

CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP

A MANUAL

BY

CARLOS MARTYN

Author of "Wendell Phillips: The Agitator," "John B. Gough:
The Apostle of Cold Water," Editor of the Series
of "American Reformers," etc.

NEW YORK
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
LONDON AND TORONTO
1897

Copyright, 1897, by
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
[Registered at Stationers' Hall, England]
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES

CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP.

323.6
M36c

REMOTE STORAGE

CONTENTS.

PART I.

CITIZENSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|
| I. The Male Citizen, | 11-22 |
| II. The Female Citizen, | 23-42 |

PART II.

CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP.

- | | |
|---|-------|
| I. Why Christian Citizenship? | 45-49 |
| II. Power and Responsibility of Christian Voters, | 50-56 |

PART III.

THE ARENA.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| I. Primary and Ballot Box, | 59-66 |
| II. The Civil Service, | 67-79 |
| III. Unrestricted Immigration, | 80-89 |
| IV. The Liquor Appetite and Traffic, | 90-101 |
| V. Social Evil, | 102-121 |
| VI. Gambling, | 122-130 |

v

673355

15 Feb 29 848

VII. The Devil in Ink,	131-141
VIII. The American Sunday,	142-158
IX. Young People's Societies and Christian Citizenship,	159-165
X. Organization — Basis, Objects, and Methods,	166-186
XI. "Hitch Your Wagon to a Star,"	187-192
Appendix,	195-213
Index,	215-224

P R E F A C E .

SOME years since the writer put his pulpit on wheels, made a meeting-house of the continent, and began to preach a series of peripatetic sermons with Christian citizenship for the uniform text. As he proceeded in his work he discovered the need of appropriate literature — a need everywhere confessed and lamented. To meet the want, and in compliance with urgent request, he has prepared this Manual.

The title defines the necessary limits of the work. It does not undertake an elaborate discussion; that would require a library, but aims simply at an outline of the tumultuous issues which now tax the thought and evoke the remedial energy of Christian citizens. Nevertheless, an attempt has been made to conduct the treatment in a philosophical spirit, and in the order of logical sequence. Part I. consists of two chapters, under the caption of **CITIZENSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES**, and is foundational. Part II. deals, also in two chapters, with the modification of American citizenship, known as **CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP**. Part III. leads Christian citizens into the **ARENA**, and, in a succession of chapters, indi-

cates the subjects which challenge their attention, together with the means whereby law and order may secure the victory. In the APPENDIX a mass of corroborative or illustrative material is grouped. A complete INDEX is subjoined.

It is confidently believed that the Manual contains a suggestive discussion not elsewhere to be found between two covers. As a labor-saver, therefore, and as an indicator of what the French call "burning questions," and of remedial agencies, it has a value of its own. Hence it is commended to the attention of clergymen, young people's societies, and sociological students.

Christian citizenship is the latest, largest, and most hopeful movement of the times. Its youth explains its lack of distinctive literature. Its promise is fitted at once to provoke and reward study.

As Noah sent the dove from the ark to find the land when the deluge began to subside, so is this dove dismissed to flutter down upon the reappearing earth under the flood of evils so long prevalent in America.

CARLOS MARTYN.

Chicago, January, 1897.

PART I.
CITIZENSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES.

CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP.

I.

THE MALE CITIZEN.

THE word citizen' has a high, historic meaning. Riding like a king in his chariot, it comes down to us from the Greeks, through the Romans, and across the Middle Ages, resplendent with honor and proud with dignity. In the ancient civilization the citizen was a member of a haughty, exclusive class. Below him, and subject to him, stood all others in the state who were outside of this class. Among the Greeks admission to citizenship was easy at first, but difficult after Grecian civic life had reached a higher degree of organization — so difficult that in Sparta, according to Herodotus, there were only two instances of naturalization. In Rome, under the Republic, citizenship was conferred by a vote of the people — like membership in a modern club. And there were perfect and less perfect citizens. All the

private rights of citizenship belonged to citizens of the lower class, but the honors of the magistracy were denied them. Later, when the Cæsars ruled, citizenship in whatever form was abolished; and the Code of Justinian divided all persons into subjects and slaves.

