpose, they could not manufacture a Christian duty beyond the warranty of that book.

Looking, now, at positive New Testament evidence in regard to Sabbatism, the attitude of Jesus towards it is the first thing to be considered. The ground taken by him upon this subject was such that he was stigmatized by devout Jews as a Sabbath-breaker. This man they said, "cannot be of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath day." He accepted an invitation to a feast on that day. He justified his disciples in traveling and laboring on that day. And, in the controversy which he had with the Pharisees on that occasion, while they were maintaining the binding force of their fourth commandment upon him and his disciples, and he was denying it, he unhesitatingly made the claim that he was "Lord of the Sabbath;" a phrase which, in that connection, could have no other meaning than that he was Lord of it to reject it; that he and his disciples were authorized to disregard their Sabbath, were freed from the obligation of their fourth commandment, and might decide (as he said in another place), "even of themselves," what they should do, or not do, on the seventh day of the week. Jesus also commanded, in one case, the bearing of a burden on the Sabbath day, in direct opposition, not only to the fourth commandment, but to the express and emphatic injunctions of the Hebrew prophets, Nehemiah and Jeremiah. And, when accused in regard to this last act, he not only defended himself, but denied the statement in Genesis (which they seem to have quoted to him as pertinent and authoritative), about God having "rested" after the work of creation. Jesus said plainly, "My Father worketh hitherto." He never needed rest, and never did rest.

The point of positive New Testament evidence next in importance on this subject is the teaching of "the Apostle to the Gentiles" in regard to it. Paul, born and educated a Jew, and taught from his youth to consider Sabbath observance as a duty, would of course have continued to teach and practice it under the new religion, if such observance had formed a part of the new religion. It is a highly significant fact, considering Paul's antecedents, that no word of injunction to keep either the Sabbath or a Sabbath ever dropped from his lips after he became a Christian. But we are not left to this negative evidence. He plainly teaches, in strong, varied, and multiplied forms of expression, that Christian proselytes from Judaism are delivered from the Sabbatical obligation, as from all other distinctively Jewish obligations. Observance of days, to the Jew who became a Christian, was utterly abolished. To all such, as soon as they received the doctrine taught by Jesus, Paul proclaimed their entire freedom from all Sabbatical ordinances. Hear him:—

"And you, being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in the sabbath days, or in the new moons, and in the sabbaths, or in the old moons, which is called holy of the Jews; or in the sabbath days; or in the shadow of their ordinances; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." (Col. ii. 13-17.)

There were at that time many Judaizing Christians, persons disposed to incorporate the old faith with the new, instead of turning decisively to the latter as preferable. To such, Paul speaks of their disposition to sabbatize as a suspicious circumstance; as showing a remainder of subjection to the obsolete ordinances ("beggarly elements" he calls them, Gal. iv. 9), of the Jewish system. To such he says, "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." (Gal. iv. 10, 11.) Still, Paul claims for every man, under the Christian system, the right to make peculiar use of a special day, if he shall think it desirable. "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike; let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." (Rom. xiv. 5.) This passage is eminently noteworthy, for two reasons: first, it expressly allows to Christians the observance or non-observance of a Sabbath, according to the preference of each person; next, the fact of such allowance proves that Christianity, as Paul understood it, does not require nor include Sabbath-keeping.

In view of the evidence above cited, the ground taken by Jesus and by Paul may be properly called, I think, anti-Sabbatical.

It is instructive to notice that the persons in controversy with them were devout conservatives, pious Jews, who were really shocked at the denial, by the new reformers, of points so vital in the old system as the sanctity of the Sabbath and the infallible inspiration of the Scriptures. Nevertheless, when, at a later period, the distinguished success of Paul and his associates in converting Gentiles had made it needful for the Judaizing Christians to compromise for the sake of union, and to yield some points in favor of the new doctrine, the fact is
specially noteworthy that Sabbatical observance went, with circumcision, among the points to be yielded. The fifteenth chapter of the book of Acts gives us the proceedings of the first Christian Council, which was convened, by the authorities of the Church at Jerusalem, to consider this very matter. After full and free debate as to how many points of Judaic observance were "necessary" for Gentile Christians, "it pleased the apostles and elders, with the whole Church," to select and prescribe four only, among which Sabbath-keeping was not mentioned.

"The first day of the week" is a phrase several times met with in the New Testament; and the use of this phrase is so insisted on by Sabbatarians that one would naturally expect to find, in connection with it, some authority for the pretence that the Sabbath has been "changed" from the seventh day of the week to the first. It is on the assumption of some authority connected with this phrase that labor or recreation on Sunday is stigmatized as "Sabbath-breaking." Let us look at the record, and see what ground there is for such assumption.

We may clear the way for this examination by noticing that the first day of the week is never, in the New Testament, called the Sabbath. There, as in the Old Testament, the word Sabbath always means the Saturday-Sabbath of the decalogue. The fact that "Sabbath" in the New Testament means a different day from the first day of the week," is clearly shown in Matt, xxviii. i, which says, "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene," &c.

The cases in the New Testament where "the first day of the week" is mentioned in connection with an assembly of people, a coming together of numbers (whether for food, worship, preaching, or anything else), are just two; two, and no more. They are the following:

"Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus," &c. (John xx. 19.)

"And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them (ready to depart on the morrow), and continued his speech until midnight." (Acts xx. 7.)

Here are two historical facts: 1. The disciples of Jesus met together as quietly and secretly as possible on a Sunday evening in Jerusalem, two days after their dispersion in consequence of the crucifixion of their Master. 2. A considerable time after this, the Christians in Troas, in Asia Minor, came together on a Sunday evening to break bread, and to hear an exhortation from Paul, who was going away the next morning.

From just these two little facts, the mention in the Christian records of Sunday evening as the time when two meetings were held, the following unauthorized assumptions are made:—

That all Christians, everywhere, are to hold meetings every Sunday.

That they are not merely to copy these incidental instances of what the early disciples did, by meeting on Sunday evening, but to devote the whole of every Sunday to rest and worship.

That these things are God's command, instead of merely somebody's hasty inference from insufficient premises.

And that God intended, by the mention that these two meetings of early disciples, in different cities and at different times, took place on Sunday evening, to have it understood that a Sunday Sabbath was thenceforth to be binding upon all Christians, in place of the obsolete Saturday-Sabbath of the Jews.

Is it not absurd to attempt to manufacture a "Christian Sabbath" out of these two evenings of the "first day of the week"? But they do it because there is nothing else in the New Testament to make a Sabbath of, while yet a Sabbath seems essential to the successful working of their theological system.

Let it be further noted, that, even on the unproved sup-position that these two evening meetings were held for worship, there is not the slightest reason to doubt that the disciples went to them after spending the daylight hours in their ordinary bread-earning occupations. The pretence of a Sabbatical day preceding these evening assemblages is destitute alike of evidence and probability.

The phrase "the Lord's day"—often applied to Sunday, the first day of the week, by people who wish to have it thought that God requires some special observance of that day—occurs just once, and no more, in the New Testament. The author of the book of "Revelation" says (i. 10), "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." What time, or what day of the week, he meant to designate by that, no one can possibly know, though any one may guess as he pleases. What is certain is, that you cannot get out of this passage an injunction for all Christians to observe one day of the week as a Sabbath.

The failure of the fourth commandment argument in this matter is so thorough,—it is so self-evident that an injunction to Jews to abstain from labor on Saturday cannot also require, by those same words, that Christians everywhere shall hold meetings for worship on Sunday,—and there is such an utter lack of evidence in all that can be scraped together from the New Testament in support of Sunday-Sabbatism, that the advocates of that theory resort, in despair, to a text in Genesis to help them. This is it: "On the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made."
The sufficient answer to any sabbatical claim founded on this passage is, that a statement which neither directs any man to do, or not to do, anything whatever, cannot possibly be admitted as a command for a specific duty binding on all men in all ages. No priestly imposture in the world was ever greater than the citation of this passage as requiring that our Sunday be sacredly observed as a Sabbath.

The doctrine of complete identification of the Sabbath with Sunday seems to have been first formally set forth by Rev. Dr. Bound (A. D. 1595), a divine of great authority among the Puritans in England. From him it was adopted into the Confession and Catechism of the famous Westminster Assembly of Divines, thus becoming a recognized tenet of the English and Scotch Presbyterians. From them it came to this country with the Boston Puritans and the Plymouth Pilgrims, and strict regulations for its enforcement were incorporated with the first laws of Massachusetts. Portions of these Sunday laws (laws founded on the utterly mistaken notion that they enforce a rule of Scripture) are still on our statute books, and still exercise considerable control over the community. False as their basis is, their operation is in part salutary, since it interferes with the disposition of some persons to carry on the ordinary course of labor and business seven days in the week without intermission. On the other hand, these laws have always obstructed measures highly useful to the whole community, such as the opening of public libraries, reading-rooms, museums, and galleries of art, and the running of street-cars and railroad trains on Sunday; and they have been successfully appealed to, not only to prevent public benefits of this sort, but to punish a quiet citizen for training a vine against his own door-post on Sunday morning.

Sunday-Sabbatism, even to this extent, is inculcated by the great Protestant sects which call themselves "evangelical" all through this country, and the ministers of most of them not only assume a divine ordinance of it as unquestionable, but seriously present, as scriptural, proof of that doctrine, such statements as have been—answered in this paper. The English Church, however, does not inculcate this view of sabbatical observance among her authorized formularies, and no such doctrine or practice is known on the continent of Europe.

To sum up: I have tried briefly to show—
That the sabbatical observance enjoined in the fourth commandment of the decalogue and in many subsequent portions of the Old Testament was intended for Jews, and for no other nation or people, and that its requisition was rest on Saturday and labor on Sunday:
That, if any Christians think this fourth commandment binding on them, they also should rest from labor and business on Saturday, and should work on Sunday and the remaining days of the week, since that commandment cannot possibly be obeyed in any other manner:
That, since the Christian Scriptures neither enjoin Sabbath-keeping nor forbid Sabbath-breaking, nor specify any day for particular observance of any sort; and since Paul by elaborate argument, and Jesus both by word and deed, claimed immunity for Christians from fourth commandment Sabbatism; and since the phrases which have been quoted from the New Testament as establishing a "change of the day" are found, on examination, to have no such force or meaning, the phrase "Christian Sabbath" must be held unjustifiable, and the thing intended by it non-existent; and, finally:
That, since the view of sabbatical obligation brought to this country by the Boston Puritans and the Plymouth Pilgrims, and now taught by various sectarian bodies here and in Great Britain, can be clearly traced to its origin in the sixteenth century in a work by Dr. Nicholas Bound, and to the Westminster Assembly of Divines as the chief instruments of its propagation, we need feel no hesitation in treating it like other exploded errors, and in holding the very different ground maintained by Jesus and Paul in the New Testament.

Let it be noted that the view taken in this paper by no means impugns, or is designed to interfere with, that excellent custom and consent of civilized peoples by which the ordinary course of bread-earning labor and business is discontinued one day in seven. Rest and recreation to that extent are clearly beneficial to men's bodies, minds, and souls; and since Sunday is already used for those purposes, as well as for assemblages for religious instruction and worship, it is far better to retain, than to change, our habit of devoting that day to them. Only let the true grounds of such observance be understood, and let not sectarians impose their church rules upon the community under the pretence that they are laws of God.

Part II.

The History of Sunday Observance.
Sunday in the Church.

The History of Sunday Observance.—Sunday in the Church.

By Rev. M. J. Savage.

My topic is to give some account of what Sunday has actually been since the closing of the New Testament record,—that is, Sunday in the Church.

I certainly am not in favor of the abolition of Sunday. Just as we need some time to devote to our material welfare, so we need some time to devote to our religious welfare. If you should find a man who professed to be about his business seven days in the week, and yet you should be unable to catch him at it on any particular one of the seven days, you would have a suspicion that it was not looked after very closely. So I believe that people who look after their religious affairs always, and never do it at any particular time, leave them somewhat neglected, to say the least.

If we go back to the founding of the Church, we find that the most marked feature of that age, so far as the Church itself is concerned, is the grand division between the "Jewish faction," as it was called, and the followers of Paul. This division was so deep, so marked, so characteristic, that it has left its trace all through the New Testament itself. It was one of the grand aspects of the time, and the point on which they were divided was simply this: the followers of Peter, those who adhered to the teachings of the Central Church in Jerusalem, held that all Christians, both converted Jews and Gentiles, were under obligation to keep the Mosaic law, ordinances, and traditions. That is, a Christian, according to their definition, was first a Jew; Christianity was something added to that, not something taking the place of it. We find this controversy raging violently, all through the early churches, and splitting them into factions, so that they were the occasion of prayer and counsel. Paul took the ground distinctly that Christianity, while it might be spiritually the lineal successor of Judaism, was not Judaism; and that he who became a Christian, whether a converted Jew or Gentile, was under no obligation whatever to keep the Jewish law, so far as it was separate from practical matters of life and character. We find this intimated in the writings of Paul; for we have to go to the New Testament to find the origin of that which, we find, existed immediately after the New Testament book was written. Paul says, "One man esteemeth one day above another; another man esteemeth every day alike." (Rom. xiv. 5-9.) He leaves it an open question; they can do as they please. Then, "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." (Gal. iv. 10, 11.) And if you will note this Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, you will find that the whole purpose of his writing it was to protest against what he believed to be the viciousness of the Judaizing influences. That is, he says, "I have come to preach to you the perfect truth, that Christ hath made us free; and you are going back and taking upon yourselves this yoke of bondage. My labor is being thrown away; my efforts have been in vain." Then he says, in this celebrated Epistle to the Colossians, that has never yet been explained away or met, "Let no man therefore judge you any more in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days" (Col. ii. 16, 17),—distinctly abrogating the binding authority of the Sabbath on the Christian Church.

So that, if Paul's word anywhere means anything, if his authority is to be taken as of binding force on any point whatever, then Paul is to be regarded as authoritatively and distinctly abrogating the Sabbath, and declaring that it is no longer binding on the Christian Church.

I hinted, a moment ago, at a council. We find that this breach in the early Church, this controversy, resulted at last in Paul's going up to Jerusalem to meet James, and the representatives of the Jerusalem Church, to see if they could find any common platform of agreement,—if they could come together so that they could work with mutual respect and without any further bickering. What is the platform that they met upon? It was distinctly understood that those who wished to keep up the observance of Judaism should do so; and the Church at Jerusalem gave Paul this grand freedom, substantially saying to him, "Go back to your missionary work, found churches, and teach them that they are perfectly free in regard to all Mosaic and Jewish observances, save only these four: Abstain from pollutions of idols, from fornication, from things strangled, and from blood." (Acts xv. 20.) The point I wish to ask your attention to is, that the question of Sabbath-keeping is one of those that is left out. The point that Paul had been fighting for was conceded by the central church at Jerusalem, and he was to go out thenceforth free, so far as that was concerned, in his teaching of the churches that he should found.

There is no mention of the Sabbath, or the Lord's day, as binding, in the New Testament. What, then, was
the actual condition of affairs? What did the churches do in the first three hundred years of their existence? Why, they did just what Paul and the Jerusalem Church had agreed upon. Those who wished to keep the Jewish Sabbath did so; and the Judaizing faction, and the converts from the Gentiles, both, were accustomed to meet together some time, morning or evening, on the first day of the week, and to hold their public religious services to celebrate the resurrection of Jesus, and to eat together the Lord's Supper. But there appears nowhere any least, slightest, smallest hint that on this day they were to abstain from labor, or that they were to be hindered in doing anything they pleased, or going anywhere they pleased,—that is, there is no trace of their confounding this first day of the week with the Jewish Sabbath. The Judaizing faction kept both: they kept the Jewish Sabbath, and they also met the other Christian brethren on the Lord's day. The Gentiles simply met on the Lord's day, and usually left the Jewish Sabbath entirely one side. This, I say, is the fact of history.

There are one or two things I wish to speak of in connection with this, before passing to the next point,—two or three omissions, well known, which are very significant. The writers of the New Testament, in several places, catalogue at length all kinds of sins and offences against Christian character. They are so long, so exhaustive, that it is apparent, on the part of the writer, that he wishes substantially to cover the whole ground. Now, it is very remarkable that nowhere is there any mention of Sabbath-keeping, of Sunday-keeping, of Lord's day-keeping, as binding; and that nowhere is any fault found with anybody for neglecting to keep any of these days. Now, if you remember that a large part of the Christian Church were converted heathen,—people who had been swept in under the influence of the preaching of the apostles, who were not accustomed to keep any such day, who had no idea of it,—you would suppose that that would be one of the first points in which they would be most likely to step over Christian observance, providing that that was a Christian observance. Yet there is no trace of it anywhere.

One other thing, which is more conclusive than this: During the persecutions under the emperors of the Roman Empire, during the first centuries of Christianity, we know that this was true: that there were sons and daughters of heathen tyrants who were Christians,—there were officers in the Roman army, there were common soldiers in the Roman army, those representing all its ranks from the lowest to the highest, who were Christians. There were members of Cæsar's household in Rome, even, who were Christians,—Christians at a time when to be known as a Christian was certain death; and yet they were able for weeks and months and years to keep perfectly secret the fact of their Christianity. Consider for a moment how utterly impossible any such concealment would have been, if they had felt themselves bound to keep every seventh day, after some certain public fashion, as an observance of Christian rules and laws. Particularly if this was a distinguishing mark of Christianity, and they were under obligation to keep it publicly as the Christians' Lord's day, not a single one of these men or women or children would have been able to conceal their Christianity for more than six days at a time. Yet they did conceal it for weeks and months and years; and a striking thing is that there is no apology from anybody for being under obligation to conceal it to save his life. There is no dispensation on the part of the Church permitting it to be done; there is no explanation of it; there is no mention of it at all. This seems to be a pretty conclusive argument that the thing never was thought of as binding, during the times of this persecution on the part of the Roman emperors.

The first legislation we come to on this subject very naturally is under Constantine; because Christians, not having gained recognition until this time, they had no power, if they wished, to make or enforce any legislation. But when we come to the year 321, we find this edict of Constantine. I have not found a translation of it, except one that I have made myself. It is a very free translation. If any of you should accuse me of not knowing much about Latin, I shall do as a certain class of politicians do when they have been caught stealing: I shall fall back on the fact that my "heart is sound on the main question," and offer no other excuse. The edict is dated in the year 321, and is substantially as follows:—

Let all judges and inhabitants of cities, and all craftsmen, rest on the venerable day of the sun. But countrymen may freely and lawfully attend to the cultivation of the fields, lest by delay the opportunity granted by the favor of heaven should be lost; seeing that it frequently happens that the grain and the vine cannot be so fitly planted on any other day.

The manumission of slaves, however, was excepted from this sweeping edict, that the judges should be free from all labor and occupation on that day. One or two points about this I would like to have you notice. In the first place, Constantine does not say anything about the Lord's day or Sunday. Everybody admits that he means that day which we call Sunday to-day: but when you remember that Constantine, at the best, after all his whitewashing, was rather a poor kind of Christian; and when we remember that he was a worshipper of the sun, an adherent of the old pagan religion, before he found it for his interest to adopt and patronize Christianity,—it is a question how much love for the Lord's day is to be found in this edict. And then it is very strange, if there was any general public opinion on the part of the Church that it was wicked to do any work on Sunday,—it is very strange that he should have made this grand exception, leaving all countrymen free to go about their daily avocations. And it is very strange, if he believed the Almighty God had absolutely forbidden all labor on this
day,—it is very strange. I say, that he should make such a curious reference as he does when he says that
countrymen are permitted to go about their daily avocations, "lest by delay the opportunity granted by the favor
of heaven should be lost;" as if the very heaven that had forbidden such a use of the day was liable to give them
special opportunities and chances to do their work, in direct contravention of its own orders and law!

Additions were made to this edict under various emperors. In the year 425, under Theodosius II., games
and theatrical exhibitions were first forbidden; in 528, the third council of Orleans forbade all labor on Sunday.
We find this, then, is a fact, that up to the time of Constantine even courts were held, and all the usual work of
the city, as well as of the country, went on; after his time, half a century or more, agricultural labor still went on
as usual; only in 425 were theatres forbidden; and in 528, for the first time, all labor. This, then, for the
legislation.

I come now—and this is some of the most important testimony I have to offer—to consider the opinion of
certain great fathers on this subject. Of course they, being accounted in their time orthodox, standard
authorities, and being so accounted still, cannot be accused of having any bias or prejudice in the matter. They
must have known what were the actual practices, and they must have been aware as to what was the ideal
practice which the Church demanded and desired. I give you only a few specimens. In the year 345, after
Constantine's edict I wish you to notice, St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, says this,—and you will notice that it is
implied that his Christian followers were inclined to turn out of the really true way of Christianity and go after
their old ideas, just as Paul found his inclined. He says, "Turn thou out of the way to Samaritanism or
Judaism; for Jesus Christ hath redeemed thee. Henceforth reject all observance of Sabbaths, and call not meats,
which are really matters of indifference, common or unclean."

This is St. Cyril, twenty or thirty years after Constantine's edict. In the year 392, still later, St.
Jerome—pretty good ancient authority—says, "On the Lord's day, they went to church: and, returning from
church, they would apply themselves to their allotted works, and make garments for themselves and others."
And again: "The day is not a day of fasting, but the day is a day of joy; the Church has always considered it a
day of joy, and none but heretics have thought otherwise."

I skip from that time till we come to Luther. What does Luther say about it? Luther says, "If anywhere the
day [Sunday] is made holy for the mere day's sake,—if anywhere any one sets up its observance on a Jewish
foundation,—then I order you to work on it, to ride on it, to feast on it, to do anything to remove this
encroachment on Christian liberty." And Calvin—he certainly was no looser on the Sunday question, or any
other, than his flock—even went so far as to propose to change the day from Sunday to Thursday, as a distinct
assertion of the Christian principle that one day was just as good as another; and one day, when John Knox
visited Calvin on Sunday afternoon, he found him playing at a game of bowls. Now, John Calvin is almost
worshipped in our modern orthodox churches; and yet, if he were consistently living to-day after the pattern
that he followed when he did live, there is not a church in Boston that would not discipline him.

Beza, another great reformer, advocated work on Sunday. Bucer insisted that abstinence from labor could
not possibly be pleasing to God.

We come, now, then, to the Puritan reaction, and to notice its causes. I must be very brief in all this. The
first cause, it seems to me, apart from that which Mr. Whipple has stated, was this: Here the Catholic Church
had had almost an innumerable number of festival days or church days—holy days—one of them, so far as the
ordinary Catholic was concerned, being just as holy as the other. These had based themselves on their
traditions. The authority of the Church was sufficient for keeping Sunday or any other day; but the Protestants
protested against the authority and the power of the Church, and distinctly placed themselves on the foundation
of the word of God. What they could not find there, they didn't claim to find anywhere. They wished, and it was
a necessary part of their system, that they should continue the observance of the Lord's day. It was a day when
they met together to preach,—a day, it is fair to say, without which the existence of the Church itself would
almost be an impossibility. Since they had thrown away the Pope and the authority of the Church, they must
find greater authority for the clay, or else they must give it up; and so of course they took the best sacred
authority they could find, whether it was very good or not. They didn't attempt to find much in the New
Testament. They went back distinctly and directly to the fourth commandment, and said, "Here is divine
authority for keeping the Sabbath day; and no matter if it is now the first day of the week, instead of the last, we
don't know but that the apostles of Jesus, in some unrecorded saying or institution, or conversation, made the
change." So that the Church simply switched off from one track to the other, and has since that time come down
the centuries on the first-day track instead of on the seventh. They read this fourth commandment in their
service every Sunday, and based here the keeping of the Lord's day.

But another important influence was the Puritan revolt from the rude sports of the time. The young men
were accustomed to practice all sorts of rude, half-barbarous sports on Sunday. Of course they interfered not
only with the purity necessary to the highest civilization,—and it was well they were abolished,—but they
shocked the religious spirit of the time. As an illustration of what they were, Thackeray says: "An Englishman
is not necessarily a brute; but an English brute is the worst sort of brute." You can judge from a passage like
that as to what the nature of these sports might have been, and how they shocked the really high sentiment of
Puritan theology and purity of principle; while on the other hand the Puritans carried their opposition to
worldliness, to worldly pleasure, to worldly joys so far, that to their minds it was wicked to be frivolous on
Sunday, and perhaps on all the other six days beside,—but at any rate on Sunday, whether they could stop it at
any other time or not. So Macaulay, hitting at the extreme repugnance of the Puritans to popular sports, says a
thing on the other side that perhaps is something of an exaggeration, and no more just than Thackeray's
statement on the first. He says, "The Puritans opposed bear-baiting on Sunday, not because it gave pain to the
bears, but because it gave pleasure to the people."

But the Puritan Sunday (and here I come to another important division) has been called "Sabbatizing," or a
going back to the Jewish Sabbath. This is popularly supposed to be true, and the day has come to be called the
Sabbath; but let us see whether it is true or not. I have said, and I have admitted, and I wish to refer to it,—they
did go back to the fourth commandment as the fundamental law on which they built their divine demand that
the Sabbath, or the Lord's day, should be kept; and it is popularly supposed, and no doubt they supposed, that
the kind of Sabbath which they instituted, the Puritan Sabbath as it has come to be called, was really the
resurrection of the old Jewish Sabbath,—that they had gone back and picked up again the genuine thing. Now
let us see if that were true. What was the Jewish Sabbath? What kind of a day was it? Was it anything like the
Puritan Sabbath? I quote the late Emanuel Deutsch, a librarian of the British Museum, and one of the most
learned Orientalists of his day, author of remarkable articles on Islam, the Talmud, &c. He was one of the best
authors on this subject, probably, the world contained at that time. He says, "We cannot refrain from entering
an emphatic protest against the vulgar notion of the Jewish Sabbath being a thing of grim austerity. It was
precisely the contrary, a clay of joy and delight, a feast day, honored by fine garments, by the best cheer, by
wine, lights, spice, and other joys of pre-eminently bodily import." That is his authority as to what the Jewish
Sabbath really was. You will notice, he does not say they labored on that day; that one thing is left out.

Take a more ancient authority still. Nehemiah, in the eighth chapter, tenth verse (and remember that he was
building the city again, that he was restoring the ancient religion of the Jews to what he supposed to be its pure
and original condition), says to the people who were sobbing and weeping when they found what laws of God
they had broken, and how they had fallen under his wrath, "Go your way. Eat the fat, drink the sweet, and send
portions to them for whom nothing is prepared; for this day is holy unto our Lord. Neither be ye sorry, for the
joy of the Lord is your strength." And the twelfth verse adds, "And all the people went their way to eat, and to
drink, and to send portions, and to make great mirth." That was not the Puritan way, certainly, of keeping
Sunday.

Now only ignorance can possibly talk of the Puritans as Judaizing, or of going back to the original Bible
idea when they were making their Sunday. There is no day in modern times that people are familiar with, that
can so fitly and properly be spoken of, in comparison with the old Jewish Sabbath, as our Thanksgiving clay.
Simply leave out the element of labor, and then, in this gathering of children and friends about their festal
boards, the joy and lights, and the good time, the happiness and mirth of all this, you might look upon as almost
a perfect literal resurrection of the old Jewish Sabbath. The Puritan Sabbath, then, was not the resurrection of
anything. It was an outright creation of something that never existed in the world before.

Now as to whether this is the fourth commandment, and as to the Church's attitude to-day in going back to
the fourth commandment as authority for Sunday-keeping, I wish to say one word, and this is my last. I wonder
if it ever occurs to ministers, before preaching on the Sunday question, and to their people while they are
listening to them, or afterwards,—I wonder if it ever occurs to them to read the fourth commandment, with the
distinct purpose of seeing just what it says. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy;" and "holy" there, as
everybody knows, means simply, according to its ancient significance, something sacred, set apart, to a
particular and special use, which particular and special use was, the command goes on to define, simply this :
Thou shalt do no labor. The whole of the fourth commandment, without any evidence of any reservation
whatever, the totality of the fourth commandment, is simply abstinence from labor. Now I dare assert, without
fear of contradiction, that except in some few special cases there is not an Orthodox minister or church-member
in Boston, unless he is sick so that he cannot move easily, who ever thinks of obeying the fourth
commandment, or ever does it. What is it they do? Why, they have invented a whole round of
duties,—church-going, Sunday-school, everything,—against which, mark me, I have no word to say; but I say
they have invented a whole round of duties, a whole curriculum of obligations, lasting from sunrise to sunset, in
many cases, that neither the fourth commandment nor the Bible anywhere has ever said one single word
concerning. And then, on the basis of the fourth commandment, they demand that you shall religiously be
bound to keep all their observances. Because the fourth commandment commands certain people, on a certain
day, to abstain from labor and to do a certain thing, therefore all people, in all ages, on some other day, shall be
under divine obligation to do something else. That is the whole of it.
Now for this Christian nation to assume the position which it did concerning the Centennial Exhibition being open on Sunday, and to claim that they did it because of the divine authority of Christianity or of the Old Testament, one or the other, I say they are guilty before the enlightened intelligence of this country and of the world of one of two things: either of such gross ignorance as unfit them to be teachers of the intelligence of the nineteenth century, or else they are guilty of the grossest hypocrisy—hypocrisy that claims goodness and character on the score of doing something that God has never asked anybody to do. The very minister who preaches the gospel to-day in Boston, by as much as he is faithful to the needs and wants of his parish, is breaking the Sabbath, according to the fourth commandment, every single Sunday,—that is, admitting the transfer from Saturday to the first day of the week. It simply says, "Thou shalt not labor," and there is not a man who felicitates himself on the faithfulness with which he discharges his Christian obligations who is not going right square in the face of the fourth commandment every hour of the Lord's day, from sunrise to sunset; and yet they come to us, and charge us with infidelity, with lack of reverence for God and his word and truth, because we can't possibly see how an obligation of the Jews to do one thing is obligation on us to do another thing.

Part III.

The Lord's Day Legislation of Massachusetts.

The Lord's Day Legislation of Massachusetts

By Charles E. Pratt, Esq.

When I received one of Mr. Potter's very winning letters inviting me, a few days ago, to furnish an essay for this afternoon, I expressed grave doubt whether the exactions of my profession would admit of my taking time for it. The result has proved that my fears were correct; and therefore, instead of giving an essay, as I find it announced, I shall only be able to give you some crude, desultory, extemporaneous remarks, helped out by some memoranda of statutes and laws passed heretofore in this Commonwealth, and in the province and colony of the Massachusetts Bay.

I regret all the more that I was unable to prepare a written essay, because upon this question it is necessary to observe great carefulness of expression. If one expresses liberal sentiments in regard to Sunday observance, or if he suggests that the law as it stands might be advantageously changed, on the one hand he is said to be attacking the institution of Sunday; on the other hand, if he is conservative, and a little careful that innovations shall not come too fast, is willing to observe the good and the blessings in the institution as it is, then he is likely to be called a bigot, or an unenlightened conservative, behind the time.

I believe in a secular Sunday. In this secular government of ours, and under its sway, laws should be secular, institutions should be secular, and so far as the statutes have anything to do with the observance of Sunday, or any other holiday,—for you recollect Sunday is but one of the holidays,—these laws should be strictly secular in their purport. And, having said this, I would also add that I believe in the observance of a secular Sunday; in the careful, social, moral, and religious observance of Sunday; and I believe that some laws are necessary for the preservation of an institution fraught with so much good and so much of blessing to the community, and of happiness both by the fireside and in the social public.

The Jewish Sabbath of the fourth commandment I understand to have been a special institution for the Hebrew race. The ceremonial observance of the Jewish Sabbath was discountenanced by Jesus and his disciples, and no other day was by them substituted in its place. The Jewish Sabbath occurred on the seventh day of the week, and the Lord's day, as we call it, or Sunday, occurs on the first day of the week; and therefore, both historically and Biblically speaking, I think it is to be agreed that we have no Scriptural foundation for the observance of the Lord's day, as it has been historically observed in this Commonwealth. It was not, as I understand the history of it, till about the year 321, under the rule of Constantine, that any civil law was passed recognizing the observance of Sunday. And it was not till the reign of Queen Elizabeth, in England, that any English statute was ever passed that I have been able to find respecting Sunday observance. Nor was the religious observance of the day a part of the common law. Sunday, therefore, is a human institution, and not a divine. It is a subject, not of moral law, but of statute law. Non observance of it is violation, not profanation: *malum prohibitum*, not *malum in se*. 
I cannot go into these questions, however, which I have merely hinted at in these preliminary remarks. I must be limited to the historic legal aspects of Sunday and its observance in this Commonwealth; but I thought it necessary to sketch first this understanding which I have of the institution, this previous legal history of the day, before the English statutes, under which our forefathers were when they came to this country, that you might see what foundation there was behind our forefathers upon which they could plant their Sunday laws. It will be evident that they did not hold this view of the Lord's day.

Two hundred and fifty years ago, they used indiscriminately in the statutes, for a short period, the term "Sabbath" and the term "Lord's day." I don't find that "Sunday" was ever used in the statutes; and, as the name of the day is significant, in passing I will call attention to it. The more careful of the colonists called it "the first day of the week," as the Quakers do; the more Biblical of them called it the "Sabbath,"—but always in the laws you will find it called the "Lord's day." I have no doubt that a legislature of Free Religionists, under a secular government, would give the day its secular name.

Our forefathers brought the Lord's day with them when they came to this country; and as a creation of statute law it was then very recent. At the common law no such thing as the "Lord's day" is known. It has sometimes been stated erroneously in this country that Sunday is a part of the common law. As a matter of fact, the only recognition of Sunday at the common law was that it was, in law phrase, not a judicial day. The Lord's day is not a judicial day. "Dies dominicus non est juridicus." Parliament sat on Sunday, festivals were held on Sunday, everything could be done on Sunday, but courts of law could not sit, and judicial processes could neither be issued nor served.

The first English statute which I find imposing any restraint or duty upon the observance of the day was passed in 1558, in Queen Elizabeth's reign; and that statute required all persons who had not reasonable excuse to resort every Sunday and other holiday to church for divine service and worship.

2 Eliz. c. 2.

But there came a time in the first quarter of the seventeenth century when the affluence of religious expression and the poverty of religious action were truly surprising. And from the year 1625 the day was referred to in English statutes as the Lord's day. In that a year a somewhat more stringent Sunday law was passed.

1 Car. 1. c. 1. 3 Car. 1. c. 1.

And subsequently, under Charles II. and William III., statutes were passed which I believe are still in force in England, and which were quite as rigid as any of our early statutes, though not carried to so extreme detail.

29 Car. 2. c. 7. 7 Will. 3. c. 17.

Under the latter, about 1693, all persons were required to apply themselves to the observation of the Lord's day, by exercising themselves thereon in the duties of true religion, publicly and privately. No work, save of necessity or charity; no sport, game, or pastime; no travel, &c.,—was to be allowed. And all these English statutes were put upon a religious basis. They were passed for the honor of God and for the preservation of true religion.

From some attentive perusal of the early statutes, enactments, and orders in this land, I have come to the conclusion that the same affluence of religious expression and poverty of religious doing prevailed with our forefathers when they came here and brought the Sunday laws with them. The colony charter was granted in 1628, as you will remember. The first colonists were then under the English statutes, which I have read extracts from; but these seem not to have been sufficiently strict; for as early as the 17th of April, 1629, we find the first Sunday law of the colony to read thus:

"And to the end the Saboth may bee celebrated in a religious mannr, we appoint, that all that inhabite the plantacon, both for the gen'all and pticuler imploymts, may surcease their labor every Satterday throughout the yeare at 3 of the clock in the afternoone, and that they spend the rest of that day in catichising and pparacon for the Saboth, as the ministers shall direct."Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England, vol.—., app. 395.

That is the first Sunday law. In 1634 they passed a second one, which read as follows:

"Whereas complainte hath bene made to this Court that dyvers psons within this jurisdiccon doe usually absent them-selves from church meetings uppon the Lord's day, power is therefore given to any two Assistants to heare and sensure, either by ffyne or imprisonmt (att their discrecon), all misdemeanrs of that kind comitted by any inhabitant within this jurisdiccon, provided they exceed not the ffyne of vs for one offence."

1d., p. 140.?

In 1644, the law-makers put certain questions to the elders, for the purpose of being guided thereby in passing laws, very much as our General Court sometimes propounds questions to the Supreme Judicial Court, for its opinion to guide in passing laws,—and among these questions was this: "Whether a judge be bound to pronounce such sentence as a positive law prescribes, in case it be apparently above or beneath the merit of the offence?" And the elders answered, among other things, and this is particularly notable:
"2. In case variable circumstances of an offence do so much vary the degrees of guilt, that the offence is raised to an higher nature, then the penalty must be varied to an higher answerable proportion. The striking of a neighbor may be punished with some pecuniary mulct, when the striking of a father may be punished with death. So any sin committed with an high hand, as the gathering of sticks on the Sabbath day, may be punished with death, when a lesser punishment might serve for gathering sticks privily, and in some sore need." Ancient Charters and Colony and Province Laws, &c., app. 731.

It is to the credit of the law-makers, however, that they did not pass any law in conformity with the judgment of the elders.

On the 4th of November, 1646, I find that this law was put on the statute book:—

"It is therefore ordered and decreed by ye Corte, yt if any Christian within this jurisdiction shall go about to subvert and destroy the Christian faith and religion [by other things, and] by denying ye morallity of ye 4th commandment [&c.], evry such pson continuing obstinate therein, after due meanes of conviction, shall pay to ye comon treasury during ye first six months 20s. a month, & for ye next six months 40s. p mo, and so to continue during his obstinacy; & if any such psrn. shall endeavur to seduce others to ye like heresy & apostacy from ye faith & religion of or Lord Jesus Christ, he shall forfeit to ye comon treasury, for every severall offence therein, rfive pounds."

2 Records of Massachusetts, p. 177

And in that year there was a fine of 5 shs decreed for each absence from "hearing ye publike ministery of ye word, on the Lord's days & fast & thanksgiving days." Id., p. 178.?

A little later than that—I don't know but I ought to bespeak your patience while I read so many of these extracts; but I thought in no other way could I get the exact historical state of the law in Massachusetts before you so directly, as to read you the statutes themselves; and with your permission I will go on and read a few more:—

"Att a Generall Court of Election, held att Boston the 30th of the 6th month 1653 [30 Aug.]. Vppon information of sundry abuses & misdemeanors committed by severall psrons on the Lords day, not only by children playinge in the streetes & other places, but by youthes, maydes, & other psrons, both strangers and others, uncivilly walkinge the streetes and fields, travelling from towne to towne, goinge on shipboard, frequentinge common houses and other places to drinke, sport, & otherwise to mispend that p'cious time, whiche things tend much to the dishonor of God, the reproach of religion, & the phphanation of his holy Saboath, the sanctification whereof is sometime put for all dutyes immediatly respectinge the service of God conteined in the first table, it is therefore ordered by this Court and the authoritie, that no children, youths, maydes, or other psrons, shall transgress in the like kind, on penalty of beinge reputed great pvokers of the high displeasure off Almighty God, and further incurring the poenalties hereafter expressed; namely, that the parents and governors of all children above seven years old (not that we approve of younger children in evill), for the first offence in that kind, vppon due profe before any magestrate, towne commissioner, or select man of the towne where such offence shalbe committed, shalbe admonished; for a second offence, vppon due profe as aforesd, shall pay as a fine five shillings; & for a third offence, vppon due profe as aforesd, 10s; and if they shall agayne offend in this kind, they shalbe psented to the County Court, who shall augment punishment according to the merit of the fact; & for all youths and maydes above fourteen yeares of age, & all elder psrons whatsoever that shall offend and be convict as aforesd, either for playing, uncivilly walking, drinkinge, travillinge from towne to towne, goinge on shipboard, sportinge, or any way mis-pending that p'cious time, shall for the first offence be admonished, vppon due profe as aforesd; for a second offence, vppon due profe as aforesd, shall pay as a fine five shillings; & for a third offence, ten shillings; & if any shall farther offend that way, they shalbe psented to the next county court, who shall augment punishment accordinge to the nature of the offence; & if any be vnable or vnwillinge to pay the aforesd fines, they shalbe whipped by the cunstable not exceeding five stripes for 10 s fine; & this to be understood of such offences as shalbe committed dureing the daylight of the Lord's day."

3 Records of Massachusetts, p. 316; 4 Id., pt. i., p. 150.

In 1658, finding this statute not sufficient to answer the purpose, we have the following: "Whereas by too sad experience it is observed, the swnn being sett, both every Saturday & on the Lord's day, young people & others take liberty to walke and sporte themselves in the streets or fields in the seuerall townes of this jurisdiction, to the dishonor of God," &c., a fine or corporal punishment is decreed for the like on Saturday evening or Sunday evening after sun set.

4 Id., pt.—, p. 347.

Still later, Oct. 14, 1668 :—

"For the better prevention of the breach of the Saboath, it is enacted by this court & ye authority thereof, that no servile worke shall be doun on that day; namely, such as are not workes of piety, of charity, or of
necessity; & when other works are done on that day, the person so doing, upon complaint or presentmt, being legally convicted thereof before any magistrate or county court, shall pay for the first offence ten shillings fine, & for every offence after to be doubled; & in case the offence herein be circumstanced with prophaners or high handed presumption, the penalty is to be augmented at the discretion of the judges. As an addition to the law for preventing prophaning of the Saboath day by doing servile worke, this Court doth order, that whatsoever person in this jurisdiction shall travell upon the Lords day, either on horseback or on foote, or by boats from or out of their oune toune to any unlawful assembly or meeting not allowed by lawe, are hereby declared to be prophaners of the Sabath, & shall be proceeded against as the persons that prophane the Lords day by doing servile worke."

4 Records of Massachusetts, pt. ii., p. 395.

In May, 1677, a cage was ordered to be erected in Boston in which to confine "Saboath breakers."
Tythingmen were also appointed to inspect houses, and discover Sabbath breakers,
5 Id., pp. 133, 155.

In 1679, a ward was ordered to be set, from sunset to nine o'clock on Saturday night, both at the town's end and at the fortifications, to prevent passing out of town, with authority to stop every person passing.
5 Id., P-239.

Such were most of the colony laws respecting the Lord's day. They show that its observance was based upon purely religious and superstitious grounds. They were for a people who feared to profane the day, lest the dreadful judgments of God should fall on the colony for their disobedience. In some official editions, the laws were annotated with references to Old Testament texts.

To show further the bigotry and intolerance of the people, from their own solemn enactments, let me cite a passage or two. In 1653 it is enacted broadly, "And every person that shall publish and maintain any heterodox or erroneous doctrine, shall be liable to be questioned and censured by the County Court where he liveth, according to the merit of his offence."

Ancient Charters, &c., p. 123.

And in 1665 it is re-enacted from an older law that they who are to be admitted as freemen (that is, entitled to vote, hold office, &c.) must present a "certificate from the ministers or minister of the place where they dwell, that they are Orthodox in religion." &c.

Id., p. 117.

And we have already had a more striking specimen of their promptness in the pursuit of heresy and apostacy.

The measure of the prevalent ideas of liberty of conscience in 1691 when the Province Charter was granted, and the colony became a province, is indicated pretty clearly by a clause in that charter itself, which establishes and ordains "that forever hereafter there shall be liberty of conscience allowed in the worship of God to all Christians except Papists" in said province or territory.

Ancient Charters, &c., p. 31.

In 1692, the old colonial laws were substantially re-enacted; and in that statute occur these words: "That all and every person and persons whatsoever, shall, on that [the Lord's] day, carefully apply themselves to duties of religion and piety, publicly and privately."


. In 1727, "the solemnizing of funerals on the Lord's day," or evening following, is prohibited.
Id., P-265.

From this examination of the statutes, I think we can get a pretty fair view of what the Massachusetts Sabbath was up to the time Massachusetts became a Commonwealth. Others have supplied, or will supply, the details which show how it was practically observed; but so far as we can discern from these statute books, that is what it was. I think it is related of a chaplain of the Count de Rochambeau, who was here in Boston about 1780, writing letters home to France, that the strictness of the day's observance astonished him. It looked very strange to him to see everything so still, the streets deserted, no entertainment, nothing for diversion, except to go to church. The most innocent recreations and pleasures prohibited. If he met a person on the street he scarcely dared to stop and speak with him. Attempting to take a little walk for health and fresh air, he and his friend were met at the door by their landlord, who warned them that he would be liable to a heavy fine if he allowed them, while stopping with him, to disport themselves on that day in public. Somewhat disappointed, they returned to their rooms, and his friend, thinking to beguile part of the time in that way, took up his flute and commenced to play some pious air. He had played but a few bars before the enraged populace collected round the house, and would have given him other bars to play had not his excited landlord put his head in at the unlatched door to give him timely warning. A great many instances of that sort could be produced to show the extreme rigidity of the Sunday laws and Sunday observance at that time. I suppose, too, that at that time they were in great part sustained by the prevailing public opinion, because you generally find that the laws of a
community are not very far behind the prevailing popular ideas. They are a little behind; once fixed, it takes some time to change them, and public opinion is always a little in advance of the statute book; but when you find, as we have found here, that for a period of time from 1628 to 1780 such statutes as these existed upon the statute books in Massachusetts,—and you have only to look into the records further to find that there were convictions under these laws, that they were actually put in force,—it is pretty safe to infer that the public opinion of Massachusetts, up to that time sustained such laws.

Now, about 1780 the present constitution of the State was adopted, and Massachusetts became a Commonwealth. And I suppose it is true that about that time there were more liberalizing influences brought to bear on Massachusetts than there had been at any time before. About that time the intercourse between the several provinces and states in this country became general and frequent. They had been obliged for protection in war, and for increase in their commercial prosperity, to ally themselves with the outlying provinces and states, and to increase their mercantile and social relations with France and other foreign nations. Something of the same liberalizing influence poured into Massachusetts, and sprung up in Massachusetts, as was at that time at work in Pennsylvania, in Virginia, New York, and elsewhere, and as culminated in our secular constitution of the United States,—a constitution which could not have been drawn in Massachusetts, I will venture to say, up to the year 1850, by Massachusetts freemen. But, under the influences of these liberalizing institutions and teachings which they obtained from the outside, and which they had learned from their own experience, from the time Massachusetts became a State the Sunday laws began to be mollified. The first laws passed were in 1782. All prior statutes respecting the observance of the Lord's day were then repealed, and a long statute enacted by the General Court, reciting that "the observance of the Lord's day is highly promotive of the welfare of a community, by affording necessary seasons for relaxation from labor and the cares of business; for moral reflections and conversation on the duties of life, and the frequent errors of human conduct; for publick and private worship of the Maker, Governour and Judge of the world, and for those acts of charity which support and adorn a Christian society." There is an advance upon the old preambles! This statute prohibits keeping open shop, &c.; doing any labor or business except of necessity or charity; being present at any concert or entertainment; using any sport or game; traveling; assisting at or tolling bell for any funeral, or digging grave; entertaining or suffering to stay any except travelers or permanent lodgers, &c. "And although it is the sense of this court that the time commanded in the sacred Scriptures to be observed as holy time includes a natural day, or twenty-four hours, yet, whereas there is a differ ence of opinion concerning the beginning and ending of the Lord's day among the good people of this commonwealth, and this court being unwilling to lay any restrictions which may seem unnecessary or unreasonable to persons of sobriety and conscience," therefore it is enacted that the time to be observed be from "midnight preceding" to "the sun sitting the same day." All recreation, &c., is then prohibited on the evenings preceding and following: so entertaining, &c. The act then enjoins "the worship of Almighty God" as "an essential part of the due observance of the Lord's Day," and imposes a fine of ten shillings upon any able person not necessarily prevented who shall absent himself for a month together from "the publick worship of God on the Lord's Day." That is in 1782; and they spell the "Day" with a capital D. This statute also provides for wardens to enforce the law, and gives them power to enforce it by stopping travelers, and by entering all places where they may find, or think they may find, Sabbath-breakers.

This law continued until the revision of the statutes, in 1836, when it was substantially re-enacted, without the preambles j fines made not exceeding ten dollars; concerts of sacred music allowed on the evening preceding; and this clause added: "No person who conscientiously believes that the seventh day of the week ought to be observed as the Sabbath, and actually refrains from secular business and labor on that day, shall be liable to the penalties of this chapter for performing secular business or labor on that day, or first day of the week, provided he disturbs no other person."

Revised Statutes, ch. 50, sec. 10.

March 16, 1844, the term "Lord's day" in that part of the statute relating to inholders, keepers of public houses, &c., is extended to include the time from midnight to midnight, Statutes, 1844, ch. 160. That takes the statute law up to 1860, when our edition of the general statutes in common use was adopted. It is a maxim of law that everyone is presumed to know the law; and, taking advantage of that maxim, I will presume that to statute books in Massachusetts,—and you have only to look into the records further to find that there were convictions under these laws, that they were actually put in force,—it is pretty safe to infer that the public opinion of Massachusetts, up to that time sustained such laws.
or place of public entertainment or refreshment," "any persons not being travelers, strangers, or lodgers," or suffering "such persons on said day to abide or remain therein, or in the yards, orchards, or fields appertaining to the same, drinking, or spending their time idly or at play, or in doing secular business," under penalty of "a fine not exceeding fifty dollars for each person so entertained or suffered so to abide or remain," for the first offence, and severer penalties for after convictions; (7) being "present at any game, sport, play, or public diversion, except a concert of sacred music, upon the evening of the Lord's day, or upon the evening next preceding," "unless such game, sport, play, or public diversion is licensed by the persons or Board authorized by law to grant licenses in such cases," under penalty of a "fine not exceeding five dollars for each offence;" (8) persons "licensed to keep a place of public entertainment" from entertaining or suffering "to remain or be in his house, yard, or other places appurtenant, any persons not being travelers, strangers, or lodgers in such house, drinking and spending their time there, on the Lord's day, or the evening preceding the same," under penalty of fine not exceeding five dollars for each offence; (9) any person "keeping or suffering to be kept in any place occupied by him implements such as are used in gaming, in order that the same may, for hire, gain, or reward, be used for purposes of amusement," is prohibited from using or suffering to be used "any implements of that kind," on the Lord's day, under penalty of forfeiting a sum not exceeding one hundred dollars, or imprisonment not exceeding three months, for first offence, &c.; (10) serving or executing civil process; (11) behaving rudely or indecently within the walls of any house of public worship, under penalty of fine not exceeding ten dollars; (12) discharging any firearms for sport, or in the pursuit of game, or attempting to take or catch any fish, &c., on the Lord's day, under penalty of a fine not exceeding ten dollars.

There are limitations of time for instituting prosecutions under these statutes; sheriffs and constables are empowered to prevent violations; and the day is declared to include the time from midnight to midnight: and "whoever conscientiously believes that the seventh, day of the week ought to be observed as the Sabbath, and actually refrains from secular business, travel, or labor on that day, shall not be liable to the penalties of this chapter for performing secular business, travel, or labor on the Lord's day, or first day of the week, provided that he disturbs no other persons."

I have throughout omitted all reference to the Sunday-clauses in the laws, respecting intoxicating liquors, that have from time to time been passed. Nor, in connection with the colonial laws, did I cite those of Plymouth Colony; because they were similar to those of the Massachusetts Bay.

It may seem that progress, in this last hundred years, towards a secular Sunday, has been slow; and, so far as the statute regulation is concerned, it has been rather small. But, notwithstanding, it has been a real progress; and I think we can see, by comparing statutes, and comparing also the judicial decisions under the statutes, that the progress of the Sunday idea in Massachusetts has been constantly, since the province became a state, toward a wiser freedom and a more consistent liberty. Some of the gains are these,—I find I am overrunning my time and will try to be brief,—some of the gains I note in the statute law are these:—

- The observance of the day has been put on a secular and moral basis, instead of a solely religious basis.
- Inquisitorial provisions for enforcing that observance have been dropped.
- Liberty to seventh-day observers, Hebrews and others, who "naturally observe Saturday as the Sabbath," has been allowed, providing they do not disturb other persons.
- The time of the observance of Sunday has been shortened, so that it only extends from midnight to midnight, instead of from three o'clock Saturday afternoon, except in the case of public entertainments, &c., which must be specially licensed for Saturday evening still, and one or two other exceptions.
- Somewhat greater latitude in traveling, entertaining, and being entertained is to be observed in the present statute than was ever found before.
- Sacred concerts are allowed on Sunday evening; and other entertainments may be licensed on Saturday evening.
- There is no compulsion to attend church or other religious service, or in any other way to religiously observe Sunday, on the statute books at present.

