

dier has shown his wonted valor. Canadian and Australian have fought gallantly at his side. Our military administration seems also to have really done well and put into the field with striking rapidity an unexpected amount of force. But besides the difficulties of the country, we have encountered in our enemy a moral force on which we did not reckon, and which escaped the discernment of Mr. Cecil Rhodes. We have encountered in its greatest intensity that enthusiastic patriotism which turns the slug-gard's blood to flame. Can history show a more memorable fight for independence than that which is being made by the Boer? Does it yield to that made by Switzerland against Austria and Burgundy, or to that made by the Tyrolese under Hofer? The Boer gets no pay, no comforts and luxuries are provided for him by fashionable societies; he can look forward to no medals or pensions; he voluntarily endures the utmost hardships of war; his discipline, though unforced, seems never to fail. Boys of 16—a correspondent at the Cape tells me, even of 14—take the rifle from the hand of the mother, who remains to pray for them in her lonely home, and stand beside their grand-sires to face the murderous artillery of modern war. A newspaper correspondent the other day saw a boy of 16 lying mangled on the field, and saying: 'It does not hurt much; only I am so thirsty.' Rude, narrow-minded, fanatical in their religion, these men may be; so were the old Scotch Calvinists; so have been some of the noblest wildstocks of humanity; but surely they are not unworthy to guard a nation.

"Ax on shoulder the Boers twice went out to make for themselves a home in the wilderness where they might live their own life. Who had a right to take it from them? Her Britannic majesty did not create Africa. There is too much truth in the saying that this is the second Jameson raid. It makes me sad to think into what hands my country has fallen. Had Lord Salisbury kept the matter in his own hands, as he ought, for it was really a foreign, not a colonial question, there would have been no war."—New York Evening Sun of April 23.

THE IMPERIALIST RELIGION. THE CREED.

1. I believe in the old war taxes to prevent trade with Europe and the new war taxes to force trade with Asia.

2. I believe in excluding uneducated Europeans who wish to enter our territory, and in including uneducated Asiatics who wish to keep out.

3. I believe in home rule for Ireland, but in alien rule for the Spanish islands.

4. I believe that whites and blacks have a right to govern themselves, but not browns.

5. I believe in a Monroe doctrine which forbids Europe to interfere with self-government in America, but permits America to interfere with self-government in Asia.

6. I believe that governments get their just powers from the consent of the governed in America, but from contempt for the governed in Asia.

7. I believe that taxation without representation is tyranny when applied to us, but philanthropy when applied by us.

8. I believe that forcible annexation is criminal aggression, but that payment to non-owners makes it benevolent assimilation.

9. I believe that militarism and foreign broils strengthen despotism abroad but republicanism at home.

10. I believe that American policies have made a little America, but that European policies will make a greater America.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

1. Thou shalt have no other gods before me and only gold above me.

2. Thou shalt not worship any graven image except on bank notes.*

3. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, but shalt use it profitably to sanctify thy greed.

4. Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. On the seventh day thou shalt do no labor, but thy man servant and thy maid servant, thy freight trains, thy blast furnaces and thy sweat shops must be kept going.

5. Honor thy father and thy mother but disregard the fathers of thy country.

6. Thou shalt not kill except to extend trade.

7. Thou shalt not commit adultery, but may enter into entangling alliances.

8. Thou shalt not steal, but shall annex.

9. Thou shalt not bear false witness, but censor the dispatches.

10. Thou shalt not covet, but grab.

THE PRAYER.

O Thou, who dost exalt the mighty and put down those of low degree, crush, we beseech thee, the struggles of the Filipinos for independence. Force them to recognize that, although

they are willing to die for freedom, they are not fit to live in freedom. May they and all men forget the declaration of independence, or if they remember it may they also remember that it was not intended to apply to Malays. Strengthen in us the pride of race and the exalting conviction that we are not as other men are. Help us to scorn the Filipinos as children unworthy of the rights which our ancestors had from the days of barbarism. May we subject them to alien military rule, knowing that this is the school in which self-government and manhood are developed. May our people forget that the Filipinos had established a government in which life and property were secure before we commanded them to lay down their arms, and enable the voters to rejoice when they read of villages destroyed for the preservation of property and men killed for the preservation of life. Forbid, O Lord, that we should treat the Filipinos as we have treated the countries of Spanish America in the past, protecting them against foreign aggression and permitting them the government of their choice. Aid us in our war of subjugation to the end that we may use the Filipinos to extend our trade—and thy glory—in the orient. All this we ask in the name of Him who said: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."—Charles B. Spahr.