The Middle Ages inherited the political forms and names of Greece and Rome, both republican and monarchical. The Italian republics were based on aristocracy and cemented with the blood of historic houses. The Republic of Holland was built upon great land-holders. The Swiss republics were little groups of cousins united by blood relationship. Around them loomed the colossal monarchies of medieval Europe, with the throne for the sun and the nobility for the siderial system. All through the past the distinction between a citizen and a subject was this, that while the latter was governed, the former also governed; so that while a citizen might be a subject, many subjects were not citizens. This epigram defines the difference between the ancient and medieval republics on one hand, and the monarchies on the other: those were ruled by citizens; these were dominated by royalty. Both the terms and the distinction have survived to our day, and find practical illustration here and abroad.

The American Republic is founded, not on

privilege, like the Greek and Roman States; not on lineage, like the republics of Italy in the Middle Ages; not on land proprietorship, like the Republic of Holland; not on blood relationship, like the Swiss Cantons — but upon manhood. Our fathers said: "Just as a man is able to take care of himself physically, mentally, morally and financially, so is he able to take care of himself politically." They said: "We will build an every-day, working State on the basis of the average man." Recognizing the truth that responsibility is the great educator, they placed responsibility for the common weal on the citizens of the country. An American citizen is thus defined in Article XIV., Section 1, of the Constitution: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

In Article XV., Section 1, the elective franchise is made the indefeasible prerogative of the citizen. "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the

United States or any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Thus the American citizen stands before the world the peer of any Bourbon or Guelph, or Romanoff, or Hapsburg, or Hohenzollern, of them all. He is the heir of the liberty of the past, and the exponent of the liberty of the present — not Cæsar was more sovereign than he.

The essential principle of American citizenship is this, that no man and no set of men shall be politically dependent on any other man or set of men, but that each shall be armed for self-defense. The weapon of this self-defense is the ballot —

“ ——— a weapon firmer set
And better than the bayonet ;
A weapon that comes down as still
As snowflakes fall upon the sod ;
Yet executes a freeman's will
As lightning does the will of God.”

Certain critics on the other side of the water, echoed by un-American whiners here at home, who borrow their tone from London and Berlin, contend that the founders of the American Commonwealth made a mistake in this matter of manhood suffrage. Governments which rest on caste naturally hold that opinion. Individuals among us, who say all men are politically equal, and are afraid they will be, as naturally echo it. “The idea,” cries Mr. Purseproud, “of neutralizing my

vote by the vote of a poverty-stricken ignorantus!" This sentiment is congenial to Mr. Blue-blood, who comes of one of the best families — the best part of which, like the potato, is under ground.

Washington and Hamilton and Jefferson knew the dangers which manhood suffrage would entail. They also knew that a State can be safe and happy only in proportion to the safety and happiness of the people. They meant by manhood suffrage to put wealth and culture under bonds to see to it that every citizen had an equal chance with every other. When Russian Czar, or German Kaiser, or British Queen looks down into the cradle of poverty and ignorance, the gaze is animated by compassion. When riches and knowledge in this country behold the cradle of ignorance and poverty, they realize that that baby fist is one day to hold the ballot, and that this ballot may prove to be Thor's hammer, smiting to ruin interests near and dear to them. Not out of philanthropy, therefore, but inspired by the instinct of self-preservation, they hasten to put the Church on one side of that cradle, and on the other side the School. In America morality and education are not a mere expression of solicitude; they are provisions made by the State in the interest of self-preservation. Was it not a master-stroke on the part of our fathers to so arrange the elements of the Commonwealth that selfishness should impel us

to make the amplest provision for instruction and virtue? As a chain is not stronger than its weakest link, so a State is no better than its average citizen. The best way in which to strengthen the State is to raise the average.

This suggests a correlate truth. Whatever endangers the Republic may be summarily dealt with by it. The safety of the people is the supreme law — *Salus populi suprema est lex*, as the Latin maxim runs. The right of the government to abolish special inimical traffics, such as the liquor trade, gambling and brothel-keeping, is denied by shallow thinkers. But this authority inheres in the right of the government to exist. Under democratic institutions law has no sanction save the purpose and virtue of the people. A drunken people, a horde of gamblers, a constituency poisoned by licentiousness, can not be the basis of a free government. The vices can never be corner-stones of righteousness, prosperity, and perpetuity. "To us," therefore, as Wendell Phillips has declared, "the title-deeds of whose estates, and the safety of whose lives depend upon the tranquillity of the streets and the morality of the people, the presence of any vice which brutalizes the average citizen is a stab at the heart of the nation." For this reason publicists are substantially agreed that the Republic has full control over the whole domain of the public weal.