There are some minor betterments in the law, which perhaps others who are present may think of. I have not time to go into these in detail. With the exception of these gains,—important as I think,—with the exception of these, and a few minor points, the statute law remains the same to-day that it was. The statute law to-day, as we have just before seen, prohibits almost everything, though it directly compels the active performance of nothing. It prohibits all recreation, amusement, exercise, walking, riding, driving, traveling, hospitality, social intercourse, educational or scientific or literary occupation,—in short, all that is not of religion or charity or absolute necessity or—sacred music. And it not only prohibits so much on "the Lord's day," but it also prohibits very much upon Saturday evening.

I am persuaded that public opinion, as expressed in public action, does not sustain all these restrictions, and does encourage a larger latitude in the uses of the day,—and so is in advance of the statute book. It is true, that, in 1864, certain fines were increased. The fine, for instance, to be imposed on an inn-keeper who allows
persons to stay around his inn that are neither strangers nor permanent lodgers, on Sunday, was increased to fifty dollars; and, in 1865, shooting and fishing on the Lord's day were prohibited. And here we find the ancestral type recurring in a later generation; for among the first recorded acts of the colonial government, entered Nov. 30, 1630, was this: "It is ordered that John Baker shalbe whipped for shooteing att fowle on the Sabboth day, &c."

I Records of Massachusetts, p. 82.

And I have no doubt he was whipped; for, not much later in the record, I find that a sheriff was under charge of manslaughter for whipping a man to death in his faithful execution of a judicial sentence.

I might perhaps have better improved my time, if, instead of reading so many statutes, I had saved a little of it, and discussed with you two or three points of the law as it now exists. But that can quite as well be done by others, and better than I could do it extemporaneously. I have supplied now somewhat of a definite basis for any remarks that may follow. I should have called attention, if to anything in addition, to the provisions that Hebrews may be allowed to pursue their secular occupations on Sunday, providing they disturb nobody else,—it being a debatable question, I think, whether the law could not be well amended so that any man could do as he pleases on Sunday, providing he don't disturb anybody else, or compel anybody else to do otherwise than he pleases; or at least that he might have liberty of conscience in the matter. But the point which I think of most importance to be considered is that with reference to traveling on "the Lord's day." It is not a very long time since the question became one of a good deal of warfare in the courts, and outside of the courts, as to whether the street-cars and steam-cars and excursion-boats should be allowed to run on Sunday; and some of the most interesting literature upon this subject is to be found in the carefully rendered and considered opinions of some of the judges. For instance, the opinion of Mr. Justice Read, of Pennsylvania, in the case of Spar-hawk and others against the Union Passenger Railway Company, in which he goes over the subject of Sunday law against traveling in Pennsylvania very carefully, is one of the most interesting pieces of reading upon this subject, I think. We all see, of course, that practically there is all the travel anybody wants on Sunday; and that is just a strong reason, with me, why public opinion should be aroused to the propriety of making the statute come up to public opinion in that respect, so that the public conduct may correspond with the public law. Everybody travels all he wants to on Sunday. All the railroad and all the street-car lines and all the boats run as many trips on Sunday as they want to; and every one of them causes the law to be violated every Sunday. The people who travel on the railroads and in the street-cars and in carriages on Sunday, in Massachusetts, violate, and see the letter of the law violated, a million times every Sunday; and there is nobody to take notice of it, except in some instance of ill-will or oppression, or when some careless corporation would escape the consequence of its negligence. And when it comes to that pass with respect to a law, it is better that it should be amended than that it should remain on the statute book. But, further than this, although, as I have said, every man is supposed to know the law, as a matter of fact I should have to beg your pardon, and say that nobody knows the law.

So august and dignified a tribunal as our Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts has declared itself unable to express in words any general rule which could be a guide to a person with respect to traveling on the Lord's day. The learned Chief-Justice Gray, of our Supreme Court, in rendering an opinion in the case of "Hamilton vs. Boston,"—not a very old case,—went over this subject of traveling on the Lord's day, and with his accustomed liberality endeavored to render a decision which should be perfectly just according to the law, and morally just and liberal; and in order to do it he was obliged to resort to the feat of reviewing all the prior statutes, and putting a technical meaning into the word "travel" as used in the statute. And then, after declaring that he could not lay down in definite language any rule by which a man could be guided as to traveling on Sunday without violating the law, he uses this language: "We are of opinion that a person walking with a friend on Sunday evening less than half a mile, with no apparent purpose of going to or stopping at any place but his own home, much less of passing out of the city, and no object of business or pleasure, except open air and gentle exercise, is not guilty of traveling, or liable to punishment, under this act." And that is the best he could say for it.

What harm do the Sunday laws do as they stand? Every day in the week, except Sunday, we travel; and every day in the week, when we do travel, except Sunday, we are protected by all the force of the state, under the law that common carriers are responsible and required to be responsible for using care and diligence in carrying passengers safely, and if through their neglect or that of their employ—s any accident happens, they are bound to respond in damages for injury caused by that neglect. The consequence is that the railroad companies and the street-car companies and the hackmen and the steamboat companies and the ferry companies,—every one, who, in this commonwealth, undertakes to carry on the business of transporting passengers from one place to another,—are bound to use their best endeavors to have proper cars, proper accommodations, properly qualified officers and servants, to see to it that the passenger receives no damage. On one day,—on Sunday,—they may do as they please; and if we travel with them we do so at our own risk.
Suppose a steamboat company chooses to start an excursion steamer down the harbor on Sunday, and invites the public to go down on the excursion, and the public goes down, just as it goes now every Sunday in summer weather. They may put on a steamer that is unfit for the water, they may put on an inefficient engineer and a drunken pilot, and they may run two thousand people into Boston Bay, and nobody can hold them for damages in one cent. All the cases are decided—and you will find the reports full of them—principally upon these two points, that a man shall not be allowed to prove a case, when to prove it he must prove his own unlawful acts, and a man shall not recover damages for an injury to which his own unlawful act contributed. And it is upon this rule that the courts refuse to grant any compensation to a man who suffers injury when traveling on Sunday, unless he be traveling from necessity or charity.

Now, to show that these terms in the law are not very broad: it has been held, for instance, that the hoeing of corn or crops in a garden, which were suffering for the want of hoeing, on Sunday, was not a work of necessity; that to gather seaweed on the beach, which would be swept away by the next tide, and which was of value and an apparent necessity to a poor man needing to save it, was not a work of necessity,—and I might cite a good many instances to show that the matter of necessity and charity was narrowed down to a very close compass. One or two instances occur to me where courts have found a way to favor the side of equity and justice outside of the law, or at least in conformity to the law, by straining a point. One of these was a case of a woman who worked all the week, in Lowell, for sustenance for herself and family, whom she had to support; but she lived in a town north of Lowell,—I think in Chelmsford,—and she went home Saturday night to take care of her children, and particularly of one child who was sick. Possibly some of you may remember the case, for it is not a very old one. She took care of her sick child all day Sunday, till evening, and the child was better, yet still in need of some medicine; and she went to Lowell to procure the medicine prescribed for her child, intending to send it back by a neighbor, and to remain in Lowell over night herself, so as to be ready for her task Monday morning. On her way, on Sunday evening, to Lowell, she met with a very serious accident, which disabled her for a long time. The accident was caused by a defect in the highway, for which the town was responsible, and would have been held responsible, if the accident had occurred on any other day in the week. She brought a suit to recover damages; the town refused to pay, on the ground that she was traveling on Sunday, and not from necessity or charity. And before the case went to the jury,—she had put in her case,—the Court ruled, under the statute, the Sunday law which we have cited to-day, that she was not traveling from necessity or charity, and therefore she could not recover, and refused to let it go to the jury. The case was taken to the Supreme Court, and all that the Supreme Court could say to help her was, that, from the facts disclosed in the case, it was a fair question to leave to the jury to say whether or not she was traveling from necessity or charity. So they sent her back to have a third trial, in the Superior Court, before she could recover her measure of damages. Now, I say that a Sunday law that is so close as that,—that will put a poor person to the expense and delay and the trouble incident to three suits before he can recover his due and fair damages for an injury caused by the town's neglect, on the simple pretence that it was not a work of necessity or charity,—needs reforming somewhere.

To the instances which Mr. Pratt has cited it may be well to add a few more in answer to the question, What harm do the Sunday laws do as they stand?

1. The defencelessness of the Sunday pleasure-traveler against the carelessness of the railroad or steamboat company, to which reference above is made, is maintained by the Supreme Court's decision in the case of "Stanton vs. Metropolitan Railroad Company" (Allen's Reports, xiv. 485, January term, 1867), where the plaintiff received an injury by being thrown from one of the defendant's horse-cars, while on the way to visit a companion's friend in Roxbury. He could recover no damages; for the Court properly held him to be traveling in violation of the Sunday statute, his errand being neither "necessity" nor "charity."

2. A case occurred only a few months ago, where a person, injured by the alleged Sunday carelessness of the Boston and Maine Railroad, lost his claim for damages on the same ground.

3. On the evening of Sunday, Oct. 6, 1872, at nine o'clock, a laborer, Michael Connolly, walked off Dover-Street Bridge, the draw having been left open without guards or barriers; and, as he claimed, received severe and permanent injury. He was a night-laborer, and expected to work on Monday night; and his errand that Sunday evening was to see his employer, and get his night-work changed to day-work. The judge ruled it secular business, neither "necessity" nor "charity," so that the crippled man could not maintain an action against the city. (Mass. Reports, cxvii. 64.)

4. For the Lowell case of the mother and sick child, see Mass. Reports, cxvii. 65.

5. In the seaweed case cited by Mr. Pratt, the seaweed was gathered at ten o'clock Sunday night, and carried just up the beach beyond the reach of the incoming tide. (Mass. Reports, xcxi. 407.) From 1791 to 1844 "the Lord's Day" in Massachusetts closed at sundown. Since the latter year, by a revision of the statute, it goes from midnight to midnight. So that Connolly and our seaside farmer were unfortunate in their day only because so unfortunate in their generation.
6. The hoeing case referred to was one in which a man, after hoeing late on Saturday evening, trying to get through the job, finished it by an hour's work on Sunday morning before nine o'clock. (Mass. Reports, xcvii. 411.)

7. One Sunday, May 12, 1874, a citizen of Brookline helped his wife change a passion-flower from a small pot to a bigger pot, and, having screwed a hook into a water-spout to hang it on, was just about to hang it up, when a policeman threatened to arrest him for a violation of the Sunday law if he did not stop. Mr. W. stopped at once, expressing, however, an intention to test the matter after a consultation with a lawyer. The policeman next day complained of him to a magistrate, obtained a warrant for his arrest, and obliged him to appear before a trial justice, who fined him two dollars and costs, amounting to three dollars and ninety-five cents,—the policeman's share being one dollar and sixty cents. From this judgment Mr. W. appealed. The proceedings naturally excited the indignation of his fellow-citizens; and a petition, signed by eighteen of the most influential of them, was presented to the Selectmen of Brookline, together with a circumstantial statement of the whole matter. These petitioners requested the town authorities to see that the fine and costs should be paid by the town itself, or to assess them upon the petitioners; to stay the proceedings where they were; and to forbid the police for the future to make any further voluntary complaints on account of infractions of the Sunday law. To this petition the Selectmen returned answer by the Town Clerk, a few days later, that they had voted "that it is inexpedient to take any action upon the subject."

8. A few months ago the editor and proprietor of "The Springfield Sunday Telegram" was fined two dollars by the District Court for issuing his paper on Sunday. The motive of the prosecutor is supposed to have had no connection with the thought that he was doing God service. But the law, of course, was operative,—while policemen, court-clerk, and justice, all probably sided with the offender every Sunday in violations of the statute which their hands had to enforce on him.

9. And a news-selling case has lately occurred in Worcester in this wise. Some of the newsdealers there thought there would be a sale for papers on Sunday morning. So the boys went along the streets crying them noisily. The police men quickly hushed the noise,—but did more: acting under orders from the City Marshal, they bade the boys stop selling "The New York Graphic," and confine their Sunday trade to certain Boston Sunday papers, "The Herald" and "The Times"! Next, this City Marshal published an official notice: "Hereafter the peddling of newspapers on the Sabbath day will be strictly prohibited in this city, and the newsrooms will not be allowed to remain open for the delivery of papers, except from II o'clock A.M. to 2 o'clock P.M. All persons found violating the law in this respect will be dealt with as the law directs." Among the newsdealers were two brothers who could not understand a City Marshal's power to authorize a violation of the Sunday statute and to limit his exemptions to certain hours and papers; and they presently went on selling beyond the "2 o'clock." One of them was soon arrested and sentenced (June 26, 1876), in the District Court, to pay fines and costs amounting to more than twenty-five dollars. He appealed to the Superior Court. On the following Sunday the other brother, at the news-shop, transgressed as usual the Marshal's "2 o'clock;" and he likewise was notified by an officer to appear at court. He appeared there,—but meanwhile had called at the Marshal's office with a long list of prominent stable-keepers, railroad-directors, druggists selling cigars and soda-water, newspaper publishers, &c., all honorable men, who for the convenience of the public were constantly violating the Sunday laws; and, offering witnesses to prove the violation in each case, he had requested their arrest. The suggestion apparently closed the case against himself; he was not prosecuted, and from that day onwards sold his papers on Sunday, during what hours he would, unmolested. And boys with "Sunday Herald" on their badge have been allowed to reappear upon the streets. The first brother's case has just come up before the Superior Court, Feb. 2, 1877. It was known that, if fined, he would have to be sent to jail, as he would not pay the fine. He pleaded guilty and—went home: "sentence was deferred."

10. A Jewish citizen of Boston—a poor man, with eleven children to support, and who observed his Jewish Sabbath, Saturday—has kept a second-hand clothing store on Salem Street, for eight years past, under a license from the Board of Aldermen. The municipal regulations covering transactions in old clothes, junk, &c., provide that business can be done between certain hours on all week-days, and extend the time on Saturdays into the night. On applying, last March, for a renewal of his license, he was informed that he could not receive it because he kept his store open on Sundays. The Alderman who had ultimate jurisdiction, and to whom the matter was referred, said that, as this was a Christian country, the keeping open of a store on Sunday was offensive to the people, and was, besides, contrary to the laws and usages of the country. Hence he refused the license, pleading the fact of the law as his justification. The matter was later referred to the Board of Aldermen and laid upon the table.

11. And the Supreme Court has just rendered a decision ("Boston Evening Traveler," Jan. 5, 1877) in the case of the Commonwealth, by complaint, vs. Gehring Has. Has, who conscientiously observed the seventh day of the week as Sabbath, was complained of in the Roxbury District Court, in June last, for keeping an open shop on "the Lord's Day." The case went to the Superior Court, and Has was convicted; because the statute
reads, "Whoever keeps open his shop, ... or does any manner of labor, business, or work, ... on the Lord's Day, shall be punished by a fine," &c., and the Court ruled that two offences are thereby constituted, and that the clause which exempts Seventh Day Sabbatarians from the penalties of "performing secular business, travel, or labor, on the Lord's day," only exempts them in regard to the latter of the two offences,—that is, for doing such business, but not at all for keeping open a shop in order to do the business! And the Supreme Court sustains this ruling as the fair construction.

The cases of Sunday oppression are probably much more numerous over the State than one is apt to think; but, as few go up to the Supreme Court, they are chiefly matters of town notoriety and memory, and a special investigation would be needed to learn how many times a year this "harmless" law really grasps a victim. Similar statutes rule and similar decisions are rendered in other States than Massachusetts,—in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Missouri, for instance. In such cases the Courts uniformly claim that the statute is enacted from no religious motive and in no sense ordains a religious institution, but simply prescribes a uniform day of rest as a civil or police regulation from motives of public policy. But, in view of the history of Sabbath legislation in our land, it is straining common sense to make this claim. Till comparatively recent years the day has been ostensibly protected as holy time, as a religious institution; and, although Church and State have been more and more dissevered in laws and constitutions within the last half-century, we still think and feel and fear, and therefore half-unconsciously—only half-unconsciously—legislate and interpret legislation, in this matter under the ancestral bias. The law in its extreme provisions evidently goes far beyond the point at which disorderly disturbance of religious worshippers begins, and even far beyond the average obedience yielded to it by the conscientious "evangelical" himself: and this excess marks the depth of "Sabbatarian" sentiment in which the statute is actually rooted. Again, the very provision by which some States exempt the Jews and Seventh-day Baptists from the Sunday-labor clause, on the ground that they conscientiously keep the Saturday "as holy time, and do not labor on that day," shows clearly that there is a religious element also, and not a mere rest-policy alone, for which the legislators have regard in the present Sunday laws.

W.C.G.

Part IV.

The Working-Man's Sunday in Large Cities.

A Plea for Rest, Recreation, Education.

The Working-Man's Sunday in Large Cities: A Plea for Rest, Recreation, Education.

By William C. Gannett.

Who are the "Working-Men"?

It is not with us as it is in Europe. Here it is dangerous not to call a man a working-man, and as dangerous to call him accidentally the working-man. There are few well-to-do citizens among us who would not claim the title with an "a," and be put out with you should you deny it to them. On the other hand, speak of the Smiths and Browns and Kellys as "the" working-men, and they will have you roundly known that you are an aristocrat! And what a friend wrote me in a letter the other day has much truth; he said, "In England it is sometimes possible to work openly for the benefit of a class; in this country the only method to avoid jealousy and suspicion, and to catch your working-man, is to pretend that you don't care anything about him, but are yearning to do good to bankers and wholesale merchants." But I must run my risk. In speaking of Sunday for "working-men," the men and women that I really mean are those who have no leisure time by sunlight on the week-days; that vast class which, therefore, has no leisure time at all on week-days, save in tired evenings, because the ten or twelve hours daily work goes on from Monday's breakfast until Saturday's supper, and has to go on in that close, constant way to get that breakfast, and that supper, and the others in between. This class includes not only all who work with hand rather than with head, but very many too of those who work with head rather than with hand, with nerve rather than with muscle; includes day-laborers out of doors, the
operators in the factories, the mechanics in the workshops, the girls in sewing-attics, the clerks in stores and counting-rooms,—all these, at least, in our crowded city life: and on city life my words will chiefly bear. Once more, then,—all workers who, by the necessities of self-support, have no sunlight leisure on the week-days for rest or recreation or education: what should the Sunday do for them?

The State's Relation to Sunday's Three Uses.

It should give the Rest, Recreation, Education: those words mark the three parts into which the subject falls the moment that we touch it. And I will say at once, in rough, where I am coming out. I think that the present use of Sunday, determined by New England law and custom, and extending far beyond New England, involves for working-men a waste of opportunity to sad and great that the makers of public opinion can hardly do a better thing for their generation than to take up earnestly the question, Cannot this waste be somehow utilized for culture? At present, New England law and custom compel the Sunday rest, forbid the Sunday recreation, and do nothing for the Sunday education save in a single direction,—that indeed the most important. The change that will be advocated—under, let me confess, a strong sense of its difficulty and danger, yet with strong confidence that it looks in the right direction—maybe summed up thus: So far as the State deals with the matter, it should encourage Sunday rest, without directly enforcing it; should encourage Sunday recreation also, without directly aiding it; but should positively and actively promote Sunday education by opening whatever libraries, reading-rooms, art and mechanic exhibitions it may control, in fit localities, and by extending the public school system so far as to include free Sunday classes and lectures on "secular" subjects. Of course, before public opinion will authorize the state to do so much as this, private philanthropy must seize on this waste field of opportunity, and prove that in the vacant lot right here beside our doors there lies a gold mine!

Now, to go over the ground a little more carefully.

1. Rest.

For the working-man Sunday must still be, as now, a day of Rest, a pause in the busy week. The command seems written in our flesh and blood, confirmed by centuries of history, attested under many climates, races, civilizations,—the command, "Six clay's shalt thou labor, but the seventh shall be Sabbath," that is, rest. So ancient is it that it seems to date from the creation; so imperious that it seems to have come from God; so sure that it seems to have been revealed. Strip off these symbols by which man thinks the thought, and the thought is true. No accidental choice, no chieftain's word, is old and strong and wide of spread like this. It is from Nature,—the Nature that lies in man announces her strong law through his deep need. No beliefs in Sinairevalation or resurrection-miracle can add to its real weight, however much those beliefs have served to make men feel its weight and yield obedience. The tired muscles claim Sabbath, if the week's work has been with muscles. The tired nerves claim Sabbath, if the week's work falls on nerves. What is more, the need of the seventh day's pause increases, not diminishes, with time; for the tendency of modern industry to divide and subdivide labor is a tendency to pull but one string in the individual, and the tendency of modern civilization towards a man-to man competition in every trade and occupation is a tendency to keep that one string at steadier, tighter stretch. And if this be true of modern work in general, it is truth come truer in the rush and crush of our American life. Were a congress of physicians or of sanitary scientists to be asked the question, they would doubtless answer with one voice, that, without a periodic pause as often as one good fair day in seven to supplement the night-repairs that come in sleep, the vital forces of a modern nation would be perceptibly lowered before a single generation had run by. And not the race-vitality alone would suffer. The family life would suffer, which that great home-day cherishes. The individual's self-respect would suffer, which that recurring resurrection from the bent back and the work-stained suit, and the sense of drudgery for masters, now revives. And because the general welfare would thus be lowered, the general morality also would suffer, through and through, and show the difference between the year with Sunday pauses in it and the year without.

The Sabbath-law is growing plainer, then, than ever; the Sabbath-command is growing more imperious. Rest is still the greatest gift the Sunday can bring, it is the great gift the Sunday must bring, the working-man. Any change that would seriously endanger that, whatever good it otherwise might do, would do more harm than good.

Has the State a Right to Compel the Rest?

At once the question rises, Can the Rest be kept secure by a law like that upon the Massachusetts statute book, for instance, which peremptorily shuts the sale-shop and the work-shop, and forbids "any manner of labor, business, or work, except works of necessity and charity"? It is a question between the liberty to work
and the liberty to rest. And it moves a previous question, whether the State, in order to guard the many from acts of general ill-consequence, has a right to invade the individual's liberty. For one who believes that the State has such rights,—that the liberty of the many involves the restraint of the few,—that the citizen as "citizen" is always less, as well as more, than the "individual,"—that society exists only in virtue of partial self-surrenders, each member exchanging some of his liberty for security to the rest of it, and for a thousand helps that practically make his life of far more worth to him than liberty unaided but complete could make it,—and that that government is wise and good which secures as much and as equal liberty as possible at as small cost of individual liberty as possible; for one believing this, it then remains to answer the question asked above, whether the law depriving working-men of the liberty to work on Sunday be necessary to secure to them the liberty to rest on that day.

The public thinks Yes, seeing no way to prevent great breaks, if it begin professedly to authorize the little cracks of custom. I know the danger in answering No. Labor is still so much at the mercy of Capital that we may well pause at thought of leaving the multitude of working-men without legal bulwark against the money-hunter. The danger is nowhere greater, perhaps, than here in democratic, money-making America. Remove the Sunday prohibition, and in pressures of business a natural recourse would be had to Sunday-work as now to night-work. Or some hard and grasping man, defying public opinion, may open his shop or factory, and force his clerks and hands to give him Sunday-work or yield their places to others who will give it; and competition' is so sharp, business chances are so balanced, that what one man does, all in his trade are tempted to do, to keep their places in the race. The danger is real; not, indeed, that Sunday-work would become the general custom, but that it would be so much extended that thousands would lose the day's rest who have it now.

The Sunday Law against Work Unnecessary.

On the other hand, whatever it is safe to legalize it is unjust not to legalize. One shackle at least on Sunday work can safely be removed,—the clause whose words forbid "any manner of labor, business, or work, except works of necessity and charity." Since a Sabbatarian conscience and loyalty to it still sometimes go together, the absurd outrage, now and then reported in the newspapers, of a policeman making a raid upon a quiet individual working for himself in his own porch or on his own grounds, should be rendered impossible. Beyond this point, the difficulty of drawing a line at once begins. If a man may work for himself on his own ground, why not for hire on another's ground? If for hire in that way, why not as clerk in a store? If as clerk, why not as mechanic in a private shop-shop? If in a private workshop, why not for a corporation in a factory? It seems as if the law must stand against all hired work whatever, or allow it in all kinds and all degrees. For one, I own my hesitation, but incline to think the latter way,—that is, the repeal of the whole Sunday labor-prohibition would be safe to-day. I think so because, outside of the law, such strong safeguards would still be left to Sunday rest:—

1. That imperious need of the rest, more and more deeply felt in modern life, more and more clearly recognized as need by common sense and science, this need in itself assures the holiday to the vast majority of workers here, as in the lands of Europe. On that continent there is little of our Puritan feeling about Sunday, and, as compared with us, great freedom in the Sunday laws; yet labor on that day is exception, not the rule, and there are signs of a movement slowly rising to abolish the exception. In parts of France where the Sunday-pause is most neglected, "Monday-keeping" becomes a common practice, sadly disastrous both by dislocating industry and by making dissipation wilder. The uniformity of the Sunday-pause is a very important part of its beneficence. Moreover, the general drift of the modern laborer's demand and of his success is everywhere towards fewer, not towards lengthening, hours of work.

2. The American lack of other holidays relieving work, the rarity of saint-days or festivals—only five a year,—for us makes that assurance doubly sure.

3. Although the churchly word about the Sabbath falls to-day on deafening ears, the religious feeling already organized to shield the rest-day may be largely relied on. We are not without precedents. Abroad, the children are usually drilled in "religion" among other lessons in the public school. Church and State are too far apart with us for that; and in its stead our voluntary Sunday-school system has sprung up and covered the whole land. Again with fear and trembling, our wise men tried the experiment of voluntary churches, also, unsupported by the State laws. The lake was almost unknown in Christendom, and prophecies of ruin were rife. The result is that the nations abroad, with their established churches, point to the free churches of America as the strongest proof in Christendom of religion's vital hold on human nature. It is probable that a voluntary Sunday would turn out as these voluntary church and school experiments turned out.

4. The example of the government in closing its council-chambers, courts, and public offices throughout the land, in giving the Sunday-rest to all its direct employ—s, and in requiring the rest as condition in all the
5. And the fact is that, in this case more plainly than in most cases, it is not the law, but the public opinion behind the law, that really avails to keep the day. "Works of necessity and charity" is a very elastic phrase, and more and more exemption gets squeezed into it. Were it not for that phrase as safety-valve, the Sunday-statute would have been blown out of the book years ago. Things grow so "necessary," "charity" never faileth! There was a Sabbatarian struggle over the Sunday mail bags forty-five years ago; then a struggle over the Sunday railroad trains; lately over the city horse-cars. Many works are winked at to-day that at the half century's end would have been frowned at, or put down with the strong hand. I doubt if one person in five hundred in Massachusetts is aware that there is still a **Saturday** evening prohibition in two of our Sabbath-day statutes, so completely has public opinion freed the Saturday evening, though there the clauses linger on the page. Even in France there is a law dating from 1814, against overt Sunday sale and Sunday labor. It has been reiterated more than once; has survived two Revolutions and the Empire, while all the time more or less under discussion; is sustained by the Court of Appeal; the lower courts still pass sentence by it, fining trespassers only a single franc, perhaps. It stands there on the statute book like an old gun in an arsenal, now and then wheeled out to make a little noise,—and shops are selling, workshops working, mechanics building in the street. Public opinion keeps the door ajar, bids the builder go on if he will; and the loop-hole is provided in the statute that he may.

For these various reasons I doubt whether the Sunday law be **needed** as protection, and whether it is the real protection of the Sunday rest we credit it with being. I believe the institution is inherently so strong that the abolition of the law would have but little tendency to rob the working-men of it, and am inclined to think that the phrase used at the beginning suggests the just, safe policy: "The State should encourage Sunday rest, without directly enforcing it." As long, however, as it still persists in keeping the workshop and the saleshop closed, it should at least strike out the clause that now makes thousands of us law-breakers by forbidding "any manner of labor, business, or work, except works of necessity and charity,"—should at least strike out a clause like this, and restore to us by law the freedom which plainly harms no other. I know not whether public opinion is ripe for even so much change. I suspect it is, although since 1860 there have been five alterations in the Massachusetts Sunday law; and in four the change, instead of dulling, has sharpened its cutting edge.

Massachusetts Statutes, Chapter 84.
1862. §1. "Takes part in" any sport, becomes "is present at."
1863. §1. "Fine not exceeding $10," becomes "not exceeding $50."
1864. §3. (About keeping open places of entertainment, &c.) "Fine not exceeding $5," and upon convictions after the first" not exceeding $10 for each person so entertained," becomes "not exceeding $50" and "$100,"—respectively. But the last clause of this section, "and every person so abiding and drinking shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5," is omitted.
1865. §1. Use of firearms and fishing forbidden by penalty not exceeding $10.

It is noteworthy: in the old lands, France and Switzerland, with all their feudal memories in Church and State to give them precedent, the reformers, agitating for a better seventh day's rest, deem it a bruise to liberty to use the hands of law, in the ways that we do here, to force the individual to halt. Still greater bruise they deem it to let the religious doctrine of a portion of the citizens determine such a law. Their movement is based on the domestic, moral, and industrial good of a rest-day uniform for all; and, short of individual compulsion, they would do everything to secure the day for the workman, and win him to accept it.

See such books as Rabaud's prize-essay of the Geneva Society of Public Utility, Le Repos Hebdomadaire, 1870; and Lefort's essay, Du Repos Hebdomadaire, 1874, crowned by the French Academy of Moral and Political Sciences. Also the spirit of the Sunday resolutions recently adopted by the German Protestantenverein at Heidelberg: 1. Sunday rest ought to be a general observance, based on the free choice of the people. 2. Sunday rest consists not merely in abstinence from usual work: enervating pleasure is as much a breach of it as manual labor. 3. Sunday rest must find its highest end in Sunday hallowing: where this is neglected the moral strength of the people suffers. 4. This hallowing of the Sunday springs from the religious necessities of man, but is not a divine ordinance. 5. In order to the revival of Sunday rest, the religious life of the people must be quickened.

It is reported that, during the last nine or ten years, "the observance of the Sabbath, as a day of rest from labor, at least, has been increasing greatly in Paris. The government suspends labor on the new International Exhibition on Sundays, and the laboring classes generally are in favor of one day of rest in seven,—to say nothing of the revival of religion which followed the national humiliation of the last war. Shops are now quite generally closed on Sunday, but the places of amusement still keep open."

In this land certain of the Sunday statutes are as anomalous, under our free institutions, as negro slavery once was: as anomalous,—of course in no other point is the comparison made. When, by the common consent of good citizens, it is a statute which is practically suppressed, instead of the offence, it is the statute which is
the offence. Let me repeat: that which it is safe to legalize it is simply unjust not to legalize.

So much for Sunday as the day of rest. On its continuance as the day of rest is conditioned all the other good which the day can bring the working-man. Part of this other good is—

II. Recreation.

Given the rest-day, what shall be done with it?

The difference between nerve-work and muscle-work shows at once that even Rest must have a varied usage to be rest for all the workers. What is real rest for one would be simply continued labor for another. Much more is the like true of Recreation, so much greater is the difference between taste and taste. What is recreation to one taste is direst bore to another. What makes one smile makes another yawn. What takes one early out of bed of Sunday morning keeps another late in bed. Now the State undertakes to be very maternal in this matter, and she is a mother who ignores the differences between her children. She treats us younger ones as if we all were like the good brothers two hundred years our elders. She says, "They did not, so you shall not, go to any show or entertainment, shall not take part in or be present at any sport or game or play; you shall not fish or hunt, or travel even, except from necessity or charity, upon Sunday."

Here we stand on surer ground in urging that our mother is quite wrong. I see not that the State has taught to do with the recreation that we choose for Sunday, save to see that no one interferes with it, and that we, by ours, interfere with no one else in his,—guarding between us in this day's pleasure just as it guards between us in our six days' business. There is doubtless danger, or rather there is certainty, that theatres bad as well as good, entertainments low as well as high, will seize upon the day. That certainty exists as to the week-days also. But there is nothing to warrant prohibition on the one day more than on the six days. Religious predilection has no place here. Feelings may be shocked on one side and the other, tastes may be annoyed, tendencies may be deplored; but feelings, tastes, regrets, of this kind, are private luxuries, and neither you nor I may force such privacies upon another as fetters on his action.

**The Puritan and the Continental Sabbaths.**

The "Puritan" Sabbath and the "Continental" Sabbath are set off against each other as two great types, and each is praised, each heartily hated, by opposite parties. In each case injustice is done both to the thing praised and to the thing condemned. New England Puritanism was much more than the ascetic monstrosity which its modern scoffers mock at. That austere moral strength of which the Puritan Sabbath was the natural seventeenth century sign—pre-eminently its sign, and but very slightly its cause—has been the iron in the nation's blood down to the seventh generation. Would we had more of it left! On the other hand, the Continental Sabbath is by no means the abomination of desolation and profligacy described by those who fear it. Sunday is the home-day there as here; the general rest-day there, though not so much as here; the day of worship there as well as here, though in a less degree; and, besides this, it is there far more a recreation-day than here,—and by this last difference it goes so far towards redressing the balance of comparative good between the two days there and here, that I am not at all sure that, on the whole, our American Sunday deserves the higher praise.

Scotland perhaps out-puritans New England in this respect, and as the late Dr. Guthrie, of Edinburgh, was true Scotch Presbyterian on the subject his testimony is noteworthy. "We counted on one occasion, in Paris, thirty-three theatres and places of amusement open on the Sabbath day," he writes. Coming home, "in one hour we saw in London and Edinburgh, with all her churches and schools and piety, more drunkenness than we saw in five long months in guilty Paris." In the controversy about running the Sunday trains in Scotland, Dr. Norman McLeod, with the evidence of the Scotch Sabbaths before his eyes, took the position that, "in proportion to the strict enforcement of Sabbatarianism, there would be multiplied those practical inconsistencies, dishonesties, and Pharisaic sophistries, which prove in all ages supremely detrimental to morality and religion." The outburst of popular feeling against these views was amazing, but he never retracted a syllable. Or again, "At the Synod of the Scotch Church, in 1867, the Puritan Sabbath was openly proclaimed a failure, and ample evidence was adduced in proof, one of the speakers declaring that Continental Sabbaths produced no parallel to the disgraceful behavior which marked the day in Scotland." I do not mean to correlate the two as simple cause and effect,—the Sabbath-keeping and the drunkenness,—though there is doubtless some connection of that sort between the sombre day and the number of reelers on the street. But facts like these should be remembered in comparing the two Sabbath-types

Here is a picture from the Sunday seen by British eyes in a large Ger-man capital: "The city of Munich is, as all the world knows, and none better than its citizens, unrivalled in its beer; and, for a German town, is a very drunken one. But on Sundays, though the beer-alleys are in the open air, the quiet, as compared with an English holiday, is most striking. The cause is easily given. During the day all the churches are crowded to suffocation;
in the evening, from about six to dark, two bands of music play in the pretty 'English Park,' which is crowded by promenaders of every degree, from the royal family to the humblest handicraftsman. There are tables and booths around, where coffee and ice may be procured at a low price; and many Munich families take in this way their evening meal. Nothing can exceed the picturesque beauty of the scene except its moral beauty. We often sadly contrasted the cheerful, contented faces around us with the careworn, haggard look of the same classes of our countrymen; often wished that we too were taught to worship God with the natural homage of thankful enjoyment. . . . For the upper classes, we are sure that the self-denial—if such it is—of spending some part of this holy day in friendly intercourse with their poorer neighbors will be amply repaid by its evident influence upon themselves and those whom they seek to benefit." (Rev. Dr. John Woolley, quoted by Edward Maitland in The Sunday Review, for October, 1876, p. 32.)

. The "working-men" will have recreation, and, if the higher kinds are shut to them, there will only be the more idle men to seek the lower kinds,—the den if not the garden, the saloon if not the concert or the gallery.

The State knows Holidays, not Holy Days.

I know by the very strength of my own preference how hard it is to wholly discharge our minds of these religious predilections. But just that we should do, if we would view the Sunday question with perfect fairness. Even the most evangelical of the descendants can hardly claim to-day that the old homestead Sabbath of the fathers can be justly forced upon the vast and complex populations of strange blood and foreign customs that have been invited to the family-adopted. For ourselves it may still be holy-day; when judging for others we must remember that we judge a holiday. The State knows no holy days,—I speak of what ought to be, not is. To the State Sunday should be simply the people's rest, with equal right to each person of the people to use that rest as he may choose. In the eye of the law church-going should be but one among the recreations chosen. The church-goers have no more right to say to the riders and the ball-players and the show-seekers, "Stop!" than these latter have to say to the church-goers, "Don't you do it!" "On Saturday," pleads the horse-car company, "we carry you a pleasure or a rest ride at our profit, and at our risk if we damage you; on Sunday, by Massachusetts statutes, we carry you the pleasure or the rest ride at our profit still, but at your risk if we damage you." What right has Parson A. or Deacon B. to ordain meanness like that by deliberately refusing to order up this statute from the book?

To speak truly, it is not a question of practical interference; for the two kinds of Sunday usage do not inter fere. There is room in the city or the town for both usages, under the same forbearance that is practised and enforced on week-days without a thought of calling it forbearance, then, but simple justice. What makes week-day injustice become just on Sundays? Or why should Saturday "justice" become even "toleration" on the next day? The street is made for all the wagons: for the torchlight procession of both the parties. The town hall first echoes to Tilden's name, and then to Hayes'. So should it be with Sunday. All ears have to bear the bells; all ears should bear the band,—or bells and band should agree on separate times and places. Let the morning park have the silence of its trees, or hold the family throngs that the music will draw there. Church-doors stand open, and the concert-doors, the theatre-doors, the bath-house-doors, the gymnasium, and the garden-gates have a right to stand open that those who will may enter there. As to the employes, the employ's in the one place correspond to the employ's in the other; and the loss of their rest-day—that of the few for the many—may be similarly justified and similarly made good.

Only One Sunday, and that Withheld by the Law.

All this has been urged because, before the present Sunday-waste can be freely utilized for recreation by working-men, the Sunday must be given to them. At present it is withheld from them by the law. Well is it named for them the Sun-day! The rich man's leisure comes all along the pleasant weather; the working-man takes sunshine for his leisure—unless he be still poorer by being out of work—only on the Sunday. The rich man's home-time is almost when he wants it,—an hour later at the office in the morning, an hour earlier back to dinner, now and then, of an afternoon. The working-man's home-time is his Sunday; when else are the children really his to have? The rich man's "sport or game or play," his "public show or entertainment," his "hunting or his fishing," falls naturally enough upon some weekday. The working-man's play or show or fishing would naturally fall upon the one day that brings him ample time and freshness for it, the one day they are forbidden,—Sunday. The rich man travels almost what day he wills; the working-man's rare excursion must come on the Sunday. The rich man's vacation is a summer month or two or three; the working-man's vacation is, for the most part, the city-Sundays of those months. The rich man's country is the mountains or the sea-shore; the working man's country is the city-park or some neighboring hill-top, and his carriage to it is the
car,—in which he rides at his own risk on Sunday! The inequality being all it is by social laws that lie beyond the statute-book, the statute adds its vetoes to make it greater yet! Does not the law "withhold the Sunday" from the working-men?

The State, I said at the beginning, should encourage recreation without directly aiding it. Let that stand. The Sunday use, then, that is made of a great park, within easy reach of the population, may be no just argument by itself for creating such a park. But in pleasant summer weather no indoor show whatever can vie with grass and trees and outdoor sunniness for working-folk on their one leisure-day. The city park is the great people's-nursery, the great free hospital, the great family pleasure-ground, for the city workman.

On a single Sunday last summer, it is said, a single line of street-cars took eleven thousand people yonder to a single spot,—the Point in South Boston, where a greensward and the sea-beach still touch one another.

Since, apart from the special Sunday-question, a large park is thus needed by a city, let us hope that when our working men's children now in Boston schools shall themselves have children to spend their hot vacation on the pavement and the doorstep, and to wonder in their turn what "the country" is like,—let us hope that by that time Sunday shall see them, fathers, mothers, and little ones, streaming out from the close rooms towards their grass and trees—their own because it is the city's—to take part in any "sport or game or play" they like, with the blessing, not the curse, of the State laws upon them, and in cars that shall pay damages for every careless accident inflicted on them by the way 1

III. EDUCATION.

And yet I grant that the heart sickens to see the abuse of the day, not as Sunday, but as a day, when the population of a large city gives itself up to its pleasures,—so much of the pleasure seems so low in kind. The wish yearns in one to do something to raise the grade of pleasure for at least some of these thousands. To do that would in itself be education. It still remains to hint what might be done with Sunday in this third aspect, as the people's education-day. I speak of intellectual education. Rest, recreation,—both are familiar thoughts of the day. This other view is comparatively a modern view, not yet systematically adopted by any of our States.

Summer and winter must be here distinguished. In our Northern cities for six months of the year the day can hardly be an outdoor day. And the broad fact to be always remembered is, that the day must be occupied in order to be saved. An idle Sunday is not a rest-Sunday, and it is the kind of Sunday that makes the recreation dangerous. A fact almost as broad is, that the day is not, and will not be, occupied to any large extent by working-men in church-going. Fill the churches full, and outside there are multitudes who cannot get in, and would not if they could. And yet the day must be occupied in order to be saved. Where recreation is debarred, and nothing outside of these churches is done for education, is it not a hard case? Where recreation is allowed, and nothing outside of the churches is done besides for education, then, as I said, the heart grows sick. In either case, taking things as they are, and remembering how much the week-day's work ministers in various ways to the good of body, mind, and character, it may be seriously doubted whether the Sunday, in spite of all the churches do, is not the least inspiring day for true manhood of all the seven. If the cities could be polled of a rainy Sunday, inaction, idleness, listlessness, would be found, I fear, the actually prevailing characteristic. Not one-half the population can handle a leisure-day so as not to be bored or harmed by it! And, below a certain grade of mental resource and of home-attractiveness, it is that idleness, inaction, listlessness, which leads to the low companionship, the drunkenness, the profligacy, of the Sunday waste.

Here, then, is an empty winter Sunday, and an average city clerk or mechanic. He is not going to church; or, if he goes, that takes but a long hour. Can nothing be done to help him save his day?

I. The Public Library.

There is the Public Library reading-room. On Sundays there it wasn't till three or four years ago, thanks to some of the clerk's good friends! In Boston it took ten separate struggles, during a seventeen years' campaign, beginning with a hardly listened to proposal in 1856, and embracing long discussions in the city council and the papers, repeat ed hearings of petitioners and remonstrants, two mayors' vetoes and two appeals to the Legislature,—to open the doors to him. Feb. 9, 1873, saw him at last allowed to enter. He has scantly time for papers or magazines through the week, and there he finds a feast of them. If you go there, you will see him any Sunday afternoon or evening. According to the last report of the Boston Library, at its central reading-room, it takes on the average, that day, four hundred and seventy-six periodicals to feed him and his fellows,—the winter average, apart from the summer, much exceeding this,—and on full Sundays the congregation overflows into the next room. "A very considerable proportion are persons who do not, or cannot, visit the Library on weekdays,—reporters, mechanics, and those who work early and late." At the Christian Union reading-room, in Boston, they read books as well as papers. When that institution was reorganized, in 1868, without a word said
to any one, it simply left the book-shelves free on Sun-day, and no one said a word against the liberty. "Probably three times as many readers there as on the weekdays; before the morning church, and through the afternoon and evening. I would rather close it any other day than Sunday," says the President. The Milwaukee Library ventured to do the same in 1869 or 1870. In Philadelphia the Mercantile Library also followed suit in 1870. Before the second year was out, the attendance averaged seven hundred, "nearly all young men," and it reports gradually increasing numbers ever since. The Cincinnati Public Library, opening its doors on a March Sunday of 1871, has, the past year, averaged over eleven hundred in its Sunday reading-rooms. "How many were genuine, how many are loafers in search of a warm place on Sunday, I know not," writes the friend I quote. But where might the loafers have been otherwise? In New York the Mercantile Library began with a Sunday of May, 1872. The St. Louis Public School Library was only a month later. "It is always as full as its generous accommodations permit." In even a small city like Worcester two hundred visitors find Sunday shelter in the Library, besides a librarian who makes it a part of his personal Sunday service to minister to their individual book-wants.

It is to be hoped that the experiment of opening the upper hall of Boston's central Library will soon be tried, for the winter Sundays at least, to see if our Boston clerk and mechanic will not read books as well as papers, should the chance be given him. In the great host of the unmarried workers, men and women, whose city "home" is a cell in a boarding-house, not a few have bookish tastes and wish for culture; on the one day on which they can freely indulge such tastes, offer them a noble library and its contents, and, probably, enough will find their way to it to fill the tables and the desks.

The Public Library is still but a new instrument of education. We are only learning how to handle it. It is to grow as the noble tools all grow. In our day it is what the steam-engine was as Watt left it. It will become one of the great working-engines of the people's after-school education. And this Sunday use begins one line of its development.

Yet not everywhere does the Sunday reading-room succeed. It furnishes a silent, solitary occupation, too unsocial to win very many. In Boston the success is not what the friends of the opening hoped, or the opponents of the opening feared. In one or two of the outlying branches of the library it hardly seems worthwhile to keep the room open, so few resort to it on Sundays. The trouble may be only a matter of locality. Perhaps, some winter, an earnest man or woman will petition the city govern ment for leave to open a school-room or the ward-room of a crowded district as a free or a "penny" reading room, and test the effect of dropping a warm and quiet retreat, with a couple of hundred books and as many papers, right in the middle of a working population on their lounging-day.

2. Art Exhibitions, &c.

But, after all is done that can be done, the reading-rooms will hold but a few hundreds, or, at most, small thousands, of the idlers. Where else, then, can our clerk go on his winter Sunday? To some Museum, some Art Exhibition? Alas, no. That, indeed, would win him; but that is still among things tabu in New England. Moreover, the State has none to open. But private citizens have: will they not soon be moved to organize the "loan collection" as the next new instrument of education in the cities,—to generously resolve together that what their wealth and their refinement open to themselves all days and months shall be also opened, regularly opened, for a winter month or two, to those less fortunate? And opened most freely on the Sundays, when it could be used by the thousands who have no other day of the month on which, with fresh minds and clean clothes and the feeling of leisure, they can use it,—the day on which it would perhaps do as much good as-during the whole week besides? Will not the directors of the Natural History collections, of the new Art Museums now forming, of the recurring Mechanics' Exhibitions, consider earnestly whether it lie not in their power and within their privilege to help the idle population to keep their Sunday better?

Think of that great educator in Philadelphia standing-dumb through the Sundays of six months,—dumb to the very class who most needed teachings such as hers,— dumb to the petition of sixty-seven thousand, mostly "working-men!" It is hard to speak a single word save words of gratitude and admiration, of the men who gave their country such an educator; but for one speaking on my subject it seems disloyal not to speak right on. So long as the Centennial Commissioners were faithful to their ground for enforcing the dumbness,—that American public opinion ought not to be shocked by what it deemed a Sabbath desecration,—the loss was to be regretted as sad waste of opportunity. But when the privileged few began to be admitted on that day, the public conscience felt a shock, not only as of Sabbath desecration, but of something worse. Under the circumstances, this wicket-gate opening achieved a real success of harm to the public conscience, offset only by the pleasure made more pleasurable to the few, while whatever pain the general opening would have given Sabbatarian feeling would have had the good done to many thousands to offset it. Of foreign precedents, the good was left, the bad was chosen. In East London the Bethnal Green Museum is freely opened to the public on Monday,
Tuesday, Saturday; on Sunday it is "closed," but fine carriages and footmen, it is said, may be seen waiting at the gates through all the afternoon. Somewhat so, back in the fourteenth century in France, at a time when the Sabbath rest laws were so strict that even bakers were forbidden to bake that day, the goldsmiths and the armorers were exempted from the statute on the ground that their work concerned the nobility!

**Experience of Sunday Openings.**

Does anyone doubt whether such exhibitions as we speak of would be appreciated by the class we speak of? Appreciated as by those already privileged with education,—no: but visited, enjoyed, studied, made to serve as educators,—yes. Even this, however, would depend largely on the degree in which the "working-man" felt himself at home when there. He is not going where he believes, mistakenly or not, that he will be looked at curiously by strangers in soft raiment. In America we have but small Sunday experience in such matters. But in Philadelphia the new Academy of Arts is open on that day at the week-day price; the attendance is larger than on week-days; and of about the same character;" many in humble life, who could not come through the week, enjoying the exhibition to their heart's content, some even carrying babies rather than not come." The Zoological Gardens there are also open; and, at the usual price, the attendance on Sundays is "at least three times greater than on week-days; the class of visitors averages about the same, and it is always orderly."

Abroad the thing is past experiment. In the German city Sunday is the people's free day at the Galleries. In Berlin it is *Monday* that sees them closed and their custodians resting. In Paris it is said that the book most applied for at the lending libraries, on Saturdays, is the guide-book to the Museum for the next day's treat. That next day the Louvre opens its departments exceptionally wide. Going there, you find the rooms possessed by working-men and peasants, whole families down to the awed children, each one dressed and mannered at his best, enjoying it together. In English Birmingham they dared the experiment three or four years ago with good success.

An item, not of Sunday fact, but whose bearing lies in our direction, may be added: The Liverpool Free Library and Museum opened a picture exhibition for three months in the fall of 1873. During the three months the day admissions, at one shilling each, were 13,318. During only the last half of the time it was also opened in the evening at a three-pence admission, and 18,361 persons pressed in. In all, over 30,000, besides some 10,000 pupils, &c., admitted free.

In Dublin both the Botanical and the Zoological Gardens are opened Sundays, and have three times as many visitors on that one clay as on all the other six together. One-third of the yearly receipts by the animals are the people's pennies. The National Gallery is also open, and nearly ten times as many visit it that day as on the other six together.

In London, Hampton Court and Kew Gardens have long been open; but the Crystal Palace was closed against great petitions, and stay closed until now. The South Kensington Museum, the British Museum, and the National Gallery are also shut; and only last year the Court of Queen's Bench closed the Brighton Aquarium. By those in trust of the four noble museums just named, it is felt that "any departure from the existing practice must come from the country at large." Accordingly, four societies in England are now trying to free the day for the people. One has been trying some twenty years,—since 1855,—and has done much to educate public opinion. It works for Sunday excursions, Sunday music, and "Sunday evenings for the people." One (since 1869) works for Sunday lectures on science,—physical, intellectual, and moral,—history, literature, and art, especially in their bearing upon the social well-being. (Seats at one penny, sixpence, and one shilling.) Another (1874) would fain increase the Sunday study of Shakespeare. And the fourth, formed last year (1875), with central and provincial committees, is devoted to the single purpose of "opening museums, art galleries, libraries, aquariums, and gardens, as such, on Sundays," while earnestly "deprecating any attempt to make Sunday an ordinary working day." Such men as Huxley, Darwin, Bain, Lecky, Spencer, Seeley, Amos, Stopford Brooke, are leading it. The society has established a little quarterly journal (" The Sunday Review," Messrs. Tr—bner & Co., London, Ludgate Hill, E. C.) through which to push the appeal to the country. Twice the Sunday question has been brought forward in the British Social Science Congress. It is one of the live and growing questions of the day, and the public is going to hear more and more about it, until the friends who go to church are converted to the wisdom and the justice of extending to the whole of the community educational advantages now enjoyed only by a section of it,—only by a section because the usual "closing" falls on the single day on which great masses of the people can enjoy their share. The present government last year introduced a temporary measure favoring legislation in the direction of the society's aims. To such "openings" there is always opposition previously. The "entering wedge" is the great bugbear. And when the thing is dared and done, the opposition seems, to vanish before the innocence and goodness of the fact.