"THE CHRISTIAN."

The following is an extract from an address delivered Sunday evening, April 22, at the Vine Street Congregational church in Cincinnati by the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow.

There has been a revival of interest in Mr. Caine's book, "The Christian," owing to the drama based upon the novel, which has been presented to the Cincinnati public during the week just passed.

What Glory was to Father Storm, the theater is to the church—a gay child surrounded by many temptations. For the church to taboo the theater because its influence may be bad would be as irrational as it was for Father Storm to shut himself up in a "salvation zoo" and leave Glory alone in the world. The surest way to make a thing bad is to call it bad names. The function of the theater is to reach the mind through the eye, to convey truth by example. Let us recognize that function as natural and legitimate. Let us insist upon its noble possibilities. Let us frown upon the bad by expecting and encouraging the good. Mr. Caine's play

is a successful attempt to make the stage in its way just as ennobling as the church. I have read the book with care, and have seen the play, and I have failed to find anything in either to justify the criticism which has been made that the book is immoral in its influence. And as for the critics seeing any suggestion of carnality in the love of Storm and Glory, it seems to me that such a critic must live on the same moral plane with Lord Robert Ure, who, because of the impurity of his own heart, sneers even at the virtue of Glory.

The professed aim of the novel is to reflect "the religious purpose and social effort" of our own time. In other words, the theme of the novel is the social mission of the church, and as such claims our attention.

It is evidence of a far-reaching and vital reformation of thought that religion is being moved both from the monastery and the fashionable church to the social settlements and the club rooms of the parish house, where there is at least an honest and unselfish effort being made to do something for others. The author's ideal of a Christian, as represented in the character of John Storm, is a man who is too outspoken to be tolerated in the conventional church, who is too human and real to waste his life fighting shadows in a monastery, but whose master passion is to save the weak and the oppressed, and who is willing to try any plan or adopt any legitimate means to that end.

Unquestionably John Storm exfigures the spirit of Christ in the slums of a modern city more consistently than any other type of religious worker. But, in the changed conditions of modern life, a literal repetition of the work of Christ may not be the most effective way of saving men. What we need to-day is not necessarily an exact reproduction of the life of Christ, but men who are as earnest about saving their fellows as John Storm was, but who, instead of finding any special merit in imitating literally the life of Christ, will work in the wisest way and do the thing which in our modern life will tell most for the salvation of men.

"Go down into the slums. Live with the poor. Suffer with them. Encourage them. Help them to resist temptation." Is that the final word? Is that the last revelation of God's will to man? I think not. As the author says, religious progress is indicated by the fact that religion is moving from

the monastery and the fashionable church and is going down into the homes of the poor. But religion will not stop there. It is making another move. It is moving into the legislatures. That is the most significant move of all. The poor owe their wretchedness to bad laws more than to any other single cause. The most effective way to help them is to repeal these laws. This is a religious duty. As long as men regarded pestilences as the visitation of providence they continued to have them. They did not get rid of them until they learned that they were the natural penalty of the violation of the laws of sanitation. As long as we think God sends poverty to some and riches to others the poor will remain with us. Poverty will be abolished just as soon as we learn that it is not the gift of God, but comes as the natural result of the violation of social laws by ignorant or corrupt legislatures. I would not close the doors of a single institutional church, nor do away with a single social settlement. I would have these John Storms multiplied a thousand fold. Useless as it may seem, I would have them go down into the slums and die on their cross. I know what is going to come of it all. These men are going to see that their methods are not radical. With the same open-mindedness which took them to the slums they are going to discover that the real enemy of the poor is the injustice which ramifies our whole social system, and that nothing but radical and vital reforms can have much effect. And when they see that, with the same devotion and singleness of purpose which took them to the slums, they will go to the legislatures there to demand that the age-long burdens that have been crushing the poor shall be raised, that the yokes shall be broken, that the oppressed shall be set free. "On to the legislatures!" That is the last word religion has spoken.