We do not always realize the high educational value of manhood suffrage. How is it possible to listen to a debate of great questions, "burning questions," as the French say, by the famous debaters of the land, without a broadening of the intelligence? An election like that of 1896, which involved free-trade and tariff, the currency, the independence of the Supreme Court, the boundary line betwixt national and state rights, and a dozen lesser issues, was better than a thousand colleges. Suffrage is the people's university. And the result of every election vindicates the truth of Talleyrand's *môt*, that "everybody is cleverer than anybody." Tocqueville, in his marvellous treatise on "Democracy in America," with the surprising intuitiveness of the French mind, perceived this, ahead of all experiment. He affirmed that the ballot-box and the jury-box are the normal school of America. The jury-box: because the citizen who sits in that box to adjudicate questions which concern his neighbor's property, or liberty, or life, necessarily becomes acquainted with the phrases and phases of the law. The ballot-box: because the citizen who drops his vote there is educated by his sense of responsibility, and recognizes the fact that he is a court of ultimate appeal and final decision.

This consciousness lifts our citizenship into unprecedented seriousness. Any thoughtful ob-

server who is familiar with Europe, must have noticed how much lower the level of conversation is there than it is here. There, men chatter; here, they talk. There, the staple of remark is the latest marriage, the newest scandal, the last fad. Here, men discuss right and wrong, public policies which they mature and settle, crops, rents, markets — large questions, which broaden the mind, and touch the essence of government and daily life.

It is brought as an objection to manhood suffrage that the poor and ignorant sell their votes. There are instances of this. But in such cases who are the purchasers? Oftener than otherwise, are they not wealthy and educated men, who have had training, who are pushed by no sharp need, and who know better and might afford the luxury of a conscience? Is it any worse to sell than it is to buy? Shall we disfranchise the poverty and ignorance which do the one, and enfranchise the wealth and education that do the other?

After all, be it noted that the dry rot of legislative corruption, the rancor of party spirit, the tyranny of incorporated wealth, the bad example of profligacy, are found oftener among the classes than among the masses. As in chemistry, the scum floats uppermost. Carlyle once said: "Democracy will prevail when men believe the vote of Judas as good as the vote of Jesus Christ." The

answer is that Judas was an apostle, not a mere church member. Always and everywhere Judas belongs oftener to the classes than to the masses. As an objection to manhood suffrage, therefore, this plea falls to the ground. It flouts any form of suffrage; nay, it would make all government impossible. Corruption, whether private or public, whether among the rich or among the poor, is never to be condoned, and is always to be condemned. But as an objection to manhood suffrage it is equally unsound and absurd.

On a certain memorable occasion Abraham Lincoln overheard some one say: "Isn't Lincoln a common-looking fellow?" His immortal reply was: "Evidently the Almighty must like us common-looking fellows, or he wouldn't have made so many of us." Government should be conducted for the greatest good of the greatest number. This dictum necessitates popular government, and results in democracy. The theory of the ancient society was that the masses were born saddled and bridled to be ridden, and that the classes were born booted and spurred to ride. The lines of Robert Burns voice the theory of the modern social order:

"For a' that, and a' that,
Our toils' obscure, and a' that,
The rank is but the guinea's stamp,
The man's the gowd for a' that."

Since the citizen is thus supreme in America, it follows that he is responsible. *L'état cest moi*, said Louis XIV.—“I am the State.” What the grand monarch said in his pride, the American citizen may say in his humility—“I am the State.” Lord Brougham once said: “In England the Queen is in place; the House of Commons is in power.” In the United States, whoever is president, the people are in power. Hence the people are praiseworthy when affairs go right, and blameworthy when affairs go wrong. Nor can we abdicate the throne. Born, like other princes, in the purple, and called to rule by a diviner right than other kings, we must accept the accountability of power. Are there bad laws on the statute book? We are to blame. We put them there, actively or passively. We permit them to remain there. Are good laws unenforced? We are in fault. We do not insist upon their execution.