I spoke of a Sunday lecture society just now. The lecture is a third lever of Sunday education lately taken in hand by us here in America. In Boston, each winter since 1869, the Free Religious Association or its friends have arranged a course of ten or twelve Sunday afternoon lectures in Horticultural Hall. The lecturers have been Jew, Roman Catholic, Protestant of more than one denomination, Thelst, Atheist,—invited as thinkers having equal rights. Individual freedom, with fellowship, in religion is the Association's motto, the ideal towards which it works. Its members have usually very definite convictions of their own, some holding one belief, some another; but they are allied in their society to maintain one public platform where differences of belief shall meet on friendly terms in virtue of a common love of truth and of charity,—where the differences of belief shall meet as within sects only the similarities meet. Accordingly many speakers have been sought to speak for various phases of religious thought,—many more than have felt able or willing to accept the invitation. Not religion only and morals,—social problems, history, biography, science, art, have furnished topics. The lectures are meant to be "solid"; and the audience, a thoughtful set of listeners, ranges from three or four hundred to twice that number. The expenses are now met, in part by a ten or fifteen cents' admission, in part by private subscription.

Chicago bravely led the way in a more popular movement, and has this story to tell about it: Some thirty months ago a company of young men began the work "with abundant faith and a cash capital of six dollars." They have provided three courses of lectures. Last winter's course lasted seven months, and the audience present averaged thirteen hundred and seventy-seven persons,—the audience absent being all whom the circulation of the city newspapers printing verbatim reports could reach. No one connected with the management of the society has ever received a cent for service rendered. "It sells first-class lectures at cost price." Every pair of ears that listens pays ten cents; and this rate has provided lectures, advertisements, rent for the largest hall in Chicago, and at the season's end left four hundred dollars in the treasury. The lectures are given at 3 P.M., in order not to interfere with church services. The topics embrace nearly all the great themes of thought except theology, which is let alone. And all classes of the people contribute to the audience, though the tendency is to gather more cultured listeners than the movement was designed to help. This present winter, be it said, however, the experiment is disappointing its friends. The political excitement, the surfeit of speeches from which the public has been suffering through the whole election-autumn, the revival-attractions of Messrs. Moody and Sankey, perhaps too the fact that the purely popular speakers occasionally engaged hitherto had been dropped from the list, all seemed to converge as causes to make the audience dwindle; and, the ten cent rate no longer paying expenses, the lectures have been suspended for a while, to be resumed by and by.

Chicago's neighbors, Milwaukee and St. Louis, have followed her example. At Milwaukee such subjects as Mr. Fields carries call out eight hundred or one thousand hearers. Proctor talking of astronomy, with charts behind him, draws eighteen hundred. At St. Louis the audience last winter averaged nine hundred and sixty through rain or shine. It was largely made up of men with their families, of youths and boys even, who could hardly have afforded more than the ten cents charged. An illustrated lecture, the prospect of seeing as well as hearing, was sure to draw a crowd. In all three cities the work suffered for a while from pulpits that denounced the "Sabbath desecration," but soon their outcry died away.

The appeal to the eye is specially to be commended in any hour's instruction meant to reach our fellow-countrymen. The picture is the magnet which makes the difference between the small audience and the large, between the slack and eager interest, between the lesson vaguely and the lesson clearly understood, between distinct and fading memory of it. We know in Boston how the Lowell Institute is overcrowded to hear good narratives who goes there with a stereopticon. Let the chance of pictures be widely known, and on the winter Sunday afternoon or evening, which so many people know not what to do with, at a ten cents' admission, our Music Hall would probably be well filled to travel with such a man and such an instrument through any country on the globe, or to follow him into the wonder-lands of science or along the tracks of history and biography.

4. Sunday Classes.

More than this. No one wants the common school to go on, and make a seventh day's work for children and teachers that have already been working five or six. But it would be keeping a rest-day in the true sense, if on Sundays—as, of late, on winter evenings—extra classes should be taught of youths whose six week-days are six long work-days: industrial classes, especially, in which practical training should be given to beginners who often have to leave the school so early for the workshop and the warehouse. It is no new thought. In cities abroad it is a common practice. Norway and Sweden, Prussia, Saxony, Austria, Bavaria, Baden, and Wurtemberg, and some few towns in France, all have such Sunday schools for apprentices and journeymen and factory-hands; classes where those who have only half learned what the regular school gave may clinch that little, and where those who wish to carry their scanty education farther may do so. For these latter, besides the
common studies, the science that comes into his handicraft is practically taught the young mechanic, book-keeping and the languages are taught the clerk; and almost invariably such schools are drawing-schools. From eight to eleven o'clock in the morning, or perhaps from two to five o'clock in the afternoon, they meet. "Industrial Schools of Improvement" they are called in Wurtemberg, where seventy out of a hundred apprentices receive instruction in them. Why should not something of that kind be done here? Why on Sunday should not an empty school-hall be occupied by the voluntary singing-class and drawing-class? Or the teacher, with older listeners than children, going through the elements of science, political economy, the laws of health, the lessons of history?

There might be occasion for Sunday-school teachers of this kind to volunteer and give their hour or two, as others do in the Sunday school of the usual kind. Or the support of such a Sunday teacher would worthily be granted on the churches as part of their mission-work. But, beyond that, should the experiment be found to meet a real want, may we not look forward to the time when such classes will be grafted directly upon the public school system, as the evening schools have lately been,—the theory in both cases being that the very class that most needs teaching cannot get it in the usual working-hours? The broadest educational fact of our day is this: that the two phrases "the established church" and "the established school" stand respectively for the past and for the future in the education of the intellect. As a training institution the established church for many hundred years has been paramount, the school existing as her subordinate. It could not have been otherwise; and education, mental as well as moral, owes the church a vast debt. But now, as with so many other institutions and professions, in the course of social evolution functions are dividing. Ecclesiastical control of the mind is gradually ceasing, and the public school is the rising heir to this part of the estate. Acceptance of a "secular education is displacing acceptance of a uniform theology as condition of citizenship; and more and more the State supplies and enforces the new condition,—that is, it "establishes" the school. And as our public school system improves, and learns to use all its opportunities and handle all its instruments, I think we shall find our-selves regarding Sunday as an educational annex of the week, and utilizing a part of it in some such way as has been hinted; this, at least, in our large cities holding so many thousands to whom it is the one free day, and who will not spend that day inside of churches, charm the preachers never so wisely there. Men will yet look back with marvel on the past years dotted with fifty-two such chances lost.

And now to end. I have spoken of three uses of the Sunday,—Rest, Recreation, Education. Let the "working-man" cleave to the first as he values the other two. It is their indispensable condition. But let not society, by its customs or its laws, hinder him from giving noble meanings to these other two. Even were the Bible stories true, the best memorial of a creation-day would still be to use it for wise re-creation; the best memorial of a Redeemer's resurrection-day would be to make it minister to true redemption for our fellows and ourselves. It is for a greatened, not a lessened, Sunday reverence that I plead. I plead in no way against Worship. But the churches will take care of that, and there need be, here and now, no plea in its behalf. This is what I urge,—because the single systematic improvement of the day does not avail for all, shall we oppose, or rather favor, an ampler system of improvement? Who abolishes the Sunday? No class of earnest citizens so much as they who try to limit it to but one use, worship. Why? Because, so doing, they tend to abolish even that use. Who save the Sunday even for worship? They who would open it to many uses, but who spur themselves and others to make, among the many, the higher uses win the day. To do that is to save Sunday to the "working-man," and to put more sun into it that it may bless him through and through.

It is but to go on with this topic of Sunday education for the working-man to add here a novel and interesting suggestion in reference to the use of Sunday as election-day, made, as follows, by Marie E. Zakrzewska, M.D.:

The last "Sunday Herald" made the statement that the 4th of March, 1877, will be a Sunday, and asks the question, "Shall on a Sunday a President be inaugurated? Or shall a President for the day be elected? Or shall there be an interim in the office of the chief?" "The Herald" argues that the Constitution does not provide for such a dilemma, as it does not recognize any form of religion. It does not recognize any State-church or religion whatsoever. . . .

I would say, not only should a President be inaugurated on a Sunday, whenever that case occurs, but I would also suggest the change of all election-days for City government, for State government, for United States government,—namely, that all voting shall be appointed to take place on Sundays. Sunday being a day of rest to the weary, of worship to the worshippers, of study to the scholar, of recreation and instruction to the masses, the day would add to the dignity of voting greatly, as it does in Switzerland, where all voting is done on Sundays, no matter how important the subject or how small. School Boards, city magistrates, county and federal governments, amendments of constitution, &c., are elected or voted upon in Sunday silence and dignity; and Switzerland is by no means a Free Religious Association. On the contrary, Geneva, for instance, is as orthodox on Sunday-keeping as Boston. Only two years ago, when I spent a Sunday there, I saw a chain drawn across the main street, forcing carriages to turn into side-streets, so as to
avoid passing by a church which headed the main street. Another church I saw enclosed by chain barriers about thirty feet from the church, so as to prevent even pedestrians coming too near and possibly disturbing by step or talk outside those who worshipped within.

The Protestant Swiss are a pious, Calvinstic people in their belief, and all that tourists and guests in hotels do on a Sunday is as foreign to them, yes, more foreign than what your guests in the Boston hotels do. And yet this pious nation votes on Sunday, without thinking it wrong or inappropriate.

Now let us look for a few minutes at the effect such a change may bring here:

1. I should say that the voting on a Sunday would do a great deal towards taking off the appearance of a national gambling day. Every voter will know on Saturday evening that the result, properly counted, will not be known till Monday morning, as the telegraph wires are not fully called into work on a Sunday. Perhaps no transparencies will be hung out which will say, "T., 4; H., 5; "T., 9; H., 8;" and no excited crowd will stand narrating for their party politicians who may or may not get a chance to rule. This is all excitement of a gambling nature, and the sooner it is done away with the better; for nothing is gained by it.

2. The working-man, the employed, will not have to lose an hour, or half a day, or a whole day's work, and its pay, by voting. To the honest voter this will be a help and a relief, because he stands in this respect at a disadvantage with the richer man, whose hours are not counted. On the other hand, no so-called party politician will have the chance of offering to pay a man who will vote for his party enough for his loss of work and to give him a holiday, with free beer and whiskey besides. And I know that this is done.

3. The employers in large cities will gain if no time is taken by those who receive a salary, and to whom time must be allowed to go to the polls, no matter whether this is done in haste or at greatest leisure.

4. The voting on Sunday would also have another important effect on all,—namely, the effect of dress. And here let me say a few words in behalf of a good suit of clothes. We all know from experience the good effect a new suit of clothes has upon our feeling of self-respect. We all must admit that we feel more dignified in our best suit of clothes than in our working clothes. It renews our self-respect. Our best frock rests us from a day's labor when put on in the evening; it makes us feel like somebody.

Now, give the working-man Sunday for voting, when he can leisurely dress himself in the morning and go to the polls to vote with that renewed self-respect which his Sunday suit gives, and he will feel the dignity of being a self-sovereign far better than he does now, when he carries his vote, no matter how or in what style of dress, as a mere ticket to the polls, just at such moments when he can least afford to leave his work. He feels himself even at a disadvantage in his rough dress, when meeting a rich man of his ward, and is not fully aware that his vote has the same dignity as the vote of the well-dressed fellow-citizen. There is a good deal in dress,—far more than we all realize.

5. Through this Sunday voting and Sunday dressing another great step forward would be gained,—namely, less, roughness, less bad manners in and around the polls, so that when the time comes that women shall go to the polls, the great objection which man used to throw out to woman's voting, that the polls were such rough and indecent places where no gentleman would like to see a lady go, would entirely fall to the ground. I am sure the roughest and coarsest man always behaves well when in his Sunday clothes and sober. And if all men feel with full dignity the self-sovereign within themselves, when the working-man in his Sunday suit appears in this respect on equality with the best-dressed citizen, he will feel that he not only controls the fate of the country by his vote, but he also will feel that he is to, and has to, control himself. From such a man I don't fear indecent manners; and I have no doubt that through such a change of day and arrangements, the husband and wife, or the young lovers, can go arm in arm to the polls of their ward and vote, while the single woman will meet with respect, and the single man will act with that dignity of manner which behooves a free-born citizen and crowns him a self-sovereign.
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Preface.

The following lecture (the second on the same subject) was delivered on several occasions at Leipsic, four or five years ago, and was favorably received by all cultivated and liberally-minded persons. That this was the case is attested not only by the expressions of approval which the discourse called forth from my numerous audiences, but also by the notices which appeared of it in the local daily press. The orthodox party naturally viewed both lecture and lecturer with the reverse of approbation, and hurled their anathemas upon his devoted head. Some went so far as to denounce him from the pulpit. Victor Von Strauss violently attacked the first lecture, which had meanwhile appeared in print, and I should have published a complete refutation of the scientific part of his criticism—(the wit and persiflage are entirely irrelevant to the subject)—had I not been obliged just at that time to leave Germany and spend a considerable time in travelling, and since then have had occasion to devote myself almost exclusively to other studies. Here I need only say that the explanation I then gave of the Buddhist Nirvana, which explanation Victor Von Strauss believed he had completely refuted, has received complete confirmation during the last few years by the discovery of new inscriptions in Ceylon See a long essay by Dr. Frankfurter in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. xii.

Further, Professor Max Müller's "Lecture on Buddhist Nihilism," in which the talented author some years ago expressed his conviction that the prevailing conception of Nirvana must be false. This lecture was unfortunately unknown to me until quite recently.

I am, therefore, more than ever convinced that Nirvana does not signify "the extinction of the flame of existence," as has been thought by most of the Orientalists of Europe, as well as by Schopenhauer, but that it is "a perception of the mind—the pure, joyful Nirvana, free from ignorance and evil desires."

See Appendix.

With these few words of explanation I venture to lay this second lecture before the public, with the intention, in case of its meeting with a kindly welcome from lovers of truth, of publishing at some future date, when I am less occupied than at present, the entire series of lectures delivered by me in Leipsic and other cities of Europe, upon the so often misunderstood religion and literature of my native country.

Buddhism and Christianity.
ALTHOUGH Buddhism in its original form, as I explained in my first lecture, passes over in silence the
dogmas of a supernatural God and a supernatural immortality, it yet contains a doctrine which may be accepted
as a substitute for these two dogmas. This is the doctrine of **Karma**, or of an unavoidable moral responsibility,
which holds a very prominent place in the entire Buddhist literature. This doctrine Buddhism repeatedly
proclaims with earnestness and positiveness—that every act is inevitably accompanied by its corresponding
consequences. What a man does determines at every moment what he must do in future. What a man at one
moment thinks, feels, and does, must determine what he is to think, feel, and do in the next moment. There is
no power in heaven, on earth, or in hell, throughout the vast immeasurable universe, that can protect a man
from the consequences of his own deeds. He must reap what he sows. Neither by tears nor by prayers, neither
by hymns and songs of praise, nor by the mournful melody of a *Miserere*, can a man avoid the just
consequences of every wicked deed he has ever committed—much less by the vicarious sufferings or the
propitiatory sacrifice of another, even of a perfectly innocent person. In other words, Buddhism believes that
the law of moral responsibility is just as inviolable as any of the physical laws; as, for example, the laws of
gravitation and of the conservation of energy. Think you that you could violate one of these laws with
impunity? Just as little dare you imagine, says Buddhism, that your acts will not be accompanied by the
Corresponding consequences. Allow me to quote a few sentences bearing upon this point from the Buddhist
scriptures:

"The mind is the root, and actions spring from the mind. If a man acts from a pure and lofty mind, then joy
follows him as a perpetual shadow."

"The mind is the root, and actions spring from the mind. If a man acts from a base mind, sorrow will follow
him, as the wheel follows the step of the ox that draws the chariot."

"All that we are is the result of what we have thought, all is founded upon our thoughts. If a man speaks or
acts from a wicked mind, sorrow follows him, as the wheel the feet of him who draws the chariot."

"The wrong-doer is consumed in his own deeds, as though devoured by the flames."

"Unthinkingness is the path of death. The unthinking are already dead. The evil deed follows the fool, like
the fire glimmering beneath the ashes."

"Poison harms not him who has no wound, and for him who does no evil no evil exists."

"More than the sovereignty of the world, more than an ascent to heaven, more than universal power, is the
reward for the first step in the path of virtue."

"He who yields to pleasure of sense, who bridles not his inclinations, who knows no moderation in eating,
who is slothful and without resistance, will fall as easy a prey to Mara (temptation) as the decaying tree to the
wind."

"As the rain penetrates a badly-thatched roof, so passion penetrates the mind where meditation is
wanting."

"A man may a thousand times conquer a thousand men in battle, yet another who conquers himself is the
greatest victor."

"To conquer one's self is more than to conquer all men; not even a god, a gandharva (fairy), not Mara (the
evil one), can turn such a victory into a defeat."

"An evil deed does not change its nature as suddenly as milk; smoking it follows the fool, like fire that
glimmers beneath the ashes."

"Let no man despise sin and say: 'It will not overtake me.' The water-pot is filled by falling drops, and the
fool becomes full of evil, gathering it little by little."

"If one injures a harmless, pure, and innocent man, the evil recoils on the fool, like light dust thrown
against the wind."

"Neither in the air, nor in the depths of the sea, nor in the clefts, is there a place to be found where a man
can unburden himself of an evil deed."

"Let the wise man cleanse his soul from sin, as the refiner gradually purifies the silver from dross."

"The man who foolishly does me wrong, I will repay with my love without resentment; the more evil comes
from him, the more good shall go from me; the fragrance of these deeds will return to me, the evil in the
slanderer's words returns to him. For like the sound to the drum, the shadow to a body, so in the end evil
belongs to the wrong-doer."

"A bad man who abuses a good one is like a man who spits at the sky; he does not pollute the sky thereby,
but only soils himself. Again, he is like a man who throws dirt at another; if the wind be against him the dirt
falls back upon him who threw it. The virtuous man cannot be injured; the evil that another would do him
recoils upon the assailant."

"A man who gives himself up to pleasure, who does not strive after high wisdom, is like a vessel full of dirty
water in which are main-beautiful things; so soon as one shakes the water one cannot see the things it contains;
The Divinity speaks:

"I am the cause of the whole universe;
Through me it is created and dissolved;
On me all things within it hang suspended,
Like pearls upon a string. I am the light
In sun and moon, far, far beyond the darkness;
I am the brilliancy in flame, the radiance
In all that's radiant, and the light of lights,
The sound in ether, fragrance in the earth,
The seed eternal of existing things,
The life in all, the father, mother, husband, Forefather, and sustainer of the world,
Its friend and Lord. I am its way and refuge,
Its habitation and receptacle,
I am its witness. I am Victory
And Energy; I watch the universe
With eyes and face in all directions turned.
I dwell, as Wisdom, in the heart of all,
I am the Goodness of the good, I am
Beginning, Middle, End, eternal Time,
The Birth, the Death of all. I am the symbol A
Among the characters. I have created all
Out of one portion of myself."

(Prof. Monier Williams' translation)

This is indeed a wonderful intuition for those days! For do not all the results of our modern science, our theory of organic development, of the conservation of energy and the transmutation of force—do not all these confirm by the inductive method the insight of our forefathers?

What, now, are the two chief results at which we have gradually arrived? Without doubt, the unity of life (biological), and the unity of force (physical). If then life, force, or soul is one, so all phenomena—all beings, say the Hindus—are merely the modifications of one and the same soul, the modi of the same substance, as Spinoza would say, or as our modern physicists would express it, the transmutation of the same force, which sustains and permeates all things. When a force disappears here it reappears elsewhere, say our physicists; when a creature dies or perishes here it must reappear or be reborn in another form, say the Hindus. There is no such thing as extinction, no annihilation in the true sense of the word. The life of the universe, as a whole, is always complete. Starting from this idea of life and of the unity of the soul, the Hindu built up his cosmos entirely of moral elements, just as modern science builds up hers of atoms and atomic forces. Why does the world of phenomena, which we call the universe, exist? Because, says the Hindu, a balance yet remains to be closed out in the moral account books of the universe—because there is an Eternal Justice, which must, under all circumstances, be satisfied. The whole world, from the monad to the largest planet, exists because somewhere sin or injustice is to be found. If all were without sin, or as I said if all attained, like Buddha, "the highest felicity," or Nirvana, the world must cease; as the Hindus say, a mahakalpa or age of complete dissolution would begin, and the universe would return to the Eternal Soul from which it proceeded. I beg you to notice the grandeur of this conception.

Thus the doctrine of transmigration was principally borrowed from the Hindu religion, and Gautama accepted it, as Jesus accepted the idea of a final judgment.

The views regarding this doctrine which at this day prevail among educated people, or educated orthodox people, are childish and absurd; but beneath these absurdities there lies the recognition of a sublime truth which cannot fail to strike us: that there is in the universe an Eternal Justice, which rewards good and punishes evil, according to moral desert.

And if you meditate upon this matter you will find that the explanation offered by the doctrine of transmigration is, on the whole, more scientific, more reasonable, and more in agreement with the general facts and with the laws of nature, than the widely-spread notions of a local heaven and a local hell, such as are believed in by the Christians. It was impossible for Buddha to entertain ideas of that kind. He was born among a people with whom philosophy was a passion, and who displayed in it an acuteness of mental perception which excites the admiration of the keenest thinkers of Europe. Kapila, the founder of our S\#nkhya system, and one of the readiest and deepest thinkers who have ever lived, had preceded him.

Colebrook & I., 229.

In his youth—in that "period of storm and stress," when his giant mind was unfolding its mighty powers on all sides—when, with the passion of a lover and the devotion of a martyr, he was yearning after the light of truth, Buddha had studied with especial earnestness the great Hindu rationalists : a fact which sufficiently explains the indifference with which he persistently regarded certain theological questions which form the corner-stone of Christianity. What must have had still greater influence, however, than all his dialectical and philosophical studies, is the fact that he was born among a people who had long cultivated astronomy, a science
the progress of which puts clearly out of question the possibility of a local heaven or a local hell. In a lecture which I delivered a few months ago I spoke of the astronomical studies of the Hindus; to-day I can only say—and it is enough for our purpose—that our ancestors had at an early date arrived at the conclusion that this universe has neither beginning nor end, that the deep azure which fills us with wonder and reverence when we regard it in the solemn stillness of a summer midnight, is peopled not with angelic hosts who guard the boundaries of a heaven in which the Almighty sits upon a throne of gold, but with innumerable systems of worlds, each of which may be likened to our solar system, and in comparison to which our tiny earth sinks not only into complete insignificance, but rather to absolute nothingness, so to speak, to an atom of atoms.

See Lassen, "Indian Antiquities," and Whitney, "Śūraśādhwnta"

This conception of the infiniteness of the Cosmos, to which Europe has gradually been led by the labors of Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Newton, the Herschels (father and son), Kant, Laplace, and Leverrier, seems, at least in its chief features, to have dawned in the minds of the old Hindus. How, then, could the childish conceptions of a local heaven or a local hell find a place with them, when the entire firmament was dissolved into myriads of shining worlds?

The doctrine of transmigration contains, further, the presentiment of an important truth at which we have at length arrived through our biological studies, I mean the law of heredity. Those who are acquainted with the wonderful investigations of Darwin on this subject—or of Galton and Ribaut with special reference to our species—can scarcely refuse to draw the logical conclusions therefrom. Every organism, say they, is the total product of all the factors which have worked in former generations. Does not this sound like the Buddhist doctrine of transmigration? Both teachings point to a deep conviction of the immutability of law, a conception which Christianity rejects, or which she would fain deny. There is, however, this difference to be noticed, that while the Buddhist religion lays chief, or perhaps exclusive, stress upon moral elements, the modern biological law gives too much weight to the physical elements; and, secondly, while the latter points to the previous generations, or to our ancestors, as necessarily different from us, Buddhism understands by "earlier forms of life" those periods of existence through which we ourselves are presumed to have passed. We are what our ancestors have made us, say the biologists. We are what we have made ourselves in former births, say the Buddhists. And if we consider the matter more closely, may we not say in a certain sense, that we ourselves were present in our ancestors in a process of formation, so to speak, and are, therefore, logically responsible for what we have now become? Should I be what I am had not all my forefathers been exactly what they were, had not each of them inherited this or that peculiarity which has gradually been concentrated in my individual organism? In a certain sense, then, I was really present in an ancestor who lived three thousand years ago—as concerns myself personally, perhaps in a Vedic lyrist, who, bathing at early morn in the Sarasvat sang hymns to the praise of Usha (the Dawn)—even if not that which I now am. But what is this I that I now am? Am I what I was five years ago, or five days ago, or even five hours ago? But I fear you will say the Brahman is losing himself in his Sankliya subtleties.

This doctrine of transmigration is not exclusively a Buddhist or Hindu doctrine. It had its adherents among the Greek philosophers, and, strangely enough, in both its serious and ridiculous forms. Simonides of Amorgos (not of Cos) who is said to have lived 640 years B.C., in a satirical poem upon women, ascribes the different characters of the fair sex to the various pre-existences of women. For example, he says that the cunning woman is descended from the fox, the talkative woman from the dog, the uncleanly woman from an animal I need scarcely name, from the pig, etc. Pythagoras, the well-known philosopher of Samos, was the advocate of the serious side of this question. Xenophanes, the founder of the Eclectic school and a contemporary of Pythagoras, relates that the latter, on seeing a man beating a dog, interfered in its favor, saying: "In this animal there dwells the soul of one of my friends, whom I recognise by his voice." He also believed that his own soul had formerly inhabited the body the Trojan Euphorbus, the son of Panthous, slain by Menelaus, and stated, in proof of his assertion, that he had at once recognised the shield of Euphorbus, which had been deposited in the temple of Juno at Argos, and dedicated to the goddess by Menelaus.


Strangely enough, similar things are related of Buddha in the legends. According to one of these he passed through five hundred forms of life. He had been a bird, a stag, an elephant, etc., before he came in the flesh as son of Sudhodana. Other legends say that he had passed through every form of existence in earth, sea, and air, and that he had fulfilled all the conditions of all the ages. For this reason it was easy for him to win the sympathy of all creatures and of all the worlds, for whose salvation he was to offer himself. This transmigration through various in-carnations is another idea borrowed from the Hindus. The ten Avatars or incarnations of the Hindus are well-known. How near all this comes to the modern scientific theory of the gradual evolution of the entire organic world, which is now causing so much disturbance in our mental atmosphere, and whose most thorough-going speculative adherents maintain that the greatest man—let us say a Plato or a Goethe—is nothing but the gradual development of a moner, a plastidule, or, if you like, of a monad or an atom.
I trust that I have now give you a tolerably clear notion of what *karma*, or the principle of moral responsibility, means in Buddhism, and of the doctrine of transmigration with which it is connected. Indeed, *karma* seems to occupy the same place in this religion that God and Immortality have taken in the Christian religion. Permit me to cite here what the Siamese priest says upon this point: "There is no God who judges actions and dispenses reward and punishment, but reward and punishment are simply the inevitable consequence of *karma*, which works of itself."

In other words, Buddhism is a religion in the sense in which your noble philosopher, Fichte, once said: "The existence of moral sentiments and relations, that is, the moral order of the universe, is God." It was this religion which filled with bliss the heart of Immanuel Kant, as he penned the concluding lines of his "Critique of Practical Reason":—

"Two things fill the mind with new and ever-increasing admiration and awe, the oftener and the more uninterruptedly it is employed in meditating upon them: the starry heaven above me, and the moral law in me. I may not seek after or merely conjecture either, as being veiled in obscurity, or in the transcendent, beyond my sphere of vision; I see them before me, and connect them immediately with the consciousness of my existence. The first begins at that place which I occupy in the outer world of the senses, and extends the connexion in which I stand into the immeasurably vast, with worlds upon worlds and systems upon systems, and, besides this, into the boundless times of their periodical motion, its beginning and continuance. The second begins at my invisible Self, my personality, and places me in a world which has true infinitude, but is only perceptible to the understanding, and with which (but thereby also at the same time with all those visible worlds) I recognise that I stand in a general and necessary connexion, and not, as before, in a merely casual connexion. The first prospect, of a countless throng of worlds, destroys my importance as an animal creature, which must give back the matter of which it is formed to the planet (a mere point in the universe) after being a short time (one knows not how) endowed with vital powers. The second, on the other hand, raises my worth as an intelligence, infinite through my personality, in which the moral law reveals to me a life independent of the animal world, and even of the entire world of the senses."

It was this religion which was in the mind of another philosopher of your country when he wrote the following words:—

"Forget not for a single instant that thou art a man, and not a mere natural being; not for a single instant that others are likewise men, that is to say, with all their individual differences, are the same as thou, with the same necessities and claims as thou—this is the sum of all morality.

"Forget not for a single instant that thou and all that thou perceivest in thee and around thee, all that happens to thee and others, is no unconnected fragment, no wild chaos of atoms and accidents, but that it all proceeds according to eternal laws from the one fountain of all life, all reason and all goodness—this is the sum of religion."

Strass, "The Old Faith and the New."

I need not name him; I am almost afraid to do so, for his name is still very unpopular in many circles. He is cried down as an Atheist, not only by the orthodox party, which were easy to understand and to forgive, but also by the so-called Freethinkers, who deem that he goes much too far. But the hated optician of Amsterdam—the wretched man—as Leibnitz called him, on whose forehead all men of that epoch read the unmistakable mark of damnation, became, in a later century, a "God-intoxicated man," as Novalis calls him, and no less a man than Schleiermacher pronounced him sainted, "whose love was the Infinite, his beginning and his end." So wonderful, oftentimes, are the changes which take place in this world, and yet foolish humanity scarcely seems to have become wiser by all this experience.

Allow me to add a few words respecting the charge of Atheism which is so frequently brought against Buddhism. Atheism is one of those words which it is difficult, and I might say, almost impossible to define. I cannot help wondering that in our days of the most surprising readiness with the pen, no one has set himself the task of writing a History of Atheism, and of showing that there is probably not a single great man, not a single moral or religious reformer, not a single eminent philosophical thinker, who has not suffered more or less under this accusation—how from Kapila and Anaxagoras, to Renan and Stuart Mill, the churches have never wearied of hurling their anathemas against such men. Even Jesus was, as you know, called a blasphemer. Alexander Von Humboldt is in many circles to this day an Atheist, yet everyone who reads his "Cosmos" must feel himself elevated and inspired by the reverential piety (there is no more fitting word for it), which finds expression in this wonderful book, and which permeates it from one end to the other. The Hindus (that is to say, the strictly orthodox among them) regard those who do not believe in their thirty-three million gods, and especially in their Trimurti, or Trinity, as blasphemous infidels, and, as you well know, their Christian brethren in Europe do not act far otherwise. The Africans of Loango and Ujiji would promptly condemn both Christians and Hindus as Atheists of the first water, since they would refuse adoration to the negroes' fetishes. The Fijians are, without doubt (or were till lately), the cruellest, most bloodthirsty, and most inhuman cannibals on the face
of the globe. "Adulterer," "woman-stealer," "brain-eater," are among them titles of honor. Their gods are said to resemble them exactly, and to commit similar deeds. These gods live, besides, on the nicely-broiled souls (for with them the "souls" are material), of those whom their worshippers have eaten. Their neighbors, the Samoans, are, according to all accounts, far more humane, far more virtuous, in a word, far more human, than they, and are yet much less religious. How, then, do the pious Fijians regard their godless neighbors? Sir John Lubbock, in his well-known work "Pre-historic Times," says, p. 357: "The Fijians looked upon the Samoans with horror, because they had no religion nor belief in any such deities as the Fijian, nor any of the sanguinary rites which prevailed in other islands."

With regard to these facts the great English philosopher, Herbert Spencer, remarks: "The ferocious Fijian doubtless thinks that to devour a human victim in the name of one of his cannibal gods is a meritorious act, while he thinks that his Samoan neighbor, who makes no sacrifice to these cannibal gods, but is just and kind towards his fellows, thereby shows that meanness goes along with his shocking irreligion."


Jackson, an Englishman who was wicked enough to behave to some of these gods with less than due reverence, was angrily designated by them "the white infidel." A whole series of lectures could indeed be given casting light upon these different forms of Atheism and the causes which lie at the root of them.

Regarded from the standpoint of Christianity, which cannot conceive of a religion without a supernatural god or a supernatural future life, Buddha, then, was really an Atheist; but what eminent thinker or re former was, or is not, an Atheist in this sense? But if by Religion we mean that deep, living faith in those eternal ideas which we name Truth, Justice, and Goodness, the firm, unalterable conviction of their triumph among mankind, collectively as well as individually, if religion, I say, means accordingly (in practical life) the firm, enthusiastic resolve, which strives under all circumstances to live, even in our daily occupations, in perfect agreement with these ideas, then Buddhism can never be called Atheism, but rather a Religion in the truest and broadest sense of the word. And that Buddhism or Buddha lays especial and repeated stress upon these ideas—nay, lays the very greatest stress upon them—not even the most irreconcilable foes of this religion have been able to dispute. I will first quote Max Muller, but without accepting the definition of Nirvana which he gives in the first sentence:—

"How a religion which taught the annihilation of all existence, of all thought, of all individuality and personality as the highest object of all endeavors, could have laid hold of the minds of millions of human beings, and how, at the same time, by enforcing the duties of morality, justice, kindness, and self-sacrifice, it could have exercised a decidedly beneficial influence not only on the natives of India, but on the lowest barbarians of Central Asia, is a riddle which no one has been able to solve."


Again: "That moral code taken by itself, is one of the most perfect which the world has ever known. On this point all testimonies from hostile and from friendly quarters agree."

Ibid, vol. i., p. 221.

In accordance with this declaration, I will now cite a few witnesses, hostile as well as friendly, in order that you may see how Buddha and Buddhism are judged by different critics. Let us first hear Eugène Burnouf, who may be called the founder of Buddhist research in Europe:—

"I do not hesitate to translate by charity the word maitri, which expresses not friendship or the particular sentiment of affection which a man experiences for one or for several of his fellows, but that universal sentiment which renders us benevolent to all men in general and ever disposed to succor them."


I will next let Barthélémy St. Hilaire speak, who, though he seems never to tire of stigmatising Buddhism as "Atheism," "Nihilism," "Materialism," "Fatalism," etc., nevertheless expresses himself thus concerning Buddha:—

"I do not hesitate to say that, Christ alone excepted, there is to be found among founders of religions no figure more pure, more touching than that of Buddha. His life is without fault. His constant heroism equals his conviction, and if the theory he propounds is false, the personal example he gives is irreproachable. He is the perfected model of all the virtues he preaches. His abnegation, his charity, his unruffled sweetness are never laid aside a single instant. At the age of twenty-nine he abandons the court of his royal father to lead a religious life and become a mendicant. He silently prepares his doctrine by six years of retreat and meditation. He propagates it by the sole force of speech and persuasion during more than half a century; and when he dies in the arms of his disciples, it is with the serenity of a sage who has practised the good all his life, and who is assured of having found the true."


Further, two celebrated English writers on Buddhism speak thus of the Dhammapadam or Gospel of the Buddhists:—
"In the Dhammapadam we have exemplified a code of morality and a list of precepts which for purity, excellence, and wisdom is only second to that of the divine lawgiver himself."


"A collection might be made from the precepts of this work, that in the purity of its ethics could scarcely be equalled from any other heathen author."

"Hardy," i., p. 169.

Lord Amberley, in a clever comparison between Confucius, Buddha, and Christ, makes the following remarks:—

"Of these three men it would, perhaps, be accurate to say that Confucius was the most thoughtful, Sakyamuni the most eminently virtuous, and Christ the most deeply religious. The Hindu, as depicted in his biographies, offers a character of singular beauty, free from some of the defects which may be discerned in that of the Jew. . . . All we can affirm is that, assuming the pictures of both prophets to be correctly drawn, there is in Sakyamuni a purity of tone, an absence of violence or rancour, and exemption from personal feeling and from hostile bias, which place him even on a higher level than his Jewish fellow prophet."


Lastly, Carl Friedrich Kœppen, in his celebrated work, "Die Religion des Buddha:"—

"We could fill many pages were we to collect the honorable testimonies which have been borne to the Buddhist ethics, the pureness of its motives, the spirit of unselfishness, kindness, and meekness which pervades it, from the most diverse sources, from learned investigators, historians, and travellers, even from persons whose impartiality could scarcely have been counted upon, from the missionaries."

I close my quotations with these words of Kœppen, which say exactly what I wanted to say, and refer those who wish to study the matter more fully to the work itself.

Now, gentlemen, when a religion inculcates such sublime virtues, and, according to the testimony of both friend and foe, has had such an ennobling influence upon the races (some of them the savages and most barbarous upon the face of the earth) by whom it has been accepted, it must surely be named divine, and if pure Atheism can produce such fruit, you will certainly be inclined to cry with me, "Hail, O Atheism!"—especially if you are acquainted with the history of the various Theistic and Monotheistic religions, and remember what fearful, unheard-of cruelties the two Semitic religions—Christianity and Mahommedanism—have perpetrated during long centuries in the name of God. I will merely remind you of the persecution of the Albigenses, of the Lollards, and of the Jews in the Middle Ages; of the burning of Arnold of Brescia, Jerome of Prague, John Huss, Giordano Bruno, Campanella, Yanini, Savonarola, and the physician Servetus, condemned and burned by Calvin at Geneva on account of his denial of the Holy Trinity; I would remind you further of the glorious Pope Alexander VI. and of the glorious Borgia family, of which he was a member; of Catherine of Medici and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew—enough of horrors 1—and then I ask you: Are all these tokens of the divinity of the religion in question? Llorente, the well-known author of the "History of the Spanish Inquisition," gives us the following figures, which cannot be read without a shudder:—

In the space of eighteen years Torquemada and his hangmen are said to have burned 10,220 persons at the stake, and 6,860 in effigy, and to have otherwise punished 97,321. Further, the Holy Inquisition is said to have punished, between the years 1481 and 1808, in all 340,000 persons, of whom about 32,000 were burned.

These are facts, gentlemen, on which one could write volumes, and on which volumes have been written. And now just consider, that these deeds, or rather crimes, were perpetrated by people who claimed to be in the sole possession—to have a monopoly, so to speak—of the Divinity and the Sanctuary, and who denounced as impious Atheists all religions and sects who would not acknowledge this, and, where the opportunity presented itself, burned or suffered to rot thousands of such Atheists! On the other hand, similar proceedings are never related of Buddhism—not even by the missionaries, who always depreciate Buddhism and Hinduism in order to glorify their own religion. Buddhism seems always to have trodden the diametrically opposite path of kindness and gentleness, and in this manner to have gained its ascendency over a large proportion of the human race (it is well-known that Buddhists outnumber the adherents of any other religion), and to have exercised an altogether elevating influence over them. Of these two pictures, look first upon this and then upon that, and then tell me which is the higher, the more divine; which stands nearer to those eternally unchangeable ideas which Plato has termed divine, and for which his Master laid down his life? If the slaying of Jesus, "The tree is known by its fruit," be correct, what must be our judgment of Buddhism, which has borne such beautiful, such noble fruit? Must it not be that it is the loftiest, the sublimest, the divinest religion of the world, and that he who gave the world such a doctrine from the inmost recesses of his being must have been full of the Highest, of the Divine, whatever may be the name we may give to the Highest:
“Call it, then, what thou wilt,—
Call it Bliss! Heart! Love! God!
I have no name to give it!
Feeling is all in all!
The Name is sound and smoke,
Obscuring Heaven's clear glow.”

Appendix.

Nirvana.

From the "Gegenwart," 1877, No. 7.

Since I have been residing in Europe I have often had occasion to remark, with surprise as well as pleasure, how uncommonly warm is the interest with which the educated classes in England and Germany regard the two religions of my native land, Hinduism and Buddhism. I have been repeatedly asked to give them all the information I can on the subject; and when, in the course of conversation, I took the liberty to impugn the impartiality of some of the views expressed, to repudiate many, and to more or less modify the greater number of the ideas which obtain in these two countries respecting the above religions, I was regarded half with surprise and half with suspicion. This was particularly the case when the subject was one of the vital doctrines of Buddhism, the much-discussed question of Nirvana. The interest which this doctrine has excited is doubtless justified, since it may be said to form the corner-stone of Buddhism, or, as I have more than once mentioned in my public lectures, Nirvana occupies a position in the life and teachings of Buddha corresponding to that held by the "Kingdom of God" in the life and teachings of Christ.

The following extract, relating to this important question, from the Milinda Pracna, a Pali work, may therefore be of interest to the readers of the "Gegenwart." The work in question is supposed to have been written shortly before the Christian era. (See "Eastern Monachism," by Spence Hardy.) From this translation it is evident that Nirvana does not mean "the extinction of the flame of existence," as is commonly maintained, but rather "a perception of the mind; the pure, joyful Nirvana, free from ignorance and evil desire"—that, in truth, it signifies merely that exalted state of mental consciousness of which the poet sings so beautifully and with such deep meaning:

"The wild desires no longer win us,
The deeds of passion cease to chain;
The love of God revives within us,
The love of Man revives again."

Goethe, "Faust," Part I.

Extract from the "Milinda Pracna."

Milinda, or Menandor, a GraecoBactrian king, who reigned at Sagala in the Punjaub, shortly before the Christian era, and who was converted to Buddhism.

(Conversation between a King and a Buddhist Missionary.)

King MILINDA: You speak of Nirvana; but can you show it me, or explain it to me through the color, whether it be blue, yellow, red, or any other color; or by sign, place, length, method, metaphor, causality, or order; through one of these means, or in one of these manners, can you explain it to me?

MISSIONARY NAGASENA: I cannot explain it through one of these attributes or qualities.

MILINDA: I really cannot believe that.

NAGASENA: There is the great ocean. If anyone should ask you how many measures of water are there, or how many living creatures it contains, what would you say?

MILINDA: I should say that it was not a proper question; for it is one that no one can answer.

NAGASENA: In the same way one cannot give the size, form, color, or the other attributes of Nirvana, although it possesses its peculiar and proper character. A rishi (saint) might be able to answer the question I put; but he could not explain the properties of Nirvana, nor could any deva (god) of the invisible world.
Milinda: It might be true that Nirvana was happiness, and that its outward qualities were indescribable; but could not one portray its excellencies or benefits by any manner of comparison?

Nagaseña: It is like the lotus-flower, freed from its pain, like the lotus-flower freed from the mire in which it originates. It is like water, in that it extinguishes the fire of pain, like the water that refreshes the body; it overpowers the thirst after that which is bad, as water overpowers the natural thirst. It is like a medicine, in that it helps those who suffer from the poison of pain, as medicine those who suffer from diseases; it also removes the pain of repeated existence, as medicine removes disease; further, it renders us immortal, as medicine wards off death. It is like the sea—it is free from the impurity of pain, as the sea from every kind of rottenness; it is unmeasured, infinite, so that countless beings till it not, as the sea is unfathomable and cannot be filled by the waters of all the streams of Indus. It is like space, in that it is not begotten by any outward cause, it dies not, disappears not, is not begotten; it has no locality; it is the abode of the Arahats (those who occupy the next place to the Buddhas) and of the Buddhas, as space is the abode of the birds; it cannot remain hid, and its extension is endless. It is like the Maháméru (a mountain which plays a very important part in the Indian myths and traditions, like Olympus among the Greeks), in that it is higher than the three worlds, its summit is difficult to attain; and as seed cannot thrive on the surface of a rock, so neither can pain in Nirvana; further, it is free from hatred and from anger.

He says further:—

One cannot say that it is begotten, nor that it is not begotten; that it is the past, the present, or the future; nor can one say that it is the sight of the eye, or the hearing of the ear, or the smelling of the nose, or the tasting of the tongue, or the feeling of the body.

Milinda: Then you are talking of a thing which does not exist. You merely say that Nirvana is Nirvana; consequently there is no Nirvana.

Nagaseña: Great king! Nirvana is; it is a perception of the mind; the pure, joyful, Nirvana, free from ignorance and evil desire; it is perceived by the Arahats, who enjoy the fruits of the paths.

Milinda: If there is any comparison by which one could render comprehensible the nature or the properties of Nirvana, then have the kindness to explain it in this manner.

Nagaseña: There is the wind; but could one define its color—could one say that it is in a certain place, or that it is small or great, long or short?

Milinda: One cannot say that it is begotten, nor that it is not begotten; that it is the past, the present, or the future; nor can one say that it is the sight of the eye, or the hearing of the ear, or the smelling of the nose, or the tasting of the tongue, or the feeling of the body.

Milinda: One cannot say that the wind is thus or thus; it cannot be taken in the hand and crushed. And yet the wind is. We perceive it in that it fills our breast, beats against our body, and moves the trees of the forest; but one cannot explain its nature, nor how it really is.

Nagaseña: Exactly thus it is with Nirvana, in that it removes the infinite pain of the world, and presents itself as the chief felicity of the world, but its attributes or qualities cannot be explained.
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Bishop Mcquaid and Francis E. Abbot.
Published By The Free Religious Association, Boston: No. 1 Tremont Place. 1876. Cochrane & Sampson, Printers, 9 Bromfield Street.

Preliminary Note.

The Free Religious Association, having charge of what are known in Boston as the "Horticultural Hall Lectures," invites to its platform men whose faiths so widely differ that no other platform, distinctively religious, is apt to welcome them to equal rights. That is what the Association is for. It earnestly tries to stand for Freedom and Fellowship in Religion: its objects, as stated in its Constitution, being "to promote the practical interests of pure religion, to increase fellowship in the spirit, and to encourage the scientific study of man's religious nature and history; and to this end all persons interested in these objects are cordially invited to its membership."

One of the subjects selected for this winter was the question on which Roman Catholic citizens are taking ground so generally against their fellow-citizens,—that of the Right and Justice of our long-established Public School System. No question is more certain to be decided with snap-judgments by the thoughtless on both sides, and with prejudice even by the thoughtful. It was believed that a calm discussion between two able men, each stating squarely the strongest argument for his own side, would help both sides to see more fairly what the
Catholic's sense of justice is demanding, what the demand involves, and what real justice sanctions in the matter. No man represents the Roman Catholic's view better than the Bishop who so courteously consented to come from Rochester, N.Y., to give the first lecture here printed; and no one more strongly represents the opposite view than the Editor of the "Index," who, on the following Sunday, gave the second lecture. The two lectures have been, or will be, printed separately. But is is much to be hoped that they will be widely circulated and read together,—especially that the non-Catholic will read and ponder the Bishop's plea, and that as generally the Catholic will read and ponder the Editor's. After one of the lectures a friend came up to us and praised the Free Religious Association for giving the public the chance to hear both sides: "And now to-day," we said to him," the speaker has been listened to by an audience, most of them opposed to his and your views; how is it with your people,—are they as willing in turn to listen to the other side?" The shoulders shrugged: "Why, no," said he; "what other side is there?" He offered reasons, too; but that is the spirit which all American citizens, whether they call themselves "Catholic" or "Liberal," are equally concerned to avoid and to rebuke. That is the spirit which makes the danger.

The Public School Question,

As Understood by the Catholic American Citizen.
A Lecture By Bishop Mcquaid,
OF ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
DELIVERED IN BOSTON, Feb. 13, 1876.

I WISH to say that I am here as a Catholic American citizen, speaking only for myself and my country, and in no way responsible for Mexico, South America, Spain, or any other country in the world.

The School Question is engrossing more and more the attention of all classes in the country. President Grant devotes a portion of his annual message to the subject, and calls for yet larger consideration of it by the Legislatures of the States. Politicians worry and fret over it, not knowing how the current may chance to run, and, consequently, which course they should take. Ministers and editors, from pulpit and press, flood the country with their learning and wisdom, well spiced with warnings and threats to all who dare differ from them. And yet the last to be heard and consulted is the one to whom the settlement of the question, first and finally, belongs,—the parent of the child.

The School Question to be Settled By Parents.

The father may listen to well-meant good advice; his fears may be excited by denunciations of impending peril for himself and offspring.; laws may be enacted to interfere with his natural rights; he may be mulcted through his purse, and harassed in many ways; his neighbors may turn against him: yet, in despite of all, the responsibility of the education of his child falls on him and on no one else. He may be assisted in his work by others, if so he will, but in accordance with his will and choice, and not according to the conscience of his neighbors or of his fellow-citizens.

Parental Rights Before State Rights.

Parental rights precede State rights. Indeed, as the Declaration of Independence has it, Governments are instituted to secure man's inalienable rights; and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. A father's right to the pursuit of happiness extends to that of his children as well. This happiness is not restricted to material and earthly enjoyment, but reaches to everything conducive to joy, pleasure, contentment of mind and soul, in this world and the next, if the father believes in a future life.

Parental Rights And Duties According to Common Law.

Parental rights include parental duties and responsibilities before God and society. The common law is explicit on this point, as Blackstone and Kent assert: "A parent may, under circumstances, be indicted at common law for not supplying an infant child with necessaries."—(Chitty on Blackstone,)

"During the minority of a child . . . the parent is absolutely bound to provide reasonably for his maintenance and education, and he may be sued for necessaries furnished, and schooling given, to a child under just and reasonable circumstances."—(Kent's Com., Vol. II., p. iv.; Lec. XXIX.)

The Common Law Defined by Judge Lewis.
The rights of parents are strongly and clearly defined by Judge Ellis Lewis, in "Commonwealth vs. Armstrong, Lycoming County, Pa., August Session, 1842." The Judge, having sent his decision to Chancellor Kent, received in reply an approval of its correctness, and of the reasoning on which it was based. In this opinion Judge Lewis says: "The authority of the father results from his duties. He is charged with the duty of maintenance and education. . . . The term 'education' is not limited to the ordinary instruction of the child in the pursuits of literature: it comprehends a proper attention to the moral and religious sentiments of the child. In the discharge of this duty, it is the undoubted right of the father to designate such teachers either in morals, religion, or literature, as he shall deem best calculated to give correct instruction to his child." In sustainment of his opinion, the Judge quotes from Horry, Prof, of Moral Philosophy, from Dr. Adam Clarke, from Paley, and from Dr. Wayland, who, in his Moral Philosophy, writes: "The right of the parent is to command,—the duty of the child is to obey. . . . The relation is established by our Creator. . . . The duty of parents is to educate their children in such a manner as they (the parents) believe will be most for their future happiness, both temporal and eternal. . . . With his duty in this respect no one has a right to interfere. . . . While he exercises his parental duties within their prescribed limits, he is, by the law of God, exempt from interference both from individuals and from society." After citing these authorities and various passages of the sacred Scriptures, the Judge goes on to say: "It is the duty of the parent to regulate the conscience of the child by proper attention to its education; and there is no security for the offspring during the tender years of its minority, but in obedience to the authority of its parents in all things not injurious to its health or morals."

BY THE SUPREME COURT OF WISCONSIN.

The Supreme Court of Wisconsin, in 1874, went so far in maintenance of parental rights, that it gave to a father the right to decide for his son what branches of elementary studies embraced in the school curriculum he should not follow, against the will and decision of the teacher and the school committee. The Court based its judgment on these indefeasible parental rights embodied in the common law.

DOES THE CHILD BELONG TO THE STATE?

It is the Christian view of parental rights and duties which is here given. It is presented under the supposition, that, however great in these United States the diminution of Christians in point of numbers, there may be left enough to constitute an important part of the population, with rights warranted by the natural, the divine, and the common law, worthy of consideration. The doctrine coming into vogue, that the child belongs to the State, is the dressing up of an old skeleton of Spartan Paganism, with its hideousness dimly disguised by a thin cloaking of Christian morality. The most despotic governments of Europe illustrate the fruits of the doctrine, by making every one of their subjects an armed soldier for the butchering of fellow creatures in neighboring States, under the forms of legalized warfare.

THE EVANGELICAL CHRISTIAN'S AUTHORITY FOR PARENTAL DUTIES.

The Evangelical Christian, who believes in the revealed word of God, reads in the sacred Book the teachings of his Master on the respective duties of parent and child, and regards these teachings as the law of his life:—

"Children, obey your parents in the Lord; for this is just."
"Honor thy father and thy mother; which is the first commandment with a promise;"
"That it may be well with thee, and thou mayst be long lived on earth."
"And you, fathers, provoke not your children to anger; but bring them up in the discipline and correction of the Lord." Ephes. vi. 1-4.
"Children, obey your parents in all things; for this is well-pleasing to the Lord." Col. iii. 20.