One of the great forces of wickedness with which John Storm struggled was the worldliness of the established church of England. Storm's uncle, who was prime minister of England, watched with the keenest interest and sympathy the losing battle the boy was fighting. But he saw that the selfishness of the clergy was only a symptom of the disease, and that its real germ lay in the great temptations to selfishness which grew out of the fact that the church was a political institution and received its support by taxation. In the last analysis, the murder of his nephew seemed to him to be a political crime, having its origin in bad legislation and which therefore could

be dealt with effectively only by the legislative power of the state.

The other great evil which Storm felt called to combat was the social evil. But the social question is after all a wage question, with which the legislature has more to do than the church. Of these women Storm says:

Yet what was their condition? Think of it—their dependence on man, their temptations, their rewards, their punishments! Three half-pence an hour was the average wage of a working woman in England! and that in the midst of riches, in the heart of luxury, and with one easy and seductive means of escape from poverty always open.

Noble though it was, yet how hopeless his attempt to rescue these women so long as the poverty and the luxury remained, the one to lure them by false ideals of life, the other to goad them from the paths of virtue. It was not that Polly Love was so much weaker than other women. It was not that Lord Robert was a fiend incarnate. Just as the materialism of the clergy had grown from the soil of the marriage of church and state, so these immoralities were the weeds that grew from the soil of economic injustice which made it possible for Lord Robert to live a life of idleness and indulgence and compelled Polly Love to work for three half-pence an hour or sell her virtue. If John Storm was right in trying to lessen the temptations of slum life, and if, as he said, the chief temptations were luxury and poverty, how much more effective it would be to abolish the poverty and the luxury. But, you say, this is impossible. It would be with John Storm's methods. But give England a parliamentary majority of men with the heart of John Storm and the political wisdom of Henry George and they would do more to solve the social evil than has been done in a thousand years of noble effort.

Two hundred thousand persons own all the land of the United Kingdom. The other 39,000,000 pay tribute to them for the privilege of living under the union jack. The best argument I know for the existence of God is the fact that no state can tolerate such a wrong and not have the slums of luxury and the slums of poverty with all their trains of evil. To try to save men and women from these social vices without touching the great economic wrongs that breed the slum girl on the one hand and the idle lord on the other would be like trying to save a disabled ship by putting life preservers on its passengers. Give the drowning man a life preserver, give him that last hope if you have time. But he cannot cross the ocean

with that. The only permanent safety is in a sound ship. Religion has confined itself too long to the task of dragging drowning men out of the water. It is a more important duty to keep them from falling into the water. The greatest obstacles our John Storms have to meet are the effects in the lives of the people of hoary-headed injustice shielded by law and blessed by religion. This generation is suffering more from the lack of an aroused social conscience and a sound political economy than for the lack of agencies to give comfort and aid to the victims of social wrong. Sense and conscience are wanted in the legislatures. The most important factor in the salvation of the race is freedom.

AN APPEAL FROM THE PRESENT.

Extracts from the speech of Hon. George F. Hoar in the senate, April 17. Of the delivery of this speech the Springfield Republican said, editorially:

"There was one passage in Mr. Hoar's speech which acquired its dramatic force chiefly from the delivery. Referring to the Johnson impeachment, he said it had once been his fortune to witness the impressive spectacle in that chamber of senators responding to the call of the roll in a great state trial and giving in a sentence the reason for the vote. Would, he said, that the roll of the great men of the republic might thus be called on the pending question of imperialism. Thereupon the senator proceeded to call a number of names, such as Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Webster, Seward, Lincoln and Sumner, quoting against each some expression pertinent to the subject. They all voted no, all save Aaron Burr, whose yea vote was based on the ground that his buccaneering expedition down the Mississippi was at last to be vindicated. Then came the call, in shrill tones: 'William McKinley?' There was no answer. Then, stepping into the central aisle of the senate chamber, in still louder tones, the orator called again: 'William McKinley?' The effect given was of hesitation and reluctance to answer on the part of the one summoned to vote and give the reason. Finally came the response . . .