The indifference and preoccupation of large and influential sections of our citizenship is now the chief menace to republican institutions. Otherwise good men are too busy making pilgrimages to the shrine of mammon, and worshipping that trinity of trade, the gold eagle, the silver dollar and the copper cent—to give thought and time to the functions of citizenship. The need of the hour is the personalizing of political duty. Here, as elsewhere, the word *ought* is the weighty word

and the final word. Power entails obligation. It were well for ourselves and for our country if this truth were perceived and acted upon by every American citizen.

What a country we have to love and serve! "A country which fulfils the exact conditions of physical health," as Tom Marshall, of Kentucky, used to say; "head lifted amid the cool breezes of the tonic north; feet bathed in the tepid waters of the Gulf—head cool, feet warm." America is an epitome of the globe. It is full of nimble little rivers which gladly turn the turbines of mills before they run weary to the sea—and of majestic streams, which drain a continent and float the commerce of forty-five stalwart States. Its eastern and western shores are washed by the two great oceans of the earth. Its soil is so fertile that, as Douglas Jerrold said of Australia, "you have but to tickle it with a hoe and it laughs with a harvest," and so diversified, that every green thing grows in it, from the pines of the north to the cotton and oranges of the south. Its bowels are rich with every conceivable kind of mineral wealth—a natural treasure-cave, awaiting but the *open sesame* to disclose boundless riches, beyond the "Arabian Nights." Its wide area is unified by railroads and telegraphic wires, which annihilate time and distance, and make Boston and San Francisco next door neighbors. Best of all, it is

the land of religion and of education and of freedom. Such a country, such an arena — shall not its citizens be as pure as its breezes, as lofty as its mountains, and as firm for righteousness as the granite that underlies the continent?

American citizenship was bought with a great price. Those dreary years of colonial preparation, when our forefathers stood with the cruel sea behind them and the unbroken wilderness in front of them, peopled with savage foes, neglected by the mother country, on the boundary line of civilization—a line run by the tomahawk and the scalping-knife, were part of the price. The revolution, with Marion and Sumter marching and counter-marching in the south; with Greene and Gates manœuvring in the north, and with Washington and his army barefooted amid the snows of Valley Forge, a long and dubious and deadly struggle, punctuated by the “embattled farmers” at Concord, and by Bunker Hill, and Saratoga, and Eutaw Springs, and Yorktown, was a further instalment. And, more recently, the horrors of the civil war, with its unprecedented sacrifices of money and men, and hallowed by the martyrdom of Lincoln, made the sum complete. The citizens of the present are called of God to be the worthy heirs of the heroes of 1640, 1776 and 1861, and the apostles of a grander future.

II.

THE FEMALE CITIZEN.

It is an anomaly in American political life that while the Constitution declares, as we have seen, that "all *persons* born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens"; and that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State," the female citizen is nevertheless disfranchised. She represents the best, and brightest, and largest half of our citizenship. But her sex disqualifies her for the exercise of the loftiest and most characteristic prerogative of the citizen. She is guilty of being a woman! This inconsistency is a singular compound of injustice and absurdity.

The right, under the Constitution, of the female citizen to vote is as clear as sunlight — as undeniable as is the right of the male citizen. The reasoning which proves the right of the one also establishes the right of the other. Confessedly, woman is as intelligent as man, and more moral. Indeed, she represents the conscience side of life. The franchise stands in special need of re-enforce-

ment on that side. Moreover, the female citizen owns and manages estates, pays taxes, sits in the witness stand, and goes to jail and the gallows, on occasion. She is subject to government, ought she not to have a voice in government? "Why will you women meddle with politics?" asked Napoleon of Madame de Staël. "Ah! sire," was the triumphant answer of the great Frenchwoman, "if you will hang us, we must ask the reason." Rights are nothing but privileges until they are provided with adequate defense. For this reason the Constitution puts the ballot in the hand of the citizen, and makes it the palladium of private and public liberty.