THE CATHOLIC CHRISTIAN'S AUTHORITY.

The Catholic Christian, taught to hear the Church which is commissioned to teach all divine truths with infallible certainty, learns that he cannot neglect the care and education of his children without grievous sin; that their religious instruction demands his chief thought; and that to expose them to danger in faith or morals, in schools or elsewhere, would bring on him the just anger of God, and punishment hereafter. He knows that an education which excludes God, and is confined to material thoughts and interests, is one of which for his children he cannot approve.
How the Catholic Conscience is Formed.

On the natural law, and on the law divinely revealed, and presented to him by God's chosen agent—the Church—does the Catholic form his conscience. He does not expect that his conscientious convictions in matters of religion will please others: no more is he pleased with the professed creeds of the majority of his fellow-citizens. These form their conscience on grounds satisfactory to them; he forms his on grounds still more satisfactory to him. "The divine law," says Newman, "is the rule of ethical truth, the standard of right and wrong; a sovereign, irreversible, absolute authority in the presence of men and angels." "The divine law," says Cardinal Gousset, "is the supreme rule of actions; our thoughts, desires, words, acts, all that man is, is subject to the domain of the law of God; and this law is the rule, of our conduct by means of our conscience. Hence it is never lawful to go against our conscience."

"Conscience," says Newman, "is not a long-sighted selfishness, nor a desire to be consistent with one's self; but it is a messenger from Him, who, in nature and in grace, speaks to us behind a veil, and teaches and rules us by his representatives. Conscience is the aboriginal Vicar of Christ, a prophet in its informations, a monarch in its peremptoriness, a priest in its blessings and anathemas; and, even though the eternal priesthood throughout the Church could cease to be, in it the sacerdotal principle would remain and would have sway."

The theory of freedom of conscience guaranteed by the Constitution as a right is conceded to the Catholic by Secularist and Evangelical. The wording of the Constitution, and our loud boasting, at home and abroad, of liberty of conscience as a special privilege of democratic government, demand this concession. Theory and practice clash. The Constitution rules that all shall be free to follow the dictates of conscience, provided there is no encroachment on the freedom of others. The majority of the people rule, by the power of numbers, that a large minority shall not be free to educate their children according to their conscience.

The Catholic Conscience Should Be Free.

Having proved that the Catholic conscience is founded on the natural and the revealed law, protected in its right by the common law and the Constitution of the United States, the claim that Catholic parents should be untrammelled in the exercise of parental duties brings me to the consideration of school education as affecting this conscience.

It is conceded by Free Religionists, by the ablest of the secular press, by many representative ministers of the Evangelical churches and by large numbers of the people, that to tax Catholics, Jews, and Infidels for schools in which the Bible is read and religious exercises are held, is a wrong, an act of injustice, a form of tyranny. So understanding the case, the cities of Troy, Rochester, Cincinnati and Chicago, have forbidden religious exercises of any description in their common schools. This is a confession that would not have been made thirty years ago. It is a partial reparation of the past. Especially is it a warning to Boards of Education in other places to cease inflicting this mode of religious persecution on citizens who object to any kind of religion, or to the peculiar kind prevailing in their schools. Mr. Beecher says: "It is not right or fair to tax Catholics or Jews for the support of schools in which the Bible is read." His congregation applauded the saying. If it is not right, it is wrong, and Catholics who are thus taxed are, to the extent of the taxes they pay, punished,—persecuted for religion's sake.

Infringement of Conscience Is Persecution.

Judge Taft, in giving his opinion in the Superior Court of Cincinnati, in the case of Minor et al., vs. Board of Education of Cincinnati, expressed his judgment as follows:

"We have this unequivocal evidence of the reality of their conscientious scruples, that, when they have paid the school tax, which is not a light one, they give up the privilege of sending their children, rather than that they should be educated in what they hold to be, and what, without the adoption of one or both of these resolutions, must be fairly held to be, Protestant schools. This is too large a circumstance to be covered up by the Latin phrase de minimis non curat lex, to which resort is sometimes had. These Catholics are constrained every year to yield to others their right to one-third of the school money, a sum of money averaging not less than $200,000, every year, on conscientious grounds. That is to say, these people are punished every year for believing as they do, to the extent of $200,000; and to that extent those of us who send our children to these excellent common schools become beneficiaries of the Catholic money. We pay for our privileges so much less than they actually cost."

I quote this distinguished authority to justify the exceedingly strong accusation made a moment ago.
THE STATE HAS NO RIGHT TO EDUCATE.

The Catholic, however, is equally unwilling to transfer the responsibility of the education of his children to the State. His conscience informs him that the State is an incompetent agent to fulfil his parental duties. While the whisperings of his conscience are clear and unmistakable in their dictates, it pleases him to hear what others, non-Catholics, have to say on this important aspect of the subject.

The late Gerrit Smith, whose character as an able and fearless philanthropist I need not dwell on, in a letter of Nov. 5, 1873, to Chas. Stebbins, of Cazenovia, and intended for publication, says: "The meddling of the State with the school is an impertinence little less than its meddling with the church. A lawyer, than whom there is not an abler in the land, and who is as eminent for integrity as for ability, writes me: 'I am against the Government's being permitted to do anything which can be intrusted to individuals under the equal regulation of general laws.' But how emphatically should the school be held to be the concern and care of individuals instead of the Government! It is not extravagant to say that Government is no more entitled to a voice in the school than in the church. Both are, or ought to be, religious institutions; and in the one important respect that the average scholar is of a more plastic and docile age than the average attendant on the church, the school has greatly the advantage of the church."

The views of Gerritt Smith and of the Catholic parent coincide in a remarkable degree.

HERBERT SPENCER ON THE SAME SUBJECT.

Another authority will, I trust, be equally acceptable to my hearers. Herbert Spencer, in the chapter on National Education in "Social Statics," thus writes: "In the same way that our definition of State duty forbids the State to administer religion or charity, so likewise does it forbid the State to administer education. Inasmuch, as the taking away by Government, of more of a man's property than is needful for maintaining his rights, is an infringement, and therefore a reversal of the Government's function toward him, and inasmuch as the taking away of his property to educate his own or other people's children is not needful for the maintaining of his rights, the taking away of his property is wrong." Mr. Spencer then goes on to prove his proposition, and refute objections brought against it by various classes of objectors, thus: "The reasoning which is held to establish the right to intellectual food, will equally well establish the right to material food; nay, will do more,—will prove that children should be altogether cared for by the Government. For if the benefit, importance, or necessity of education be assigned as a sufficient reason why Government should educate, then may the benefit, importance, or necessity of food, clothing, shelter and warmth be assigned as a sufficient reason why Government should administer them also. So that the alleged right cannot be established without annulling all parental authority whatever." The destruction of parental authority, and the uselessness of mere intellectual education as a preventive of crime, are the chief points he makes against State interference with schools.

THE "JOURNAL OF COMMERCE" ON THE SAME.

"The only remedy," says the Journal of Commerce of New York, "we see in the future for the evils which are admitted, is to be found in the entire separation of the educational process from State authority. If this has been found wisest and best in matters of religion, why not in relation to all forms of education? Youth needs the higher sanction of religion in every department of culture, and this cannot be secured in a State school where there is no State church."

It can scarcely be said that the interference or noninterference of the State in school education is an open question. By concession on the part of the large majority of the population, liberty to interfere is granted. This liberty in no way includes the right so to take part in the education of children that the just and inalienable rights of parents shall be sacrificed. I have dwelt on the argument of parental rights because the assumption of the State to control education, and the indifference of many parents to this assumption, encourage the supposition that all the right is in the State and none in the parent.

COMMON SCHOOLS BEGAN ON A RELIGIOUS BASIS.

In the gradual establishment of State schools the element of religious instruction always had a place of honor. The Constitutions of your New England States, and in a very remarkable degree those of Massachusetts and Connecticut, recognize God, religion, virtue, and morality. The departure of modern methods has been from the old and sound ways of the founders of the Republic, both as respects the religious element in the education of the young, and the duty of parents to bear the burden of their children's education. The Western
States copied the Constitutions of the older States, and, like them, included morality and religion as essential parts of a sound education; but, falling into the prevailing error, learned to exclude God and religious instruction from their schools.

**HAS EDUCATION YET DECREASED CRIME?**

Now, hear their piteous lamentation: "Did not the advocates of our free school system," says Mr. Hopkins, Superintendent of Schools in Indiana, "promise the people that if they would take on their shoulders the additional burden of taxation for its support, the same would be lightened by the diminution of crime? Is there any perceptible decrease of crime in Indiana? Is there any reasonable probability that there soon will be? It is becoming a grave question among those who take comprehensive views of the subject of education, whether this intellectual culture without moral is not rather an injury than a benefit. Is it not giving teeth to the lion and fangs to the serpent? That is the true system of training which adapts itself to the entire complex nature of the child. No free government can safely ignore this grave subject, for nations that lose their virtue soon lose their freedom." Here is a remarkable statement by a friendly pen in the hand of the chief official of the educational department of Indiana, whose testimony, therefore, must be admitted as of great weight. Mr. Hopkins has been reading the newspapers of the day, and, startled by the revelations of crime among the intellectual and educated classes, who use the advantages of school learning the better to defraud creditors, embezzle trust funds, rob banks, form conspiracies to cheat the government, and sell official honor for personal gain, is seeking some explanation of a condition of public and private morals that cannot continue without destroying the liberties of the Republic. He has hit on the right starting-point. Let him go on with his investigations, and fear not to disclose his discoveries.

**WHAT IS SECULARISM?**

Our argument is now with the Secularists, pure and simple. They point to their work accomplished and bid us to the feast of rejoicing. We do not answer to the call, and stand ready to give the reason that is in us.

What is meant by Secularism in schools? President Grant defines it to mean the exclusion from the schools of the teaching of any religious, atheistic or pagan tenet. Evidently the President has never been a school-teacher, or has never tried to teach anything save the multiplication table to a bright, intelligent boy, brought up in a Christian family, on the plan here laid down. Commanding armies, handling a hundred thousand armed men, is child's play in comparison. God, Christ, sin, conscience, religion, heaven, hell, would meet him at every turn, and to flank them successfully, without insinuating a Christian, a pagan, or an atheistic tendency of thought, would give him more trouble than he experienced in outflanking the strongest army that ever met him on his onward marches.

The Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, a staunch and zealous defender of Secularism, gives its explanation as follows: "Strictly speaking, a secular school should not inculcate the belief in an overruling Providence."

The teacher who honestly means to teach according to the principles of Secularism will find himself in continual embarrassment. If he but mentions the name of God, of Christ, with reverence, he leads his bright pupils to infer that such a Being exists; if he evades a question about God, he indicates doubt; if he speaks the name with a sneer on the lip, or a shrug of the shoulders, he inculcates to young, impressible minds his contempt for such a belief. Secularists must not attempt to escape the logic of their own demands. They ask, in the language of the President, the exclusion of all religious, atheistic and pagan tenets from State schools; and where this doctrine lands them, they must be pleased to stand. They scout the idea that merely excluding the Bible means Secularism. This is the vain hope of Evangelicals, and that with this concession they will be left free to make compilations from the Bible—elegant extracts—to keep up appearances. They do not comprehend the nature of the controversy. The dread of "popery" blinds them. They will not be let off without swallowing in all its bitterness this pill which they have helped prepare.

**EVANGELICALS OBJECT TO THE TERM "GODLESS."**

Yet some Evangelical friends have been wrathful with me and others for designating the common schools, according to the new law, as godless. I do not wish them to be godless; it is not the fault of Catholics that they are becoming godless. To leave our non-Catholic fellow-citizens free to settle the question of religious instruction in the schools to their own satisfaction, Catholics all over the country have provided, or they are providing, school accommodation for Catholic children, that the religious influences in these schools may be in harmony with the religious convictions of their patrons. Hardly had we made room in our own schools for all our Catholic children in the city of Rochester than the Board of Education of the city, with little ceremony, put
the Bible and all religious instruction out of the public schools. It was this Board that made the schools under their care, in reality, if not in name, godless.

**Liberal Christians and Secularists.**

The liberal Christian, led on by Henry Ward Beecher and a large body of clergymen of various Evangelical denominations, fancies that morals can be taught like good manners, on no higher ground or motive than the one of propriety or expediency. When interest, passion, the heart’s cravings, outweigh propriety and expediency, morals thus taught go by the board.

The Free Religionist is at least consistent: consistency is more than the liberal Evangelical Christian can claim. The former rejects the idea of a God-Creator, revelation and all supernatural truths. He is justified in asking that his child shall not have its mind tinctured with such errors during school hours. He is resolute to drive out of the schools which he is taxed to support, and to which he sends his children, the sectarianism of Evangelicalism; and he is equally determined to plant in them his pet c’ctrine, the sectarianism of Secularism. It is the usual reading of history that bodies of religionists never see themselves as others see them.

The religionist, Catholic and Christian, holding to divine and fixed truths, claims the right to impart a knowledge of these truths to his child in the school to which he sends it for education. The Free Religionist, having no such truths to communicate to his child, insists that his fellow-citizen shall not be allowed to use the schoolhouse for instruction in positive religion, because he sends his child to the same school. Thus, practically, he ostracizes the religion of the Christian, which is positive, and maintains his own, which is negative. All the gain is on the side of the Free Religionist, whose system of morals is so transcendental, and out of the reach of the masses, that it is valueless for practical good. Both call for the teaching of morals, and each in his own sense. The Evangelical bases his notions of morality on the natural and revealed law; the Free Religionist, or Secularist pure and simple, on the natural law, and as he conceives it. The latter would exclude the sacred Scriptures and all positive religious teaching from the schools. Evangelicals are divided into two classes. One class would retain the Bible as a text-book of instruction in morals, as a sign of the Christianity of the schools, and as a mode of religious worship. They argue with much truth that if, owing to the neglect of parents at home, the insufficiency of the Sunday-school and church to reach the children most in need of religious teaching, it be not imparted in the week-day school, it will never be imparted. Another class of Evangelicals remit the Bible and all teaching of morals on religious grounds to the family, the Sunday-school and the church, and join hands with the Free Religionists in prohibiting the name of God, of Christ, and of his teachings in the school. The least logical is this liberalized Christian Evangelical, who professes to teach morals without the authority in which he claims to believe. There is some justification for the stand taken by the former class of Evangelicals and by Free Religionists; there is none for the position assumed by Evangelicals who hold principles by which they care not to abide. The liberalized Christian and the Free Religionist assert that to be possible which, in the nature of things, is not possible. The teacher does not exist, who, in his schoolroom, can so divest himself of his own religious or irreligious ideas that no influence, direct or indirect, shall go out from him to his pupils. His very best efforts to escape the suspicion of sectarianism will only serve to tinge his teaching with in differentism toward all religion; thus unintentionally, perhaps, responding to the wishes of the Free Religionist. Scudding from Scylla, he is wrecked on Charybdis, or *vice versa*.

On what ground, we may now ask, does either protest against the peculiar religious teachings of the other in State Schools? Both are shocked that their taxes should be used to propagate religious creeds in which they do not believe. Neither has a word to say about the wrong perpetrated on the Catholic, whose taxes are used without stint to carry on a system of schools, from which he is kept out by their dominant Evangelicalism or indifferentism.

**A Triangular Contest.**

Thus, as some declare, a triangular contest is inaugurated. The *Albany Argus*, of Nov. 30, 1875, in reviewing a sermon of the Rev. Dr. Darling, in which the reverend doctor insists on keeping the Bible in the common schools, and because this is a Christian country, remarks: "Who shall decide? Shall the schools be secularized? Shall they be exclusively Christian, after the Darling model? Shall room be allowed for the McQuaid pattern of schools pervaded by Christian influences? The School Question, then, does not bisect the community. It is a triangular contest, with the Darlings and McQuaids as allies and yet as antagonists; and with the Secularists receiving strong support from Protestant pulpits, beside the partial support they receive from arguments such as are advanced by Dr. Darling." Three parties there are beyond doubt, but the contest can scarcely be called triangular. It is rather a struggle of three in one line, with the Catholic party in the middle. Each of the others has a hand in his pocket, taking his money to support schools to which he cannot in
conscience send his children. If he but opens his mouth to complain, a din of angry sounds deafens him, and he gets more knocks than pence. His right to a conscience is admitted when his conscience conforms to the dictates of others. A few years ago his claim of conscientious convictions on the Bible question was derided. Now it is allowed. To-day he claims to educate his child in schools in harmony with his religious convictions. Neither contending party gives him heed. All point to the common schools, and while quarreling among themselves as to what they are, and what they ought to be, bid him take them as they are and as they have made them, or go his way, build his own schoolhouse, and please himself. This is moderate language; rougher and much less civil is what he hears. Strange to tell, however, no word is said of sending after him his money paid in school taxes. The ordinary principles of commercial honor are disregarded. The justice and equity required by the Constitution of Connecticut are ignored. Instead of justice the Catholic receives insults. "His money! It is the State's money—public money belonging to the State treasury—Protestant money. Be thankful that a generous people permits you to be blessed by the school advantages brought to your door."

**WHO PAYS THE SCHOOL TAXES?**

Thus the poor Catholic, who may, perchance, have a little common sense, hears, in the midst of loud talk about rights of man and rights of conscience, that his conscience is not his own, and the freedom offered him is somebody else's freedom; that his school taxes take on a special Protestant blessing as they drop into the common treasury, and may not come out without the odor of Evangelicalism perfuming them. In downright derision he is asked, what taxes he pays? is he not a poor la-borer without a home he can call his own? a mere tenant-at-will? are not the taxes paid by the rich landlord? Simple and guileless the son of toil may be, and untutored in political economy, the laws of demand and supply, the intricacies of direct and indirect taxation, but his memory reminds him, that when last the landlord called, he was told that as taxes and assessments had been so much increased, a trifle would have to be added to the rent. The same unpleasant remark met him in the grocery, the meat-shop, the shoe-store, wherever, indeed, he went to purchase the simplest necessaries of life. Anxious to learn how it was that the taxes had been augmented, he talked with his neighbors, and after many inquiries discovered that new and costly schoolhouses had been built, salaries of teachers and officials had been added to, and the sum of incidentals grown out of all proportion. A further study of the subject revealed the fact that one-fourth of all moneys raised by taxes in his town was needed for public schools. He then learnt why his rent was raised. He was not so dull that he could not comprehend, after the practical experience thus obtained, that the consumer and producer pay the taxes. The landlord, the manufacturer, the seller, draws the check in payment of the tax bill; but the consumer and producer furnish a large part of the money with which to make good the check.

**FALSE STATEMENTS AND ASSUMPTIONS.**

This subject of State school education, is overloaded with unfounded assumptions and incorrect statements. A prominent public man, clergyman, politician, or editor has scarcely given utterance to a plausible plea, when, by the grand chorus of lesser oracles, it is taken up and repeated, until it sounds like an accepted axiom.

**WHAT IS SECTARIANISM?**

The greatest abuse of language is in the popular meaning of the word "sectarian." On the frenzied brain of many it acts like the cry of "mad dog," in a crowded street. Who inquires into its signification? Light thrown on it would only weaken its power for mischief. The analyzation of the word by John C. Spencer, Secretary of the State of New York, and one of the ablest lawyers the State has produced, dissected it thoroughly, and exposes the erroneous sense in which it is used. After saying that "Religious doctrines of vital interest will be inculcated, not as theological exercises, but incidentally, in the course of literary and scientific instructions," and that such teachings are sectarian, he goes on to say : "It is believed to be an error to suppose that the absence of all religious instruction, if it were practicable, is a mode of avoiding sectarianism. On the contrary, it would be in itself sectarian, because it would be consonant to the views of a particular class, and opposed to the opinions of other classes . . . . His only purpose is to show the mistake of those who suppose they may avoid sectarianism by avoiding all religious instruction."

**INCONSISTENCY OF THE EVANGELICAL.**

Great confusion of ideas, and grievous injustice result from this misapprehension of the sense of sectarianism. No one declaims so loudly against sectarianism as your intensely religious Evangelical. Even when demanding that the Bible shall be read, and that his general form of Protestantism shall fill the
schoolhouse, by some obliquity of mental vision peculiar to his class, he startles the country by his frantic cries of danger to the public schools through sectarianism. Is this honest, or is it hypocritical? If the prejudices in which he was born and bred so confuse and blind his intellect that he cannot see a self-evident truth, his blunder may be charged to mistaken honesty. But what accumulated injustices spring out of his blunder!

**Benignity of the Secularist.**

Then up rises the Secularist, with benign countenance and gentle words, to reprove the Evangelical for wrong done to the poor Catholic sectarian, and in the name of peace and conciliation, and as a settlement of all difficulties, to offer his gift of Secularism, pure and simple. It is not courteous to examine gifts too closely, but as this one is bought partly with Catholic money, it must be borne with, that, before accepting the present, the Catholic turns it round on every side, scrutinizes its shape, its color, and its substance, to make sure that in it no danger lurks concealed. To the Catholic Secularism is as much sectarian as Evangelicalism.

**An American's Right to Agitate.**

A false statement, and one daily heard, is that to ask for a calm talk on the merits and demerits of the existing system of schools, means no less than an attempt to favor ignorance, impede education, and break down all schools. It is an American's right to argue, find fault, discuss, agitate. Agitation is healthful; in this particular instance, it quickens the building of Catholic schoolhouses. A Catholic is the last one to be taunted with want of love for education. He has only to point to his schools dotting the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. All other classes put together do not equal him in the number and efficiency of Christian Free Schools. Yet he is only at the beginning of his work.

**No Danger From the Pope.**

Another incorrect statement is, that to allow parental rights, as demanded by the natural, the divine, and the common law, is to hand over the country to the Pope and the Catholic Church. When the bigots of the country will permit the Government to deal with its citizens, the parents of the children, as equity and justice require, the liberties of the Republic will meet no danger from the Catholic Church, or the Pope. It is this bugbear of "popery," which bewilders and frightens people.

**Extent of Common School Education.**

It is not decided what is meant by a common-school education. It is anything from ABC up to a finished university course, including professional studies, except theology. President Grant restricts it to the rudimentary branches of learning. President Eliot of Harvard University, in the *Atlantic Monthly* of last June, makes this statement: "Suppose, for example, that the State requires of all children a certain knowledge of reading, writing, arithmetic and geography, such as children usually acquire by the time they are twelve years of age. It is not unreasonable, though by no means necessary, that the community should bear the whole cost of giving all children that amount of elementary training, on the ground that so much is necessary for the safety of the State; but when the education of a child is carried above that compulsory limit, it is by the voluntary act of the child's parents, and the benefit accrues partly to the State, through the increase of trained intelligence among the population, but partly also to the individual, through the improvement of his powers and prospects."

Many of the secular newspapers agree with the above authorities in limiting a common school education to the simplest elementary branches. Such a restricted education answers for rural districts in which a more extended course of studies is impossible. Tie down the curriculum of studies to the rudimentary branches of reading, writing, arithmetic and geography in villages, towns, and cities, and, in ten years' time the system of common schools will be abandoned. The ambition of all centres of population is to elevate the standard of common school education, until the town that cannot boast of its Grammar School, and its High School or day-College, drops behind its sister towns in the race for advanced education at the public expense. The Normal School, with its pretentious title, is another device for placing within the reach of large numbers, guiltless of any thought of following the teacher's profession, an education such as in former years could be had only in denominational academies and seminaries. To such an extent has this crowding out of academies and seminaries, generally under denominational control and supported by church organizations and private patrons, gone on, by the substitution of Union Schools, High Schools, Normal Schools, Free Colleges, living on the bounty of the common treasury, that many denominational institutions have ceased to live, and others are only gasping for breath.
In the scope of common school studies, Henry Ward Beecher may be pitied against President Grant, and Superintendent Philbrick, of Boston, against President Eliot. "The common schools," says Mr. Beecher, "should be so comfortable, so fat, so rich, so complete, that no select school could live under their drippings." In his annual report for 1874, Mr. Philbrick writes: "Our public schools are maintained on so liberal a scale, and their influence so largely predominates, that the private schools exert no appreciable effect upon their character." Boston has its system of Latin Schools, Normal Schools, High Schools, Grammar Schools, to demonstrate the absurdity of President Grant's expectation that the rudimentary branches would satisfy the American people. Mr. Philbrick gives statistics to show that while in 1830 there were in Boston 7430 children in the public schools, there were in private schools 4018; but in 1873, with an addition of 200,000 to the population, there were in the public schools, 35,930, and in private schools only 3887. Neither enumeration includes the 5000 children in Christian Free Schools supported by parents of the Catholic religion.

**Why They Differ.**

When the aim of the argument is to catch popular applause, we boast of a system of schools that brings "to every child in the land a knowledge of the rudimentary branches of learning. When we wish to conciliate and win the patronage of well-to-do citizens in cities and towns, we impress on their minds the economy of obtaining superior education, including ancient and modern languages and all the accomplishments, under the State arrangement rather than in private schools. The Public School system, as advocated by many to be imposed on all the citizens of this Republic, is nothing else, in my judgment, than a huge conspiracy against religion, individual liberty and enterprise, and parental rights. It is a monopoly on the part of the State, usurping to itself the entire control of the teacher's business, driving out competition, herding the children together in large numbers, working all alike as so many bits of machinery,—instead of having them in smaller family and neighbor-hood schools, acting on the children according to individual character, by teachers more immediately under the control of parents.

Various causes work to push school taxation to an unbearable degree. Friends of common schools, taking advantage of popular sympathy, urge outlays of money for houses, apparatus, books, novelties of every kind, and increased salaries of teachers, so that tax-payers are at last asking to know what was the original contract, and where these enormous expenditures are to end; they are also looking for results and comparing notes with other countries. Mr. Philbrick of Boston, when in Vienna, did not discover that our lavish disbursement of good-natured people's money had given us a high rank in school progress, as compared with European countries, except in our primary schools.

**Costliness of Common Schools.**

But business men long ago learned that no job was so expensive as a government job, and no wonder that they are now turning their attention to this monopoly of State education, as a financial interest of general and deep concern in these hard times. There are others who can give figures and statistics of school work beside State and City Superintendents of public schools. The Cincinnati correspondent of the New York Daily Bulletin, a paper strictly commercial, writes under date of Jan. 17, 1876:

"Our schools, the best of our institutions, represent, for instance, fully as much miseducation as education; and the Boards having charge of them are, compared with other bodies, least regardful of proper economy, because they act under a popular, and therefore the least analyzed, public feeling. If you will examine, you will find that, of all taxes, school taxes have for that reason increased fastest. Compare our school expenses with those of any German State, and you will find that ours cost more and perform least. The heaviest taxed German State for these purposes is Hesse Cassel; it taxes 34 cents per head, and it makes up 7 1-2 per cent, of all the taxes levied. Now, there are levied for school purposes in Cincinnati, $774,894, which is full $2.50 per head, and is about one-sixth of all the taxes, or 16 per cent. In Hesse Cassel the tax includes libraries, universities and art schools; with us it includes only the schools up to high schools, and a good part of their expense is borne by trust funds. As to the culture, the German schools reach a larger proportion of the youth of the State, and is very thorough from the lowest to the highest grade, the teachers being much better qualified than ours. Had I taken Saxony or Baden, both more economical and efficient than Hesse Cassel, the comparison would have been still more against us. Zurich, the highest taxed city in Europe for these objects, takes but 54 cents per head, and there school taxes are one-fifth of all taxes; but there also it includes libraries, a university, polytechnicism, lyceums and common schools; and surely no city on earth has a superior culture than this.
city."

Strongly as this writer puts his case, he fails to do it justice; for he omits to state that more than half the children of the city in schools are in parents' schools, or denominational and private schools. In New York City school taxes are $4.00 per head for each one of its million inhabitants; and large numbers of its children are in other than State schools. Boston, which has a less num ber of pupils in private and religious schools, shows a marked increase in the per capita cost. In 1873, for teachers and incidental expenses, not including new schoolhouses, the cost per head of its 250,000 inhabitants was $5.52; and including the buildings, it reached nearly $7. These figures are for tax-payers.

Let me say to you just here, that if the scheme of higher education extending from the elementary school up to a full university course, now broached, is attempted to be carried out in its fulness and universality, all the revenues of all your cities, towns and states, and all the revenues of these United States would not suffice to pay the cost.

Intelligent, wise, earnest parents, and friends of sound education, will watch with interest the gradual unfolding and development of the State system of schools. Their attention will be given to this crushing out of denominational schools for the humbler classes of society, to see in it the inexorable destruction of all denominational seminaries, academies, colleges and universities.

STATE COLLEGES TO CRUSH OUT DENOMINATIONAL COLLEGES.

This policy is foreshadowed in the proposed National University scheme. I am not drawing inferences from my imagination. The address of President White of Cornell University, delivered at Detroit, in August, 1874, lacks nothing in openness and directness of speech. Among other points, it contains these: "It is in view of such a meagre growth in over two hundred years, under the prevailing system, that I present the following as the fundamental proposition of this paper:—"

"The main provision for advanced education in the United States must be made by the people at large, acting through their National and Stale Legislature, to endow and maintain institutions for the higher instruction, fully equipped and free from sectarian control.

"But I argue next, that our existing public-school system leads us logically and necessarily to the endowment of advanced instruction."

To show his utter contempt for the rudimentary education called for by President Grant, Mr. White thus expresses his conviction: "The preliminary education which many of our strongest men received leaves them simply beasts of prey. It has simply sharpened their claws and tusks; but a higher education, whether in science, literature, or history, not only sharpens the faculties, but gives him new exemplars and ideals." President White and Herbert Spencer both require very advanced education before morals, under this new dispensation, avail to make a man better.

NO COLLEGES BUT STATE COLLEGES.

Mr. White's address is not a string of propositions and arguments without conclusions. Here is one:—

"Next, as to State policy, I would have it go in the same direction as heretofore, but with a liberality and steadiness showing far more foresight I would have each of those States build up higher, upon the foundations laid by national grants, their public institutions for advanced instruction as distinguished from private sectarian institutions.

"I would have each State build up one institution under its control, rather than the twenty under the control of conferences, and dioceses, and synods, and consistories, and presbyteries, and denominational associations of various sects."

There can be no mistake about the learned President's meaning, nor is one denominational organization omitted from his comprehensive catalogue. He advocates Secularism, pure and simple, in our colleges and universities, paid for by taxes levied on the laborers, mechanics, and farmers of the country. He excludes from State aid all institutions in which any religious tenet, even the existence of an overruling Providence, is taught. If, on the establishment of these secular State colleges, their authorities should permit the reading of the Bible, as a book of spiritual or religious truths of more value than the Koran, it will be the cheerful duty of the Liberal League to protest against the abuse and infraction of the law, as the League protested in Philadelphia, "The use of the Bible in the public schools is a violation of the recognized American principle that the State and Church ought to be absolutely separate."

HOW WILL THE EVANGELICALS LIKE IT?

What will the members of the New England Baptist Educational Convention, assembled in Worcester,
Mass., who recommended the establishment of at least one Academy under Baptist control in each of the New England States, say to this arrangement? What will their brethren assembled in Chicago, and representing the Western States, think of it? How will the Southern Baptists who met in Marion, Ala., and who declared that "the only hope is Christian education in our schools," like a policy destined to overshadow and destroy denominational High Schools, Academies, and Colleges, as it destroyed denominational elementary schools? These three conventions were held in 1871. President Andrews, of Denison University, Ohio, has the advantage of four years' experience and observation since the holding of these conventions. He has seen the clouds gathering; he has heard the mutterings of the brewing storm; the signs in the heavens tell him, that, when that storm bursts, it will be over the heads of denominational Colleges. "The proposed reform," says President Andrews, "will involve religious complications. Higher education cannot be separated from religion. Atheists will not pay taxes to support theistic instruction, nor theists atheistic. But to put higher instruction into the hands of the government is not only impolitic, but wrong in principle. . . . The government should hold the same relation to higher education that it does to religion. Further, religion is essential to higher culture, and the State cannot teach religion. It is injustice to those opposed to Christianity. Christianity is the natural ally of culture. Finally, intellectual culture without religion cannot build character. The great need of the nation is moral force. The divorce of culture and religion is forced and unnatural." Does President Andrews hope to avert the storm by his weak voice? Does he dream of holding the inner line of fortifications, protecting his higher education, after abandoning to the enemy all the outposts? When elementary schools, in which the foundation of sound Christian morals is laid, were given over to Secularists at their first bidding, resistance to the advancing foe became impossible.

**WHAT THE METHODISTS THINK.**

In 1873, the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the quadrennial address of its bishops, thus put itself on record: "We do not hesitate to avow that we regard the education of the young as one of the leading functions of the Church, and that she cannot abdicate in favor of the State without infidelity to her trust and irreparable damage to society. The reasons for occupying this ground, which inhere in the very nature of this interest, and in the relation of children to the Church, all are intensified by the antagonism of modern science, and the out-casting of the religious element from all the school systems fostered by State legislation. It is not ours to dispute with Cæsar; but, fully persuaded that the salt of religious truth alone can preserve education, we feel that the responsibilities of the Church grow with the progress of society and the demands of the age."

**WHAT MAKES THE METHODISTS CRAZY.**

Other authorities of high standing in the Methodist denomination might be cited in favor of religious teaching in schools. It is but fair to state that the mention of any system of schools under which common justice might be meted out to Catholic parents, suffices to drive the whole body of Methodist preachers and hearers frantic, crazy. The Baptists are not much less intolerant. Secularists may therefore count on their assistance in ousting from the schools the very name of the Christians’ God. The professed principles of these religious sects avail nothing against their avowed hatred of the Catholic Church and Catholics.

**WHO SUPPORT CHURCHES?**

The various Evangelical sects yielded up the contest for religious education in common schools almost without a struggle. It is said that the children, whose education is not advanced beyond the elementary branches of learning, do not in time become pew-holders and supporters of churches. These efficient aids to church support are found in the classes which pass through denominational schools of a higher grade. Round these all the forces of Evangelicalism will rally to uphold the right of parents of the respectable class to provide religious education for their children. Certainly the zeal, the labors, the munificent generosity, of the Evangelical denominations to build and endow Academies and Colleges, deserve unbounded praise. But when the State opens its plethoric treasury to establish secular Colleges, with allowances of freedom not possible in sectarian institutions, the struggle will be short and decisive. This is not prophecy: it is history.

**WHAT KILLS EVANGELICAL COLLEGES?**

The once flourishing Methodist College at Lima, N.Y., dwindled to insignificance, and moved to Syracuse to escape death, shortly after the opening of Cornell University. About the same time, Hobart College, under the control of the Episcopal Church, began to lose students, until now, notwithstanding large endowments, the fingers of the two hands would almost suffice to count them. The Presbyterian Seminary of Geneseo closed its
doors when a State Normal School in the same village opened its classes. The Baptist Academy of Brockport became a State Normal School to escape death. Other places have the same history. The atmosphere of these Normal Schools is still redolent with evangelicalism, but it is only on sufferance; at the first demand of Jew or atheist the names of God, Creator, and Christ will be banished, praying and hymn-singing stopped.

I now leave Evangelical Christians to ponder over President Grant's demand that no religious tenet shall be taught in State schools, and this new definition of non-sectarianism.

**Secularists are in Great Glee**

over their progress. They look forward to speedy and complete success. Their victory in common schools carries them triumphantly along to State secular Universities. Indeed, they might begin their song of triumph, if not for complete accomplishment, then for rapid advancement. Only one foe stands undismayed before them. It is the Catholic parent who permits no one to come between him and his child. The father is a Christian, prizing his faith more than his purse or the world's esteem; resolute to transmit to his offspring the precious boon of religion in its purity and brightness, undimmed by the jeers and scoffs and calumnies of unbelievers; he will not permit his children to breathe an atmosphere of infidelity. Others may think and say that he is wrong: he knows that he is right. He meddles not with others. He listens to much counsel from well-meaning friends. They tell him it is a glorious privilege for his boy to be the equal and companion of a rich man's son. It may happen—it often happens—that he cares no more for the rich man's son than for the rich man himself. They point to the palatial schoolhouse, grand and gorgeous in all its appointments; to the teachers, learned and accomplished. They tell him all these shall his son enjoy, without price or pay, if he will but intrust his boy's education to the State, which loves to play foster-father to its children. The poor man's poverty gnaws into the bone under the proffered bribe; his mind dwells on the temporal advantages so enticingly offered; he loves his child, and he believes in an overruling Providence, a God, Creator, Supreme Master of the universe; he believes in a world to come, and cherishes the hope that, after this life, he and his boy shall be reunited with the blessed in heaven. Under the coarse coat and rough exterior of many a day-laborer there beats a heart of honest manliness that would scorn to be the beneficiary of any man's aid. He pays for his child's education; he hates to pay for a superior education for his richer neighbor's son. There is a laudable pride in this spirit of independence and self-reliance, the very virtues upon which the Republic depends for its existence.

He can conceive of no true happiness except as his life conforms to the teachings and will of his God. His thoughts of happiness for himself are bound up with those of his child. His child's happiness for this world and the next interests and determines his actions at home, in its play, in school, and in church. He is concerned about its lessons, but still more about every influence bearing on the direction and formation of mind and character. Like Herbert Spencer, he knows that mere intellectual education will not form character; and, like President White, he holds that the preliminary education which many receive "only sharpens claws and tusks, and makes beasts of prey." To guard against such dangers, this father, whose religion is real and living, made up of doctrines to be known and believed, and of observances and practices to be faithfully followed, dares not before God and his conscience neglect to train his son in these observances, make him familiar with their use, and fill his mind and soul with love and reverence toward them. How will it be with his boy, if the school fail to come to his aid, or, what is worse, operate disastrously, by positive or negative teaching, upon his soul? What will be the future of that boy if the atmosphere he breathes at school be filled with doubt, sneers, negation? There is not in this audience one father, who, if he believed in a life to come, of happiness or misery eternal, would take any unnecessary chances with regard to his child's education and school life. If you judge the rest of the world only from your standpoint of belief, the brave struggle of a Catholic poor man to obtain a Christian education for his child will continue to be an enigma, and lead to acts of injustice.

**Agreements and Disagreements.**

Catholics and Secularists agree on some points, and differ on others.

They agree that education is an important factor in the making of an intelligent citizen, and is therefore very desirable. They do not agree in the character of the education necessary to make this good citizen. The Catholic points to his personal sacrifices in time, labor, and money, to secure for his children education in the sense in which he understands it. The Secularist bids us look at what the State has done for him. He cannot demonstrate the earnestness and sincerity of his convictions and preaching by what he has done. He pays, it is true, his share of public taxes. So does the Catholic. The Secularist insists that there shall be State schools after his plan, according to his convictions, paid for by taxation from which no one shall be exempt, while all shall be obliged to drink at his well of knowledge, such as it is. A Catholic argues that the Secularist's notion of education was never strong, never attained to the power of a principle, or he would have withdrawn his children from schools.
in which they were taught what he might be pleased to call the superstitions of Evangelicalism. As between the two, on the head of personal sacrifices in furtherance of the cause of education, the Catholic has an advantage over the Secularist in demonstrating the courage of his convictions.

Both agree that instruction in morals in some form is essential for the right education of youth. They differ in their understanding of what is meant by morals, and as to the authority by which such teaching should be inculcated. The Secularist rises no higher in his conception of morals than the temporal well-being of the child, and "the doing of acts conducive to general enjoyment." Rev. A. D. Mayo, Unitarian minister, calls this policy "a materialistic naturalism and a philosophical fatalism."

**Secularists Teaching Morals.**

The helplessness of the Secularist as a teacher of the people is best described by Herbert Spencer in "First Principles:" "Few, if any, are as yet fitted wholly to dispense with such (religious) conceptions as are current. The highest abstractions take so great a mental power to realize with any vividness, and are so inoperative on conduct unless they are vividly realized, that their regulative effects must, for a long period to come, be appreciable on but a small minority. . . . Those who relinquish the faith in which they have been brought up, for this most abstract faith in which religion and science unite, may not uncommonly fail to act up to their convictions. Left to their organic morality, enforced only by general reasonings imperfectly wrought out and difficult to keep before the mind, their defects of nature will often come out more strongly than they would have done under their previous creed." No one is better entitled to a hearing on the side of the Secularists than Herbert Spencer. How far they are able to provide a code of morals for the training of the young in substitution of that of the Christian religion, he has clearly stated. The child accepts its lessons in science and morals on authority. The Secularist child has no other authority than that of the teacher, supplemented and enforced by its parents. Hence the necessity of harmony of thought between parent and teacher. But "moral goodness," to be effective even in the Secularist's idea, demands vividness of conception beyond the power of attainment on the part of children, since few of their parents can rise to its realization. In other words, the teaching of morals in a Secularist's school is all but impossible.

**Standards of Morals Differ.**

The Secularist's standard of morals differs in material points from that of the Catholic. The former, in admitting the law of divorce, consents to a disruption of ties that alone guarantee the sacredness and unity of the family; permits passion, pleasure, and self-will to have their way in defiance of that law of self-restraint and patience under trials and difficulties necessary to hold the family together, at least for the children's sake. The Catholic can address the Secularist in the words of the eloquent Bishop of Orleans: "It is not so much my church which they would destroy as your home; and I defend it. For all those things which are the supreme objects of your desire,—reason, philosophy, society, the basis of your institutions, the subject of your books, the sanctity of your hearts, the morals of your children,—these are the things which I defend, and which you throw away in crowning those who would destroy them."

A Catholic's code of morals embraces the teachings of the Bible, interpreted by the Church. It does not end with teachings it has ordinances, sacraments divinely instituted to give grace, supernatural power, with which to resist temptation, overcome passion, escape from sin. Your denial of these truths does not lessen a Catholic's faith in them, nor weaken his conscience with regard to them.

You may remember Henry Ward Beecher's last Thanksgiving sermon, and the picture he drew of the condition of morals in the Brooklyn schools, in which were teachers who held their positions by the sacrifice of their virtue to School-Commissioners. You may also have heard that Thomas W. Field, Superintendent of schools in the same city of Brooklyn, in his annual report of four or five years ago, gave a fearful account of the prevalent immorality. This report was suppressed by the Board of Education, on the principle, I suppose, that the whole truth must not always be spoken. Is it any wonder that Catholic parents ask that they, and not politicians, shall have the choosing of their children's teachers? You have not forgotten the article in "The Boston Herald" of Oct. 20, 1871, giving the substance of Prof. Agassiz' address before the Massachusetts State Teachers' Association. Again, I say, is it any wonder that Catholic parents, hearing these confessions, even under a stringent policy of silence and concealment, lose faith in the State system, and provide schools of their own at sacrifices worthy of martyrs? I cite these instances in no spirit of exultation, but of regret; and it therefore gives me pleasure to say that the character of the teachers of Boston stands too high to come under such imputations.

**The State Cannot Teach Religion.**
Catholics and Secularists agree that a State without religion cannot teach religion. Therefore, say the latter, let there be no religious teaching. Therefore, say the former, let there be religious teaching in the schools by those who can impart it in harmony with the parents' belief. These say, furthermore, that, when Massachusetts had religion, she was careful that religion, and morality through religion, should be taught in our schools. It is claimed, that Massachusetts gained her most distinguished honors from men educated under religious influences in school, at home, and in church; but that now she is consuming her capital, without putting any of it at interest. The shadow of religious teachings still lingers around her schoolhouses. Shall it be that her future men of note are to be no more than shadows of those that went before them?

**Morals Without Religion.**

The Secularist maintains that all the knowledge of morals a child need possess may be obtained in a State school without religion. This is true of that species of morals which fails to recognize God, and which has no foundation in supernatural motives. The Catholic does not admit that morality based on pure selfishness is of much worth, or that it will avail a child in the moment of temptation. In this clashing of opinions and beliefs, which shall give way, if there is to be room but for one? Shall it be the Catholic? He appeals to the Constitution of Massachusetts, and to the religious element still abiding in its population. The new condition of educational aims is vastly different from that of fifty years ago. He claims that his higher standard of morality, the nobler motive on which it is inculcated, its adaptability and acceptableness to children, (waiving for the moment its divine origin and character), entitles him to have the education of his children permeated and completed by a strong infusion of religious instruction in schools. He contends for the rights and best interests of his own children. He does not dispute the wishes of others, nor seek to impose on them the adoption of his system He loudly asserts, that in every important point, except .costliness of buildings and expensiveness of teachers, Catholic schools are superior to State schools. They are more thorough in secular studies, there is less cramming, and less multiplicity of useless branches of learning; the du-ties and responsibilities of citizens are brought home to parents, where they belong, fostering a spirit of self-reliance, without dependence on public charity; and all in an atmosphere of religion and morality such as the patrons of the school desire, and are willing to pay for. I am not speaking of the beginnings of a Catholic school in some poor neighborhood. As well might you liken a country school, with its fifteen or twenty scholars, under a schoolmistress at three or four dollars a week, to one of your Boston High Schools.?

**Catholics Ask No Favors.**

While the Catholic asks no favor, no privilege, no special prerogative, no right that he does not concede to others, the Secularist on the contrary, in the name of liberality, falls into astonishing illiberality. All must yield to him. He has broken down the Evangelical; he will subdue the Catholic. He will concede no rights to others, save the one of bending to his will, if that can be called a right which is the result of sheer force, through the power of a prejudiced and unrelenting majority. The Catholic wants to know why his right to have schools for his children, in which the tone of religious thought shall be Catholic, is not as valid as the right of Evangelicals and Secularists to have schools for their children in which the tone of thought shall be Evangelical or indifferent to any religion. It must not be lost sight of, in this argument, that our rights go where our money goes. A Catholic's money goes into the schools, and his rights go with it. An inalienable right is infringed upon, is curtailed, is cut off altogether, when he appears at a schoolhouse door, leading his son by the hand, only to find at its threshold the emblem or sign of a hostile creed, or, what is worse in his belief, the chilling atmosphere within of doubt, negation, or an ignoring of the God-Creator, Sovereign Lord and Master, and final Judge of man's thoughts, words, and acts, for whom it has been the father's duty to instil into his child's mind and heart the most tender love and reverence.

**How Some are Saved.**

No one need tell me that I exaggerate and picture from fancy, nor yet again that there are illustrious instances of boys and girls that have passed through the common schools without inhaling the poisonous atmosphere of which I speak. I do not deny the fact. These easily counted exceptions but prove the rule. The prayers, the watchful care, and unceasing devotion of capable and pious parents, must count for much in the saving of these few. Again, there are schools, in which the majority of the children and many of the teachers being Catholics, a diluted Catholic atmosphere floats about the school, rendering less, in some degree, the danger of losing Catholic faith and morals. If we ourselves cannot see this danger, ministers and editors, in sermons, addresses, and editorials, kindly point it out, and bespeak our attention. Their zeal and ardor are aroused to new endeavor in the charitable hope of hurting "Popery." The thought lends courage to their hearers. "It will
de-Romanize the children," says one. "The Bible and the common schools will grind out the Catholicity of the children," says another. Similar expressions might be multiplied without end. Forewarned is for the wise to be fore-armed. It was only when the Bible in the schools had ceased to be the question in dispute that the Bible was put on the cold side of the door.

**WHAT RAISES THE STORM.**

There is small hope that justice, or even patient and unbiased hearing of our grievances, will be accorded, when, as soon as a voice is raised in behalf of God-given rights, forty thousand pulpits ring with bitter invectives, gross misrepresentations, and appeals to the lowest passions of those who gather around them; when politicians (not statesmen) catch up the cry, and trading away all principle, if they ever had any, ride into office in the fury and madness of the hour. Secret societies, that have so often proved political sepulchres for demagogues, lend their help.

The darkest and fiercest hour of the storm is that which precedes its breaking. We take courage, then, from the extreme and unbridled fury of the hour, and from the violent language used in defiance of good taste, reason, brotherly kindness, and all regard for just rights.

**LEADERS CHANGE.**

The people will yet become disgusted with the unreasonableness and changeableness of their leaders. A few years ago they were told to stand by "the Bible in the schools;" to "strike down any one who dared raise a hand against it;" that "to die for it would be a glorious martyrdom." Secret societies were formed for its protection. Now editors and ministers frankly confess it was all a mistake; that our liberties do not depend on keeping the Bible in the schools; that to do so is illogical, wrong, unjust to Catholics, Jews, and infidels. There has been no more powerful advocate of the Bible in the schools than Dr. J. G. Holland, who, in this month's "Scribner," admits that "the compulsory reading of the Bible was to the Catholic, to the Jew, to the atheist, a grievance, a hardship, an oppression." "For ourselves," he says, "we must confess to a change of convictions on this matter. . . . If we do away with the grievance of the Catholic, we do away with his claim; and we mark out for the Catholic and Protestant alike the path of peace to walk in side by side." The doctor does not seem to understand the nature of our claim. It is not to deprive Protestants of their Bible in their schools: it is to educate Catholic children in Catholic schools with our own money, under State supervision if you please. We do not want Protestant money, nor any State money that was not taken from our purses. We want not one dollar for pope, bishop, or priest; not one cent for our church. We do not desire the doing-away of common schools: we are establishing schools all over the country on a thoroughly democratic basis. We are striving for a stretching of a hide-bound system. We wish it to be more directly under parental control, more economically managed, restricted to its proper function of elementary education, and violating no conscientious duty of parents. It is just as likely that a few years hence the people will be told that education belongs to parents, and that if the State interferes it must be in accordance with the wish of parents. When communism becomes rife and bold, property owners may be willing to discuss principles only to learn that they are reaping as they sowed. Some heads take in truth slowly, others only by trepanning.

**FAIR PLAY EXPECTED FROM FREE RELIGIONISTS.**

We are justified in expecting fairer treatment at the hands of Free Religionists. If we may trust Herbert Spencer as a worthy exponent of this class, toleration in its widest sense is a fundamental dogma of their creed: "Our toleration should be the widest possible; or, rather, we should aim at something beyond toleration, as commonly understood. In dealing with alien beliefs our endeavor must be, not simply to refrain from injustice of word or deed, but also to do justice by an open recognition of positive worth. We must qualify our disagreement with as much as may be of sympathy." ("First Principles.")

From scientists and Free Religionists, then, we may expect the same rights they claim for themselves. As they would not consent to our forcing their children into schools under Catholic influences, direct or indirect, so they will not ask that our children shall be forced into schools under objectionable influences. As they do not permit us to decide upon the truth or untruth of their religious opinions, so they will not seek to decide for us upon our doctrines. Here comes in the apparently insurmountable obstacle to an amicable settlement of this vexed question. Each one of the disputants, except the Catholic, wants to make all others bend to his plan, or way, or system, seemingly satisfied that he alone is right. The Catholic, on the contrary, says, Let each one have his own plan; and with an even start, and on equal ground, let it be seen which party, the Evangelical, the scientist or Free Religionist, or the Catholic, can make the greatest sacrifices, accomplish the most work in the most satisfactory manner, for the thorough religious and secular education of all the children they can bring
under their control.

No Religion in a Bank.

Free Religionists, and the large class of Christian religionists represented by Henry Ward Beecher, answer. Religion has no place in the State school; and, with it kept out, the school is as free to one class of religionists as to another, and equally so to Jews and infidels. To illustrate this theory, they say that as there need be no religion in a bank, a shop, or a business office, so there need be no religion in a school. This is as strong a justification as they can bring.

