

ing" for a chance to show their "gameness."

The average "good" citizen in that posse had an exaggerated idea of the damage that might be done by, say, the impact of a spoiled egg or an overdue tomato. No policeman will kill a stranger who calls him a "scab" or hits him with an egg. A trained soldier, whether regular or militia, is likely to smile grimly at a volley of mud, or even stones, but the millionaire posse man, very fragrant, very clean and quite undisciplined, smells revolution in the effluvia of putrid missiles, feels anarchy in the smack of a clod of mud and begins to shoot in a frenzy of good citizenship. Furthermore, even the most peace-loving labor man is not pleased to see perfumed and curled shots of millionaires stalking him with shotguns and ordering him to "move on" if he pauses to light his pipe.

The battle between strikers and rioters in Washington avenue was precipitated by the trivial causes here set forth. Five hundred conductors and motormen marched past the barracks of the posse. They had been to a picnic and were marching home. They should have avoided the barracks as a matter of mere prudence. But they did not know what an "itch" for fighting the young deputies had who patrolled the sidewalk. A stranger named Kennedy threw a brick through a passing car just as the strikers came abreast of the barracks. There was a striker named Thomas in line with the missile, and Deputy Webster "thought" it was he who threw the brick. It is worth noting right here that a policeman half a block away chased the real brick-thrower a block and caught him while the deputies were shooting down "rioters." Webster tried to arrest Thomas, who protested; a crowd of strikers gathered to object to the capture of an innocent man. That was another mistake, of course, but it was enough for the deputies. They poured out of their barracks and swept the streets and the adjoining buildings with buckshot. Three harmless strikers fell dying in their tracks. The man who started the trouble by throwing the brick was not a striker. The man who caught him was not a member of the posse comitatus. Left to himself, that policeman would have been enough to handle that especial case in its incipency. "Assisted" by a hundred hot-headed amateur "officers," the affair became a horrible tragedy.

The same afternoon four deputies, sons of prominent citizens, chased a dozen disorderly characters who were stoning cars. When the fugitives ran

through a gateway and closed the gate a deputy promptly put the muzzle of his gun into a knothole in the fence and blew the head off an old citizen who was reading his Bible in his own doorway within. Even when the deputies "fired over the heads of the crowd" they usually contrived to wound the ubiquitous innocent bystander. Nobody in St. Louis except deputies with a thirst for man-hunting now believes that a posse of citizens is a safe or effective means for establishing law and order. The posse has never stopped the sporadic attempts of unorganized mobs of women to denude others of their own sex. Every volley fired by deputies has been "impromptu," without orders, and justified by the general instructions of the sheriff to oppose force with force. A blow from a clod of mud has been answered with a charge of lead big enough to kill a buffalo. What is perhaps a more enduring evil resulting from this form of enforcing law and maintaining order is the enhanced bitterness with which the laboring classes of St. Louis, who are in sympathy with the strikers, regard the men of means and education who are carrying shotguns against what they believe is their cause. They respect a policeman, they would tolerate a militiaman in times of trouble, but a millionaire—"man hunter," they call him—looks all wrong. The posse comitatus is not a success in St. Louis.—Chicago Record of June 25.

THE CHINESE MOTES AND THE AMERICAN BEAMS.

An extract from a sermon by Herbert S. Bigelow, delivered in the pulpit of the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, June 24. The subject was The Boxers, and the text chosen was: "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"

Press reports say that regret was expressed in the navy department at Washington that the American ship did not participate in the action against the Taku forts. Regret did not seem to be that the bombardment should have been necessary, but that American seamen had not the savage satisfaction of taking a hand in the ugly business. Thus it is that while the Christian sentiment may be reluctantly drawn into a war, there is also the savage nature which glories in the occasion for war.

While we deny the Chinaman's right to murder foreigners who are there under treaty guarantees, are we equally ready to concede the right of his government, in a peaceable and legal way, to exclude foreigners? We exercised that right when we passed the

Chinese exclusion act. If the Chinaman does not like us, so much the worse for his taste, of course. But have we any stones to throw on that score? What are the Boxers but an A. P. A. organization, with yellow skins and pig-tails, and with the courage of their convictions?