"Eye-witnesses describe the effect as very dramatic. A most impressive stillness came over the chamber as the name of the president was called, and the large audience awaited the response breathlessly. It is further stated that when Mr. Hoar reached that passage in his peroration: 'I appeal from the millionaire and the boss and the wire-puller and the manager to the statesman of the older time in whose eyes a guinea never glistened,' etc., he looked squarely at Senator Hanna. The latter's face flushed, and for once, says the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Inter Ocean, his smile of indifference or contempt forsook him. He was visibly angry."

Until within two years the American people have been wont to appeal to the declaration of independence as the foremost paper in history. As the years go round the Fourth of July has been

celebrated wherever Americans could gather together, at home or abroad. To have signed it, to an American, was better than a title of nobility. It was no passionate utterance of a hasty enthusiasm. There was nothing of the radical in it; nothing of Rousseau; nothing of the French revolution. It was the sober utterance of the soberest men of the soberest generation that ever lived. It was the declaration of a religious people at the most religious period of their history. It was a declaration not merely of rights but of duties. It was an act not of revolution but of construction. It was the corner stone, the foundation of a great national edifice wherein the American people were to dwell for evermore. The language was the language of Thomas Jefferson. But the thought was the thought of everyone of his associates. The men of the continental congress meant to plant their new nation on eternal verities which no man possessed by the spirit of liberty could ever thereafter undertake to challenge. As the Christian religion was rested by its author on two sublime commandments on which hang all the laws and the prophets, so these men rested republican liberty on two sublime verities on which it must stand, if it can stand at all; in which it must live or bear no life. One was the equality of the individual man with every other in political right. The other is that you are now seeking to overthrow—the right of every people to institute their own 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, and so as to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature's God entitles them. Equality of individual manhood and equality of individual states. This is the doctrine which the republican party is now urged to deny. . . .

Certainly the flag should never be lowered from any moral field over which it has once waved. To follow the flag is to follow the principles of freedom and humanity for which it stands. To claim that we must follow it when it stands for injustice or oppression is like claiming that we must take the nostrums of the quack doctor who stamps it on his wares, or follow every scheme of wickedness or fraud, if only the flag be put at the head of the prospectus. The American flag is in more danger from the imperialists than there would be if the whole of Christendom were to combine its power against it. Foreign violence at worst

could only rend it. But these men are trying to stain it. . . .

Mr. President, it was my good fortune to witness an impressive spectacle in this chamber, when the senators answered to their names in rendering solemn judgment in a great state trial. By a special provision each senator was permitted, when he cast his vote, to state his reason in a single sentence. I have sometimes fancied that the question before us now might be decided not alone by the votes of those who sit here to-day, but of the great men who have been our predecessors in this chamber and in the continental congress from the beginning of the republic.

Would that that roll might be called. The solemn assembly sits silent while the chair puts the question whose answer is so fraught with the hopes and liberty and destiny of the republic.

The roll is called. George Washington: "No. Why should we quit our own to stand on foreign ground?"

Alexander Hamilton: "No. The declaration of independence is the fundamental constitution of every state."

Thomas Jefferson: "No. Governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Every people ought to have that separate and equal station among the nations of the world to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them."

John Adams: "No. I stood by the side of Jefferson when he brought in the declaration; I was its champion on the floor of congress. After our long estrangement, I come back to his side again."

James Madison: "No. The object of the federal constitution is to secure the union of the 13 primitive states, which we know to be practicable, and to add to them such other states as may arise in their own bosoms or in their neighborhood, which we cannot doubt will be practicable."

Thomas Corwin: "No. I said in the days of the Mexican war: 'If I were a Mexican, as I am an American, I would welcome you with bloody hands to hospitable graves;' and Ohio to-day honors and loves me for that utterance beyond all her other sons."

Daniel Webster: "No. Under our constitution there can be no dependencies. Wherever there is in the Christian and civilized world a nationality of character, then a national government is the necessary and proper result. There is not a civilized and intelligent man on earth that enjoys satisfaction with his condition if he does