The comparison fails for want of resemblance between the things compared. A man goes into the bank, the shop, the office. A boy goes to the school. The bank, the shop, the office, has for its object the transaction of its own special material business. The school deals with the boy's mind and heart; is a place set apart for the forming, disciplining, educating the young, by trained and skilled manipulators of the intellect and emotions. The young look up to these teachers with sentiments of respect and often of reverence; nor are they capable of analyzing and judging the influences brought to bear on them. They are in the school six hours a day, for five days in the week, ten months in the year. They are justified in voting all schooling, in excess of these long hours, a bore. They who go into a bank, or any other place of business, are men grown, fully competent to judge of insidious or open attempts to prejudice their minds on points of religion or morals. These business offices are not monopolies like the State school, and their proprietors know the danger of meddling with their customers' religious opinions. The example of a man asking for a Bible in a hat-shop has not yet occurred; and, when it does occur, it will be met by calling in a policeman to arrest an escaped lunatic. But a child asking a teacher to tell it something about God, Christ, the redemption, sin, or the life to come, would ask a proper question, entitled to an answer from a competent teacher. Much as our opponents may be pleased to protest against religion in the State schools, it is there, and in some shape it will be there till the end of time. I am not speaking of Evangelical schools, but of schools purely secular, in which there is no Bible, no text-book of religion, no prayer, no hymn; and yet, in this expurgated and shrivelledup school, the teaching will be for or against religion, as the teacher happens to be. His children do not come to him to buy bills of exchange, or boots, or hats, but to acquire knowledge, to learn, to take in, through open eyes and ears, information concerning the things it sees, and the truths and facts of which it hears. President Anderson, of Rochester University, is an authority in educational methods and means, of great weight wherever known. He exhibits this power of the teacher in a few striking passages thus:—

President Anderson on Incidental Instruction.

"With the element of Christian faith in head and heart, it is impossible for an earnest teacher to avoid giving out constantly religious and moral impulses and thoughts. He must of necessity set forth his notions about God, the soul, conscience, sin, the future life, and divine revelation. If he promises not to do so, he will fail to keep his word, or his teachings in science or literature or history will be miserably shallow and inadequate. . . . Incidental instruction in morality and religion, then, ought to be the main reliance of the Christian teacher. The ends of a Christian school, while working by its own laws and limitations, ought not to be essentially different from a Christian church. The principles we have thus indicated are universal in their application. If the Christian teacher must make the elements of his religious faith color all his teaching, the same must be true of the unchristian teacher. . . . There is no good thinking that is not honest thinking. . . . If parents wish their children educated in Christian principles, they must seek out honest Christian men to be their teachers."

Here in a few words is the plainly spoken judgment of an experienced teacher. It is true, President Anderson is contending in behalf of higher education in colleges and seminaries. But I do not hesitate to say, with no small experience as an educator, that in elementary schools, where young minds are dealt with, the incidental teaching in morals and religion is of vastly greater extent and effect. They who assert so boldly that children of inquisitive and unfolding minds can frequent schools for secular learning, without being influenced by the dominant religious tone of the school and teachers, speak without warrant.

The Multiplication Table.

As meaningless an illustration is that in which the multiplication table plays a part. There is no religion, they say, in the multiplication table. I never heard any one say there was, while it is not unknown that there may be religion, or antipathy to religion, in him who teaches the table, as well as in the place in which it is taught. A sneer at "Popery" requires no allusion to figures or ciphering, unless when the years of the Apocalypse, or the coming of Antichrist, are under discussion.
A COMMON LANGUAGE.

But, after all, the vexed question of religion aside, see the gain to the Republic by giving a common language to all its children, through the common schools. Then why, if that is a gain, provide a teacher of German wherever a few German children are found, or, where there are many, give them a school with German as its language, as in Erie, Penn.? There is room for any thing and every thing except religion.

DOES THIS SYSTEM ABOLISH CASTE?

Anyhow, it cannot be denied, we are told, that the common schools bring all classes of children to the same level, make them meet on equal ground, and sit side by side on the same benches. This speech belongs to the demagogue and the electioneering stump. The level spoken of may be found in rural districts and small towns; it is quite unknown in large cities in practice, while no one denies the beauty of the theory.

It is well known that in cities the rich, as a rule, live in neighborhoods where no poor man can have his home. When there is danger of contact, the rich man sends his daintily nurtured and well-clad child to a private school. There are public schools in New York and Brooklyn, whose pupils come solely from the comfortable classes. What an advantage to the pride of so many admirers of common schools, that thirty thousand children of laborers and mechanics in New York, and twenty thousand in Brooklyn, are educated in Christian free schools! It makes access to the public schools so much the more pleasant. Why is it that so many thousand children receive their elementary education not in the public schools, but in the schools of the Children's Aid Society, under Evangelical influences? Is it not beyond doubt that if in New York City the compulsory law were to be enforced, and all the children now running the streets, and all the children now in the Aid Society's schools, and all the children now in the Catholic free schools, were to be marched into their district public schools, an almost equal number of well-dressed children would be marched out? If in any school the influence of money and good society predominates, the poor will quit it for shame's sake; if patched pants and calico dresses rule, the rich will go out for pride's sake. You will find truer democracy in the Christian free schools of New York than in the common schools.

SCHOOL HOURS AND SCHOOLMASTERS.

The week-day school, we are told, is not the place for teaching religion; there are hours enough for these lessons at home and on Sunday. This advice comes with a bad grace from Boston, since the Medical College of Middlesex has laid down these two rules among others: "The duration of daily attendance, including the time given to recess and physical exercises, should not exceed four and a half hours for the primary schools." "There should be required no study out of school for children of the primary schools."

A more serious consideration is that of compelling parents to be schoolmasters to their children. It is cruel to put this task on backs already overburdened. Father and mother toil like slaves from morning to night. Do their mentors think of the early rising, the hasty breakfast, the long hours of wearying and exhausting labor, of the fatigued frame that at the coming on of night seeks needed rest? We are not speaking in favor of clerks, merchants, and professional men. They can speak for themselves and their requirements; their friends are numerous, intelligent, and active. Legislation always takes their circumstances and wants into account.

It is among the laboring and mechanic classes that a numerous progeny is found. The mother sees to her household and the wants of her many children. Her education in book-learning may be defective; and, if she undertook to compete with the trained schoolmistress, her deficiencies might become known to her young ones. Time, strength, capacity,—all are wanting. Yet she is reminded, if she reads the newspapers, that one minister and another devote their time to the set and formal religious instruction of their children, out of school, in the evenings, on the Saturdays, and with special care on the Sundays; and she is piously advised to do the same. These learned, eloquent, leisured clergymen put themselves on a par with the hard-working mason and the humble washerwoman. It is, I say, an unworthy mockery of these respectable bread-winners, day-workers, or betrays profound ignorance of their conditions and daily occupations. These poor people pay their taxes to have others in whom they have confidence, whose religious convictions harmonize with their own, relieve them of a duty they feel incompetent to perform. The Sunday-school and the church remain. Good children go to Sunday-school; those whose homes are least Christian in spirit and teachings keep clear of it. Besides, who would be satisfied to have his child put off with one lesson a week in any of the rudimentary branches belonging to the common school? Yet the lesson of lessons, the law and will of God as manifested to his creatures, by which character is formed and moral principles are established, may be satisfactorily learned in the short hour of a Sunday-school.

Parents need the church and the best services of the clergyman on Sunday more than their children, that
they may not forget the lessons of their youth.

**THE SPECIAL ADVANTAGES OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.**

It seems more than unreasonable to ask Catholic parents to forego advantages attainable in and through Catholic schools,—advantages far superior to any offered by State schools.

First, Catholic schools instruct in all the useful branches of a sound English education.

Secondly, They are more economical, costing no more than one-fourth or one-third the expense of supporting State schools; and commanding at the lowest possible price, merely food and clothing, one of the most expensive necessities of the age and country,—skilled and trained intellectual labor.

Thirdly, Their teachers are devoted to their work of teaching as a life-work; study every day, and waste no time in idle visits and foolish amusements.

Fourthly, These teachers are in sympathy with the religious faith of the patrons of their schools.

Fifthly, Parental schools alone will stand the test of logic; they are consonant to sound democratic republican doctrines; they make possible the inculcation of morality by the authority of a divine Lawgiver; they respect the natural rights of parents, and meddle with and infringe on no one else's rights.

They are a necessity demanded by the circumstances of the times, and the demoralized condition of the country, as well as for the future welfare of the Republic. It is our common country, belonging not to one man more than to another. He is the best citizen, no matter where he was born, who loves it most and labors in his sphere of life, according to his ability, with purest motives, for the honor and prosperity of the Union. He would be a renegade and base betrayer of his country, who, believing that morality on a religious foundation was essential to the safety and continuance of the Government, should consent to withhold from children all possible means of growth in sound moral principles and conduct.

**RIGHTS OF MINORITIES IN OTHER COUNTRIES.**

The experience of every civilized nation of Europe is against the suicidal career that we are entering on. No difficulty is found in countries whose inhabitants are of different religious beliefs, in arranging a system of schools for all. Though some of those countries are spoken of as despotic in character, their despotism never goes so far as to interfere with the religious convictions of Catholic, Jew, or Evangelical. At least, Catholic Canada, our immediate neighbor, Catholic Belgium, Catholic France, Catholic Bavaria, and Catholic Austria, respect the parental rights of the minority, with a sense of justice we would do well to study. The wisdom and good sense of the world are not concentrated in the American people.

**THE QUESTION MUST BE SETTLED.**

This question, thanks to various causes, is now fairly before the country for discussion and settlement. To shelve it by Constitutional Amendments will be no lasting settlement. Constitutional enactments in contravention of parental rights not transferred to the State are worth the parchment on which they are written, and no more. This is not an original idea. I have picked it up in Boston. This lesson was taught to the nation by the settlement of slavery.

**POLITICAL PARTIES.**

The agitation, I must confess, is embarrassing to both political parties; much more so, however, to political aspirants who fear pitfalls, and are anxious lest they bury all their hopes in graves of their own digging. One party is rushing along on its path of injustice, because popular clamor impels that way; the other, half willing, half unwilling, does not dare say a word in opposition, for it, no more than the other party, has statesmen for leaders, while politicians abound. We are accused of an alliance with one of these parties. The party that forms an alliance, open or covert, with any religious body in these United States, proclaims its own folly, and signs its own death-warrant. The leaders of the Catholic body are neither fools to trust any political party, nor knaves to seek privileges and favors over the religious denominations of the country by such unworthy and dishonorable means. No prominent politician believes the absurd imputation. It is a sop thrown to Cerberus, to bigotry. We seek equal rights for all, favors for none. Until correct principles obtain recognition, this question, affecting the interests of millions of citizens, will remain a cause of controversy and disturbance. Thirty years of patient submission have brought us scarcely a kind word; and the condition of Helotism into which we have been falling is regarded by many as fitting and proper, and by others as right and just. There is a sound maxim in the American mind, that any class suffering from disabilities and a violation of rights should resort to established methods for a rectification of these wrongs, and that a class that does not care enough to seek a remedy for its
sufferings may be left to nurse its grumblings in private, without thought or attention from their fellow-countrymen.

While, therefore, we do not feel disposed to waste gratitude on the Democratic party for favors never received, and owe no more to the Republican party, we have only contempt for the hangers-on of both parties, who would have us hold in abeyance the assertion of our rights, lest this office-seeker or another should be embarrassed. Catholics are learning to break away from both parties, watch events, and treasure in their memories the brave words and deeds of politicians who, taking advantage of a momentary outbreak of bigotry and religious hate, write a record which a few years hence they would give their right hand to blot out.

**CHARGES AGAINST THE SYSTEM.**

We charge upon the system of State schools, as now carried on in these United States, the perpetration of manifold injustices and the upholding of false principles.

First, It is an infringement of parental rights and duties, inasmuch as it compels poor people, who educate their own children for conscience's sake, to help educate their richer neighbors' children.

Secondly, It cruelly oppresses poorer citizens by giving to their richer neighbors' sons not simply an elementary education, but an education sufficient to earn their living by means of a learned profession. To put both on an equal footing, poor children should be taught a trade at the expense of the State.

Thirdly, The State does not know what its system should be. In some States the education is restricted to rudimentary studies; in others, it extends to a University course. Some States allow a qualified amount of Evangelical teaching; others, professing to exclude all religion, permit any except the Catholic. These are the inconsistencies and hypocrisy of the system.

Fourthly, it is narrow, contracted, limited in its scope, afraid of rivalry, and incapable of the very function for which it was established. Its right to educate is denied by its admission that it cannot educate in the true sense of the word.

Fifthly, It stultifies itself; for, beginning on a religious basis, and acquiring its chief renown by the fruits of its first work, it would end by banning and barring all religious beliefs, even "the existence of an overruling Providence."

Sixthly, It establishes a monopoly of business best left to individual enterprise and the immediate control of parents.

Seventhly, The principles on which it is justified will justify with greater force the claim of the Communist to labor and bread.

**ADMIT THE WRONG, AND CHANGE THE SYSTEM.**

After so much fault-finding with the existing system of common schools, it is not out of the way to ask what system is proposed in exchange. My object is not to propose plans and systems, but to argue that the present one is radically wrong, and needs amendment. Until the American people admit the failure of the system as it now is, no change need be looked for. Once admitted, they will be quick to bring about a change. They will either throw education directly and compulsorily on parents, paying only for those unable to pay for themselves, or they will so broaden the system that all can come under it without the sacrifice of conscientious rights. This plunging into Secularism is only the cowardice of the politician who fears to face the consequences of sound logic, commonsense, equal rights, parental prerogatives, and a secretly nourished hatred and conspiracy against the Catholic Church. To put off justice in deference to the expediency of the hour, is the way of the politician; the statesman announces his principles, and stands or falls by them. Truth is old; it is ever new; it endures forever.

**FULL DISCUSSION AND FAIR ARGUMENT.**

I appear before you at your request. On one point at least we agree. It is your good pleasure to listen to arguments in favor of principles and doctrines with which you do not agree because in your judgment they are not sound. You do not, on that account, question my honesty of purpose, my sincerity of conviction, or my love of country. Perhaps the speaker of this afternoon and his hearers are as wide apart on this question as any two individuals in the country. Yet we have come together,—I, to address you in plainness of speech, not wanting, I trust, in courtesy; you, to listen patiently and attentively.

**BOSTON SHOULD SETTLE THE QUESTION.**

When designing men are plotting mischief and breeding hate and rancor, it is well for Boston to furnish this
useful lesson to other parts of the country.

To you, men of Boston, to the intelligence and honesty of Massachusetts, and especially of Boston, I in my character of Catholic American citizen appeal in behalf of the rights of parents for dispassionate consideration of this subject; confident that, if not heeded to-day, the day is not distant when it will be considered. I have said it before, I say it again, that the settlement of this great question, affecting the future welfare and stability of the Republic, must come from Boston and Massachusetts. It is more creditable, in the mean time, for us to suffer, to be punished and persecuted, than for American citizens to be the persecutors. The rights you would maintain at any cost for yourselves, I beseech you not to deny to the humblest citizens in the land, however help less they may seem. For large numbers, who have few to speak for them, I plead before you. Your interests and theirs, as fellow-citizens, are bound together as one. Our country is with unparalleled quickness becoming one of populous cities. These centres of population, notwithstanding extraordinary efforts to counteract the danger, are nurturing street-Arabs, wild youths, bands of trained depredators on others' property, hosts of corrupt, demoralized inhabitants. Peaceable and order-loving citizens are bound for their own sake to look to the danger, call to their assistance every available agency, and engage the services of all who can work in this vast and difficult field. In vain will they develop vigor and power of body in the young, and brighten and quicken the intellect, if the cunning of the one, and the passions and appetites that spring from the other, be not held in subjection by the elevation and strengthening of the heart.

HELPERS IN THE WORK.

We offer to do a work for our own poor, which you yourselves confess you cannot accomplish. We possess, in our religious orders of Brothers and Sisters, armies of skilled teachers voluntarily consecrated to the work of laboring among poor children and instructing them in secular learning, while grounding them in virtue and morality. They are ready to spend their lives in this work of highest love and self-sacrifice: they can reach the hearts of these children of poverty; they can calm turbulent passions, and teach self-restraint, love of order, and respect for the rights of others.

The large cities need the services of these workers and teachers. It is unwise, it is worse, to cast them off, in view of the non-success of common schools to reach thousands of poor children; it is unwise to assert principles, that, logically carried out, lead to Communism; it is dangerous unto madness to hinder the influences of religion from reaching to the lanes and by-ways of our crowded cities; it is sowing discord, and engendering heart-burnings, to trample on the just rights of any class in a Republic.

Parental rights, involving parental duties imposed by the natural and the revealed law, sanctioned and upheld by the common law and the Constitution, cannot be persistently disregarded without danger and detriment to the nation.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

In a few words let me resume and give some conclusions logically deducible from the facts, statements, and arguments submitted to you in this paper.

In a Republic whose citizens are of different religious beliefs, who are voters needing intelligence, who are parents breeding races of freemen, the following principles are primary and vital:

- The non-interference of the State in religious matters, in church or school.
- Compulsory knowledge, through parents' schools, under parents' control, and at their cost.
- Free trade in education, or no monopoly of the teacher's profession.

The Public School Question,

As Understood by the Liberal American Citizen.

A Lecture by Francis E. Abbot,

Editor Of "the Index."

DELIVERED IN BOSTON, FEB. 20, 1876.

It is my duty this afternoon to speak to you upon the "public school question as viewed by the Liberal American Citizen;" terms which I understand to indicate merely the point of view occupied by those who look at this question in the light of well-recognized American principles, and with reference to the interests of the whole people and their self-chosen government, as distinguished from the point of view occupied by those who look at it in the light of other than American principles, and with reference to the interests of a party, a sect, or a church. There is a sectional, and there is also a national, aspect of every great public issue; there is a partizan,
ecclesiastical and sectarian view of the school question, and also a universal, secular and strictly non-sectarian view of it. It is the latter view alone that I hold, and I shall try to represent faithfully this afternoon all who hold it. That they are only a portion, though a very large portion, of the entire population of the country, I of course admit; but that they look at this question in the light of their own interests as a party, and not in that of the equal interests of each and every inhabitant of the land, I emphatically deny. In other words, I maintain, contrary to the plausible and ingenious misrepresentation sometimes put forward, that the secular party to this school question is not a "sect," and cannot be justly so considered from the mere fact of its not embracing the whole population. If that fact alone were decisive, then unsectarianism is an impossibility, so long as a difference of opinion exists among men. But what really makes a party partizan, or sectarian, is the selfish endeavor to sacrifice the interests of the whole people to their own interests as a mere part of the people; while, if any party aims honestly at securing the interests of the whole people by rendering equal and exact justice to every individual, it is a strictly non-partizan and non-sectarian party. For instance, the Republican party, whatever its subsequent sins, was an organized national and non-partizan party during the war of the rebellion, because it aimed at the true interests of the whole nation, including the very South which was in rebellion; and to-day the great body of honest men, who are opposed to the army of corruptionists in politics, is an unorganized national and non-partizan party, because it aims at establishing politics on the basis of common honesty, which is really the equal interest of all. Precisely in the same manner I maintain that the secular party on the school question is a strictly non-sectarian party, and not a sect at all, because it aims solely to settle this question on the basis of that equal justice which is the common and supreme interest of all mankind. What I have to say on the school question, therefore, will be said in the interest of no part of the people, but of the whole people; for, unlike some others, I belong to no party or sect which has interests separate from, or hostile to, the interests of the whole people.

But how comes there to be any school question at all? The public school system was established, and has been sustained, by the people itself, solely for the purpose of supplying a universal want: namely, the education of the people's children. Nothing human is perfect, and the school system is not perfect; but it was honestly founded for the good of the whole people. A protest manifestly so sincere, urged in the sacred name of conscience, deserves to receive the most respectful and dispassionate consideration of the majority. If the protest is a reasonable one, and if the public school system really infringes the undeniable rights even of a single citizen, reform and redress are the only right course to be adopted; and if not, the fact of even an unreasonable protest on the part of so large and so rapidly increasing a portion of the people is cause for grave disquietude in the minds of all intelligent patriots. The school question thus raised is complicated still further by the fact that the great body of non-Catholics who heartily support the public school system are themselves divided as to the relation it ought to bear to religion—one part holding that the schools should have a distinctively Protestant Christian character, the other part holding that they should be wholly colorless or neutral with respect to religious beliefs. The former maintain an intermediate position between the positions of the Catholic and the secular or liberal parties, and are in fact attempting to reconcile irreconcilable principles. But their consistency or inconsistency does not immediately affect the main question of the support or the abolition of the State school system. Protestants and liberals are nearly unanimous in supporting it, and differ only on the question whether the schools supported by the State shall be wholly or only partially secular. But the protest of the Catholic Church strikes at the very foundation of State schools; it denies the right of the State to educate at all, and claims the whole field of education as part of the domain of the Church itself. Let us, then, concentrate our attention for the present on the Catholic protest, and consider, without passion and without prejudice, how far this protest is grounded in justice and in truth.

**MINOR OBJECTIONS.**
On the minor objections urged by the Catholic Church against the public school system, I shall touch very lightly, reserving my chief attention for the one great and central principle of its protest.

It is charged, for instance, that the public school system, as compared with the Catholic parochial school system, is unduly expensive, and the merit of superior economy is pleaded for the latter. This may be true to some extent, and is easily explained when the two kinds of education imparted are compared as to their intrinsic value. Economy is not always secured by buying cheap articles; and the cheapness of Catholic education is no argument in its favor, when its character is considered in the light of certain Catholic admissions which might easily be quoted. But that the universal adoption of the voluntary denominational system, supplanting the public schools with church schools established by each sect in its own sectarian interest, could possibly reduce the total cost of education on the whole, is incredible. The cost of so many sets of schools would greatly exceed the cost of our present school system, if the same number of children should be educated with the same degree of thoroughness as now.

Again, the gradual expansion of the common school system, by the establishment of State high schools, normal schools, and universities, is dwelt upon as a great evil, which will ultimately involve the destruction of denominational institutions of the corresponding grade. Perhaps no higher encomium, in the eyes of every enlightened friend of education who knows the worthlessness of most denominational colleges, could be passed upon our present system. Whoever is competent to compare Cornell University and Michigan University with sectarian colleges that could easily be named, will see that this objection is of the nature of a boomerang, and returns to damage the unskilful launcher of it. It would be foreign to my present subject to discuss the equity of sustaining high schools, normal schools, and universities, as State institutions, since we are now concerned only with the elementary public schools as such; but I would enter a general denial of the assumption that the lower grades of State schools are inequitable because of the supposed inherent tendency of the system to expand into higher institutions of learning. Certainly a very strong argument can be made, on grounds of a thoroughly democratic character, in defence of that tendency, if it exists.

Again, the argument that the secular education given in the common schools not only does not tend to diminish crime, as is claimed by their friends, but, on the contrary, does tend directly to foster immorality both in teachers and pupils, was urged on this platform last Sunday by Bishop McQuaid. But statistics of unquestionable accuracy are against him on the former point, as any one may learn from the "Report of the Committee on Education of the New York City Council of Political Reform on Compulsory Education," published in 1873; while on the latter point it is sufficient to say that moral abuses tend to creep into every great institution, and that infinitely worse stories are told, on authority at least as good, of the immorality practised in Roman Catholic convents, nunneries, monasteries, and so forth, than have ever been told of American public schools. This is a very dangerous argument for Roman Catholics to use; it will hurt their own church a great deal more than it can possibly hurt the public school system; but it is one which I have little inclination to go into, and one which will certainly draw upon the Catholic Church a host of assailants, if the Church is incautious enough to give them an opportunity. The wholesale charges brought by Catholic writers against the public schools with respect to their so-called immoral tendencies will not always be suffered to go unchallenged. Whatever truth there is in them should be made manifest; whoever is guilty should be exposed and punished; but wholesale insinuations against the teachers and pupils of the public schools will call out at last a species of reply not very agreeable to those who have indulged in this mode of warfare. No argument against the justice of taxing the whole community for the support of public schools can be drawn from any such local and incidental abuses as were referred to last Sunday; whether actual or invented, they are neither part nor product of the public school system as such; and I pass them by, not simply because they are irrelevant to the argument, but also because, if the debate is diverted to a discussion of the relative moral influence on society of the public school system and of the Roman Catholic Church, the latter will have all it can do to defend its own principle of ecclesiastical celibacy, and the historical record of its effect on public morality.

The Catholic Conscience.

It is not these minor and subsidiary objections to the system of State schools—their alleged expensiveness, their tendency to supplement themselves with public high schools and colleges, or the insinuation of their necessarily immoral influence (which, if the insinuation could be sustained by proof, would be anything but a minor objection)—that constitute the real strength of the Catholic protest against the public school system. Its strength lies in the claim that the Catholic conscience is violated and oppressed by this system. This is a claim which demands the most patient, serious and candid attention of every just man. No matter whether the claim of an aggrieved conscience is made by a great party or by an obscure and unsupported individual, it is a claim which commands instant and reverential heed; and no institution can be solidly built or stable which rests on disregard of one man's outraged conscience. Unless the foundations of the school system are laid on the rock of
absolute equity and impartial justice, it is built upon the sand, and must fall; and the examination of the soundness of its foundations cannot be postponed, if only a solitary voice is raised in solemn protest against it.

Nevertheless, it does not follow that every protest made in the name of conscience must be obeyed or yielded to, even if made in most absolute and unquestioned sincerity. Conscience itself is under law; it is bound to be reasonable. So far as the individual is concerned, his private conscience, whether in fact reasonable or not, must be obeyed; for it is to him the expression and measure of his moral reason, beyond which or above which he cannot go. But so far as his claims on other men are concerned, his individual conscience is not and cannot be the ultimate law of their conduct. They too have consciences, as sacred to them as his to him; and the one common law of reason is binding on all alike. Hence the Catholic's claim of an injured and wronged conscience is not of itself a sufficient warrant for the immediate abandonment of the school system; he must first prove it to be a just and reasonable conscience. Un-instructed and perverted consciences are altogether too common in this world,—foolish and wrong things are too often demanded or done in conscience' name,—to make it either wise or right to give up a great public institution of proved beneficence, or to surrender the necessary conditions of its existence, the very first moment that it is challenged. Despite his infallible standard of right and wrong, the Pope's ex cathedra deliverances, the Roman Catholic in this free country must waive his divine authorities of Pope and Church, and consent to plead his case before the bar of the universal reason of mankind. This Bishop McQuaid did last Sunday; from this platform he addressed his plea to the public intelligence of the country, just as if no Pope had ever sat on the throne of the Vatican; and he never once quoted the authority of his infallible Sovereign as the supreme confirmation of his own words. The Catholic Church itself, Pope and all, must do the same; it protests against the school system, and addresses the protest to the general intelligence of the country; and by the verdict of this intelligence the protest must stand or fall. Therefore I say that the Catholic claim of an outraged conscience, with the tacit but evidently implied sanction of Bishop McQuaid and every other Catholic who consents to reason his case before the public, must be judged by the laws of reason; and, if it is adjudged to be unreasonable, such Catholics cannot without tergiversation repudiate the legitimacy of the verdict they have invoked and thereby sanctioned in advance.

What, then, is the essence and the rational ground of the claim that the Catholic conscience is wronged and trampled on by the maintenance of the public school system?

**WHAT THE CATHOLIC CONSCIENCE CLAIMS.**

1. The Catholic conscience demands, in the apt phrase of Cardinal McCloskey, "Catholic education for Catholic children." But by whom is this demand refused? Surely not by the State, which imposes on no child any particular form of religious education. I admit that the practice of Bible-reading in the public schools is a wrong and infringement upon the rights of Catholics, Jews, and all non-Protestant-Christian children; but that this practice prevents Catholics from giving Catholic education to their children, it would be preposterous to pretend. They are doing it at this very time. Certainly the demand of "Catholic education for Catholic children" is granted in advance, unless it means that the State should furnish such education. That is a very different matter. Whoever wants sectarian education is perfectly free to get it; but it must be at his own cost. The State ought to furnish education, but not sectarianism; that is his own affair altogether. The right and wrong of this matter are evident: the State should not and does not prevent "Catholic education for Catholic children;" but equally it should not and does not furnish it.

2. The Catholic conscience demands freedom of exercise, says Bishop McQuaid, and he proceeds to declare: "The majority of the people rule, by the power of numbers, that a large minority shall not be free to educate their children according to their conscience." I can only pass over this assertion in mute astonishment. The simple fact is, that Catholics are educating their children according to their consciences, either at the public or at the parochial schools, as they freely elect.

3. The Catholic conscience demands "equal rights." Very well: that it ought to have. The equal rights of the Catholics, like those of the liberals, are infringed by Protestant worship in the public schools. Equal rights will be established when the Catholics have as much right to have their religion taught in the schools as the Protestants, Jews or Radicals,—that is, no right at all. The trouble with the Catholics is that this equality of rights does not satisfy them; they feel aggrieved unless their own religion is positively taught in the schools to which their children go. But, so far as the public schools are concerned, this is to demand unequal rights; and this is to have a very unreasonable conscience.

4. The Catholic conscience demands, in Bishop McQuaid's words, "the non-interference of the State in Church or in School." On the other hand, the secular conscience requires the non-interference of the Church in State or School. To which shall the school belong, to the Church or to the State? That is indeed the clean issue. But I do not see any way to reconcile here the two consciences. I suspect they are equally stubborn, equally unable to yield; but which is the more reasonable, is a point which must prove in the end decisive.
5. The Catholic conscience claims to be violated by a system which supports Protestant schools at the public expense; and the justice of this claim must be allowed. To make the public schools Protestant by requiring or permitting Protestant worship in them is truly a violation of all but Protestant consciences. But it is easy to rectify this wrong, and to establish a perfect equality of rights in the case, by simply secularizing the schools altogether. If this would satisfy the Catholic conscience, a permanent settlement of the school question could be effected; but the Catholic conscience is not satisfied with equality—it demands privilege, which is a very different matter.

7. The Catholic conscience claims to be still more violated by a system which should support secular schools at the public expense. Now what is a secular school? A school in which the elementary branches of an English education—reading, writing, arithmetic, &c.—are taught, and in which religion is not taught; one which teaches nothing but what all children, whether of Catholic, Protestant, or liberal parentage, alike need to know, and which is scrupulously protected from all usurpation by any class of parents in the matter of religion. To pretend that this careful exclusion of all religious worship and instruction is to teach irreligion, is an instance of unparalleled audacity. It is impossible to teach the alphabet or multiplication table and the Catholic catechism at one and the same instant; and even in the Catholic school a certain time is devoted to teaching the alphabet and the multiplication table exclusively. Is that to teach irreligion? It is undeniably to separate religious and secular education for the time being; but is that to teach irreligion? I must press this question: is it teaching irreligion to devote a portion of time exclusively to teaching arithmetic or geography? If it is, then Catholic schools also teach irreligion just so long as they are teaching arithmetic or geography, and they should be denounced just as sweepingly as the public schools. But if not—if it is not teaching irreligion to devote in Catholic schools one or two hours exclusively to instruction in secular knowledge,—then it is no more teaching irreligion to devote in the public schools three or four or five hours to the same instruction. The Catholics may choose which horn of the dilemma they please: either the Catholic schools teach irreligion part of the time, or else the public schools do not teach irreligion at all. The sole ground of complaint against secular schools is that they omit to teach positive Catholic doctrine; and the attempt to twist this omission to teach Catholicism into a direct teaching of the contrary is a very desperate shift. Let me illustrate. I go to a carriage warehouse where buggies are advertised for sale, and order a horse and buggy. "But," replies the proprietor, "I do not sell horses; I sell only buggies." "That will do very well for those who want buggies only," I answer; "I don't believe in separating horses and buggies, and my conscience forbids me to purchase them separately." "I should be glad to accommodate you," replies the puzzled proprietor, "but really, my dear sir, I have only buggies for sale." "Then," I exclaim, "I denounce you for a violation of equal rights and for a secret purpose to outrage the community by abolishing horses. You grant all they ask to those who conscientiously want buggies alone; but you refuse what I ask, when my conscience demands a horse and buggy, one and inseparable. This is an invidious discrimination against my equal rights, a direct assault on the very existence of all horses; and now I propose to shut up your establishment altogether!" This is exactly what the Catholics are doing; they propose to shut up all State schools, if they can, because State schools can teach only secular knowledge, and not religion at the same time. They have profound scruples of conscience against buying buggies without horses.

7. But the gist of the claims made by the Catholic conscience is that Catholic parents ought not to be taxed for anything but Catholic schools, since they cannot conscientiously send their children to any other; and, since the State cannot support Catholic schools, Catholic parents ought to be relieved from school taxes altogether, or else to receive back their own taxes from the State to be expended under their own control for Catholic schools. This is the beginning, middle, and end of the Catholic claim; all other claims of the Catholic conscience grow out of this. Bishop McQuaid says distinctly: "Catholics who are thus taxed are, to the extent of the taxes they pay, punished—persecuted for religion's sake." And again: "It must not be lost sight of in this argument that our rights go where our money goes."

It is in the name, therefore, of Catholic parents, who are taxed by the State for the support of the public schools, that the whole protest of the Catholic conscience is entered. But in truth the State deals exclusively with individuals in this matter of taxation; it deals with them neither as Catholics nor even as parents, but simply and solely as citizens. The State does not ask whether the tax-payer is a Catholic, or Protestant, or Jew, or free thinker; it does not ask whether he is married or unmarried, a parent or childless; it only asks him to pay his fair proportion of the school expenses as an individual member of the civil community. Now the question whether the State, which wholly ignores the inquiry as to the tax-payer's religion or family relations, has a right to tax all citizens indiscriminately for the support of the public school system, will presently come up for independent discussion; but I wish to point out that this general question is not raised by the Catholic conscience, which claims exemption from the public school tax for Catholic parents as such. It is the duties imposed by Catholic parentage which constitute the ground of the demand of "Catholic education for Catholic children," and it is the rights inherent in Catholic parentage which constitute at least the ostensible grounds of protest against taxation for the public schools. The protest is essentially a denial of the general obligations of
citizenship in the name of church membership and family ties. Before discussing the right of the State to tax all its citizens for public schools, I must first consider the astounding claim of Catholic parents to be treated as if they were not citizens at all, but to be excepted, set apart by themselves, and permitted to receive the benefits of the State without discharging the corresponding obligations. The Catholic claim is—not to be taxed for non-Catholic public schools; and it rests wholly on the alleged absolute rights of Catholic parents as such. These rights, it is evident, must be closely scrutinized and analyzed.

"PARENTAL PREROGATIVE."

The protest of the Catholic conscience against taxation for a non-Catholic public school system grows out of what Bishop McQuaid has well described as "Parental Prerogative." But in this matter he speaks not for himself alone. Chief-Justice Dunne, of Arizona, in a lecture delivered a year ago, laid down these two principles as the basis of the Catholic demand respecting the schools:

- Religious instruction is of paramount importance.
- Each parent has the right to say what religious instruction his child shall receive.

And he says in another passage:

"This claim to the absolute control of our domestic affairs is a sacred right which we cannot yield to the State."

The Catholic World for January speaks in the same strain, laying the foundation for the Catholic demands in a seemingly very harmless proposition:

"Whatever you do, keep your hands off the family altar. Do not set foot into the hallowed precincts of the domestic sanctuary. The family, though subordinate, is not to be violated by the State. Parents have rights which no government can usurp."

(These rights are intended to include absolute control over the education of children.)

Rev. Father Müller, in his book called Public School Education, defines the doctrine of "parental prerogative" as follows:

"It is not on the State, but on parents, that God imposed the duty to educate their children, a duty from which no State can dispense; nor can fathers and mothers relieve themselves of this duty by the vicarious assumption of the State. They have to give a severe account of their children on the Day of Judgment, and they cannot allow any power to disturb them in insisting upon their rights and making free use of them. The State has no more authority or control rightfully over our children than over a man's wife. The right to educate our children is a right of conscience, and a right of the family. Now these rights do not belong to the temporal order at all; and outside of this the State has no claim, no right, no authority."

Again, condensing into a pregnant phrase the whole Catholic theory of "parental prerogative," Father Müller emphatically declares—and I would solicit special attention to the declaration:

"The social unit is the family, not the individual."

Bishop McQuaid thus stated the same general position in a lecture at Rochester, N.Y., in March, 1872:

"Parents have the right to educate their children."

"It is wrong for the State to interfere with the exercise of this right."

"By the establishment of Common Schools at the expense of all tax-payers, the State does interfere with this right, especially in the case of poor parents who find it a burden to pay double taxes."

Last Sunday the Bishop expressed the same general views as follows:

"The last to be heard and consulted is the one to whom the settlement of the question first and finally belongs—the parent of the child. . . . In spite of all, the responsibility of the education of his child falls on him, and on no one else. . . . Parental rights precede State rights. . . . A father's right to the pursuit of happiness extends to that of his children as well. . . . Parental rights include parental duties and responsibilities before God and society."

After quoting various authorities in defence of his position, the Bishop continued:

"It is the Christian view of parental rights and duties which is here given. . . . The doctrine coming into vogue, that the child belongs to the State, is the dressing-up of an old skeleton of Spartan paganism, with its hideousness dimly disguised by a thin cloaking of Christian morality."

I have quoted enough, I think, to give a fair view of this theory of "parental prerogative," on which the Catholic protest against the public school system is founded. Its principal points are as follows, restated in something like logical order:

1. The social unit is the family, not the individual; and in the family the father is the supreme authority, or head,—both the wife and the children being required by the Catholic Church to "obey" him.
2. The father, representing the family, is charged with all rights, powers, and responsibilities concerning the education of the children. The State has absolutely no share either in the rights, powers, or responsibilities; for
all education must be Catholic, and the State has neither capacity nor authority to impart it.

3. The State, consequently, by establishing a Common School System and taxing all citizens to support it, violates the sanctity of family rights, invades and usurps the "Parental Prerogative," and oppresses the father's conscience by requiring him to support a system of schools to which he cannot send his children, and by which all these wrongs are committed.

Here we have the core and pith of the Catholic protest against taxation for the public schools, so far as it is deemed wise to address it to the general intelligence of the American people. It is the side of the Catholic conscience which is turned to the outside world, although there is another side of it which is turned towards the Catholic Church. We see that, so far as this protest is addressed to the universal reason of mankind, it plants itself on a doctrine of "Parental Prerogative" which is at bottom a general social theory: namely, that society has for its ultimate unit the family, not the individual, and that all the educational rights, powers and responsibilities of the family are concentrated in the father as the Divinely constituted head of the family. Whether, therefore, the protest of the Catholic conscience against the public school system is an intrinsically reasonable conscience, or not, is a question which can only be determined by examining the social theory on which it rests. Should this theory not prove to be inherently reasonable, but to involve unreason and injustice of a grave character, then the school question will be fundamentally changed. It will no longer be the question whether we ought to abandon the public school system out of deference to the rights of an oppressed minority, but rather how we should most justly and most tenderly deal with the honest, but unenlightened and dangerously misguided, conscience of a sect which is discontented with the essential principles of republican institutions. This is certainly a question of the greatest gravity; but it is not so grave as one which involves the possible abandonment of all State education. If the Catholic protest is actually not based on sound reason and impartial reverence for the rights of all,—if it turns out to be the stealthy and masked attack of an ambitious hierarchy on the bulwarks of popular liberty,—our minds will be, at least, relieved of much perplexity and embarrassment. What, then, is the intrinsic character of this doctrine of "Parental Prerogative"? Is it true or false?

THE CATHOLIC SOCIAL THEORY A RELIC OF BARBARISM.

Remembering clearly the chief features of the Catholic social theory which lies at the bottom of the so-called "Parental Prerogative,"—namely, that the social unit is the family, not the individual, and that all powers and rights touching the education of children are vested in the father, as the head of the family,—you will gain a clearer insight into the truth of this matter, if, instead of giving you any reflections of my own, I read to you some pretty copious extracts from a book which every well-read person will recognize at once as one which enjoys a world-wide reputation of the highest possible character. I refer to the treatise of Sir Henry Sumner Maine on Ancient Law, a work which by common consent ranks among the ablest and most valuable productions of the century. What he has to say on this subject will hardly be gainsaid by any but the uninformed; and I prefer to give his views in his own language without attempting to translate it into my own. Sir Henry Maine says:

"The effect of the evidence derived from comparative jurisprudence is to establish that view of the primeval condition of the human race which is known as the Patriarchal Theory. . . . The difficulty, at the present stage of the inquiry, is to know where to stop—to say of what races of men it is not allowable to lay down that the society in which they are united was originally organized on the patriarchal model. . . . The points which lie on the surface of the history are these. The eldest male parent, the eldest ascendant, is absolutely supreme in his household. His dominion extends to life and death, and is as unqualified over his children and their houses as over his slaves; indeed, the relations of sonship and serfdom appear to differ in little beyond the higher capacity which the child in blood possesses of becoming one day the head of a family himself. . . . If I were attempting to express comprehensively the characteristics of the situation in which mankind disclose themselves at the dawn of history, I should be satisfied to quote a few verses from the Odyssey of Homer: 'They have neither assemblies for consultation nor themistae, but every one exercises jurisdiction over his wives and children, and they pay no regard to one another.' . . [Archaic law] is full, in all its provinces, of the clearest indications that society in primitive times was not what it is assumed to be at present, a collection of individuals. In fact, and in the view of the men who composed it, it was an aggregation of families. The contrast may be most forcibly expressed by saying that the unit of an ancient society was the Family,—of a modern society the Individual. . . . In most of the Greek states and in Rome there long remained the vestiges of an ascending series of groups out of which the State was at first constituted. The Family, House, and Tribe of the Romans may be taken as the type of them, and they are so described to us that we can scarcely help conceiving them as a system of concentric circles which have gradually expanded from the same point. The elementary group is the Family, connected by common subjection to the highest male ascendant. The aggregation of Families forms the Gens or House. The aggregation of Houses makes the Tribe. The aggregation of Tribes
constitutes the Commonwealth. . . . No doubt, when with our modern ideas we contemplate the union of independent communities, we can suggest a hundred modes of carrying it out, the simplest of all being that the individuals comprised in the coalescing groups shall vote or act according to local propinquity; but the idea that a number of persons should exercise political rights in common simply because they happened to live within the same topographical limits was utterly strange and monstrous to primitive antiquity. . . . This was the principle of local contiguity, now recognized everywhere as the condition of community in political functions."

We thus see clearly that the Roman Catholic social theory, according to which (in the very phrase of Father Müller himself) the "social unit is the family, not the individual," appears to be a mere relic of primeval barbarism, the survival of an antiquated and fossilized conception utterly out of harmony with the pervading spirit of modern society.

**The "Parental Prerogative" Only the "Patria Potestas."**

A closer investigation only reveals this fact more plainly. The "Parental Prerogative" of Bishop McQuaid is nothing but a modification of the "Patria Potestas," or Fatherly Authority of the ancient Roman law. What this was, Sir Henry Maine shows as follows:—

"On a few systems of law the family organization of the earliest society has left a plain and broad mark in the lifelong authority of the Father or other ancestor over the person and property of his descendants—an authority which we may conveniently call by its later Roman name of Patria Potestas. No feature of the rudimentary associations of mankind is deposed to by a greater amount of evidence than this, and yet none seems to have disappeared so generally and rapidly from the usages of advancing communities as this. . . . In the mature Greek jurisprudence, the rule advances a few steps on the practice hinted at in the Homeric literature; and though very many traces of the stringent family obligation remain, the direct authority of the parent is limited, as in European codes, to the non-age or minority of the children, or, in other words, to the period during which their mental and physical inferiority may always be presumed. . . . The Patria Potestas of the Romans, which is necessarily our type of the primeval paternal authority, is equally difficult to understand as an institution of civilized life, whether we consider its incidence on the person or its effects on property. It is to be regretted that a chasm which exists in its history cannot be more completely filled. So far as regards the person, the parent, when our information commences, has over his children the jus vitae necisque, the power of life and death, and a fortiori of uncontrolled personal chastisement; he can modify their personal condition at pleasure; he can give a wife to his son; he can give his daughter in marriage; he can divorce his children of either sex; he can transfer them to another family by adoption, and he can sell them. Late in the Imperial period we find vestiges of all these powers, but they are reduced within very narrow limits. The unqualified right of domestic chastisement has become a right of bringing domestic offences under the cognizance of the civil magistrate; the privilege of dictating marriage has declined into a conditional veto; the liberty of selling has been virtually abolished; and adoption itself, destined to lose almost all its ancient importance in the reformed system of Justinian, can no longer be effected without the assent of the child transferred to the adoptive parentage. In short, we are brought very close to the verge of the ideas which have at length prevailed in the modern world. . . . The movement of the progressive societies has been uniform in one respect. Through all its course it has been distinguished by the gradual dissolution of family dependency and the growth of individual obligation in its stead. The Individual is steadily substituted for the Family, as the unit of which civil laws take account. . . . Nor is it difficult to see what is the tie between man and man which replaces by degrees those forms of reciprocity in rights and duties which have their origin in the Family. It is contract. Starting, as from one terminus of history, from a condition of society in which all the relations of persons are summed up in the relations of Family, we seem to have steadily moved towards a phase of social order in which all these relations rise from the free agreement of Individuals."

We are now in a condition to understand precisely the value of that "Parental Prerogative" on which Bishop McQuaid and other Catholics base their claim that the school system violates "parental rights." It is the "old skeleton of" Roman "paganism"—dressed up with a "thin cloaking of Christian morality." It is the ancient and outgrown Patria Potestas, intruding itself into modern society with its claim of despotic authority for the father over his child, and ignoring both the personal rights of the child and the collective rights of society. It is the galvanized corpse of the old Patriarchal Theory, good enough for the days of Abraham, who in obedience to it undertook to murder his own son, but a disgusting anachronism in the nineteenth century and the Centennial Year. The school question cannot be justly referred for settlement to the "parents" alone; the children have something at stake—society has something at stake—and parents must dismiss the notion that their despotic selfishness will be allowed to substitute the rights of one party alone for the rights of three parties to this issue. The Catholic social theory, with its claim that "the family, not the individual, is the social unit," is the unburied skeleton of pre-historic barbarism, the most ancient and best authenticated relic in the keeping of the church;
while the "Parental Prerogative" which is so confidently relied upon to crush the great public school system under its elephantine tread is nothing but the pale and powerless ghost of the ancient Roman Patria Potestas, with not enough substance in it to crush the life out of a daisy.

**The "Parental Prerogative" a Mere Stalking-Horse of the Pope.**

But I have not got through with this "Parental Prerogative" yet. It is a most shrewd and sagacious appeal to the very democratic instinct to which it is really opposed. It is an endeavor to rouse the jealous independence of the American father in repulse of a purely illusory attack on his reserved parental rights. That he has parental rights I am the very last to deny; I am a parent myself, and not slow to defend the rights of a parent. But it is tyranny for a parent to forget or disregard the rights of his child; and it is usurpation for a parent to defy or despise the rights of society. Let the parent by all means stand firmly by his true parental rights in this school question; but let him be intelligent and self-restrained enough to recognize that he is not proprietor of all the rights in the case. Children are no longer the absolute property of the father. The plea of "Parental Prerogative" is well calculated to create a sense of wrong where no wrong exists—to sting ignorant parents into claiming a jurisdiction that does not belong to them, and to induce them to look on the Catholic Church as the bold champion of their rights against the assaults of a tyrannical majority. Such parents as these need to have their eyes opened; they are unsuspicious dupes. When the Catholic Church pleads "Parental Prerogative" to break down the beneficent public school system, and seemingly champions the rights of parents against the oppressions and aggressions of the non-Catholic majority, such parents ought to see that the church does not recognize any "Parental Prerogative" at all as towards itself. No sooner has the Church succeeded in rescuing the Catholic parent from the imaginary jaws of the State, than it immediately proceeds to devour both parent and child with its own jaws. It claims for the parent, so far as the State is concerned, absolute and undivided authority over his child; but, as the Divinely deputed parent of all Catholics, it claims for itself absolute and undivided authority over both parent and child. It is well to understand this matter thoroughly. Whatever "parental rights" or "parental prerogative" the Church may claim for Catholic parents, it concedes to them no rights whatsoever that are inconsistent with its own autocratic dominion over them. Let no one for a moment imagine that the Church would tolerate any exercise of "parental prerogative" which should withdraw Catholic children from parochial schools to place them in the public schools. That sort of parental independence it is swift to punish with the severest penalties in its power to inflict. I must adduce some evidence of this statement, to convince you that I am not talking at random.

In the list of "damnable heresies" known as the *Syllabus Errorum* denounced and condemned by Pope Pius IX. in 1864, the forty-eighth is as follows:—

*"That method of instructing youth can be approved by Catholic men which is separated from the Catholic faith and from the power of the Church, and which has regard, or at least principally, to a knowledge of natural things only, and to the ends of social life on this earth."*

The condemnation of this proposition is the explicit condemnation of all secular education by the supreme and infallible Head of the Church; and it forbids all Catholics to sanction or approve anything but strictly Catholic education. The whole warfare of the Catholic Church in this country against the public school system is the direct consequence of obedience to this command of the Pope; and the Church could not possibly recognize any "parental prerogative" which would withdraw Catholic children from parochial schools to place them in the public schools. That sort of parental independence it is swift to punish with the severest penalties in its power to inflict. I must adduce some evidence of this statement, to convince you that I am not talking at random.

In the list of "damnable heresies" known as the *Syllabus Errorum* denounced and condemned by Pope Pius IX. in 1864, the forty-eighth is as follows:—

*"That method of instructing youth can be approved by Catholic men which is separated from the Catholic faith and from the power of the Church, and which has regard, or at least principally, to a knowledge of natural things only, and to the ends of social life on this earth."*

The condemnation of this proposition is the explicit condemnation of all secular education by the supreme and infallible Head of the Church; and it forbids all Catholics to sanction or approve anything but strictly Catholic education. The whole warfare of the Catholic Church in this country against the public school system is the direct consequence of obedience to this command of the Pope; and the Church could not possibly recognize any "parental prerogative" which would withdraw Catholic children from parochial schools to place them in the public schools. That sort of parental independence it is swift to punish with the severest penalties in its power to inflict. I must adduce some evidence of this statement, to convince you that I am not talking at random.

Further, in answer to the question, "Who is bound to obey the Church?" the Catholic Catechism replies: "All baptized persons, for we are commanded by Jesus Christ himself to obey his Church." What "parental prerogative" is left outside of this obligation of universal obedience?

But I do not adduce merely abstract declarations of Syllabus or Catechism. The Dubuque *Daily Telegraph* of Jan. 3, only seven weeks ago, had this paragraph:—

*"Father Ryan announced in St. Patrick's Church yesterday that the rule heretofore adopted of refusing the Sacrament of Penance and Holy Eucharist to parents who send their children to the public schools would be enforced and adhered to henceforth. He spoke emphatically on the matter, and advised parents who send their children to the public schools not to attempt to approach the sacraments, while they persist in refusing obedience to this law of the Church, alleging that such is the law."*

Remember that to refuse the sacrament to a Catholic is practically to condemn him to an eternal hell. There can be no doubt that this is the law of the Church. Bishop Gilmour, of Cleveland, explicitly declared it to be the law in his Lenten Pastoral of 1873, as follows:—

*"We solemnly charge and most positively require every Catholic in the diocese to support, and send his children to, a Catholic school. When good Catholic schools exist, where it may be honestly said a child will get a fair common school education,—if parents, either through contempt for the priest or through disregard for
the laws of the church, refuse to send their children to a Catholic school, then, in such cases, but in such cases only, we authorize confessors to refuse the sacraments to such parents as thus despise the laws of the Church, and disobey the command of both priest and Bishop."

In Rhode Island, according to the New York Independent of Feb. 10, 1876, "it seems that the father of a Miss De Fray made an affidavit in which he swore that the mother of the child had been excluded from the sacred rites of the Catholic Church, because she allowed her daughter to attend the public school, and was told that, so long as she persisted in doing so, she would not be entitled to the privileges of the Church." In consequence of this oppression, a bill has actually been introduced into the Rhode Island Legislature to prohibit such interference with family affairs. In other words, the State, which is denounced as violating "parental rights," is actually invoked to protect Catholic parents from violation of these very rights by their own priests!