But, we complain, the Chinaman does not want to trade with us. It is too bad he does not understand the beneficial ethical as well as economic effects of free trade. But are we the ones to instruct him? The difference between a Puerto Rican tariff, a McKinley tariff and a Chinese tariff is after all one of degree. All tariffs are relics of barbarism. Would that the American people were civilized enough to know that. But if England were to send her imperial armies here to teach us that lesson, what American would not rather die in the trenches than be enlightened?

But the Chinaman does not like our religion. Neither do I like the brand that is usually exported for his consumption. The more benighted a man's religion the more anxious he is to bestow it upon others. Missionary zeal seems to bear an inverse ratio to religious enlightenment. The natural method for the religious regeneration of a country would seem to be a reformation of the native faith by natives, not the imposition of a foreign faith by foreigners. To send missionaries to the heathen when we have such an abundance of paganism at home seems as much like impertinence as benevolence. We abominate the Chinese practice of shoe-lacing—a practice which is less injurious than the American way of lacing. We are shocked at the wicked ancestor-worship. We have never thought that some of the effort spent in destroying the ancestor-worship in China might be spent with profit inculcating respect for parents in the American youth. If, instead of exporting our Christianity, we should apply some of it to a solution of the problems of poverty, we would render a greater service to civilization than by converting the Chinese to the medieval elements of our theology. I sympathize with the preacher who said that he had no piety to boast of, and no religion to spare. It seems to me a trifle inconsistent for those who profess to believe in the fatherhood of God to suppose that the people who have not subscribed to their creed must depend for their salvation upon the somewhat uncertain contributions to the missionary box. I wish the Chinamen were enough advanced in civiliza-

tion to realize that the truth in their own religion would only be purified and strengthened by allowing foreigners their utmost freedom in trying to undermine it. But are we that civilized? It is a pity that the trustees of our colleges do not put the same value upon the freedom of thought and discussion. The press informed us that a body of Cincinnati preachers waited on the mayor one day last summer and asked that the police power be used to prevent the preaching of Mormonism on our street corners. It is no doubt to the credit of these preachers that they did not murder the Mormon missionaries. But the use of the police power to suppress freedom, and the use of a mob, are only different ways of doing the same thing.

But it is said the Chinaman is shockingly behind the times. Yet before we are carried away by the Kipling hysteria it would be well to consider the beam in our own eye. I do not believe we should permit the murder of our citizens. Neither do I believe we should begin the war for the protection of the missionary, and end it with a claim for territory. The Boxers were too accommodating. They seem to have proceeded on the plan of Artemus Ward, which was to find out what your enemy wants and then let him have it. In the light of previous aggressions upon Chinese soil we may perhaps be forgiven the suspicion that the powers might consider this opportunity worth the blood of several missionaries. It is certainly the duty of the United States to take no part in this business beyond the protection of American citizens. It is our manifest duty to practice the virtues of a Christian democracy. As Gladstone advised: "Let us recognize, and recognize with frankness, the equality of the weak with the strong, the principle of brotherhood among the nations and of their sacred independence."

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

Adopted about midday, July 4, 1776, by a Congress of representatives of the Thirteen Colonies, assembled in the State House, Philadelphia. It was sent forth with the signature of President John Hancock only, but was afterward written on parchment, and on August 2, 1776, the names of all but two of the Signers were affixed. These two were added afterward. Charles Carroll, the last survivor of the Signers, died in 1832.

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to

which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among those are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established, should not be changed for light and transient causes; and, accordingly, all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But, when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these colonies, and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government. The history of the present king of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having, in direct object, the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these states. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world:

He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his governors to pass laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his assent should be obtained; and, when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of representation in the legislature; a right inestimable to them, and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly, for opposing, with manly firmness, his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused, for a long time after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the legislative powers, incapable of annihilation, have returned to the people at large for their exercise; the state remaining, in the meantime, exposed to all the danger of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these states; for that purpose, obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.

He has obstructed the administration of justice, by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers.

He has made judges dependent on his will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies, without the consent of our legislature.

He has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power.

He has combined, with others, to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation:

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock trial, from punishment, for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these states:

For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing laws on us without our consent:

For depriving us, in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury:

For transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses:

For abolishing the free system of English laws in a neighboring province, establishing therein an arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries, so as to render it at once