I must not fail to add some personal testimony of my own to the same effect. Last Sunday evening, Bishop McQuaid lectured on "Catholic Education for Catholic Children," in St. Mary's Hall, Cambridgeport; and, desiring to hear him speak on this subject to a Catholic audience, I attended the lecture. Among other things, he said substantially this (I may not give the exact words in every part, but I know I give the exact substance of his words): "Now I am going to read to you from the Syllabus, which is a bugbear to many people, as if it were the horn of the beast of the Apocalypse thrown into the world to make mischief. But the Syllabus is only the condensation of great truths which the world needs for its salvation." He then read the extract I have already quoted, condemning so emphatically all Catholics who approve of any education apart from the faith and power of the Church, and said, with a lowering of the voice and an intensity of manner and tone which well conveyed the verbally suppressed menace: "Whoever does not believe in the Syllabus as the infallible truth of God ceases to be a Catholic. He may perhaps attend Mass, and go to confession; but"—and he spoke with an emphasis sure not to be misunderstood—"I would not like to have the absolving of him!"

Such, then, is the extent of the "parental prerogative" which the Bishop so eloquently claimed for Catholic parents on Sunday afternoon, and as eloquently scattered to the four winds of heaven on Sunday evening. Nothing can be plainer than that the Catholic conscience hurled against the school system is not the free and independent consciences of individual Catholic parents, but rather the conscience formed irresistibly in them by the clergy to whom they listen with fettered minds, massed like an obedient and well-disciplined army in defence of the Church. It is not the unbiased conscience of the parents as such, left to form their candid opinions in profoundly respected liberty, but the coerced and yet honest conscience of spiritual slaves. It is, in short, not the conscience of free parents at all, but the organic conscience of the Church of Rome, knowing its own interests, oblivious of everything else, and determined to protect them at all costs. It is the conscience of the priests, the bishops, and the Pope, using the consciences of the laity as mere pawns in their desperate game with modern civilization. Let us understand the matter; the battle is between the corporate, consolidated, ecclesiastical conscience of the Roman Papacy, on the one hand, and, on the other, the multitudinous, independent, and secular consciences of the American Republic—nothing but that; and this whole theory of "parental prerogative," which is now held up high before the gaze of the outside world in order to compass the destruction of the public schools, and now trampled scornfully under foot within the precincts of the Church in order to build up the parochial schools, has no life, meaning, or veracity except as the Pope's stalking-horse. In saying this, I do not in the least question the sincerity of the Roman priesthood. Ambition is a terribly sincere thing; despotism is a terribly sincere thing. But the American citizen who is deceived by this talk of "parental prerogative" and consents to abolish the public schools out of tenderness for "parental rights," unbolts and unbars the cage of a tiger whose first leap will be at his own throat. The Church cares nothing for parental rights except as an outer wall of defence against the Republic's just claim to establish schools for the education of her own children. Before the Church, the parent has no right but to obey. The Pope commands the bishops; the bishops command the priests; the priests command the parents; the parents command the children; and the burden of the command is evermore the same—"Believe and obey!" That is the beginning, middle, and end of "parental prerogative." Shall any freeman be so simple as not to know slavery when he sees it?

**The American Social Theory.**

No—it is high time for all who would enjoy liberty to understand the conditions of liberty. While the Church is built on the social theory which makes the family, not the individual, the social unit; while it binds the parent both to be a true and obedient Catholic himself, and to make his children also true and obedient Catholics; and while it teaches the doctrine of "parental prerogative" in this, and no other sense,—the free State is built on a social theory exactly the reverse of this. It recognizes the individual, and not the family, as the true social unit, the ultimate atom of human society; and it exists solely to guarantee and to protect the equal natural rights of all individuals. This is the distinctly avowed basis of the American Republic. The Declaration of Independence proclaims, as the first great principle of our national existence, that "all men are created equal;
"All men, all individuals," not all families or all parents. The preamble of the United States Constitution, ordaining and establishing the fundamental law of the land, does so in the name of—"We the people:" that is, we, the aggregated individuals who compose the people, and not we the families, or we the parents. In accordance with this initial recognition of individuality and the rights of individuality as the prime fact of human society, all our institutions are framed. Our national life consists in a fuller and higher realization of this supreme principle. While the Church binds women and children to domestic servitude under man, as the Divinely appointed head of the family, the State is coming more and more to restrict this irrational and oppressive supremacy of man. It is coming to recognize woman as man's equal before the law; it has long regarded marriage as a civil contract only, and this is leading to the gradual establishment of woman's equal civil and political rights. That is the deeper meaning of the woman movement, which aims to establish and protect woman's right to the enjoyment of her own free individuality. So also the movement for a better and more strictly universal education, the movement to extend and improve the public school system, is at bottom nothing but the State's growing consciousness that children are also individuals, with all the rights of individuality,—not, as the Church makes them, the personal property of the father, but really wards entrusted to his fostering care during the period of their immaturity. Just as the movement for female suffrage is a growing recognition of the rights of women as individuals, so is the movement for better public schools a growing recognition of the rights of children as individuals. Whoever would consent to the abolition of State schools, which are necessarily imbued with this principle of the individual rights of children, consents to the substitution in their place of the inevitable Church schools, which are all more or less imbued with the principle of the Christianized Patria Potestas.

Alas for the radicalism which, through jealousy of the State, would thus unwittingly handing over the education of children to the Church! The abolition of State schools means the inevitable establishment of denominational or Church schools. But the social theory and tendency of the State is the development of free individuality, while that of the Church is the development of ecclesiastical despotism. Which has the better claim to be the educator of those on whose shoulders must rest the responsibility of handing down free institutions to posterity? Vicar-General Wendischmann, of Munich, who clearly saw that the control of the future belongs to those who educate the children of the present, and who uttered the profound conviction and fixed purpose of the consolidated Roman hierarchy, did not exaggerate the importance of the school question, when he exclaimed: "The struggle for the school has the same importance in the nineteenth century that the struggle for the occupancy of the bishoprics had in the eleventh." It is indeed so. There are but two contestants in this great controversy—the despotic and remorseless Church of Rome, the democratic and humane Republic of America; and that one of the two which shall control the education of the common people will be lord of the land from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean.

**Rights of the Child.**

I think it must now be sufficiently clear that, instead of handing over the school question for final settlement to the parents alone, as Bishop McQuaid recommends (of course with the reservation that the parents must settle it just as the Church dictates, on pain of being deprived of absolution for their sins), the question can only be justly settled by the whole community, after a careful consideration of the rights of the three parties interested: namely, the children, the parents, and the State. Parent though I am, I should refuse to be made judge in a case in which I am myself one of three equally interested parties; and I must decline election to the bench under such circumstances, even on so flattering a nomination. But I find it my duty to present to the community, the real tribunal, my view of the case as involving these three classes of rights.

The child's principal rights as an individual seem to be, briefly, these:—

- **The right to existence.** The father has no right to deprive him of it, for that would be murder, and the State, the protector of rights, would not admit the plea of "parental prerogative" as any defence against the just punishment of the crime. Even before the child's birth, his individual right to existence begins; and foeticide is justly regarded as a crime of the blackest dye.

- **The right to proper maintenance, including food, clothing, and shelter.** To withhold these is a crime against the laws of the State, which again stands ready to invade the "sanctity" of my household, if I press my "parental prerogative" so far as to wrong the little being entrusted to me by a wilful failure to provide for its fundamental wants.

- **The right to a fair education, as the necessary condition of a happy and useful career in the life for which I am responsible.** This right is very imperfectly protected by the law; and it is a right which constitutes a claim not only on the parent, but on the State. Society has even a larger stake in my child's education than I have, since the larger portion of the child's life is to be spent away from my care and control. The child has a right to be educated, for his own sake and for society's sake; and society, having at least as large a
stake as mine in his future, must share with me the duty and the expense of furnishing the education. The burden and the cost of the education by which society is to be benefited at last even more than I, and to which the child may plead justly a natural right, ought in equity to be divided between the State and the parent. The right of the child to education, therefore, constitutes in equity a joint claim on both.

- The right to be protected by the State against parental selfishness, cruelty, ignorance, indifference, superstition. No parent has a right to over-work a child for the sake of his little earnings, or to work him at all to the neglect of his education. No parent has a right to abuse the child in any way. Such things as these are violations of the child's rights as an individual, and ought to be protected better than they are. The State is responsible for this protection, and sometimes affords it. An important case has just occurred in England, in which the State most righteously interfered to protect children from the unintentional cruelty resulting from mere superstition. Harper's Weekly, in its issue of Dec. 18, 1870, says:—

"An important decision has been given by Lord Coleridge in the case of the 'Peculiar People,' which was carried up on appeal. A member of this sect, for neglect to provide medical attendance for his sick child, was charged with manslaughter. The conviction for this offence in the court below was affirmed by the judges. Baron Bramwell said that 'the man thought that to fulfil the duty imposed by statute was wrong; the law, however, did not excuse him on that account.'"

It is part of the creed of this sect of the "Peculiar People" never to call in medical aid in sickness, but to rely only on prayer; and it was rightly held that the child's right to decent care in his sickness could not lapse by reason of the father's superstition. This is a very instructive case, and shows how respect for the rights of children is gradually abolishing the barbarous "parental prerogative." The plea of parental "conscience" in this instance is no justification for the infringement of the child's right to life; it will be found equally invalid in justification of infringement of his right to education. The child has a right not to be taught superstitions which shall unfit him to be either a good man or a good citizen. He has a right to be taught what the rights of others are, and what his own corresponding duties are. A school which should teach children that it is wrong to take or to give medical advice in sickness would be as mischievous and criminal in character as a school for instruction in the "fine art" of murder. The facts of the universe discovered by physical or moral science are a part of the great human heritage of which it is as much a crime to defraud a child as to defraud him of his share in his father's estate. Children's rights in these matters have yet to be studied and defined far more exactly, and protected far more efficiently, than is done to-day; and they have a very important bearing on the whole school question.

Children, therefore, have, as individuals and members of society, a right to life, a right to maintenance, a right to education in the knowledge of those facts of the universe which are essential to their social welfare, and a right to protection against their own ignorance of those facts, whether enforced in the name of "parental prerogative" or any other name; and the State, which exists to protect individual rights, should protect the child from violation of these rights either by its own parents or by the Church.

Rights of the Parent.

But the parent has also rights which are just as sacred as those of the child; and I am just as strenuous for the protection of them as Bishop McQuaid.

1. The parent has a right to exercise authority over the child so long as he does not violate the rights of the child or the rights of the State. His authority is that of the natural guardian of the child, not that of his owner or proprietor; and it can only be exercised within the limits of that relationship. The child's reason and conscience being undeveloped, the parent represents them during the child's minority, and is consequently bound to act from his own mature reason and conscience, not from his own arbitrary will or caprice. Being justly required to maintain the child, he has a right to such small services as the child may render without being deprived of the rights above defined; and he is no tyrant or oppressor in requiring from the child a general deference and obedience to his own commands. The natural affection for his offspring, and the natural wisdom derived from superior experience, which must be presumed to be his until the contrary is proved, entitle him to be free from all intrusive interference or petty supervision on part of the State in the exercise of his authority as the child's natural guardian; and it is only after a manifest and proved abuse of this authority that the State can justly interfere with the child. From the nature of the case, there is little danger of too much interference by the State: the danger is all the other way.

2. The parent has also the right to supervise and direct the education of the child to a very considerable extent. Provided he does not withhold altogether the education to which the child has the right already explained, he may justly decide the place where it is to be acquired, and the agencies by which it is to be imparted. He may either educate the child himself, or send him to a public or private school at his own option. The child has simply a right to a certain amount of education; provided he is not deprived of this, places and
times and instrumentalities are nobody's concern but the parent's. Especially with regard to religion and religious influences, the parent has an undoubted right to teach his child what he believes to be the most important of all truths. But there is a plain limitation of this right. Under the name of religion he has no right to teach anything which shall lead the child to trample on the rights of others or unfit him for the duties and responsibilities of good citizenship. The State has a wholly independent right to protect the child from such abuse of parental authority as this. No parent, for instance, has a right to teach his child that stealing is the proper way to secure a livelihood. If he does, the State has a right to interfere and see that the child is taught to respect the rights of others with regard to property. There is a certain natural morality resulting from the mere co-existence of many individuals with equal rights in one society; and this the parent has no right to disregard in any instruction he may give to his child. But he has a right to teach his child whatever views of religion, outside of this natural morality, he may hold to be true and precious. All that the State has a right to require is that the child shall not be prevented from knowing what is essential to the discharge of his duties as a member of society, and shall not be taught what is inconsistent with those duties.

The Rights of the State.

Besides the child and the parent, the State has rights and duties of its own absolutely independent of the Church. It does not ask any permission of the Church to exist or ensure the conditions of its own existence. Rightly considered, the State is nothing but human society, acting collectively to preserve the equality of rights among all the individuals that compose it, and to guarantee to each individual the maximum of individual liberty which is compatible with this equality of rights. If all individuals knew and respected the rights of others, there would be no need of the State as an organized power; and the power of the State will fall into disuse precisely in the proportion that all individuals do actually learn to know and respect the rights of others. The organized power of the State, however, must continue to be exercised until that day; and it does not exist by the sufferance of, or in subordination to, the organization known as the Church.

• The first great right of the State, then, is to exist, and to perpetuate its own existence. Whatever conditions are indispensable to its existence, it has an absolute right to require. It is based wholly on the social theory that the individual, not the family, is the social unit. On this theory its right to exist as an organization rests on the prior rights of the individuals that compose it; and its whole function is to maintain, protect and enlarge, as much as possible, these antecedent individual rights.

• The second great right of the State is to establish universal suffrage, as the necessary condition of its own existence as a society in which the rights of all individuals shall be equally respected.

• The third great right of the State is to establish universal intelligence and social morality, as the necessary condition of universal suffrage.

• The fourth great right of the State is to establish universal education, as the necessary condition of universal intelligence and social morality.

• The fifth great right of the State is to establish a universal system of public schools, as the necessary condition of universal education.

• The sixth great right of the State is to establish universal use of the means of education by the instruction of all children either at the public schools, or at private schools, or at home, as the parents may elect; and, further, to establish public examinations of all children at proper times and places. If the children pass these examinations successfully, the State will be satisfied, no matter how or when or where they acquired the requisite knowledge; but, in the case of children who fail to pass the examinations, it will properly require them to attend such schools as shall furnish it.

All these six rights are involved in the right of the State to exist as a society of individuals whose equal rights are universally known and respected. A knowledge of these rights and the corresponding duties constitutes that social morality which should be taught in the public schools; and it can be taught easily from textbooks which shall not infringe in the least on the religious beliefs of anybody. All religions profess to teach it; it can be taught, and should be taught, as a simple matter of positive knowledge, without stepping outside of the circle of the common relations of human life.

The State's Right to Tax for Public Schools.

Now, from what I have said, it clearly follows that the State has a right to tax all its tax-payers for the support of public schools:—

• Because the child's right to an elementary education is a joint claim upon the parent and the State; and the State can only discharge its own part of the obligation by maintaining a public school system.

• Because the State finds the public school system to be an absolute condition of its own existence as a free
society, charged with the protection of all individual rights, including the rights of children as individuals.

- Because the school taxes are collected for the support of the school system as a whole, of which all taxpayers alike receive the benefit through the perpetuation of the State as the protector of all individual rights, including their own. If the State has the right to tax all for any purpose, it has the right to tax them all for the public schools, which are the indispensable condition of its own continued existence. The school tax, paid by each tax-payer, is not the payment of his separate bill for the instruction of his own child, for he may be childless, yet justly taxed all the same. The school tax is only the just assessment on each tax-payer of his share of the cost incurred in maintaining the existence of the State which protects his individual rights in all their multiplicity. It is a distorted, false and wretchedly contracted view of the matter to see nothing in the school tax but a bill for the tuition of the tax-payer's own children. On the contrary, it is only a part of his general contribution to the support of the State itself.

That it is not only the right, but the duty, of the State to support a system of public schools, which can only be clone by the impartial taxation of all, is no new doctrine. Daniel Webster said: "The power over education is one of the powers of public police belonging essentially to government. It is one of those powers the exercise of which is indispensable to the preservation of society, to its integrity, and its healthy action. It is evident, therefore, that popular cultivation, as diffuse and general as the numbers comprising the Republic, is indispensable to the preservation of our republican forms; and hence arises the great constitutional duty of the government. It is the duty of self-preservation, according to the mode of its existence, for the sake of the common good."

Barsdow, the great-grandfather of Professor Max Müller, about a hundred years ago taught the true doctrine on this subject in Germany. The German Biographia, recently published by the Bavarian government, says, in its life of Barsdow: "This one great principle he established: that national education is a national duty; that national education is a sacred duty; and that to leave national education to chance, church, or charity, is a national sin! Another principle which followed, in fact as a matter of course, as soon as the first principle was granted, was this: that in national schools, in schools supported by the nation at large, you can only teach that on which we all agree; hence, when children belong to different sects, you cannot teach theology."

On this great right and duty of the State to perpetuate itself, and on the impossibility of its doing so, when its fundamental basis is the equal rights of all individuals, except by means of a State education which shall be universal and secular, rests the great positive argument for the public school system, and the justification of the State in taxing all tax-payers equitably and impartially for its support. It is no wrong to any man to tax him for this purpose, even though he be childless; it is no wrong to tax him for it, even though he prefer to send his child elsewhere than to the public schools, as many besides Catholics do: for the protection of his individual rights in this free Republic is a full and fair equivalent of his money. When the Catholic conscience, which is only the conscience of the Pope enforced on all Catholics, and not the free, independent consciences of Catholic parents as individuals, claims exemption from this just school tax, it is a selfish, blind and arrogant attempt to get the benefits of this free government without paying for what they get.

It is a conscience essentially unreasonable and unjust; and reason and justice, therefore, command the American people to follow unflinchingly the better-instructed con-science which has built, and will still sustain, the grand American system of public schools. It only remains to make them absolutely secular.
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Proceedings of the Annual Meetings (essays and addresses), for 1867, '69, '70, '72, '73, '74, '75. 35 cents each. Package of four, $1.00. Reason and Revelation, by William J. Potter. 10 cents; ten for 60 cents; one hundred, $3.00. Religions of China, by William H. Channing. 25 cents.


The Index Aims—

To increase general intelligence with respect to religion:
To foster a nobler spirit and quicken a higher purpose, both in society and in the individual:
To substitute knowledge for ignorance, right for wrong, truth for superstition, freedom for slavery, character for creed, catholicity for bigotry, love for hate, humanitarianism for sectarianism, devotion to universal ends for absorption in selfish schemes.

In brief, to hasten the day when Free Religion shall take the place of dogmatism and ecclesiasticism throughout the world, and when the welfare of humanity here and now shall be the aim of all private and public activities.

In addition to its general objects, the practical object to which The Index is specially devoted is the Organization of the Liberals of the Country, For the purpose of securing the more complete and consistent secularization of the political and educational institutions of the United States. Let everyone who believes in this movement give it direct aid by helping to increase the circulation of The Index.

Prof. Max Mueller, of Oxford, England, in a letter to the Editor published in The Index for January 4, 1873, says : "That the want of a Journal entirely devoted to Religion in the widest sense of the word should be felt in America—that such a journal should have been started and so powerfully supported by the best minds of your country,—is a good sign of the times. There is no such journal in England, France, or Germany; though the number of so-called religious or theological periodicals is, as you know, very large." And later still : "I read the numbers of your Index with increasing interest."

Mr. Charles Darwin, author of The Origin of Species, says, in a letter to the editor not originally intended for publication, but subsequently authorized to be used: "I have now read 'Truths for the Times,' And I admire them from my inmost heart; and I agree to almost every word."

Send $3.00 for one year, or 75 cents for three months on trial.

Address
The Index, No. 1 Tremont Place, Boston, Mass.

Twentieth Annual Report of the Committee of Management of the Benevolent Institution Dunedin;
With the Objects of the Same, and a List of Subscriptions and Donations
For the Year 1882.

"In Prosperity Remember the Poor."

Printed By John Mackay Moray Place, Dunedin MDCCCLXXXIII.

1882

President: R. B. Martin, ESQ.
Vice-Presidents : Alex. Rennie, ESQ., AND James Fulton, ESQ.
Trustees : R. B. Martin, ESQ.
T. S. Graham, ESQ.
A. H. Ross, ESQ.
Hugh Gourley, ESQ.
A. Rennie, ESQ.
Treasurer : T. S. Graham, ESQ.
Medical officer : T. M. Hocken, ESQ.
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The Committee regret, as on former occasions, to have again to refer to the increasing demands on the funds placed at their disposal; in fact, the various phases of poverty which exist in their Provincial District must be known to the public at large, but more especially to those clergymen, benevolent ladies, and others who are brought into daily contact with the cases which come under the notice of the Committee with a view to relief.

The usual cases of poverty are always cropping up, and with an increasing population are likely to continue. Deaths from natural causes, fatal accidents to heads of families, sickness, and various casualties—some of a temporary nature, and others permanent—all help to swell the list of applicants for relief.

One grievous and crying evil is that of wife desertion, which year after year is sadly on the increase; in fact, if legislation of a deterrent nature is not brought to bear on this growing crime, serious results to the tax-paying public must ensue. It is quite enough for the benevolent to assist in cases of pure misfortune, but to be called upon to support the families of the class referred to is more than can be reasonably borne. Reference to paragraph 9 of this report shows the extent of this evil, the great majority of cases being of a depraved nature.

The funds at the disposal of the Committee being totally inadequate to meet the pressing demands made on them, they had to ask the assistance of the Colonial Bank for an overdraft, which was kindly conceded to them pending steps being taken to raise funds other than from ordinary sources. In this the Committee were successful, and, as heretofore, the able and valuable services of several of our citizens, as well as of many friends in the country (who on former occasions had given their assistance), were called into repuisition, and they undertook the task of starting the fourth Carnival, the result and success of which will be found in the report herein incorporated. This extreme mode of raising money for carrying on the work of the Institution ought not to be resorted to, and it is well known that those who have borne the burden of the work have only done so under a deep sense of the absolute necessity of finding funds. It is a well known fact that the principal portion of the funds collected from this source comes out of the pockets of the business men, as well as of the working men; and it is to be regretted that a large proportion of the wealthy classes in the Provincial District do not subscribe, as a reference to the subscription list will at once show. On the whole the Committee have reason to be thankful for the liberal support accorded during the year, and the manner in which the public responded to their call, notwithstanding that the management and its officers were the subjects of a searching investigation into the whole working of the Institution, conducted by Royal Commission appointed by the Government, the report herewith of the gentlemen forming that Commission will speak for itself.

The total amount received from all sources was £7,674 12s 4d, of which £3,343 11s 7d were subscriptions, collections, and donations. On this sum a Government subsidy was received. The total amount disbursed for the year was £6,698 6s 4d, of which sum £4,056 14s 4d was expended in out-door relief—viz., food, clothing, rents, fuel, payments of passages to various persons to reach their friends, etc.

The cost of the Institution at Caversham amounted to £2,015 17s 1d; the weekly average of patients being 90, which gives a weekly charge of 8s 7½d per head per week. This sum is slightly in excess of the previous year, and can be accounted for thus: increase in price of meat from previous year, and replenishing clothing for old people—contributions of old clothing being unequal to the demand—many persons' clothing on entering the Institution having to be destroyed. The increase in the consumption of food is caused by having so many old people of broken-down constitution, whose wants require more than the ordinary food; in fact, the Institution is performing the functions of an incurable hospital.

The total number relieved out-door during the year was 1,771—viz., 143 widows and 404 children; 79
deserted wives, with 276 children; 70 men and 69 women suffering from illness, with 191 children, temporarily out of employment; 16 men and 14 women, with 6.5 children; 42 single men from various causes, and 30 women; 12 young women, with a like number of illegitimate children, were granted temporary assistance; 6 women, with 24 children, whose husbands were in the hospital; 9 women, with 26 children, whose husbands were in gaol; 4 women, with 18 children, whose husbands are in the Lunatic Asylum. Casual cases relieved—40 men, 61 women, and 160 children.

The number received into the Institution during the year was 47 :—viz., 23 men, 8 women, and 16 children; the number discharged was 50,—viz., 20 men, 11 women, and 19 children, all the latter being taken out by friends; leaving in the Institution on the 1st January, 1883, 50 men, 10 women, and 27 children.

The medical officer's report, balance-sheet, and tables will be found in due order; also list of subscriptions, donations, &c.; for gifts, &c., to Carnival, see "Carnival Report."

The Committee cannot close this report without expressing their regret that through the failing health of Mr M'Fie, religious instructor, who has been in the service of the Institution for a number of years, and had given the various committees very great satisfaction in his ministrations and general attention to the inmates, especially the children, had to relinquish his post, and the Committee can only reiterate their expression of regret for the cause of his resignation.

On Mr M'Fie's retirement, the Rev. Mr Ronaldson, Anglican minister, and the Rev. Mr Fraser, Presbyterian minister, mutually tendered their services to the Committee to take alternate Sundays in giving instruction, and also every alternate Thursday. This offer was gladly accepted by the Committee, and the kindly manner in which the offer was made was duly acknowledged with thanks. Since this arrangement was entered into, the Rev. Mr Fraser was transferred to Lawrence; his place has been taken up by the Rev. Mr Gibson, Wesleyan minister, and his assistants.

The Committee have to thank the clergymen referred to and their assistants for the interest they have taken in the spiritual instruction in this connection.

The grounds and crops are in good order, the supply of winter fodder for the cattle being abundant. The partial failure of last year's crop entailed a heavy expenditure for winter feeding.

The secretary, matron, and other employees continue to give entire satisfaction to the Committee.

Seeing that the demands on the charity are so heavy and likely to increase, the Committee urge on all citizens to bring under the notice of the secretary any instance of abuse of the relief granted.

In conclusion, the Committee tender their best thanks to Mr John L. Gillies and to the ladies and gentlemen who kindly assisted him in carrying out the late Carnival; to Mr Donald Reid for the liberal manner in which he placed his new store at the disposal of the Carnival Committee, at great inconvenience to his business; to all subscribers, and donors, especially to those in the country districts who contributed so handsomely to the funds; to the clergymen of the various congregations for their usual collections; and also to the proprietors and managers of the under-named papers, supplied gratuitously to the Institution, viz. :—"Otago Witness," "Saturday Advertiser," "Evening Star," "Morning Herald," two copies; "Illustrated New Zealand Herald," "New Zealand Presbyterian," "Christian Record," "New Zealand Tablet," "New Zealand Churchman."

Their term of office having now expired, the Committee resign their trust; they are, however, eligible for re-election. Two vacancies have occurred through the resignation of Mr George Blyth and Mr James Brown. Mr T. S. Graham was appointed treasurer in place of Mr Brown.

E. B. MAETIN,
President.

decorative feature

Medical Report

DUNEDIN,
March 5th, 1883.

To the Committee of the Benevolent Institution.

GENTLEMEN,—During the past year there have been six deaths in the Institution—David Thomson, 67, of chronic lung affection; J. G. Hunter, 60, of general paralysis; J. Cunliffe, 74, cancer of the stomach; Charles Robb, 73, Apoplexy; Mary Jenkins, 71, and Selina Grenford, 66, both of general decay.
The general health of the inmates has been, on the whole, good; that of the children especially so.

The complaints from which the old people have suffered have been almost entirely those associated with advanced years and injured constitutions.

During a few months' absence in the Home Country, my duties were effectively discharged by Drs. Brown and Fergusson.

Seeing, as I did whilst in England, something of the squalor and wretchedness amongst the poor, the conclusion was often forcibly impressed on me with regard to the recipients of our own charity, that their lines have indeed, comparatively speaking, fallen into pleasant places—well housed, fed, and cared for.

Again I would favourably remark upon the attention paid by Mr and Mrs Quin to the thorough cleanliness and ventilation of the Institution, and to the comfort of the inmates.

I have the honour to be, Gentlemen,

Yours most obediently,
T. M. Hocken, Medical Officer.

Otago Benevolent Institution.

Revenue Account for 12 months ending 31st December, 1882. DR. ... £ s. d. £ s. d. To live stock ... 95 18 8
Outdoor relief ... 4056 14 4
Groceries, meat, bread, &c. ... 802 6 5
House furnishings and repairs ... 113 6 5
Salaries of secretary, matron, ... cook, gardener, household ... servants, &c. ... 547 8 6
Salary of medical officer ... 50 0 0
Salary of schoolmistress ... 60 0 0
Repairs to buildings, fencing, &c. ... 95 19 6
Clothing and repairs ... 218 11 3
Fuel ... 116 5 10
Printing and advertising ... 29 18 0
Medicines, seeds, rates, postage, labour, insurance, bank in terest, &c. ... 325 1 8
Office rent and stationery ... 53 13 9
Appropriation for play-shed ... 60 0 0
Appropriation for house and land at Port Chalmers ... 73 2 0
Unexhausted revenue, 1st January, 1883 3799 8 0 £10,497 14 4
CR. £ s. d. £ s. d.
By unexhausted revenue, 1st January, 1882 ... 2823 2 0
Government subsidy to 31st December, 1882 ... 3310 4 1
Subscriptions, collections, and donations, as per list (including £33 7s 6d of 1881) ... 3343 11 7
Interest on Savings' Bank securities and revenues investment ... 794 11 2
Rents of land at Pine Hill ... 66 8 0
Receipts on account of inmates ... 64 17 6
Education grant ... 95 0 0
£10,497 14 4 £10,497 14 4

Otago Benevolent Institution.

Endowments 14,823 10 0
Revenue appropriation, furniture 250 0 0
Revenue appropriation, buildiDgs 263 2 0
15,336 12 0
Sundry creditors ... 99 10 11
Unexhausted revenue ... 3799 8 0 £19,235 10 11
Assets. £ s. d. £ s. d.
Pine Hill, land ... 108 10 0
Saddle Hill, land ... 10 0 0
Caversham, land ... 600 0 0
Caversham, buildings ... 4590 0 0
Caversham, furniture ... 250 0 0
Land and cottage at Port Chalmers ... 73 2 0
Endowment, investments ... 9705 0 0
15,336 12 0
Unexhausted Revenue, investments ... 1555 0 0
Cash in hand ... 16 15 4
Cash in Bank, on current account ... 111 16 7
Sundry Debtors ... 150 16 6
Government of N.Z. (subsidy to ... 31st December, 1882) ... 2034 10 6
Live stock ... 30 0 0 3898 18 11 £19,235 10 11

I have examined the Books, Vouchers, and Securities of the Benevolent Institution, and find the above Balance Sheet correct,

9th February, 1883.
William Brown,
Auditor.

Report of Proceedings at the Annual Meeting,
The annual meeting of subscribers to the Benevolent Institution was held in Farley's Hall on 6th March, at 4 o'clock. The president (R. B. Martin, Esq.,) occupied the chair, and there were also present—Ven. Archdeacon Edwards, Rev. Dr. Stuart, Rev. W. Ronaldson, Rev. A. R. Kerckham, Rev J. Niven, Captain Thomson, Messrs M. W. Green, M.H.R., A. H. Ross, G. R. West, Alexander Rennie, E. E. C. Quick, James Brown, W. G. Geddes, William Wilson, Hugh Gourley, John Barron, John Scanlan Alexander Grant, James Mollison, W. S. Douglas, and Richard Quin (secretary.)

The Rev. Dr. Stuart: I rise to move the adoption of the report. I have read it over with a great deal of care, and have been struck with the amount of work—with the tale of work which it records. Somebody or some persons must have done a great deal of work in conducting the inquiries and agencies that are employed in assisting so many people. I still look upon this Institution as not only a necessary but also as a most beneficent institution. I cannot imagine how we could get on without some such establishment; and though the management even of a family can never be perfect, much less of an Institution that has to deal with so many broken-down families, and with so many people made wretched by poverty, and desertion, and misery—my astonishment is that the Committee have succeeded in giving such very general satisfaction. For myself, I voted and spoke strongly in favour of an inquiry into the management of the Institution, and made up my mind to give no rest to the Government or to the Committee until such an inquiry was instituted. I have now a very great deal of satisfaction in saying that the result of the inquiry has been to show that the management in all its departments was substantially sound, and I believe that the result of the inquiry of the Royal Commission has been endorsed by the whole of the community. It has been to myself a very gratifying fact this, for when the establishment required additional funds, and when a particular effort had to be put forth to secure them, the community responded most wonderfully. It was predicted that the fourth Carnival would be a failure, but the fourth Carnival—I am not pronouncing judgment on that mode of obtaining money, but I will only say that the community responded very handsomely to the application for additional funds, and I think the response must be regarded and ought to be taken as a complete endorsement of the management. Sir, there are some sad things brought under our notice in this report. One of those sad things is the number of families in a new community and in a new country that fall into impoverishment year by year. Reflecting upon this matter which the report brings under our notice, I asked myself, "Is there any means to prevent this going on?" I think that the Committee and that gentlemen of education and of good position in the community should exert themselves to induce family men to join the benefit societies that exist in this community. As a minister of religion, I come a great deal across impoverished people. Now, I find that the working man who is an Oddfellow or a Forester—if he has got a broken limb, or if he has been laid aside by any serious illness—that for a time he receives at the rate of £1 per week. I have many men of that kind in my mind's eye just now, and in these cases they receive medical attendance too; and their families never become—on account of their illness—quite impoverished. They are able to keep their heads above water, and that is the result of the man's own forethought. I am sure that ministers of religion, and the people of Dunedin generally have not sufficiently recognised the advantages that result from being members of the benefit societies. I am quite sure that if nine-tenths of our people were members of these friendly societies, the work of our Benevolent Institution would not be half so onerous or anything like so troublesome as it is.—(Hear, hear.) The matter of wife desertion is one which the report directs special attention to. I have asked "What is the cause of it—what is the cause of this wife desertion? What is at the bottom of it?" I have come to this conclusion, sir—that too many families are crowded into Dunedin. I find, for example, that men who obtain their daily bread by working in the country, generally have their families in the city, and as winter comes on they come home, and during the the greater part of the winter they scarcely ever get a day's work; and when their little accumulations are exhausted they go on the tramp in search of work. They go to Timaru as Timaru people come down here, or they go to Christchurch as Christchurch people come down here. Wife-desertion is therefore more seeming than real. The husbands go away in search of work while there is no work for them in the towns. I wish that strong efforts were made to popularise our agricultural settlements. If a man makes a living for some time at harvesting or sheep-shearing, I should like to see him obtain and cultivate an area of about five acres, so that during the winter season, when it is impossible for him to get work in town, he might have work in improving his little farm. I am sure that special attention should be directed to a matter like that in the annual report of this Institution, and if the suggestion were adopted it would relieve the Institution immensely. It would put these men into a position of never needing help. They would have a permanent home on say from three to five acres, which would continually improve in value. They could grow fodder for their own cow, they could keep pigs, and what with plenty of milk and meal no difficulty should be experienced in providing for the family. The expense of dress and food would be scarcely a tithe of what it is now. Unless there is a check put to this tendency of people coming into town and against settling in the country, I believe the result will be to check the growth of the community in virtue, as well as in substantial comfort. I believe that men in high places here are to blame for the popular opinion that it is useless for men to attempt to settle in the country districts, unless they can obtain hundreds of acres. In other communities a man
with a family can manage to support them comfortably on one or two acres. There he obtains comfort all the year round, instead of working for nine months and being a pensioner on the Benevolent Institution for other three months. Personally, I feel grateful to the gentlemen who year by year so admirably manage this Institution. In some respects it might be more economically managed, but I would just ask those who may be of that opinion to come in and give it a trial, and see how difficult it is to deal with hungry men—how difficult it is to satisfy mothers who have half-a-dozen bairns at home poorly clad and poorly fed. They clamour for 7s 6d instead of our 5s, and you can scarcely help giving half-a-crown more to give their children something of the comfort that you would like your own children to have.—(Applause.)

Archdeacon EDWARDS: I have much pleasure in seconding the adoption of the report, and I cordially endorse every word that Dr Stuart said with reference to that Commission of Inquiry. Of course it must be a great source of satisfaction to the members of the Institution, and especially to the committee, to find that the committee came so triumphantly out of that ordeal. I wish to say one or two words on what Dr Stuart has said in reference to that one of the most prominent features of the report—the desertion of heads of families by the heads of those families. There is a good deal of truth in what has been said, but unfortunately it does not stop there. I believe I am correct in saying that two or three years ago there was a conference at Sydney or Melbourne in which this matter of wife desertion was brought forward by the Colonial Secretary, Mr Dick, and I believe the Home Government are the only authorities that can deal with this matter; it was brought before them, and nothing was done in the matter. It occurs to me that something might be done in connection with this important subject by the Colonial Institute. They seem to take all sorts of questions into consideration and urge them upon the Home Government, with very great success. For instance, there is Sir Francis Dillon Bell. He might be induced to bring this question before the Home Government, and urge them to take it up. It does not affect New Zealand only; it affects all the other colonies. Many of these men are constantly deserting their wives and families. I suggest that the new committee should take the question into consideration, and see what can be done in that direction. I have very great pleasure in seconding the adoption of the report.—(Applause.)

MR QUICK (in reply to Dr. Stuart's suggestion that business men and the Committee should warmly recommend workmen to join the Oddfellow's and other friendly societies) said that the best actuaries in the world reported that the benefit societies in England were most extravagantly managed, and he therefore suggested that workmen should be advised to invest their earnings in the Savings Banks. With regard to wife-desertion, he thought that the committee should go to the Government and say, "Unless you try and put a stop to this wife-desertion, we will throw up the management of the Benevolent Institution; or if you do not improve the present state of the law on this subject, we must come to you for a larger sum towards the support of the Institution." The matter of wife desertion should be prominently brought before the Colonial Governments, and if they agreed on the subject, there would be no difficulty in getting an Act passed by the Imperial Parliament. Men who deserted their wives and families should be brought back to the colony.

The REV. DR. STUART: Many of those husbands are not worth bringing back.—(Hear, hear.)

MR G. R. WEST: some of the deserters would not work if they were brought back to the Colony.

Archdeacon EDWARDS: Put them in gaol and make them work.—(Hear, hear.)

The Rev. Dr. Stuart, replying to Mr Quick's remarks, said that he was not capable of giving a judgment concerning the opinions of the English actuaries, but in this colony the Oddfellows, the Foresters, the Sons of Temperance, the Rechabites, and the Druids had hitherto kept their engagements as benefit societies. They conferred great benefit upon their members, especially in times of sickness and death.

The CHAIRMAN said that in reference to Dr Stuart's remarks that certain men should disperse themselves over the country, he was sorry to say they were a very idle, loafing, useless class, and they had neither thrift, nor energy nor enterprise. It was useless to recommend those people to go and settle in the country. They came to the Institution only when they were absolutely ruined, and it was too late to give them advice. The cure really rested with the clergy, who should preach to those men and tell them what they ought to do.—(Hear, hear, and applause.)

MR M. W. GREEK, M.H.R., would like to make one remark with reference to cases of wife desertion, and he thought that members of the committee and all the governors of the Institution should exercise their influence and do something to minimise that evil. He thought it would be taken for granted that they never found an abstainer depending on the funds of the Institution, and they never found an abstainer becoming a burden in the Institution. He understood from the police that when deserted wives told what had brought about the desertion, it was pitiable enough to melt a heart of stone. The root of the evil was in the drinking customs of the day. Working men had so many facilities for squandering their money, and by the habit of drinking they lost all natural affection. He could give a most horrible case that occurred at Port Molyneux, but he need not mention it there; but it was plain that the habit of drinking embittered a man and destroyed all natural affection. When a man squandered his money there was nothing to prevent him from deserting his family. Now, he appealed to members of the committee to justify him in stating that eight-tenths of the cases of wife desertion...
were caused through drink. Was it not the duty of the subscribers to do all they could to set a good example to the working classes, and to curtail the opportunities for indulging in excess. He held that prevention was better than cure. He knew that it was not the popular phase, but it was the true phase of the subject, when he stated that they would get at the root of the evil by dispensing with the drinking customs of the day. That would be far better than going to the trouble to send the deserting husbands back to their families. If the people took away which led the husbands to desert their wives and families there would be very little further trouble.

Mr Alexander Rennie endorsed the remarks of the previous speaker, and specially adverted to the cruelty of the husbands who descended so low as to desert their wives and families.

The motion was then put and carried unanimously.

**Religious Instruction.**

The Rev. W. Ronaldson, in reply to a correspondent, pointed out that since the retirement of Mr Macfie, he (the speaker,) the Rev. J. M. Fraser, lute Presbyterian minister of Caversham, and the Wesleyan minister, had regularly attended to the, spiritual wants of the inmates of the Benevolent Institution.

The Rev. Dr. Stuart said that he had intended to direct attention to the valuable services rendered by the ministers of Caversham, but he had ommitted the reference because he thought he had occupied too much time. He thought that the ministers who attended to the inmates of the Institution deserved the warmest thanks of the subscribers.—(Applause.)

**Election of Officers.**

The Chairman said that a desire had been expressed for the infusion of further fresh blood into the management of Institution, and he would be glad to be relieved of responsibility. He would retire in favour of anyone whom the meeting chose to nominate, with a view of seeing the Institution well managed.

The Rev. Dr Stuart: I rise to propose that Mr R. B. Martin be appointed President of the Institution for this year.

Mr G. R. West: I have much pleasure in seconding the motion.

There being no other nomination, Mr Martin was unanimously re-elected President of the Institution.

Mr M. W. Green: I have much pleasure in proposing Mr Alexander Rennie as Vice-President.

Mr A. H. Ross seconded the nomination.

Mr Rennie announced his intention to retire from the management of the Institution.

After some discussion Mr Rennie withdrew his objection, and was unanimously elected Vice-President.

Mr James Fulton, M.H.R. for Taieri, was also reelected Vice-President of the Institution, on the motion of Archdeacon Edwards.

On the motion of the Rev. Dr Stuart, seconded by Mr G. R. West, Mr T. S. Graham was appointed treasurer.

The following members of the committee were duly elected:—Captain Thomson, Messrs A. H. Ross, John Carroll, Hugh Gourley, T. W. Hungerford, Henry Wise, James Mollison, and William Wilson.

Mr Quick declined to stand for re-election to the Committee, on the ground that he was likely to be absent from Dunedin several months.

Mr Ross suggested that a bye-law should be passed authorising the committee to fill vacancies occurring in their ranks during the year.

The Rev. Dr Stuart suggested that next year the secretary should publish a list of attendances of the committee.

**Complimentary.**

On the motion of Mr Quick, seconded by the Chairman, a hearty vote of thanks was passed to Mr James Brown for his valuable services as treasurer to the Institution.

Mr Brown briefly acknowledged the compliment, and said that he had retired from active service in accordance with the suggestion of his medical adviser.

The Rev. W. Ronaldson proposed a vote of thanks to the President and the retiring Committee for their services during the past year. He had attended some of the weekly meetings of the Committee, and found that their duties were not of a very easy character.
Mr G. R. West, in seconding the motion, said that for three years he had sat on the Committee, and never heard of a clergyman attending their meetings. He thought that the clergy should follow Mr Ronaldson's example, and attend the meetings as members of the Committee *ex officio*. It would do the clergy good to hear the cases brought before the Committee.

Rev. W. Ronaldson: I was there as a suppliant.

Mr A. H. Ross pointed out that only ministers of congregations in Dunedin that contributed towards the funds of the Institution were members of the Committee *ex officio*.

Mr West: I thought that all the congregations contributed annually.

Mr Ross: That is not so; all the congregations are not contributors to the Institution.

The motion was carried by acclamation.

The Rev. A. R. Kerkham expressed regret that there was not a large attendance at the annual meeting of this noble and beneficial Institution, and he suggested that the time fixed for the meeting was inopportune.

Mr Quick humorously suggested that if Mr Kerkham got up a row in connection with the management of the Institution, he would probably have a crowded meeting.

The usual compliment to the Chairman terminated the proceedings.

decorative feature

Benevolent Asylum Inquiry.


Sir,—I have the honour by the direction of the Colonial Secretary, to forward to you herewith for the information of the Committee of the Benevolent Institution, a copy of the report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the management of the Institution.

Mr Dick thinks it would be very advisable to publish this report for general information, and he hopes the Committee will take the same view of the matter.—I have, &c.,

G. S. Cooper.
R. B. Martin, Esq.,

President of Benevolent Institution, Dunedin.

To His Excellency the Governor.

May it please your Excellency—

We have the honour to report that in pursuance of your Excellency's commission dated the 19th of June ult., we have made inquiry into all complaints respecting the management of the Benevolent Asylum at Dunedin and the conduct of the officials which have been made to us, as well as into such other matters connected with the Asylum as have been brought before us.

We began by notifying through the Press the time and place of our sitting, and by inviting the attendance of all persons who might wish to make statements bearing upon the subject of our inquiry.

We held our first sitting on Monday, the 26th June, at the Laud Office at Dunedin, which Mr Maitland, Commissioner of Crown Lands, kindly placed at our disposal.

On that occasion Mr James Tyree, of Dunedin, attended for the purpose of putting us in possession of the case against the Institution, and of furnishing us with the names of the witnesses who could or would give evidence in support of the allegations made. Mr Tyree has attended throughout our enquiry, which has been conducted partly at the Land Office and partly at the Asylum, and has questioned and cross-questioned the witnesses. We have also obtained by summons the attendance of witnesses who would not voluntarily appear except when it was desired to call them to give evidence that was irrelevant, or otherwise inadmissible in its character. But although Mr Tyree thus undertook what may be called the case for the prosecution, he had formulated no distinct charges against anybody, but put before us voluminous documents containing the statements which either had been made by the witnesses, or which it was supposed they would make; and it was from the statements made by the witnesses in reply to questions suggested by these documents that we had to gather for ourselves what the charges really were.
The charges so gathered from the evidence may be arranged as follows:—

- Against the Committee, for neglect of sufficiently frequent and regular visits to the Asylum on the part of the Visiting Committee.
- Against the Committee, master, and matron, for neglect on the part of the latter to preside at the meals, as required by the rules, whereby partiality and unfairness in the distribution of food was caused.
- Against the same parties, for allowing contractors to supply inferior articles of food.
- Against the master and matron, for general neglect of sick and dying persons, and giving improper medicines.
- Against the master, of frequent intoxication.
- Against the master, for employing inmates of the Asylum to work at cottages—his own private property.
- Against the master, neglecting to check disorderly conduct on the part of the inmates, and paying no attention to complaints of such conduct when made to him.
- Against the master, showing partiality to particular inmates.
- Against the medical officer, for neglect of the sick.

The above headings are sufficient by their terms to cover all degrees of wrong-doing, from the most trivial instances of neglect to the gravest instances of heartless and cruel treatment. That the latter would, at all events in some cases, be proved, might fairly have been expected by those who were acquainted with the rumours that were in the air, and who were aware that there had already been an investigation by the Committee, an enquiry before two gentlemen specially requested by the Committee to undertake the task, and a trial in the Supreme Court, all arising out of grave accusations made against those who had the management of the Institution.

With the matters involved in the trial before the Supreme Court we have nothing to do; but it is necessary for us to note the fact that the prosecutor in that case was Richard Quin, the secretary of the Benevolent Institution, and the defendant Charles D. Hitchcock, who had published libellous statements of a very gross character concerning the prosecutor. At the trial no attempt was made to show the truth of the libellous statements, which were entirely abandoned and withdrawn. The defendant was convicted of the libel, and was bound over to come up for sentence when called upon. The obligation thus entered into seems to have been the reason why Mr Hitchcock refrained from attending our sittings; and since it appeared that he had no evidence to give, bis attendance was of course unnecessary, although under other circumstances he might have been expected, as a most industrious collector of evidence, to have put the facts or allegations before us. But, in the position he oc cupied, we have no doubt he acted wisely in putting his papers into the hands of Mr Tyree.

Of the other inquiries above referred to, that by the Committee took place on the 5th of March, 1881. Its object was to examine into complaints made by two of the inmates (Martin and Walsh) of the quality of the food supplied to the sick and others. The Committee on that occasion resolved that the charges were wholly disproved. Afterwards, in consequence of a letter from Mr R. Hudson to the Mayor, enclosing written statements concerning the treatment of an inmate (since deceased), James Knight Neil, and of other parties mentioned by William Farrant (whose evidence we have taken), the Committee asked Messrs Bathgate and Logan to inquire into the whole matter of complaints against the management. This inquiry was undertaken, but never completed, in consequence of the want of power on the part of the gentlemen presiding to enforce order or control the conduct of the proceedings.

The trial in the Supreme Court took place in April, 1882, and the jury added to their verdict an opinion that an inquiry should be held into the working of the Institution. It is the action of the Committee consequent upon that re-commendation which has led to the inquiry which we have now completed. In conducting it we have taken cognisance of every complaint, however trivial, which has been put before us; we have made repeated visits to the Asylum, and have invited statements of grievances from the inmates; and we have neglected no means that occurred to us of ascertaining the truth. Mr Tryee has expressed his conviction that our inquiry has been an exhaustive one; and the chairman of the Institution, Mr R. B. Martin, has given us all the help in his power in sift ing the matters brought before us.

We now proceed to state our opinion on the several charges above enumerated.

1. A statement is appended showing the recorded visits of the Committee. There is also evidence of frequent unrecorded visits of one or more members at irregular times. There may perhaps have been some defect of system and method in the proceedings of the Visiting Committee, and perhaps more regularity in this respect might have enabled some cases of insubordination or misconduct which have been disposed of by the master to have been more satisfactorily dealt with by the Committee. But we have had no proof of any mischief having occured, or of any grievance remaining unredressed inconsequence of any want of attention on the part of the Committee.

2. During the time when the complaints were made the rule requiring the master or matron to preside at the meals was not commonly observed. The dinners were carved either by Mrs Quin or the cook, and distributed by a man named Scott. The complaints against the latter of partiality, or a desire to annoy particular
persons, are very frivolous and unsupported by good evidence. The meals are now superintended by the second master, and everyone seems satisfied.

(3) This charge is not sustained. It has not been shown that any complaint made in the proper quarter has been neglected; and it has been shown that when such complaints were made, good articles have been supplied in place of those found fault with.

(4.) This is the most serious of all the charges made, and we have done our best to get at the truth about it. The principal case adduced is that of a black man named John Wesley, who is alleged to have been shamefully neglected before his death, which took place in December, 1874. The remoteness of this date makes it difficult to get at the exact truth, and this difficulty is increased by the absence from Dunedin of Mr Hocken, the medical officer who attended the man, and who could throw most light upon it. This patient suffered from erysipelas, going on to gangrene. He appears to have had sloughing of the buttocks and parts in that neighbourhood. It is alleged that he was neglected by the doctor; that nursing and cleanliness were neglected; that he died alone in the night; and that after death he was found to be in a shocking state of filth and putridity from from the inhuman neglect he had suffered. Now, the effects upon the human body of a fatal attack of gangrenous erysipelas are in themselves sufficiently shocking to rouse very natural feelings of indignation in the mind of any person who should hear it described, and at the same time be told that it was the result of neglect rather than of disease. But there can be no doubt that such a disease requires careful attendance and systematic appliances and dressings to the sloughing parts. Whether the patient in this case got such attention seems doubtful. We have no evidence that he did. We have some evidence that he did not; but, unfortunately, we have not the medical evidence, which might perhaps make the whole matter clear. What evidence we have amounts to this: that the patient, on account of the smell from the diseased parts, was removed a week or ten days before his death from the room inhabited by other inmates to a small room, in which he was isolated. His bedding was not changed after that time. He did not die in the night, but in the day time, whilst his attendant, who had just seen him, was gone to get him some food. The principal witness who has made these statements about Wesley is William Farrant. He states also that Wesley was buried the same day that he was found dead, and with indecent haste. This statement, as well as the previous one, that he died alone in the night, is entirely false; and the recklessness of the witness in making such statements is enough of itself to discredit much of his evidence unless otherwise strongly corroborated. The length of time that has elapsed since the occurrence of this case, the absence of medical evidence, the proved inaccuracy of some of the statements made, and the evident desire of the principal witness to make things out as bad as possible, prevent our forming any accurate opinion on the exact state in which the patient was. We think that he did not receive sufficient attention in respect to the cleanliness of his person and his bedding, but we see no reason to believe that he was not seen often enough by the doctor, or that he was neglected in respect of food or other matters.

The principal lesson to be learned from such a case is that some special provision should be made in the Asylum for the treatment of such cases. There should be a separate ward for cases requiring special treatment, and, if necessary, extra or paid nursing should be provided. We have spoken at length of this case, because it is the only one of all those that have been brought under our notice affording any support to the accusation of neglect of the wants of the sick or dying; and in this case, owing to the causes which we have mentioned, we do not see our way to do more than calling attention to what appears to us to be a defect in the machinery of the Institution.

In no other case have we had any trustworthy evidence of neglect of the sick or dying, either in respect of food, nursing, or medicine.

(5.) We have heard several charges of intoxication against Mr Quin, the master of the Asylum and Secretary to the Committee. Of these statements one or two appear to have been made in good faith, but the greater number by witnesses whose animus is very manifest. Some of them have been clearly refuted by positive evidence, and none appear to us worthy of very much credence in the face of the amount of voluntary testimony that we have received as to the secretary's general sobriety and good conduct during a long course of years. We have, moreover, medical evidence that lie suffers from the disease known as locomotor ataxy, which might induce in the mind of an ordinary observer the impression that he was under the influence of liquor. We think that this charge has not been proved.

(6.) It has been shown that one or two of the inmates of the Asylum have occasionally done a little work upon or about cottages the private property of Mr Quin. The amount of such work has probably been very slight, and it does not appear that the Institution has been in any way defrauded or injured; still, we think, as a matter of principle, that such a handle to censure and misrepresentation should not be given. We have no doubt that it is quite sufficient to call the attention of the Committee and the master to the subject to prevent its recurrence.

(7.) There is nothing whatever in this charge.

(8.) This charge also is without any proof.
There is no trustworthy evidence of neglect on the part of the medical officer; but we may take this opportunity of expressing our approval of the rule introduced somewhat recently by the Committee, requiring the medical officer to visit regularly, whether sent for or not. It appears that both the present and the former medical officer agree in thinking such a regulation unnecessary, but we cannot help thinking that an institution of this kind ought to be regularly visited and inspected by a competent medical officer, who should be adequately paid for his services. But previous to this regulation there was no reason why the medical officer should call unless he was sent for, and we have no reason to suppose that he ever neglected a summons.

The result of the above remarks is that, in our opinion, the charges that have been made have almost entirely broken down. At no time can we find that any grounds have existed for making serious charges against the management of the Institution, although it might be possible to point out some little defects in the machinery, and some accidental mishaps in the working.

There is some evidence of general improvement during the last twelve or eighteen months, and it is only natural to suppose that the violent attacks on the management that were for so many months systematically made would have the effect of inducing a stricter watchfulness on the part of the managers in avoiding all causes of blame. But we think that this improvement has been much exaggerated by the promoters of the charges, who, finding how little proof of the latter they are able to bring, now fall back upon this alleged improvement, which they pretend has closed the mouths of witnesses, and done much to bury all past offences in oblivion. This resource, however, ought not to be permitted to the promoters of groundless charges, and we feel it our duty to say that the promoters of the charges which we have had to investigate have proceeded with conspicuous unfairness and with unscrupulous disregard of the characters and reputations of the persons assailed by them. The work of getting up the charges appears to have been voluntarily undertaken by Mr Hitchcock, with whom Mr Hudson at an early period seems to have associated himself. The latter we believe to have been actuated by personal hostility to Mr Quin; the former, we are ready to believe, supposed himself to be acting in the public interests, but his judgment seems to have been singularly weak, and his notions of fair play singularly perverted, whilst his devotion to the public interests very soon began to degenerate into personal malignity against all who in any way opposed his rash and unscrupulous proceedings. These assertions are justified by the scurrilous and abusive letters which have come under our notice, as well as by the vuluminous manuscripts which testify to the perverted industry with which he sought to collect every item of gossip that could be supplied by the idle, the ignorant, and the discontented, to the injury of the reputation of the Asylum and its managers.

We have only to add that we have several times visited the Institution, and that we have found no cause of dissatisfaction, except what may be thought to be implied in the following recommendations:

- That a separate room, with proper appliances and means of nursing, be provided for the sick.
- That more systematic records be kept of the visits of the Medical Officer and Visiting Committee, with notes of complaints and other matters worthy of notice.
- That the Master's power of summarily expelling inmates for insubordination or misconduct should, if retained at all, be reserved for the most extreme cases, all others being referred to the Committee.

We cannot conclude this report without expressing our high sense of the present excellent management and state of efficiency of the Asylum. The interior management reflects the highest credit of Mrs Quin, and the excellence of the general arrangement is abundantly attested by the general comfort and contentment of the inmates and the almost unanimous chorus of negation with which our invitation to make complaints was made.

In support of our conclusion we forward with this report the notes of evidence, which we are sorry to say contain much that is as trumpery as it is tedious.

We have, &c.,
CALEB. WHITEFORD,
JOSEPH GILES.

Table I.

| Shewing the number of adult Inmates at Caversham, 1st January, 1883, and what incapacitates them from earning a living. Male. Female. Total. Old and past work ... 18 4 22 Rheumatism 5 2 7 Paralysis ... 7 ... 7 Spinal disease 3 ... 3 Crippled ... 4 ... 4 Blindness 4 ... 4 Ruptured 2 ... 2 Chest disease 2 ... 2 Hip disease 2 ... 2 Nervous debility 1 ... 1 Destitute ... 4 4 Skin disease 2 ... 2 50 10 60 |
Table II.

Shewing the respective ages of the Inmates of the Institution, at Caversham, 1st January, 1883. Men's Ages. Total. Women's Ages. TOTAL. Children's Ages. Total. Grand Total. Years. Years. Years. 83, 80, 80, 83, 73, 71, 15, 15, 11, 77, 76, 66, 62, 61, 12, 11, 11, 75, 75, 53, 36, 33, 10, 10, 10, 75, 74, 74, 21, 9, 9, 9, 8, 73, 73, 72, 8, 7, 7, 7, 72, 71, 71, 7, 6, 6, 4, 4, 71, 71, 70, 4, 4, 2, 69, 69, 68, 67, 66, 66, 66, 65, 64, 64, 63, 63, 61, 61, 61, 59, 57, 56, 51, 51, 49, 47, 44, 41, 35, 34, 31. 50 10 27 87

Table III.

Shewing the Number of Persons Admitted to and Discharged from the Asylum during 1882, and Number remaining 1st Jan., 1883. Men Women Children Total Protestant Roman Catholics Corresponding Totals. 1881 1880 1879 1878 1877 Inmates 1st Jan., 1882... 47 13 30 90 78 12 95 86 76 74 78 Admitted during 1882... 23 8 16 47 43 4 51 76 58 41 76 Total 70 21 46 137 121 16 146 162 134 115 154 Discharged during 1882 20 11 19 50 45 5 56 67 48 39 73 Remaining 1st. Jan., 1883 50 10 27 87 76 11 90 95 86 76 81

Table IV.

Shewing the Total Number of Persons Relieved Outdoor and Discharged during 1882, and the Number remaining on the Books, 1st January, 1883. Roman Catholic Corresponding Totals Men Women Children Total Protestant Total 1881 1880 1879 1878 1877 Relieved during 1882... 168 427 1176 1771 1474 297 1771 1685 1601 1521 1436 Discharged during 1882 126 251 699 1076 883 193 1076 963 1008 1002 1042 Remaining on Books 1st Jan., 1883 42 176 477 1591 104 695 772 593 579 394

Table V.

Shewing the Number of Persons Dischaged during 1882. Causes. Men. Women. Boys. Girls. Total. Left voluntarily 5 7 ... ... 12 Discharged 8 ... ... ... 6 Dead 4 2 ... ... 5 Taken out by friends ... ... 10 9 19 20 11 10 9 50
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Rules of the Renebolent Institntion Dunedin

Objects:
To Relieve the Aged, Infirm, Disabled, and Destitute of all Creeds and Nations, afford them Medical Relief and to Minister to them the comforts of Religion.

Rules & Regulations.

Qualifications and Privileges of Governors and Subscribers.

Qualification of Life Governors.

1. Every donor of £20 or upwards shall be a Life Governor; and every person who may have raised, or shall raise, by one or more collections in one year, the sum of twenty pounds (£20) or upwards, from persons not claiming membership on account of their contributions towards such sum; and every executor first named in any will, proving the same, and paying to the Institution a bequest of fifty pounds (£50) or upwards, shall have all the rights and privileges of a life governor.

Qualification of Members.

2. Every Subscriber of one guinea or upwards shall be an Annual Member, and shall have the privilege of recommending cases of distress for relief, and of voting at the election of officebearers, provided that be shall not be entitled to vote until three months after the payment of his first Annual Subscription. The Annual Subscription shall be due and payable on the 1st day of January in each year.
Annual General Meeting in the month of January.

3. There shall be, in the month of January in every year, a General Meeting of the Life Governors and members of the Institution, to be held at such place as the General Committee shall appoint (of which meeting fourteen days' previous notice shall be given in two or more of the Dunedin newspapers), to receive the Report and Accounts of the Committee of Management; to elect the Committee and other Office-bearers; and to transact the general business of the Institution.

Office-bearers to be elected annually.

4. The Office-bearers of the Institution shall consist of:—a President, Vice-President, Honorary Treasurer, and a General Committee of any number not exceeding eight members (exclusive of ex officio Members), to be elected at the Annual General Meeting by and from the Life Governors and Members.

Ex-officio Members of Committee.

5. The President, Vice-President, Treasurer, Honorary Medical Officers, and the resident principal Minister of each congregation contributing a collection to the funds of the Institution (being qualified as Governors) shall be ex officio Members of Committee; but no ex officio Member's except Honorary Office-bearers, shall vote on the removal or appointment of any paid servant of the Institution.

Committee Meetings, when to be held.

6. The General Committee shall meet once in the week, and at all such other times as they may appoint, to receive the report of the various officers, and to discuss the general business of the Institution; three to form a quorum. A Committee Meeting shall be held on the first Monday in every February and August, to enter into the contracts for the supply of provisions and other necessaries; five to form a quorum.

Who to preside at Committee Meetings.

7. The President, Vice-President, or Treasurer shall preside at all meetings of Committee, and in their absence, the majority present shall appoint their own Chairman, who shall have an additional or casting vote.

Committee to frame Bye-laws & Regulations.

8. The Committee shall frame such Bye-laws and Regulations as they may deem necessary, the same not being at variance with the general laws of the Institution.

Special General Meeting of Subscribers, how to be convened.

9. The Committee of Management may convene a special general meeting of subscribers at any time, upon giving notice at least fourteen days previously, in two or more of the Dunedin newspapers, which notice shall be repeated three times. Any thirty Life Governors or Subscribers may request the Committee to call a special meeting at any time; and should they, after receiving such requisition so signed, refuse or neglect to call such meeting within fourteen days, it shall be in the power of the said requisitioners to convene such meeting, upon giving notice as directed above.

Bye-laws to be repealed only at special meetings.

10. No bye-law or regulation shall be altered or repealed except at a special meeting of Committee; such meeting to consist of not less than five members.

How appointments are to be made by the Committee.

11. That in electing to any appointment by the Committee, when there are more applicants than are required, the voting shall take place by voting cards; and in all cases the salary shall be determined before proceeding to election.

Honorary Medical Officers and their qualification.

12. There shall be two or more Medical Officers, not to exceed four, whose appointment shall be honorary; and no one shall be eligible for the office of Medical Officer who is not certificated by the Medical Board of Otago.

Appointment of Honorary Medical Officers and filling up of vacancies.

13. The Honorary Medical Officers shall be chosen by the Committee, and shall be amenable to the rules made by them. If any vacancy occurs by death, removal, or retirement, such vacancy shall be filled up at a special meeting of Committee to be convened for that purpose.

How Medical Officers shall report.

14. That the Honorary Medical Officers shall report on the state of the inmates at the weekly meeting of Committee.

Conditions of ad-mission to Institution.

15. That no application be received unless signed by a Subscriber; and no person shall be admitted until the expiration of one week from the date of applying, to allow time for inquiry, except in special cases.

Tenders to be called for supplies.

16. Tenders for all supplies shall be invited for a period of not less than 6 months, the amount of such tenders to be duly recorded in the Minute-book. No member of Committee to supply any article for the use of the Institution, for which he may receive pecuniary or other compensation.
House Tinting Committee, how to be appointed

17. The House Visiting Committee, consisting of three Members, shall be appointed by and from the General Committee, at the monthly meetings in February, May, August and November in each year, to act in rotation. Members retiring to be eligible for re-appointment.

Duties of Visiting Committee.

18. It shall be their duty to visit the Institution at least once a week, to make a general inspection, and to record the result in the Minute-book to be kept in the Institution; such book to be produced at the weekly meeting of the Committee.

Management of Institution.

19. The superintendent, or other officer appointed by the Committee, shall have the management of the Institution, subject to the regulations and orders of the Committee.

Religious Instruction.

20. The inmates of the Institution will be allowed religious instruction from the ministers of the denomination to which they belong, at such times as the Committee may appoint.

Life Governors.

- Abraham J.
- Bannerman, Rev. W.
- Barr, John A.
- Bastings, Horace
- Beaumont, Ven. Archdeacon
- Bateman, G. C.
- Bell, Sir F. D.
- Bolt, Wm.
- Brown, J. C.
- Brownlie, Robt.
- Borrie, Donald
- Bradshaw, E. It.
- Bright, Charles
- Bunbury, Cornelius
- Burton, A. H.
- Byng, Rev. C. J.
- Cable, H.
- Calcutt, Thomas
- Campbell, Hon. Robert J.
- Chapman, Robert
- Clarke, Sir Wm. J., Sunbury,
- Victoria
- Court, Louis
- Coote, Charles
- Crawford J.
- Cutten, C. W.
- Davidson, James
- Davis, Rev. J. U.
- Dench, H.
- Dodson, Thomas
- Douglas, W. S.
- Dowse, George
- Driver, Henry Duncan J. Dunne J.
- Edinburgh, H.R.H. Duke of
- Edmond, John
- Edwards, Ven. Archdeacon
- Fargie, John
- Farrer, W. E.
- Fish, H. S. junior
- Forsyth Robert
Fulton, Francis
Fulton, James
Geddes W. G.
Gillies, J. L.
Gordon, G. H.
Gourley, Hugh
Green, M. W.
Guthrie, W.
Haynes, C.
Hardy, H. F.
Harris, Woolf
Hazlett, James
Henry, J. G.
Hodges, J. C.
Hislop, John, jeweller
Holmes, James S.
Holmes, Hon. Matthew
Hudson, R.
Hume, Marcus
Hungerford, T. W.
Inglis, A.
Jack, A. Hill
James, Sydney
Jameson, J. M.
Jobberns, J.
Kennedy, William
Kirkcaldy, W. C.
Lambert, W.
Lane, William
Larnach, W. J. M.
Laurenson, Fleming
Leary, R. H.
Leitch, Peter
Little, Samuel
Low, Thomas
Mackie, Rev. L.
Macandrew, James
Mackay, Robert
McKegg, Amos
Maitland, J. P.
Marshall, James
Martin, R. B.
Meenan, F.
Mercer, Andrew
Mill, John
Moore, Caleb
Morley, Carmini
Murray, R. K.
M'Callum, Captain
M'Gregor, Alex.
McLean, Hugh J.
McLean, Lachlan
McLean, Hon. George
M'Dougal, Wm.
MacNeil, Hugh
McTaggart, Duncan
Neill, P. C. Patterson,
William
Roberts, John, of Murray Roberts and Co.
Petre, F. W.
Pyke, Vincent
Ramsay, Keith
Reany, J.
Reeves, Charles S.
Reid, A. G.
Reid, Donald
Rennie, A
Richardson, James
Robin, James
Russell, Geo. G.
Rutherford, J.
Scoular, J.
Simpson, James
Shrimski, Samuel
Sidey, John
Smith, S. G.
Snow, William
Spedding, D. M.
Stephenson, John
Stevenson, William
Stratford, H. A.
Street, C. H.
Strode, A. C.
Stronach, Donald
Stuart, Rev. D. M.
Sutherland, Rev. J. M.
Taggart, W. H.
Telford, William
Templeton, Thos.
Thomson, C.
Thomson, Captain
Thomson, R.
Trotter, Wm. S.
Turnbull, George
Valentine, Arch.
Vogel, Sir Julius
Wain, Job, jun.
Walter, Henry J.
Watson, John
Watson, Wm.
West, George R.
Wilson, Wm.
Young, Joseph

Ladies who are entitled to the rights and privileges of Life Governors.

Mrs. L. O. Beal
Miss Buchannan
Mrs. E. B. Cargill
Miss Carr
Mrs. Champion
Mrs. C. Cook
Mrs. S. Dewes
Mrs. Dick
Mrs. Edwards
Mrs. Farley
Mrs. Fisher
Miss A. T. Gillies
List of Subscriptions, Donations, and Collections For The Year 1832.

Abraham, J. £30 5 0
Abbottsford Colliery per J Freeman 3 6 0
Adams, R. N. - 1 1 0
Andersons Band, per G. Morris - 5 0 0
Bagley, B. -- 2 2 0
Bagley, R. P. - 1 1 0
Baird, R. B. - 5 0 0
Balclutha, Football Club, per W. Patterson -- 3 0 0
Balclutha, Concert at, per R. C. King - 6 6 0
Bank, Colonial N. Z 5 5 0
Bank, New Zealand 5 5 0
Bank, Union Australia -- 5 5 0
Barron and Co 2 2 0
Bastings Leary & Co 2 2 0
Baxter, David, - 1 1 0
Baxter Joseph - 1 1 0
Beale, L. O. - 2 2 0
Begg, A. C. 3 3 0
Bell, G. 2 2 0
Bing Harris & Co - 3 3 0
Blue Spur, collected at, per J. Campbell -- 40 0
Boot, A. -- 1 1 0
Borthwick, Mrs - 5 0 0
British and N. Z. Mortgage Co. - 5 5 0
Carried forward £173 3 0
Brought forward £173 3 0
Brent, S. -- 2 2 0
Brewn, George 2 2 0
Brown, James 3 0 0
Brown Ewing & Co. 2 2 0
Cash found in shop -- 3 0 0
Brown, W. - 4 4 0
Burt, A. & T. -- 2 2 0
Burt, A. & T. (workmen's box) 1 2 6
Butterworth Bros. - 2 2 0
Campbell, D. - 2 2 0
Campbell, Hon. R. - 10 0 0
Carnival Committee 1 5 0 0
Cazley, Mrs (collected) 8 0 0
Chapman, R. 7 7 0
Chatton, Concert at, per F. Collins - 8 1 0
Churches—Knox Church - 58 19 5
First Church - 25 0 0
St. Matthew's - 12 9 0
St. Paul's - 17 10 1
Clinton, Ball at, per C. Lange - 1 5 0
Connell, J. A. (subscribed & collected) 4 13 6
Court, L. -- 1 0 0
Couston, W. - 2 2 0
Cowie, G. -- 2 2 0
Cunningham, Wm. (collected) - 5 0 0
Carried forward £1865 19 6
Brought forward £1865 19 6
Dalgetty & Co. 5 5 0
Deep Dell Station, per C. S. Hay - 4 2 6
Donaldson, J. 1 1 0
Downey & Duffy (collected by) - 5 4 0 0
Dunedin Jockey Club 60 0 0
Edmond, J. - 1 1 0
Fergusson, Capt., and others (collected)—Cameron, Capt (U.S.S.Co.), £94 15d 6s; Carpenter s. s. Albion, £4 2s 6d; Carpenter s.s. Ara-wata, £4; Carpenter s.s. Hawea £6 15s 7d; Carpenter s.s. Rotomahana, £6 2s; Carpenter s. s. Wakatipu, £5 15s 6d; Fergusson, Capt. £3 13s 6d; Shipwrights at Port Chalmers, £14 4s 139 8 7
Fish, H. S. - 1 1 0
Forlong, Gordon 1 0 0
Fulton, F. - 5 0 0
Fulton, General 5 0 0 1
Fynemore, Mrs. (collected) - 8 0 0
Gage, J. & W. (disputed commission) 2 0 0
Gardner, R. S. 1 0 0
Gartshore & Jennings (collected) 1 4 0 6
Gibbs, Bright & Co.
220 Gilchrist, W. 220 Gillies, J. L. (collected)—Baird, Alex., £1; Burt, A. £1; Carlin, N. £1; Evans & Mace (collected), £10 Carried forward £2172 3 1 Brought forward £2172 3 1 8s 6d; A Friend £1 1s; Galloway, £1; Gillies, J. L., £1; Gillies, Mrs J., £1; Gillies, R., £1; Guthrie, N., £1; Jacobsen, Olan, £1; Mill, John, £1; Paterson, J., £1 10s; Paterson & M'Leod £1; Paul en, R., £1; Smith, Daniel, £1; Stewart, James, £1; Sparrow, R. S., & Co., £1 1s; Stokes, F. S. (collected), £3 10s; Wilson & Co., R., £1s 1d; Ramsay, Keith, £1; Amounts under £1, £24 2s 6d 5 Gillanders, Duncan - £3 3 0 Gore, Jas. -- 10 100 Goldston, S. - 0 10 0 Hardy, H. 12 10 0 Harris, R. G. 6 100 Hartley, J. -- 2 00 Hayman & Co., P. - 2 20 Herbert, G. 5 5 0 Herbert Haynes & Co. 5 5 0 Heymanson Low & Co 2 20 Hood, Miss (Half Way Bush) 5 0 0 Holmes, A. 1 100 Howell, G. -- 1 10 Humphrie, T. S. (6 miles Strath Taieri) 3 46 Hungerford, T. W. 2 20 Hutchens, G. 0 50 Hutton, J. D. 1 10 Invercargill Band, concert by 7 30 Ibbotson, F. W. (collected at Otawa) 9 100 Carried forward £2315 15 1

Brought forward £2315 15 1 Irving, J. (artist) 6 00 Kemptphorne Prosser & Co. -- 4 40 Kennedy W. 2 20 Lawrence, collected at, per Ven. Arch deacon Beaumont—Abel, H. J., £1 1s; Clayton, H., £1 1s; Herbert & Co., £2 2s; Nicoll, Frank, £1 1s; Smith James, £5 53; Smith James jun., £1 1s; Smith J., £1 1s; Taylor, G. C., £1 1s; Withers, Dr., £1 1s; Amounts under 20s, £3 9s 18 3 0 Livingstone & Wilson (collected by) - 30 10 0 Logan, James (Tap-anui) -- 0 00 Lyceum concert, per J. Braithwaite - 16 14 0 Machin, E. - 1 10 Marks, R. M. - 1 10 Matthewson J. (collected) -- 95 0 0 Meenan, M. and J. 1 100 Mercer Bros. - 2 20 Michaelis, Hallen tein and Farquhar -- 3 30 Middleton, J. - 2 20 Mollison, Jas. - 1 10 Moloney, N. - 1 10 Munro, G. (collected) 20 00 Murray Roberts Co. 2 20 M'Donald, J. - 1 10 M'Duff, Alex, (collected) -- 4 00 M'Farlane, A. & J. - 0 20 M'Kerras & Hazlett 2 20 M'Gregor & Williams (collected) 27 90 Carried forward £2561 16 1 Brought forward £2561 16 1 M'Laren, K. - 2 20 M'Laren, J. (Fred-erick Street) 1 00 M'Landless & Co. - 1 1 0 M'Lean & Co. 3 3 0 N.Z. and Australian Land Co. 10 100 N.Z. Hardware Co. 2 20 N.Z. Mercantile Co. 3 3 0 Orbell, H. -- 1 10 Palmerston, collected at, per C, haynes 66 0 5 Park & Curie - 2 20 Perth, Angus, Mearns, and Aryshire As. 1 00 Pillans, Mrs. (Ineh Clutha) 3 3 0 Pine Hill School, pu pilss of -- 0 15 0 Proud foot, J., per J. Duncan 47 13 10 Puerua, concert at, per W. Stevenson 31 4 0 Rattray, Jas. - 5 50 Ravensbourne, concert at, per J. M'Neil -- 10 4 0 Reid, C. -- 5 5 0 Robin, Jas. -- 2 20 Ross & Glendining 5 5 0 Ritchie, J. D. (Mount Royal Station) - 5 0 0 Russell, G. G. - 23 19 4 Ryley, J., Rev. -- 1 00 Sargood, Son & Co. -- 7 70 Sawyer's Bay, concert, per Capt. Thomson - 8 00 Scanlan, J. - 1 10 Scoullar, J. - 2 20 Shaw, J., (Balcutha) 1 00 Sievwright & Stout - 2 20 Sise, G. L., & Co. - 2 20 Sky, H. - 2 10 0 Slaties & Mitchell - 3 00 Smith & Smith - 1 10 Somerville, J. (Anderson's Bay)-- 1 10 Carried forward £2835 19 8

Brought forward £2835 19 8 Star Runners, per F. Williams - 3 30 Stratford, H. A. (collected) 20 00; Stuart, Mrs., per A. Rennie - 1 100 Sutherland, W. D., and others (collected) - 30 000 Taieri Beach, concert at, per J. Harrison 10 14 9 Tapanui, collected at, per R. Dewar - 75 0 0 Taylor, J. -- 1 100 Telfer, W. - 5 0 0 Thomson & Co. 1 10 Thomson, W. 1 10 Torrance, J. A. (collected) -- 65 0 0 Union S.S. Company 9 5 0 Union S.S. Company (proceeds of ex hibition s.s. Manapouri) 37 13 3 Volunteer Church Parade, per Capt. Lambert 10 00 W.J. -- 0 15 0 Waikouaiti, enter tainment at, per A. Reid 52 2 6 Carried forward £3154 16 2 Brought forward £3154 16 2 Waitahuna, collected at, per D. M'Taggart and others 30 00 Waitahuna, True Blue Lodge, per G. M'Kenzie - 8 00 Waiden, H. - 1 10 Walker, A. - 0 100 Watheu, W. A. - 0 100 Watson, J. - 5 00 Watson's Hotel (ex hibition of Electric Light) -- 0 13 0 Warepa, concert at, per J. Crawford 22 19 11 Wilkinson & Pettit - 25 13 0 White, A. (Mataura) 1 00 Wilkie, M. - 5 00 Wilson, R. - 2 20 Wilson, W. A. (Portobello) - 1 00 Wise & Co. - 1 10 Wright, Stephenson 2 20 Wright, W. -- 2 20 X.Y. -- 1 00 £3264 10 1 Amounts published last year in sup plementary list 79 1 6 £3343 11 7

Supplementary List of Subscriptions received too late for insertion in Balance Sheet.

Aikman, John - £1 10 Baptist Church, per A. Broad 8 18 8 Beaumont, Archdeacon 1 10 Dey, Peter - 1 00 Eraser, Hon. Capt. - 5 0 0 Kaikorai Presbyterian Church, per D. Hood -- 9 150 Kaitangata, Cale - donian Society, per H. D. Parry 25 000 Carried forward £51 15 8 Brought forward £51 15 8 Miller, C. B. 1 10 Rennie, Alexander - 1 10 Ross, A. H. - 2 20 Rowlev and Hamilton 1 000 Quick, E. C. - 2 20 Brown, J. C. (collected) -- 100 0 0 £168 18

The Committee also acknowledge receipt of Clothing, &amp;c., as follows:—Clothing from Messrs. Nicolson, J. Cargill, T. M. Wilkin-son, C. Smith, Ferrier, M'Kay, Hardie (clothier), Farley, James Smith, and Mrs. Campbell; cakes, &amp;c., from Committee of Skating Rink, sausages from A. Dornwell, and illustrated papers from Southern Club; clothes, Mr. M' Donald, Outram; parcel of clothes, Mr Morris; do, Mr J. B. Mudie; do, Mr J. Roberts (Murray, Roberts and Co.); large box cakes, tea and sugar, Mr Wilson, Waiwera; 20 dozen buns, Mr Gollar; 23 dozen do, Mr Hall, Princes street; large box cakes, Rev. Inglis, Otari; 30 loaves, 1 saddle mutton, leg mutton, and roll corned beef, C. C. Armstrong; parcel of clothing, Mr Austin; do, Mr Todd, Arthur street.

Note.—Contributions such as the above, being very acceptable at the Institution, will be gladly received. decorative feature
Carnival Report, 1882.

On 17th October, 1882, a meeting was held, under the auspices of His Worship the Mayor (Mr. James Gore, and who acted throughout as Chairman and Treasurer), for the purpose of organising a Carnival, in aid of the Benevolent Institution, to be held in Mr. Donald Reid's new Wool and Grain Stores, Cumberland and Vogel Streets, which had been most kindly placed by that gentleman at the meeting's command. The following gentlemen gave their assistance on the several Committees appointed:—Contributions and stalls: Messrs. R. Wilson, J. T. Mackerras, M'Kinlay, Brownlie senr., W. Watson, G. H. Gordon, R. K. Murray, Wm. Wilson, and John Lewis. Exhibits and works of art: Messrs. Hodgkins, A. H. Ross, R. A. Lawson, F. R. Chapman, D. Ross, Burton, Armstrong, R. Clifford, G. Joachim, F. R. Smith, Mendershausen, Wilkie, Hutton, and E. Chapman. Finance and Printing: W. G. Geddes, Connor, R Mackay, Sligo, Robin, and West. Furnishing and decorating: Messrs. J. B. Thomson, W. Basket, N. Y. A. Wales, and R. Brownlie. General Amusement: Messrs. H. Robinson, W. Thompson, E. R. Bradshaw, R. Clifford, Thos. Low, H. Bastings, W. Lambert, Mills, Jas. Richardson, and S. Wright. Lighting and Water: Messrs. Watt, Jones, Whittington, Burt, Anderson, and R. Brownlie. Letting lower floor stalls: Messrs. T. S. Grahame, H. Gourley, W. S. Douglas, De Beer, W. Watson, and J. Carroll. Music, Concerts, &c.: Messrs. G. R. West, Wishart, Paton, A. J. Towsey, Parker, A. R. Kelsey, A. J. Barth, Braik, Stewart, Little, Coombs, and Mears. General Management and Honorary Secretary, Mr. John L. Gillies; Secretary, Mr. A. J. C. Baber. A ladies' meeting was also held, when it was arranged that those whose names appear in the accounts of the receipts should take charge of the stalls for the sale of goods purchased and donated. These, with their numerous fair assistants, entered most enthusiastically into their work, which is evidenced by the handsome result of their labours. Where all did their parts so well, it would be a difficult and invidious task to single out any individuals for special mention; and I believe that those who most exerted themselves have no wish to have their names so dealt with, being more than rewarded by the inner consciousness of having contributed to so noble a work as that of helping to provide the ways and means for so valuable an institution. The thanks of the General Committee are, however, due to the kindly assistance of some outside of their number, viz., Mr Logan, of the telegraph department, for the erection of the telephone, and in connection with it Mr F. Downes; also Messrs. Wignall, M'Kinnon, and ladies who every night kept up a series of concerts at the telegraph Office, Port Chalmers, which could be very plainly heard in the apartment fitted up in the pro tem carnival building; Mr Hungerford for his beautiful water fountain; and the following who gave their voluntary services in supplying and providing music for the concerts and otherwise—Mr De Maus and his Port Chalmers Colored Opera Troupe, the members of the Musical Union, the Dunedin Glee Club, the Kaikorai Excelsior Brass Band (Bandmaster Mr Chapman), the Naval Brigade and 1st Battalion Bands, and the members of the Apollo Club, who took part in a "smoke concert," Mr. Leech's Violin School Band must also be included, as also the services of Mr Reunert, of Balcutha; electric lights from the Harbour Board; flags from the N. Z. Shipping Co. and Union Steam Shipping Co., as also the handsome models of two of the latter's steamers; finally, Mr Bartleman, for auditing the accounts. The carnival extended for 10 days, from the 23rd November to 4th December.

The following is a statement of the Receipts and Expenditure, with a list of donations in goods so far as supplied to the Secretary, Mr. Baber.

JOHN L. GILLIES, Hon. Sec.

Receipts.

Carpenters' and Joiners' Society—
Carpenters' and Joiners' Society—(Continued)—
Carpenters' and Joiners' Society—(Continued)—
Otago Heads, Per John Loudon—
Green Island, Per J. S. Kennedy & D. Mills—
Per A. Woollatt—
Per J. S. Kennedy & W. Irvine—
Green Island—(Continued)—
Ootram, Per W. Snow and H. Wilson—
Walton and Fairfield District, Per Mr. John Blair—
Milburn, Per Mr. Mcdonald—
LOVELL’S FLAT—
Per Mr Fraser—
Lovel’s Flat—(Continued)—
Per J. G. Closs—
TE HOUKA, Per W. Ronton—
Te Houka—(Continued)
WAITIEPEKA, Per Somerville Bros—
CHRISTCHURCH—
AKATORE, Per N. McLeod—
Akatore—(continued)
STALL NO. 1, MRS WEBB—
STALL NO. 2, M.ESDAMES HISLOP, MARTIN AND WATSON—
Stall No. 2—(continued)
Per John Duthie, Milton—
Stall No 2—(continued)
STALL No. 3, M.ESDAMES GORE AND LIGGINS—
STALL No 4, LADIES FREETHOUGHT ASSOCIATION—
STALL No. 7, M.ESDAMES GRAHAM, ZEILE, AND SINCLAIR—
Collected by Mrs. S. T. Graham and Mrs. Zeile—
Per Mrs Sinclair—
Stall No. 7—(continued)
Per Miss Mackerras—
Per Miss Maggie Mackerras—
Per Misses Annie and Lucy "Wilson—
Per Miss A. Gillies—
Stall No. 7—(continued)
ENTERTAINMENTS—
Discounts—
Discounts—(continued)
A. BARTLEMAN, Auditor. JAMES GORE, Treasurer.
J. L. GILLIES, Hon. See. A. J. C. BABER, Secretary.

Goods Donations.

DUNEDIN—Miss Johnson, Mr Bremer, Mr March, Mrs Fleming, Miss Strachan, Mrs Bernard, Miss Christian, Mr White, Mrs Burnside, Mrs Glasgow, Miss Hales, Mrs J. Gillies, A. Jackson, Mrs Paton, Mrs Guthrie, Mrs McDonald, Madame Lubecki, Mrs Malcolm, Mrs McLean, Mrs Jones, Mrs Bennie, Mrs Peacock, Mrs Pym, Mrs Mills, Miss Anderson, Miss Hay, Mrs Batchelor, Miss Kemphthorne, Mrs Vivian, Mrs Staveley, Mrs McFarlane, Mrs Raymond, Miss Malcolm, Mrs Culling, Mrs Hyndman, Mrs Hurland, Mrs Mitchell, Findlay and Co., Mr Wingfield, P. Anderson, W. Percival, Hammond and Co., Kempthorne, Prosser and Co., Mackay, McLeod Bros, W. Gilchrist, Smith and Smith, A Lees, F. Fogo, Mr Tiley, Mr Peters, Mr Jacobs, H. Pauli, A. Palmer, A. Chiaroni, Barningham and Co., Mr Taylor, Wise and Co., Mr Austin, Guthrie and Larnach, Mrs Armstrong, Miss Dawson, Mrs Meredith,—Reid,—Matthews,—Gebbie, R. Clifford,—Coxhead, Burton Bros, Mrs Sibbald, Miss Forsyth, Mrs Wilson, Mr Anderson, Lo Keong, J. Pryor, Mr H. S. Fish, Miss Wilkinson, Miss Hardy, Mrs Rattray, Mrs Sprent, Mrs R. Cowie, Mrs Mosch, Mrs Hydes, Mrs Lochead, John Hislop, Corbett and Knox, Melville, McLeod Bros., N.Z. Hardware Co., Mills, Dick and Co., Hogg, Howison, Nicol and Co., W. Wright, Miss Angell (Mornington), Royse, Stead and Co., Sew Hoy, T. Broadway, A. Solomon, N. smith, Salvage Co., A. Beckingiale, Esther and Low, A. J. Kane, J. Cable, Irvine, R. Meffen, Allman, R. Anderson, J. Sutherland, Jas Keir, J. T. Christie, Jas. Brown, Alex. Browne, C. Shepherd, Neill, Lange, W. Melville Lear, Bible Depot, Durie and Murphy, Sligo, W. Wallace, Chin Shing, T. Collins, W. J. Gregg, Barningham, C. Nunn, J. and M. Stewart, Sinclair and Morton, A. Gibbs, J. Hucker, McLaren, A. Lees, Guthrie and Larnach, R. Macquaid, Brown (Confectioner), Shearman, J. Binnie, Alexander and Shepherd, Renton, W. Duthie, Logic, Kroon, Newbury, J. Peterson, Hutton and King, Keenan, Albany St. School children, William St. School children, John Irvine, R.S.A, Hon. R. Oliver, Boys’ High School, W. Wills, Southern Cross Soapworks.Cotail and Firewood Donations—Simpson and Mitchell, Swan and Son, Jas. Macfie, Clarke and
Woman Suffrage.

Part I.

The Counterfeit.

There is much misunderstanding in regard to the real character of what is known as the Woman Suffrage movement in this country. It is not surprising. The ostensible demand is made for Woman Suffrage. The organization that represents this demand is described as the "Woman Suffrage Society," the meetings are called on behalf of Woman Suffrage, and Women enfranchisement is the alleged object of agitation. Speakers and writers who come forward to advocate the cause, make their most touching appeal by declaring that they plead for "half the human race." They tell us in reply to one form of objection, that the perils of maternity are not less hazardous than those of war. As a matter of fact, we understand that the percentage of women who lose their lives in the dangers incident to them in the profession of marriage, exceeds the percentage of soldiers killed in battle. A reply to Mr. Fitzjames Stephen, &c. By Miss Lydia Becker.

All that they say leads us to infer that Woman Suffrage in its proper sense is the object of their demand. Yet, when we turn from professions and declarations to examine the actual substance of the measure which is proposed, we find that if it be adopted only propertied single women will be raised to citizenship! Widows, spinsters, and other single women possessing households, all the women, in fact, who are in an abnormal state—those who form the mere fragment of their sex—are to exercise political power, while wives and mothers, unless mothers be widowed, are to remain without the vote. Can this, then, be termed a genuine Woman Suffrage movement? How can it be said to represent "half the human race"?

As the substance of this pamphlet has been given already in the form of a lecture, not once but several times, and as discussion has followed upon each occasion, as likewise the Woman Suffrage Society appointed an eloquent lady

Miss Fenwick Miller.

to deliver a lecture in answer to mine, I have had every opportunity of ascertaining the manner in which my objections are met.

Two replies are almost invariably made in justification of the present form of the Woman Suffrage demand. They are as follows:—

1. We take the law as we find it; we find that certain property qualifies the owner to vote, we demand that where it qualifies a man it shall qualify a woman—that there shall be no sex disqualification.
2. The measure we propose, although it may only obtain Single Women Suffrage now, represents the "thin end of the wedge": it must be regarded only as an instalment of the larger measure which will comprehend Wife Suffrage.

There is, perhaps, some further reply in the common remark that no other mode of female enfranchisement would receive consideration. The dilemma exists of having to propose Woman Suffrage based upon the property qualification, however fanciful the result may be, or of not proposing it at all.

The first of these replies sounds plausible. I do not say that those who make it are conscious of this: but it is plausible, or in other words, superficially satisfactory, as a reply to the objection I have raised. I maintain, and have reiterated on each occasion of delivering my lecture, that the advocates of Women Suffrage are bound to consider that the present electoral law was framed, both in spirit and letter, solely with a view to male voting. It was devised with the object of enfranchising certain men representative of their sex and race. Whom did it select as representative? Not the staid bachelors, nor the wild ones, nor the unmarried especially. It sought representation among the fathers and husbands—in the heads of households. They were necessarily associated with property: but property was not the object of representation, as it has become recently; it was the men. The Woman Suffrage Society propose now to pervert this law to the enfranchisement (as it is erroneously termed) of women: thus perverted it can of course only act in a fanciful and inappropriate manner. Used as a means of female enfranchisement, whom do we find that the altered electoral law selects as representative of the woman sex? Not the mature women, the wives and the mothers, but spinsters, widows and other single ladies. Miss Lydia Becker, the active Secretary of the Woman Suffrage Society, speaks occasionally of the "brand of electoral incapacity" which now rests upon women. Whether it is a brand or not, I will consider later. But it is certain that if the Single Woman Suffrage Bill is passed and political power is declared the privilege of single women alone, then a veritable stigma will be attached to wives, and marriage will represent, as far as they are concerned, the very livery of political subjection. This will be so on Miss Becker's own showing; I find the following passage in the pamphlet I have already quoted from in a footnote: "Every extension of the franchise to classes hitherto excluded lowers and weakens the status of the classes which remain out of the pale." If there be any truth in this declaration it applies with double force to Miss Becker's own scheme of woman enfranchisement. There is no stigma on wives while no women exercise political power, but a stigma is created for the first time if the enfranchisement of women is announced in a measure which deliberately excludes them. Moreover, if one class of men have ever been enfranchised to the detriment of a non-enfranchised class, it has at least been done upon the alleged social or intellectual superiority of the newly enfranchised, but even Miss Becker will hardly venture to assert the superiority of spinsters and widows over married women. The supporters of the measure say that it will "give the franchise to women upon the same terms on which it now is, or hereafter may be granted to men." This seems to me to be merely playing with words. Nominally it may be so; substantially it is otherwise, for while husbands will have the vote, wives will be deprived of it. An electoral law will be in force that qualifies propertied women so long as they avoid or survive marriage, and thus marriage will be invariably identified with political disability.

The advocates of the Bill say they take the law as they find it: and they frequently claim credit for not altering it: they are only going to give it a new signification. "Man" is to mean "Woman." This sounds delightfully simple: but it represents a considerable alteration. It would have been more straightforward to endeavour to alter it so as to embrace the genuine principle of Woman Suffrage.

This might have been done by proposing that, simultaneously with the adoption of the minor alteration, wives shall be held to share their husband's qualification. I do not advocate this, because I am entirely opposed to Woman Suffrage. I merely indicate the proper course for those who desire something more than nominal Woman Suffrage.

instead of attempting to pervert the law and mislead the public for the benefit of a counterfeit principle.

There is, I am sure, no intentional deception. The promoters of this movement do not realize that they support a counterfeit principle, but they commit the common error of mistaking the shadow for the substance. And there is everything to encourage them in this error. They find themselves embarked on a politic course. To the astute Conservative mind that leads,

See Appendix i. Letter of approval from Mr. Disraeli.

the scheme is altogether deserving, it may be truly termed a "constitutional" one, it is favourable to people who have "a stake in the country" as it is called; the Conservative does not much care who is connected with property so long as it is represented, and then he reflects that most women are likely to be Conservatives. The Radical is also conciliated. Extension of the franchise, never mind how allotted or how collected, is his one panacea for all ills. Then there is the concession of an abstract right. All his own pet arguments and declarations about the rights of every man, &c.,—why not "every woman"?—are turned upon him. He thinks the measure is in favour of every woman; he is told that this is the ultimate object, although the Conservative is carefully told that it is not so.
There are some ladies in this movement who know that it does not comprise genuine Woman Suffrage, but they regard it as a stepping stone. Theirs is the reply to the Radical; they say that the anomaly created by the measure—the maid voting, and the wife disfranchised—will be so outrageous that public opinion will not sanction its continuance.

These ladies deceive themselves. I warn you not to share their generous confidence. Anomalies which are favorable to property are always tolerated in this country. And "Public Opinion!" Who can have faith in what is termed Public Opinion? The conditions under which a seat is obtained in the House of Commons are such as almost to close the Parliamentary channel for the expression of independent opinion.

It will be found in nearly all constituencies that the party managers on the Liberal side represent the Nonconformist and non-political Middle Class point of view. It may be asked, if "non-political," why do they organize opposition to the Conservatives? The reply is that party feeling, inherited apparently as an instinct, seems to prompt the opposition. There is very frequently a hot contest in which the actual difference of idea upon politics between the candidates is imperceptible, but one is called a Conservative and the other is called a Liberal. This being the case, a man of independent political thought is by no means acceptable as a candidate. It is the pliant man, it is he who has not thought upon political subjects at all, and who turns to his agent for the cue to each public reply, who is known to be the model candidate for an electoral campaign. On the Conservative side orthodoxy is indispensable. While the condition of national publicity to opinion is that it shall be common place enough to suit the average mind, and obtain the "largest" or a "world-wide" circulation. No prominent publicity can be obtained for opinion which is likely to be unpopular with the propertied class. The proposal to give all wives votes, which would include the wives of all working men, (just conceive the effect of a proposal to double the terrible Democracy!) would not even obtain discussion in our prudent London Daily Press—that Cerberus, which has taken charge of our liberties, and guards us carefully from the access of disturbing unorthodox ideas, or only admits them duly caricatured and discredited.

But the influential and official representatives of the Woman Suffrage Society disclaim the idea of seeking Wife Suffrage. Theirs is the reply to the Conservative. At a public meeting held at St. George's Hall in May, 1875, by this society, when resolutions of support were submitted to the meeting, but no discussion was permitted on them until after they had been passed, Mrs. FAWCETT said:—

"If the bill is carried, I do not think anyone need be afraid that an agitation for Married Woman's Suffrage would take the place of the present agitation. The heart would be taken out of the whole movement."

And this is perfectly true. But note that there are two faces to the movement, the one irreconcilable with the other. Mrs. FAWCETT's reply is the true one. A proposal to enfranchise wives would be scouted.

Mrs. FAWCETT, in the same speech that I have quoted from, claims credit to England on account of the position which the Woman Suffrage question occupies, as compared to the position it occupies in all other countries. I say that this position is a discredit to the country; in no 'other could a vessel have sailed so far without having its true character exposed. Its progress here is mainly due to the surreptitious knowledge of conservative supporters that it makes for a goal far different to the one which is inscribed on its banner. It is chartered by money, plied by Conservatives, it has the generous breath of radicals in its flag, and makes with ammunition (an armory of votes) to an enemy's port. Once in that port, the banner will be hauled down, and the ammunition will be expended in opposing the rights of women and the rights of men.

If you think I am severe in my description of the Woman Suffrage Society measure, I will quote an opinion to you which you may consider less prejudiced than my own. It is the opinion of a talented lady who is a well known advocate of Woman Suffrage. I refer to Mrs. BESENT. She uses the following words in a letter addressed to an American newspaper:—

"The real truth is that the Woman Suffrage movement, as conducted by the National Society, is in no sense a popular movement in England; it is a movement of the upper classes, of the propertied women to whom alone a vote would be given if Mr. Forsyth's Bill became law. It is timid, apologetic, and irresolute, favoured much by the clergy, and smiled on by Conservatives."

Here is another witness. The following passage is from a letter addressed to the Standard, and quoted with approval by the Woman Suffrage Journal in which I found it:—

"I should be glad to know," writes a lady correspondent, "what action, if any, the Conservative Association is prepared to take on the important question of the so called 'Woman Suffrage;' to my mind, more properly to be named 'property suffrage.'"

I oppose this agitation, then, upon the following grounds:—

- Because it is falsely termed a Woman Suffrage Movement.
- Because the measure advocated will create an invidious distinction between wives and other women, at the expense of the former.
- Because its success will constitute a triumph of the representation of property as against the
representation of persons.

- Because the effect of the Bill proposed will be to strengthen the reactionary party, and thus to impede National Progress.

Of course it is sufficient to oppose a measure which has proclaimed itself as "advanced" or "progressive" to invoke the usual taunts of illiberalism and shafts of ridicule. The fanatic of every idea invariably pronounces opposition as contemptible or prejudiced; each petty whipster of a notion declares that those who are against it enact the part of the opponents of Galileo, Newton, &c., or institute a comparison with Mrs. Partington's combat with the ocean; yet for one idea—heralded forth with this customary braggadocio—that proves its fitness to survive and benefit mankind probably ninety-nine perish. Another effective device is to recall the foolish predictions which have been made at various times upon proposals of beneficial reform, and thus to confound two entirely dissimilar cases.

"Well, sir, very likely you and others in this room can remember the time when our Catholic fellow-countrymen struggled for their emancipation: did you not hear the same sort of thing from the Admiral Maxxes of the time?"—Miss Fenwick Miller's reply to my lecture delivered at the Eleusis Club.

According to this mode of reasoning, the infallibility of all projects is necessarily assumed. Yet a sufficient number of people can always be collected who will applaud such an exhilarating fallacy.

I do not, therefore, exaggerate the probable effect of my opposition. All I am anxious for is that you should realize the position that will be attained by this measure, and consider carefully whether it is likely to be of much value. Single women who are householders will have the vote—wives will be excluded from the poll. The Woman Suffrage Society will expire, its "heart" will go out. Then how shall we be? What will be the practical outcome? What sort of a political force shall we have released under the pretext of emancipating the sex? We have to consider the character and disposition of average women who are now all at home encompassed by a household horizon, and who trouble themselves little about this or any other public movement. They would rather not have the vote. It is common for the Lady Suffragists to allege that women approve of their measure because they do not come forward to oppose: it must be remembered, however, that it is not consistent with the views of ladies who object to the vote to make platform appearance. They are deficient in public spirit and in a knowledge of the ways of public life. Another fallacious statement is that if they do not want the vote they can "leave it alone." But will they be left alone? It must be remembered that they are unprotected, there is no male tyrant at hand to intimidate canvassers. What part, then, will these women play—the widows, the spinsters, and the single ladies—who are suddenly called in to give the casting vote upon many a momentous question? You will form a singularly erroneous notion if you regard the ladies who have come forward to demand the vote as representative of their sex. When they go to the poll, they will, I venture to predict, meet with an overwhelming antagonistic-vote on the part of their ungrateful sisters.

It is claimed that women have voted well in School Board elections; I do not know upon what ground this claim is made; I am disposed to think that the Woman School Board vote has been a clerical one.

It does not follow that this vote need be a Church vote; there is a Nonconformist clerical vote as well as a Church clerical vote. The last London School Board contest (1876) was mainly a struggle between Liberals and Nonconformists on one side and Conservatives and Churchmen on the other: it is likely that the woman vote followed congregations and was equally divided.

Their voting in municipal elections has not so far been characterized by much public spirit. I received not long since a somewhat discouraging letter from a friend who lives in one of our largest Southern towns; he wrote, in reply to a question I put to him concerning the number of women voters and proportion to class, as follows:

> We are blessed with about 500 lady voters on the burgess roll; of these the preponderance is very large on the side of the Upper and Middle Classes. This arises from the fact either that many of the widows of the Working Classes, when the head of the household is gone, content themselves with becoming lodgers, or are excused their rates, or procure the aid of the Parish Authorities. Nearly all the women vote Tory. The women of the Upper Classes are naturally Tory by association and connection. The Church parson and his district visiting ladies are converted at the election times into an active Tory Committee, whose influence the women of the Middle Class do not attempt to withstand. The parson recommends them in the way of business, and the association is of too flattering a character to be separated on polling day. My belief is, that at the last municipal election in All Saints, go out of 100 women of the Middle Class voted Tory. I canvassed one lady whose husband was a Liberal in his life time, but she voted Tory, and said afterwards, "How could I refuse Miss—who is always so kind to me, and what could I say to the clergyman when he asked me to accept a ride in his brougham to the poll."

Then the widows of the very poor vote Tory also. The parson at Christmas pleads for the poor widow, and he and his visiting ladies distribute amongst them the parochial charities. When election time comes, the parson is found among these people, pleading that one good turn deserves another, and when they in their turn...
ask a favour, and one so slight, how can it be refused?

Dissenting ministers abound amongst us, but the parochial system of the Church is one in which they have no lot or part, and they find it much easier to propound a principle eloquently in the pulpit than to give effect to their views by bringing to the polling booth those over whom they have influence. When, at our last municipal election, there were at least six Church parsons at work bringing up voters, it was impossible to induce the Dissenting Ministers to budge one inch further than to record their own votes.

Of course it is retorted that there are men voters just as bad. But because there are many men who do not know how to vote, does it follow that women will know how to do so? I fail to see how one evil will be corrected by the introduction of another. Political responsibility has not educated the men, why should it educate the women? And we must remember this—much as self-dependent women may repudiate the idea of dependence—single women are more likely to be "dependent" than men voters. At least the men, if they choose, can protect themselves: it is more the nature of women to yield to solicitation; and whatever may be pretended to the contrary, it is certain that average women are more subject to clerical influence than men.

"Any one acquainted with the enormous power of popular preachers over the susceptible sex must know how little it depends on the matter of the appeal, or the object to be gained or the arguments used."—*Times*, April 28, 1876.

When I speak of clerical influence, pray understand that I refer to the doctrine more than to the man. I speak of the influence derived from human opinion claiming supernatural sanction and expressed through an ecclesiastical agent. Gibbon says, that "To a philosophic eye the *vices* of the clergy are less dangerous than their *virtues*"—their virtues are doubtless many. What with their doctrine, their virtues and various accessories, they exercise great power over women. The priest from his pulpit—or as the kind excellent friend which he so frequently is—can more readily excite women against public measures than he can excite men. I have known a clergyman send women out of his church, during a School Board election, in a state of righteous indignation against a "secular" candidate, and fully resolved to sustain the Church in its combat with Satan. If you wish to learn the influence of the clergy over women, look into the churches and observe the proportion of women.

See appendix II. for an interesting table showing the relative number of men and women who made requests for special intervention through Moody and Sankey.

Some will account this a merit, for it will be tantamount to saying that women care more for religion than men. But the word religion requires more than any other to have some definite meaning attached to it. Too often it may be described as the deification of human error. Feelings and thoughts, however mean, however selfish, and however ignorant—and excelling only in the quality of vehemence—ticket themselves as "religious," and forthwith claim a sacred immunity. "This is a religious feeling," it is said, "and you must respect it."

Now women resort to this plan of dignifying mere impulse with the name of "religious feeling," far more than men, and they claim a virtue for it. I fear that this religious "feeling will, at the time of an election, be made use of (especially in the case of lonely women) to oppose all movements of progress.

The common reply made to the objection that women are likely to vote under the influence of the Clergy, is that we have surrendered them to the Priests by failing to give them sufficient interest or concern in the affairs of the country; and Mill told us often that the explanation of the Priest having so much influence over woman is that he is the only person who speaks seriously to her. One of his objects in demanding the vote for woman was to counteract the influence of the Priest by means of the influence of the Politician. I fear I cannot share this sanguine expectation. Women are highly emotional, they fear death more than men, and they are weak. The Priest appeals to their emotions. He offers them access to celestial joys, he abolishes death, and holds in reserve a method of alarm which few women are strong enough to despise. The dead can never return to refute his words. What sort of a rival is the Politician with his meagre fare of doubtful benefit to others!

I am aware that taunts of illiberality are made against me, because I point out that the woman vote is likely to be Clerical. It is said, "They are of course free to vote as they like." This reply may perfectly serve for those who concede the right to vote. But I do not concede any abstract right to vote at all. The right to vote I regard as a question of expediency and fitness. It is easy to sneer at expediency, to toss the head, and enquire who is to judge of rightful expediency. The indignation with the word arises from its oppressive misuse. I will venture to say that there is not one person in this hall (however riotous his sense of justice may be) who is not prepared to defend some position he holds upon the ground of expediency. I have not heard the vote claimed for minors. I defy anyone to defend the non-enfranchisement of a young man of twenty, of a foreigner, or of a pauper, upon any other ground than that of expediency. The respective arguments of adolescence, of nativity, and of poverty, are expediency pleas, and none other.

A writer in the *Englishwoman's Review* for January last combats the above remarks in the following manner: "To our mind it is a question of right that every person shall have during his or her life a chance of self-government. A minor can become of age, a foreigner can be naturalised, a pauper may become a man of
substance, a criminal may reform" (it should, perhaps, be added here, "A wife may become a widow" in anticipation of proposed law), "an agricultural labourer can emigrate to a town; it is in the possible future of all of these to become voters—only women have the franchise put out of their reach for life." The "chance of self-government" here spoken of is clearly a fiction, and a fiction invented for the occasion. If the "right" exists, the pauper may object that the chance of his becoming a "man of substance" is too remote to satisfy it. It is evident that the writer refuses the vote to the pauper upon the same ground of expediency as I do.

As it is a favourite declaration on the part of members of the Woman Suffrage Society that women are placed in the same political category as paupers, criminals, and idiots, I must emphatically repudiate any such interpretation being placed on the illustration I have just given, the object of which is merely to show that Society determines the Suffrage upon the ground of expediency, that is to say, of fitness.

See Appendix III. for American opinion on the Expediency of Woman Suffrage.

Women are excluded for a number of reasons, which I shall consider later; but they are excluded, as they are excluded from the army—without contempt.

Leaving this I may say that even if I did concede the right to vote which is claimed, I should still be entitled to protest against the enfranchisement of a particular section of women whose position renders them peculiarly subject to reactionary tendencies, and might demand as a set-off the simultaneous enfranchisement of the wives of town bootmakers.

Certainly the ladies theory is a highly convenient one. They consider themselves entitled to dwell as fully as they please upon the beneficent changes which will result from the enlightened vote of single women. They may proclaim the advantage. I am to be debarrd from showing the disadvantage—they may affirm that women will vote right; if I suggest that they may vote wrong, they indignantly exclaim "Is it possible that a Liberal can desire to constrain the liberty of the voter!"

The Woman Suffrage advocates generally commence their charge by stating a number of evils and oppressive laws from which women suffer, and which I desire to see abolished as heartily as they do—then, with an amazing inconsequence, they produce the single-woman vote as a remedy! It is assumed that with this vote the evils will commence to disappear, that it will correct bad laws, and abolish the existing legal disabilities. "Ten years after women become voters," says, one sanguine lady, "there will be some erasures in the Statute Book." This is just exactly what I deny—namely, that there will be some erasures favourable to women. The single-woman vote will, in my opinion, confirm the bad laws, and maintain the very restrictions that we desire to be rid of.

The evils referred to are due to other causes than that of the non-enfranchisement of single or other women. They are largely due to the intolerance and wilful ignorance of women themselves; they are partly owing to what women have made of men.

"It is an undeniable truth that women ought to be infinitely better educated than they are, taught juster methods of reasoning, and a greater regard for facts. But when women rage passionately against the injustice of their own ignorance, they never seem to remember that it is they themselves who have so willed it. It is not the fathers who choose the schools for their daughters. Whatever girls' schools may have been, women alone have made and ordered them. It is women who mould and regulate the lives of women; and if the answer is, Mothers make their girls what men desire them to be, is there not a counter reply, Are not all men the sons of women? The miserable thing called a polite education has been, and is emphatically the work of woman; that more miserable thing, a fine lady, is still more emphatically her work and creation."—"Woman's Place in Nature and Society;" an article by Mrs. Lynn Linton, in Belgravia, May, 1876.

As far as the evils can be traced to political representation they are due to an Electoral system which (among other defects) is antagonistic to the representation of ideas upon National subjects. There are plenty of ideas in the country favourable to progress for both men and women, but the means of representing them in Parliament is limited. It is the tendency of this system to elect members upon personal considerations, and local interests. Electors do not vote in virtue of themselves, but in virtue of a restricted locality, a method which breaks up association in the interest of the nation at large. They find, therefore, in too many instances, that the great privilege of the franchise gives them the opportunity, once in seven years—sometimes once in three years—of supporting one of two parish opinions, viz.: whether the vote shall be given to that well-known Conservative Tweedledum, who has always lived among them, or whether it shall be bestowed upon Tweedledee, who is Liberal to everything and in favour of nothing.

There is one favourite argument I must refer to before passing to the consideration of True Woman Suffrage. It is founded on the notion that representation is the correlative of taxation. This one of those popular formulas which has no foundation in fact.

It is a mere phrase; women make themselves supremely ridiculous when they mimic Hampden, by refusing to pay taxes and allowing their spoons to be sold. All people are taxed and few people are represented. Lodgers of all kinds and classes, married men, married women, adults, minors and the entire peasantry, are taxed
"Because we are taxed we are not therefore entitled to vote. If we were, a minor who pays taxes is unjustly deprived of the franchise. Our taxes pay for the protection of our persons and property, and the benefit of Society."—Letter in Index.

"It is seen that the property of a woman is taxed, and that she is not allowed to vote: it is forgotten that the property of the Corporation, the minor, the non-resident, is taxed under the same circumstances. Taxes are assessed upon property with no reference to the owner. If it be urged that the women whose property is assessed for 100 or 1000 dollars ought for that reason to be allowed to vote, it may with equal propriety be maintained that a Corporation that pays one half the tax of the town, as in many instances they do, ought to be allowed more than one vote... The proposed change is opposed to the fundamental principle of Republican Government—namely, persons, not property, constitute the basis of representation; and property, not persons, is the basis of taxation."—"Woman and Politics;" an Essay read by Rev. E. S. Elder, before the Chestnut Street Club, Boston, U. S.

There are in England and Wales some 12,000,000 adults who pay taxes, and of these 12,00,000 people, only two million (I speak in round numbers), have votes, that is to say, are nominally represented—and then, as an amazing climax of our Constitution, a minority of these electors return the majority in the House of Commons! so that less than one million people have veritable representation. If you want an anomaly to wax indignant over—here is one! Here is an answer to those who assert that public opinion will not brook the anomaly of Woman Suffrage—minus wives!

If this movement makes way, it is because the Nation slumbers. We live at a period which all patriotic men must contemplate with some sorrow. In the powerful press—I do not refer to the honourable course of the subterranean unheeded Democratic press—there is a conspiracy of silence in regard to all great Domestic Questions. I measure a question by the number of people it affects. When meetings are held upon really important questions, such as the Agricultural Labourer question, the Land question, the Electoral Reform or State Church questions, they are disregarded, or are treated as minor questions, while questions that are really minor—such as administrative blunders or subjects that are sensational—are converted into great ones. I observed not long since that a leading journal which knows what kind of literary ware best suits the "largest circulation," gave nine columns to the details of a murder, and not one inch to the report of a great political meeting at Sheffield, where a man of Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN'S mark attended and made one of his ablest speeches. Ambitious ministers study silence also. No Statesman dare, under our parochial system of election, express an honest conviction upon a People of England's question; and the safest seat in Parliament is held by the man who has not yet committed himself to "yea" or to "nay" upon a serious political issue. That honest Conservative, Mr. THOMAS COLLINS, said, in his evidence before the Commission appointed to enquire into corrupt practices, that when he went to Boston as a candidate, he was told that if he wanted to secure the seat he must be careful to avoid politics! What a comment on the power of the non-political class! What an illustration of public apathy and insensibility to national affairs! It is not surprising that at such a time as this a Counterfeit Image of Progress should appear on the lifeless political scene

The Eastern Question has arisen since this passage was first prepared, and it may be said that the political scene is no longer "lifeless." But the passage has reference only to domestic questions. It would be strange, indeed, if the horrors which have been committed in the East, and the danger with which we are threatened of having to embark upon an unjust war did not cause some national perturbation.

and receive a certain amount of applause.

A lady asked, upon the first occasion of my giving this lecture, how I reconciled my opinion of the smallness of the measure before the public with the magnitude I appear to attach to it. This is easily explained. It is small when compared with the principle it professes to represent, but looked at in its proper light as a property representation measure, it is large by reason of its delusive and class character, and by the effect it may produce in close political contests.

Part II. True Woman Suffrage.

And now I will offer some remarks upon the question of True Woman Suffrage, no proposal for which has ever been placed before the country. I must decline to consider any demand for Woman Suffrage as other than counterfeit which does not include wives in the proposed enfranchisement; and I would warn you here—as a part of both questions—against the possible effect of a favourite metaphor which is used by the advocates of the measure I have discussed. They call it—that is to say a few of them do, those who address the ingenuous Radical—the "thin end of the wedge:"

"The thin end of the wedge of justice will be inserted in our Constitution, at any rate, by Mr. Jacob Bright's
now I wish to impress on you that if by the "wedge" is meant genuine Woman Suffrage, this implement does not enter at all: indeed if we must have metaphor (though I think metaphor often misleads) the wedge is not put to its proper function: it is converted into a hammer to weld and strengthen the resisting medium.

The Question of True Woman Suffrage I approach with a different feeling to that with which I regard the other proposal. Generous sentiment inclines to it. I always bear in mind that Mr. MILL advocated Woman Suffrage in that noble book of his the "Subjection of Women." What man with mind is there who will not sympathize with Mr. MILL in his desire to elevate women and to give them strong minds?—for strong minds not less than feminine grace are precious in women. The more women there are who interest themselves in politics, the better it will be for all of us. Who is there that does not feel that until women share the best and most difficult aspirations of men the burden on the latter is double, and that

"A dreary Sea now flows between."

But the question over which there may be difference of opinion is as to the means of elevating women. Mr. MILL’s eloquent book seems to me more powerful as a plea for the alteration of the Marriage Law, for the removal of legal disabilities, and for throwing open all vocations and occupations, than it is powerful as a plea for political power. And remember this—his whole argument is founded on the position of Wives. I think he exaggerates the slavery of their position: as when he speaks of each wife living "under the very eye of her master . . . . in a chronic state of bribery and intimidation combined," or when he describes her as "the actual bond-servant of her husband; no less so, as far as legal obligation goes, than slaves commonly so called." There are not a few husbands who—notwithstanding legal obligations—could tell a different tale. Marriage is as often slavery to the man as it is to the woman. Speaking broadly, it maybe said, that while a woman gains her independence by marriage a man loses it, and as far as I can observe, no amount of Voting Power enables him to recover it. I find it very difficult to reconcile Mr. MILL’s confidence in the vote as an instrument of redress, with statements he makes of the dependence of women on men, and the improbability he thereby suggests of their making an independent use of it. At page 46, he says, that "the greater part of what women write about women is mere sycophancy to men;" also that the majority of the women of any class are not likely to differ in political opinion from the majority of the men of the same class. Is it then likely—as he asserts—that they will strike out an independent line upon a question in which the interests of women, as such, are involved? Can you fancy many women "tampering," as it would be called, with the Marriage Law, or—considering their alleged sycophancy to men—supporting a programme of Women’s Rights, however just such a programme might be?

My point of view in this question is that of regarding women in their normal relation to men; that is to say, the position towards men which the majority of them occupy. I hold the theory to be erroneous which treats them as a class apart from, or existing independently of, men. Now I trust I shall not be misunderstood. I do not say that women should not have their independent individual existence as far as they can create it. There are a number of women entitled to our highest esteem, whose lives are entirely separate from the lives of men. But we cannot, and ought not, to judge the whole case of the sex from a consideration of their exceptional position; neither should we impose duties and privileges on them which are not common to all women.

Again, as we should not argue the case upon a consideration of the exceptional position of certain women, neither should we argue it upon the exceptional qualities of superior women. Yet this is a very common practice. Certain dis-tinguished women are compared with ordinary or inferior men, and the average equality of the sexes is supposed to be established. It may be as well to note, on our way, that although women of genius are constantly quoted to attest the mental calibre of their sex, these eminent ladies manifest a remarkable indifference to the question of Woman Suffrage.

Then Mr. MILL quotes certain people who are distinguished by position—Queens and Princesses—who are supposed to have exhibited considerable talent for government; but the fact is that we know nothing of royal personages. If they commit error it is concealed from our vulgar knowledge. The King "can do no wrong" is a constitutional maxim. There is so much glamour thrown upon their proceedings that they are almost fictitious personages. Men require under a Monarchy ornamental persons at the head of the State, and a woman will serve this purpose better than a man, for her weakness and sex appeal to the sentiment of chivalry, and by this means obtain support and forbearance. If, however we are to go off upon this false issue and form judgment from the conduct of women brought up, for the political purpose of men, under the artificial conditions of royalty, I should like you to compare the opinion of Mr. GOLDWIN SMITH on this subject

Macmillan’s Magazine, June 1875. See Appendix iv.

with that of Mr. MILL. But the question is really beside the main issue: this is not—"Who is to impersonate or to image the Governing Power?" but "From whom is it to be derived?"

To vote means to govern, that is to say theoretically: of course under our Constitution and Electoral System the real power of voting is slight. But the theory is that the voters elect the Government: and it is with this
object that the vote is claimed; it is a means to governing the nation.

This raises the question whether there is or there is not a natural province for women as there is a natural province for men. I am quite aware that in using this term "natural" it may give rise to a little feeling of triumph on the part of some of my adversaries. They will say "Here is the old plea of every oppressor," and MILL's inquiry will be remembered as to whether there was ever any dominion which did not appear "natural" to those who possessed it?—whether the dominion of the white man over the black was not alleged to be "natural?" &c. &c. But because a word has been misused it does not follow that it has no significance. No one will gainsay me if I assert that it is "natural" (according to our present definition of natural) a man should protect a woman in the presence of danger, that it is "natural" he should serve as a soldier in war; nor on the other hand, if I said that it is "natural" a wife should bear a child, and that it is "natural" women should depend on the men who love them. It is not my fault—though it may be my misfortune—that I am compelled to use arguments and words which have been perverted to justify oppression and wrong doing. Reasons may be applicable in one case which are not so in another. Good government and bad government may be defended in precisely the same words. I dwell upon this because the following retort appears to be regarded by so many people as conclusive. "If you deny the claim in one case I do not see how you can concede it in another," it is said, when the two cases are entirely different; each must be judged upon its own merits. I am never deferred from acquiescing in a right because an unreasonable claim may be founded upon it. If it be asked—who is to decide as to the difference of case? I can only answer—Clearness of mind and an improved Public Opinion.

I beg, therefore, you will dismiss from your mind any prejudice which may have been created by the misuse of words. When I say "natural," I do not mean "usual;" I mean natural in the sense of conforming to a known invariable relation between persons or things.

Defined thus, I do not shrink from asserting that women have a natural province, and that the exercise of political power or government of the nation is inconsistent with it. MILL says at page 38, "What is now called the nature of women is an eminently artificial thing." It depends upon who is speaking, MILL's view in this matter appears to be ROUSSEAU'S, it is represented in the doctrine of the Fall of Man. Whatever is bad results from art and civilization; whatever is good belongs to nature—so back to nature: and what do we find there? the men fighting and the women treated as chattel. "Nature" appears to place women entirely at the mercy of men. Their independence is an artificial product: it is the outcome of civilization, and the growth of sentiment, but we shall err in supposing that there are no natural limits to such independence.

We cannot make women the equal of men in male strength; and there are certain male duties which result from this strength. Mr. GOLDWIN SMITH truly says, that "the law, after all, though the fact may be rough and unwelcome, rests at bottom on the force of the community, and the force of the community is male. No woman can imagine that her sex can execute, or in case of rebellion reassert the law; for that they must look entirely to men," and he remarks:—

"In France, it is morally certain, that at the present moment if the votes were given to the women, the first result would be the restoration to power of the Bourbons, with their reactionary priesthood, and the destruction of all that has been gained by the national agonies of the last century. But would the men submit?"

This passage from Mr. GOLDWIN SMITH forcibly illustrates the necessity of the voting power corresponding with the real strength of the nation. Rebellions occur sometimes under male legislation. Peoples will submit to much vexatious legislation, rather than resort to rebellion; but when great questions are at issue, and there is national excitement, they will not submit to an oppressive edict if they consider they are strong enough to resist it: the knowledge, or even the suspicion, that such law is enacted by the vote of women supplementing that of a minority of men would be sufficient to provoke rebellion.

As in the discussion which took place on this point there was some misunderstanding, and it was assumed that I proposed the absurdity that all women would be found voting on one side and all men upon the other, I will give an illustration of my meaning. Let us imagine that in France under a law of universal male and female suffrage there are some 22,000,000 votes equally divided between the two sexes. A Plebiscité is taken as to whether a Democratic Republic or a Roman Catholic Monarchy shall be established. Nineteen million votes are polled. They are disposed in round numbers in the following not improbable manner:—

The majority in favour of the Monarchy would thus be 1,000,000. But would a Monarchy thus established rest on a solid basis?

I trust that this grave point will be considered by my adversaries. As I am very anxious that there should be an exact understanding upon the relative positions occupied by myself and opponents upon this question of Physical Force, I will quote one or two passages from the replies given by the latter, and will give them the benefit of their strongest points.

The writer in the Englishwoman's Review says, in reviewing my lecture, "Is moral force of no value unless backed up by physical force? . . . Are we to go back to the policy of savage times, when might was the only right to frame our code? "Miss FENWICK MILLER exclaims," Since the days of Rob Roy .... such an opinion as..."
this argument implies of the rights of Brute Strength has never been enunciated."

I must ask you here to disregard mere declamation about "savage times" and "Brute Strength" which is indulged in for the purpose of giving an odious character to an agency which, as Society is composed, is indispensable. It is very easy to sneer at what Mr. MILL calls the "law of the strong," and the sneer is perhaps excusable when we consider how often it has been unjustly imposed and glorified by Carlylean hero worshippers irrespective of the cause it upheld, but the law of the strong settles some things wisely. The independence of nations has been achieved and is preserved by means of it. Good laws result from strength as much as bad laws.

Does this involve the absurdity of advocating "Brute Strength" as divorced from mind? Certainly not. Brute strength built the houses we live in, and it arrests the criminal, but there is mind to determine its exercise. What does this show? Clearly that beneficial power is derived from the combination of reason with strength.

Miss LYDIA BECKER in her pamphlet on Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, produces an illustration as follows:

"If it were thought expedient to invest women with equal property rights with men, and with the electoral franchise, the law would be as competent to secure their rights to women—notwithstanding any inferiority in physical power—as it is to secure the property rights of infants who are infinitely weaker than women, but who are in this respect treated by the law as the equals of the strongest men."

My comment on this is that the infants are not protected by infant made law. The law to be efficient and to command respect—especially at a national crisis—must be male made.

I am anxious that women should have equal property rights and equal independence with men, but they can never obtain it themselves. I not only concede this equality, but demand it—not from them, however, but for them—by male legislation. I hope at least that there are some among my opponents who will moderate their indignation, and endeavour to comprehend my views. I want all that the most enlightened women ask for. I am as strong a champion for their personal rights as the most devoted daughter of MARY WOLSTONCRAFT can be, but I do not confuse personal right with political or military right. I hold that the personal right to be equal in the eye of the law, and to obtain redress for the wrong committed by men, does not involve the political right, and that the exercise of the latter will be damaging to the former. It requires a woman of masculine thought to demand in its full meaning personal and equal rights for women; now I believe that from the majority of women you will only get what is commonly known as feminine thought. I form my judgment upon observation of the common characteristics of women. I decline to decide this question upon an inference drawn from their exceptional characteristics.

Mill's error on this point has been adopted by all his disciples. There can be no doubt but that he formed his idea of women generally from a consideration of his wife's peculiar character: in fact, in an unconscious manner he admits as much, for he says that one may infer to an almost laughable extent the character of a man's own wife by the opinion he expresses of women in general. Now although this assertion is absurdly untrue as far as men are concerned who have mixed much in the world, and who have women relatives and friends presenting every variety of character, it is probably quite true as far as Mill's own life and experience went, and he is at least entitled to receive the benefit of his own statement. Mrs. Mill was, from all we can gather, precisely one of those women—endowed with masculine thought—whose character was exceptional to that of her sex.

It will be admitted that one common characteristic of the sex is timidity—timidity mental, not less than physical. During one of the discussions that followed the lecture, one gentleman turned with some impatience, if not anger, upon a previous speaker, who had suggested that women were not constitutionally fitted for political life, and asked him to state—"What there is in the constitution of a woman to hinder her from exercising a sensible choice between two parliamentary candidates?" If the gentleman interrogated had bethought him of an appropriate reply, he would have said—"Constitutional Timidity."

Rival candidates represent rival ideas: one set of ideas may include a project of political enterprise, that is of reform, which may be very needful either for the nation or for women themselves, but the constitutional mental timidity of women will cause them to dread and oppose it. Of course I do not refer to the ladies who advocate Woman Suffrage. They are endowed with considerable mental energy, an energy that I value highly, though I wish it had taken another direction. My reference is to women as they are commonly characterised.

The Englishwoman's Review then varies the illustration and asks if Physical Force is so "What does our law mean by disfranchising the exponents of physical force, policemen, and soldiers?"

It may be replied that soldiers and policemen are the voluntary exponents of force, and that they acquiesce in the condition of disfranchise-ment; it is certain that if they did not acquiesce they would rebel. There is no analogy whatsoever between their case and the case I put of the male majority declining to acquiesce in the decree of a feminine majority.

It may be said that it would be very wrong to rebel against a law which has been decreed by Parliament.
Nevertheless, insurrections do occur, and men have been called patriotic for resisting an odious law. Mill said that the only justification for insurrection was the probability of success. I maintain that under woman-made law the prospect of this will tend to encourage insurrection.

Women, misled by a purely artificial condition, may declare that they are entitled to play exactly the same part as men—that they will make laws, share government, and enforce obedience to the official declaration of their will. The idle claim may be made, sentimentalists may applaud it, and party politicians may, during a sickly period, carry it into law. But, inevitably, whenever the real strain comes, under the flowing tide of energy and thought, and men are suddenly called upon to submit to an artificial yoke, not all the invocations of justice in the world, or the wildest rhapsodies over abstract right will lend strength to the brittle toy. The relative position of men and women will be reasserted in the midst of confusion, and society will learn that it can only advance under certain fixed unalterable conditions.

The Physical weakness of women and their dependence on men is a reason why female government should not prevail over male government as it might well do if all women had votes: it is also a reason—though not generally regarded as a degrading reason—why women are excluded from the Army, Navy, and Police. If we argued, after the fashion of the lady suffragists, from the exceptional women, this reason would not hold. Sir Robert Anstruther, M.P., while presiding over a Woman Suffrage meeting in Hanover Square two years ago, was considered to have made a successful retort to the physical strength argument by saying that he could produce a Scotch fish woman who would walk the wind out of me in five minutes.

I will make him a present of the following case, which I cut out, not long since, from a Northern paper. "In the Dundee Police Court, on Saturday, two women, Gordon Stewart and Elizabeth Melville, mill-workers, were fined twenty shillings or twenty days, for fighting with each other in a field, on Thursday week. After both had got into boxing trim, the fight was conducted according to the etiquette of pugilistic science, and was witnessed by a crowd of females. There were three tough rounds, in which Melville was severely punished and latterly rendered insensible."

We are told of the brand of Electoral incapacity; but since women can fight so well it might be argued—why should they be humiliated with the brand of military incapacity? Yet we may say—without being accused of dogma or of invoking "the law of the strong"—that military service is inconsistent with the natural province of women.

I must endeavour here to clear up a misconception. It is assumed by Woman Suffrage Advocates that we declare women should not vote because they do not serve in the army. This is not so. The object of my reference to the army, navy, &c., is to show that there are certain offices from which women are excluded on account of sex, and without indignity. We must be governed, as it is necessary to repeat ad nauseam, by the general characteristics of women: timidity and physical weakness.

But it is said there are men also who are timid and weak. "Yet no one proposes to recognize a difference in the personal rights of able-bodied and infirm men." (Lydia E. Becker—Reply to Fitz James Stephen). The comment on this sally is that men do not lose the privilege of their sex by becoming infirm anymore than do the women, who take to pugilism, lose their privilege of sex to be exempt from military service.

disqualify them as soldiers.

Women are under no brand on account of their weakness, their timidity, and the grace of their natural dependence—or they are under the brand of nature—if to be a woman is a brand. And I can quite understand that in some cases sex may be felt in a woman with honorable shame and regret: that is, when a woman possesses a masculine and vigorous mind with all sorts of capacities, and with an intellect far surpassing that of ordinary men. It is in her favour and our interest that I occupy the paradoxical position as some regard it, of objecting less to the woman vote than to the admission of women to Parliament. I know one or two women now whom I would gladly accept as my representatives in the House of Commons. It is women of this sort who very naturally repudiate dependence on men; but we must not, as I have urged before, commit the blunder of arguing the case of women on consideration of the exceptional qualities possessed by a few, nor suppose that these qualities can, by means of political enfranchisement, be made characteristic of women in general.

Let us now consider how far the natural character of women fits them to enter public life and give weighty decisions. I think it will be admitted that very few of them perceive that there is any connection at all between private and public life. Their domesticity has its drawback. They care only for that which is near them, for the actual which is within touch. The waves which come in from outer life and affect domestic circumstances, which indeed create and destroy them, they mostly ignore. Of course, I speak of average women. The position I am placed in of having, apparently, to draw up an indictment against the sex, it is an extremely disagreeable one. I would rather dilate upon their private worth, but as it is proposed to confide the national destiny into their hands, it is necessary to discuss seriously their character and disposition for public life. If, then, we take women in the mass, we shall find that they exaggerate the worst characteristic of the English people, namely, a failure to appreciate the effect of indirect cause. I will illustrate my meaning. If we see a shot fired at us, it is easy to
attribute the discharge to a gun; but it would be folly to blame the gun, we should consider who fired it, and the motives that prompted the hostility. Women, as a rule, can only perceive the gun, that is to say, the nearest visible cause of evil. They would not knowingly harm a fly, especially one that is in the room; yet, by means of their sympathy and influence, they contribute powerfully to the indirect causes of human suffering and massacre. They, more than others, are responsible for those

"Specious names learnt in soft childhood's unsuspecting hour," which sanctify the sword, and send men to kill each other. They hate war and adore the army. They will wring their hands over the battle field—their's to bestow the glory and to applaud the barbaric pomp and glittering pageantry which excite men to conflict. Their's the mission to teach children that other peoples are inferior and should be held in subjection, and when they have it, their's will be the vote for naval and military expenditure.

They, more than others, "pity the plumage and forget the dying bird." They grieve over poverty, yet rebuke the innovator who attempts to deal with its ancient causes. He may disturb the "plumage." They desire to be good, and are good, often are far better than men, but they do not desire to think, failing to realize that

"Evil is wrought by want of Thought
As well as by want of heart."

Those who think unorthodox, that is, unusual thought, they believe to be wicked. Wise thought must have some pomp and outward circumstance. Then they turn instictively from all initiative movement. Even superior women rarely have sympathy with the struggling principles which determine the life of a nation. They are only interested in public affairs within the limits of the Parish, or in the cause blazoned round the land. They were not to be counted among the active supporters of the National Education League, but under the advice of the Clergy are warm supporters of Denominationalism in their respective parishes: they did not send us a single half-crown in support of Mr. MILL'S Land Tenure Reform scheme, neither have they given much countenance (except the women who were concerned with the men) to the Labourers' cause, or to workmen's independent movements.

Miss Fenwick Miller, in reply to this passage, asks me if I have never heard of Madame Roland and Charlotte Corday. But these women were the eccentricities of their sex; the first a noble one, and the latter, let us hope, a very rare one; a more treacherous deed than the one which lifted Charlotte Corday to fame it is almost impossible to conceive.

"It hath not much
Console the race of mastodons to know
Before they went to fossil, that anon
Their place should quicken with the elephant;"
And so are we living men of these generations; let us at least plead for our children and for those who follow them, if we may not plead for ourselves. It is right we should live for posterity; but we are not entitled to gamble away our heritage upon the mere chance of a remote benefit. And if the experiment does not succeed! If the total effect of the Woman Vote turns out so oppressive that it becomes insupportable to the majority of men, remember that nothing less than an insurrection will suffice to withdraw the vote. Professor Cairnes, in his reply to Mr. Goldwin Smith, suggests that at a crisis, if free institutions were likely to be jeopardised by the Woman Vote, the appeals of husbands, fathers, and brothers would induce a sufficient number of women to abstain from voting; that is to say, we are to surrender the power of suppressing free institutions into the hands of women (who do not want it!) in order to entreat them not to exercise it when political responsibility is put to its highest test.

As I have been accused of mis-representing Professor Cairnes, in the above passage, I will give his exact words as they appear in Macmillan's Magazine for September, 1874. Mr. Goldwin Smith had said that "Female Suffrage would give a vast increase of power to the Clergy." Professor Cairnes, after remarking that he is quite unable to discover what the grounds are for such a supposition" proceeds thus: "Even if we were to make the extravagant supposition, that the Clergy are to a man in favour of personal government and absolutism," (it may be remarked in parenthesis that the extravagant supposition about the clergy "to a man" was Professor Cairnes' and not Mr. Goldwin Smith's) "there would still be husbands, fathers, and brothers, whose appeals on behalf of free government would not surely pass altogether unheeded. Is it being over sanguine to assume that at the worst a sufficient number of women would be kept back from the polls to leave the victory with the cause that is 'characteristically male.'"

There is another argument I may use. It is that political government by women conflicts with the ideal relation of man and woman. This ideal relation may be rarely fulfilled; men and women are trained to miss it; formalities, custom, and a bad marriage law, with social penalties that encourage hypocrisy, all conspire to make true union rare; but nevertheless I think that all reform likely to alter the relation of the sexes should be considered with this ideal steadily in view; women going to the poll to govern men, to act as an opposing class (the whole theory of the value of the vote rests upon the supposition that they will oppose male legislation), this picture conflicts with the ideal relation.

Not one wife out of fifty wants to go to the poll whether she attains the ideal relation or not: the majority of wives are either indifferent or hostile to the vote. I do not refer merely to the thoughtless, I refer to the opinion of the most thoughtful of wives. I fancy I can hear someone say, "Slaves never wish to be free," but if they are slaves, does the vote give them freedom? The analogy is a forced one. Freedom in the case of Slaves means release from ownership. In the case of women, according to Mr. Mill, marriage constitutes the so-called slavery, and this is to remain. Since they continue slaves, how can they be expected to vote for freedom? According to the premisi they will insist upon shackles for themselves while possessed of the power of forging shackles for men.

There remains something to be said—as against the alleged Subjection—of the Dominion of Women. Previous to giving them a strength entirely foreign to their nature, it may be as well to consider whether their natural influence is not already excessive, and whether their feminine power requires to be supplemented by artificial or masculine power. I am aware that in the public treatment of this question, it is the fashion to ignore entirely the sex relation and influence; still I do not think we shall come to a wise decision unless we bear vividly in mind the potent force, derived from sex attraction, which is perpetually at work, whether we approve of it or not, establishing the Dominion of women. How much of the World's working power is not due to Woman motive? It may be concealed, but there it is supplying the fuel to men's energy. Women may disclaim the desire for homage, they may caricature it as constituting them the "puppets of a dream," but they may just as well attempt to alter the law of gravitation as endeavour to alter their own mode of attraction and the corresponding deference of men.

"Surely their influence is strong enough as things are without their direct invasion of the political platform. As wives and mothers, as sisters, friends, and the first woman whom the young man loves, they have immense power over men" "Woman's Place in Nature and Society."

The woman who takes an interest in politics, such is her sex influence, exercises far more political power than any man occupying a private position. It is asserted that this is an injurious indirect influence, but the vote will not abolish it; on the contrary, if women are to become more interested in politics by means of the vote, it will make them all the more anxious to exert their influence whether it be described as direct or indirect.

I am quite sure that, whatever may have been my reasoning, I shall have done little to dislodge the intense
feeling which some ladies have worked themselves up to on this question of Woman Suffrage. The roots of strong feeling run too deep to be affected by argument. I must, however, protest against the common supposition that strength of feeling affords any indication of the righteousness, wisdom, or ultimate success of a cause. If earnest feeling be the test of truth, then Roman Catholic, Protestant, Buddhist, and Freethinker are equally right. The fire of conviction belongs to each. Yet it is probable that one or the other is entirely mistaken. Of course, intensity of conviction is generally accompanied by so much earnestness of character and rectitude, resulting from fidelity to principle, that one hardly likes to discourage it, and yet we all know—when wedded to error and strong it has been the scourge of mankind. I would entreat ladies to look into history, and note how many movements, great and small, have been lifted into temporary notice, and have produced cases of martyrdom—entirely thrown away—far more heroic than is displayed by the martyrdom of submitting to the sale of silver spoons. Mill truly says, that "It is one of the characteristic prejudices of the reaction of the nineteenth century against the eighteenth, to accord to the unreasoning elements in human nature, the infallibility which the eighteenth century is supposed to have ascribed to the reasoning elements."

We have some American experience upon Woman enfranchisement, which hardly justifies the sanguine expectations of its supporters here. The experiment is only local in the United States, therefore the evil effect is limited, but the account I have here taken from an American newspaper

Index. Boston. September 9th, 1875; quoted from The Rocky Mountain News. See Appendix V.

favourable to Woman Suffrage, is very suggestive:—

At Wyoming, it seems the Woman advocates not only obtained the vote, but, declaring (with vehement conviction) that only a jury composed of both sexes is capable of rendering a just verdict, they secured to women the privilege of sitting as jurors. Then I read that "After a few trials the system of placing women on the jury was quietly abandoned, and has never since been revived." The necessary exemptions amounted to nine-tenths of the whole sex. "When a jury consisting of men and women (five of the latter) were long detained and locked up for several hours, the resulting inconvenience was so great that both sexes were heartily sick of the experiment." Concerning the Suffrage it says:—

"Some complain that the cost of running for office has greatly increased, and as the candidates have to bring out their lady supporters in carriages; but the ladies, in their convention a few weeks since, unanimously resolved against it, declaring themselves 'as able to walk to the polls as to Church or Market.' A few fights have resulted from challenging the votes of ladies. The first lady whose vote was challenged at Laramie dropped her ballot, and indulged in a good cry, whereupon her escort sailed in and made it hot for her challenger. After a few fights on this subject, challenging ladies was, by common consent, discontinued; and in that particular at least they have the advantage over men. As far as can be known the ladies divide their vote between parties as much as men do; rather more, perhaps, voting for personal friends. To sum up; the opinion of the best informed is that Woman Suffrage in Wyoming, has resulted in making everything just as it was before, only a little more so."

I should tell you that the Woman Suffrage advocated in America is the True Woman Suffrage.

In Massachusetts there are now 367,236 Male Voters.

Woman Suffrage will give 386,848 Female Voters,
giving the Women a majority of 20,000!

Fortunately, if we may accept the evidence of a Boston gentleman—the Rev. E. S. ELDER—Massachusetts, as well as other parts of New England, remain supremely indifferent to the proposed revolution. He tells us:—

"It is not a little remarkable that after the woman suffragists have laboured ably and persistently to convince the women of Massachusetts that they ought to vote, that they are suffering from their political disabilities, that the welfare of the State depends upon their participation in politics,—it is not a little remarkable after so much has been said and done that they still remain unconscious both of their duties and their sufferings. It would seem that if they are wronged, enslaved, they ought to know it for themselves; but if they are still insensible of their sufferings and wrongs after the persistent iterations and appeals of the advocates of woman's suffrage, it is difficult to foresee what will bring them to their senses.

"Woman and Politics," quoted previously.

Now this is not the evidence of an opponent of Reform, but of a gentleman who is well known for his liberal views: and his paper was read before a society of advanced thinkers. There are many symptoms that the Woman Suffrage movement in America is commencing to languish. Mr. ABBOT, one of the ablest of its advocates, tells us, in an article published last February,

Index. February 1st, 1877.

that an "increasing number of free and thoughtful "minds" contemplate it with apathy, and even fears himself that "if women obtain the ballot by "the exertions of the enlightened few, they will "forthwith use it to destroy the very political ideas "to which they have owed their enfranchisement." This is a pretty strong admission coming from a supporter of the movement.
I will not detain you longer; but before concluding I must refer to the accusation which has been made against me of resisting the Woman Suffrage measure upon what are called "party" grounds. Only superficial, non-political people can be misled by a charge of this sort. Party does not signify to me a collection of men struggling for office: there is little chance of my becoming a Lord of the Admiralty under either Whig or Tory administration. Party signifies to me principle: it means verifiable progress: association for the promotion of certain ideas. One of these ideas is assertion of the interests of the poor in the Political and Social Compromise that governs us, in a far broader sense than they are at present recognized as deserving. It is not a popular idea: neither are certain other principles I am stubborn enough to believe in, one of which is, let me say, the utmost practicable emancipation of women. My principles being unpopular, it follows that the association supporting them is by no means powerful. I care little for Party, but I care a great deal for the cause identified with Party. The case stands thus: I want what I believe is likely to benefit mankind, meaning by mankind both sexes. The Single Woman Suffrage party offers me—wrapped in specious phrases—that which I believe to be bad for mankind, and because I say "The advance of the good I believe in will be retarded by the success of this deceptive movement," I am accused of rejecting it upon "party" grounds, and Mr. AUBERON HERBERT writes to the Times to say that I find no difficulty in telling women that I would have given them the right of voting if they had agreed with my political views, but as they are not sufficiently fortunate to do so I decline to concede it. Now what is the ground of this mispresentation? Simply that when women make it part of their claim to vote, that they will contribute enlightened and valuable thought to Parliament, I express my belief that the contribution will be, as far as the majority is concerned, of a reverse character. The accusation of being actuated by "party" considerations is as childish as it is unjust, and it can have no force against one who occupies a position almost outside the two great governing parties.

In conclusion, I have a word or two to say upon the subject of progress. I was asked by the Chairman of one of my lectures to consider whether, even supposing the Woman Suffrage Measure to produce the reactionary effect I anticipate, other counteracting forces will not be likely to come into play which will preserve our momentum forward? I am not certain, to begin with, that there is a momentum forward; but if there is, I cannot perceive that this affords any argument for creating a hindrance. I am not a fatalist about progress. Indeed, I regard the belief in insensible inevitable progress—a progress to be obtained without human striving—to be as pernicious as any old theological belief that sent men striving on the wrong track. It absolves the majority of men from responsibility. There is surely no law to make us wise. I cannot believe it possible that progress will come to a people that does not make constant effort to be worthy of it. Progress of course means improvement. Individual improvement is, to a great extent, the result of individual effort, but it is affected by external circumstances and institutions. National progress means the improvement of these circumstances and institutions for the general benefit, (as for instance by an Education Act or Reform of the Land Tenure system), and must be the result of National effort. I look around and do not observe much sign of this. The men who endeavour to initiate national or political effort—politics being only a means to national effort—are too often ridiculed as theorists or decried as disturbers.

Of course, progress and national greatness must have some common meaning attached to them. There are those who regard France as having been greatest under Louis Quatorze and Napoleon, England as greatest under Pitt, Germany as greatest now. But mere military strength does not represent progress or greatness in my eyes. We may cast a "Woolwich infant" (an appropriate offspring of the 19th century), launch huge sea monsters, furbish up the deeds of our ancestors and celebrate Balaklava charges. We may, in the exuberance of our wealth, despatch Arctic expeditions to the North, purchase the Egyptian canal, and display gorgeous processions of State pageantry in the East: we may prostrate ourselves, with kneeling elephants, at the feet of Royalty as the symbol of magnificence. Still, this is not progress. History—if there be progress, and history expands its stature to a corresponding degree—will push all this splendour and tinsel on one side, and will say, "At this time, what were the numbers and what was the condition of the English poor?" Here is the true test of national well being. Progress must mean moral growth; it must mean the general bettering of human life: less drunkenness, less brutality, less killing—greater susceptibility to ideas, and an uneasy conscience when wrong doing prevails, or when Civilization, as it is called, produces a "Black Country," a joyless landless peasantry, or city squalor.

All that we can say is, that we are surrounded by latent possibilities. If progress is to be evolved it will only be obtained by the exercise of human wisdom—certainly not by such an act of human folly as would be achieved by conceding direct Political Power to women.

Appendix.

I.
Mr. Disraeli on Propertied Single Woman Suffrage.

The following letter appeared in 1873:—

"DEAR GORE LANGTON,—I was much honoured by receiving from your hands the Memorial signed by 11,000 women of England, among them some illustrious names, thanking me for my services in attempting to abolish the anomaly that the Parliamentary franchise attached to a household or property qualification, when possessed by a woman, should not be exercised, though in all matters of local government, when similarly qualified, she exercises this right. As I believe this anomaly to be injurious to the best interests of the country, I trust to see it removed by the wisdom of Parliament.

"Yours sincerely,
"B. Disraeli."

II.

Table showing the relative number of men and women who made requests for special intervention through Moody and Sankey.

Several weeks ago, being struck with the great disparity in the number of requests for prayer made by men as compared with the number of those made by women at the Moody and Sankey Meetings, we began to clip from the daily issues of the Boston Journal the successive lists of these requests. Such lists were not published every day, and latterly seem to be almost discontinued; nevertheless, collating all that came under our notice in the morning Journal day after day, we now subjoin a statistical table of no little interest, following the classification of the revivalists themselves, and presenting in convenient form the condensed results of our comparison. We give the number only of those by whom, not of those for whom, the requests were made, and pass over all cases in which the sex is not indicated:—

Table.

Showing the relative number of men and women who made requests for prayer at the Moody and Sankey meetings in Boston, from February 3rd to March 24th, 1877.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Fathers</th>
<th>Sons</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th>Brothers</th>
<th>Miscell.</th>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th>Daughters</th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th>Sisters</th>
<th>Miscell.</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEB. 3</td>
<td>2 1 1 2 3 7 5 1 6 16</td>
<td>&quot;9 1 2 1 7 9 4 3 0</td>
<td>&quot;13 5 3 5 2 3 5 1 3 2 1 1 5 7 1</td>
<td>&quot;15 5 6 1 1 3 1 1 2 9 1 1 1 2 3 6</td>
<td>, 16 5 1 1 2 2 2 5 1 4 2 3 2 1 1 1 6 6 4</td>
<td>&quot;17 4 1 5 1 1 6 1 2 2 0 1 1 4 8</td>
<td>&quot;20 6 5 3 1 4 9 1 7 2 4 1 5 9 0</td>
<td>&quot;21 9 2 3 1 3 4 6 1 1 9 2 6 1 8 9 2</td>
<td>&quot;22 4 3 1 9 3 7 7 2 9</td>
<td>&quot;24 6 3 2 6 4 1 4 1 7 2 9 6 3</td>
<td>&quot;26 6 1 1 5 9 6 3 0 2 5 1 8 1 2 1</td>
<td>&quot;28 1 1 3 1 0 1 1 1 3 4 3</td>
<td>MAR. 1 4 1 3 2 1 5 1 5 4 8</td>
<td>&quot;2 5 1 8 8 6 2 6 4</td>
<td>&quot;3 1 2 1 8 2 2 4 3 6 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.

Is Woman Suffrage Expedient?

"A few years ago no one believed more firmly in Woman Suffrage than the writer. But thought and observation have led me to doubt, like many others, whether more evil than good would not be the result. We all know that abstract principles of right cannot be applied in all conditions of society, especially in human governments. What is best in one stage of social evolution is not best in another. Circumstances seem to determine the right or wrong of forms of government and social institutions. Some of our political principles are generalizations, fitted for an ideal state of society, but not adapted either to the apprehension or practice of men and women in a semi-savage condition.

"We say, for instance, that the majority should rule. This is our American principle. But suppose that majority in any part of the country should be Indians; then we make an exception to the principle without any hesitation. But why? Simply because it is expedient. Look at the dilemma in which the administration and the country are placed with this Southern question. It is not a question between Packard and Nichols, Chamberlain and Hampton, but simply of race supremacy. The majority in some of those Southern States are unquestionably of the inferior race, just out of a semi-barbarous condition, utterly unfitted to rule; and yet under the principle referred to, they have an undoubted right to rule. Just what might have been expected, therefore, has come to pass; constituted as human nature is, it could not have been otherwise. No white race in the world, saints or sinners, Northerners or Southerners, would willingly submit to it."
"We have no infallible rule, or infallible application of principles, in politics any more than in religion or daily life. Dogmatism, here as elsewhere, is out of the question. Woman Suffrage, therefore, it seems to us, is a subject which must be considered entirely from the stand-point of expediency. To assert that it is right, irrespective of consequences, is simply begging the question, as it would be to assert that it was right for minors or criminals or Indians to vote.

"The expediency of Woman Suffrage we have been led seriously to doubt within the last few years, and mainly for the reasons indicated by some of your correspondents. With the ardour of her feelings and the depth and earnestness of her religious nature, woman is the slave of the Church. We say the slave—not the free, self-reliant, and independent helper, sitting in calm judgment both on creed and priest and sacrament,—simply devoted to the Church because ' she has been more fully recognized in it than in any other great department of society.' We wish we could take this view of the matter. But we cannot. We know that the majority of men in our churches are poor, pliant tools enough in the hands of an ambitious and power-loving priesthood. But everyone knows that women are a great deal more so."

The above passages are taken from a letter addressed to the Index (April 12th, 1877), by Mr. R. Hassall, of Keokuk, Iowa.

Another correspondent writes as follows:—

"I do profoundly respect human rights, but without more or less surrender of our personal rights, civil government is impossible. It seems hard that an intelligent, educated young man twenty years old is forbidden to vote. But it is the best we can do. He may be better qualified to vote than many men double his age. And of lawful Voters, the wisest man is on a level at the polls with the most ignorant. And after the voting is done, it turns out that nearly one half are practically disfranchised, for the majority have the power, and the minority become as—women.

"Now who can contemplate these and cognate facts, and not see that ideal justice and equality are unattainable in political adjustments? They should be approached as near as possible, all things considered,—in other words, as near as is expedient. I am not afraid of the word. The best form of civil government is an expedient, and the wisest men study expediency all their lives."

IV.

**Mr. Goldwin Smith on Women Rulers.**

"Mr. Mill had persuaded himself that great capacity for government had been displayed by women, and that there was urgent necessity for bringing them into the management of the State. But he can hardly be serious when he cites as an instance of female rule a constitutional queen whose excellence consists in never doing any act of government except under the guidance of her ministers. The queens regnant or consort, before our monarchy became constitutional, who may be said to have wielded power, are the Empress-Queen Matilda, Eleanor the wife of Henry II., Isabella the wife of Edward II., Margaret of Anjou, Mary, Elizabeth, and Henrietta Maria. Not much can be made of this list, when it is considered that both Margaret of Anjou and Henrietta Maria were, by their temper, principal causes of civil war, and that the statesmanship of Elizabeth has totally collapsed between Mr. Froude's first volume and his last, while her feminine relations with Leicester and other favourites have contracted a much more ominous complexion in a political as well as in a moral point of view. On the other hand, it is probable that Eleanor the wife of Edward I., and certain that Caroline the wife of George II., rendered, in a womanly way, high services to the State. Mr. Mill says, from his experience at the India Office, that the queens in India are better than the kings. But the reason is obvious. British protection has suspended the operation of the rude checks on the vices of Indian despots, and a woman brought up in the zenana, though she cannot possibly be a good ruler, may well be better than a hog or a tiger.

Neither the cases of queens, however, nor those of female regents of the Netherlands, to which Mr. Mill gives so strange a turn (as though Charles V. and Philip II. had preferred females on account of their ability to male members of the house), are in point. They all belong to the hereditary system, under which these ladies were called to power by birth or appointment, and surrounded by counsellors from whose policy it is scarcely possible to distinguish that of the sovereign.

Female Sovereigns, as a rule, have not been eminently pacific. It would be difficult to find four contemporary male rulers who made more wars than Catherine the Second of Russia, Maria Theresa, Madame de Pompadour (who ruled Prance in the name of her lover), and the Termagant, as Carlyle calls her, of Spain. It is widely believed that the late Empress of the French, inspired by her Jesuits, was a principal mover in the attack on Germany. Those who know the Southern States say that the women there are far more ready to renew the civil war than the men. The most effective check on war is, to use the American phrase, that everyone should do his own fighting. But this check cannot be applied to women, who will be comparatively
irresponsible in voting for war. A woman, in fact, can never be a full citizen in countries where, as in Germany, it is part of a citizen's duty to bear arms."

*Macmillan's Magazine, June 1874.*

V.

Miss Fenwick Miller was very indignant over this extract—declared it to be an anonymous letter to the *Denver (Co.) News*—and called upon me "publicly to remove the passage altogether" or "to state the place and circumstances in which it appeared." The passage must stand in its original words; but the authority was always forthcoming. The letter from which the extract is taken appeared in the *Index* of Boston: the date is given in note, p. 59. It is there quoted as taken from the "Rocky Mountain News," not from the "Golden Age" as was entered in my first uncorrected proof, a copy of which I lent to Miss Miller. Of course I always intended to look up and verify the quotation previous to final publication. I do not know that the authority of one of these papers is greater than the other: the authority of the passage in my eyes was that Mr. Abbot, Editor of the *Index*, a gentleman whom I know and trust, and who is favourable to Woman Suffrage, had copied the letter into his journal.
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