The truth is, that woman has been excluded from the franchise at the behest of inherited prejudices. The pagan conception was that she was a mere adjunct of man. She was looked upon as either married or to be married. In either case she was *nupta* — hence our word nuptial — that is, veiled. In the Norman-English law a married woman was termed *femme-covert* — she was *covered*, absorbed by the husband. Medieval and modern law have borrowed this conception from paganism. Woman has been viewed as a mere annex. Man has represented her, and abused and fondled her by turns, and at will. The whole legislation of the world is a commentary on this theory — woman nothing; man everything.

Whatever importance she possesses she gets through him.

The woman of to-day, and especially the American woman, with her enlightened ideas and freer habits, is naturally disgusted by this overweening male assumption and presumption. She announces her purpose to voice her own mind and safeguard her own interests. As the means she claims the ballot.

Various objections to this claim are urged.

It is said, for instance, that the female citizen should continue to trust herself to the protection of the male citizen. The answer is that the American principle forbids it, by declaring that each class shall take care of itself.

Moreover, all history is a thunderous declaration of the folly of such a course, and proves that it is like asking *Little Red Riding Hood* to trust to the tender mercies of the wolf. In Greece, under man's protection, woman was a chattel-personal, and passed to the creditor with the other household effects of a bankrupt father or husband. In Rome it was death for her to do what he was expected to do and applauded for doing. Through the Middle Ages she was deprived of her dearest rights of property, person, and motherhood by man-made laws. "There is no instance on record," affirms Buckle, in his "History of Civilization," "of any class possessing exclusive

power without abusing it." And John Stuart Mill asserts that "there ought to be no pariahs in a full-grown and civilized nation; no persons disqualified save through their default." He adds: "Every one is degraded, whether aware of it or not, when other people, without consulting him, take upon themselves unlimited power to regulate his destiny." Would any man be willing to put himself in the power of any other man, however good or great? Why should woman be asked to do it — woman, whose disabilities are emphasized by all the attractions and temptations of sex?

It is further objected that the female citizen is already virtually represented by the male citizen. But how? Wendell Phillips used to tell of a man in Massachusetts who married a girl who was worth \$50,000. He died shortly afterwards and left her the \$50,000 so long as she should remain his widow. What a satisfactory representative! And what shall be thought of a code which makes such an act possible?

When our ancestors in colonial days protested against taxation without representation, England pleaded this same objection, that the colonies were virtually represented in the British parliament. The Patriots scouted the claim — asked how they were represented, when the choice of representatives was made, and insisted that all just government rests upon the expressed consent of the gov-

erned. "No such phrase as virtual representation is known in law or constitution," cried James Otis, with Faneuil Hall for a platform, Boston for a sounding-board and the world for an audience. "It is altogether a subtlety and illusion, wholly unfounded and absurd." Woman may well avouch her scornful repudiation of this claim of virtual representation by the example of the sons of liberty in '76, and the eloquence of James Otis.

It is gravely asserted that the ballot is not a panacea. Man has it, but he has not introduced the millenium by means of it. If woman imagines that a vote will right all her wrongs, she has but to view the political situation to-day, the idleness, the poverty, the misery, among men; the illiteracy, the grinding monopoly, the municipal misrule, despite the fact that these men are voters — so it is urged.

The reply is easy. And it is that the voters have the remedy in their own hands. If they "prefer darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil," such a choice does not invalidate the disused or misused means. Besides, if the men have made such a sad mess of it, there should seem to be the greater need to call in the women in order to revitalize the flabby franchise and save the state. Nobody expects to vote in the millenium. That must come in us by regeneration, and

then out of us and into citizenship and the statute book. But that same opportunity and advantage which the ballot gives to one sex it should give to the other — the opportunity of self-expression, and the advantage of self-protection.

'Tis said that woman already has influence ; that a vote would not increase it. The influence of the female citizen is unquestionable ; but in politics it is hidden and unwatched. It needs to be sobered by a sense of responsibility. Tocqueville, in one of his most remarkable letters, ascribes the treachery of some of the most promising leaders of the reform movements in France to this powerful backstair and boudoir influence of wives and daughters over fathers and husbands, inducing them to use their position for personal ends or family advancement rather than in aid of the principle they had espoused. "Yes," cries the famous publicist in ending his letter, "it is the women of France who have wrecked some of our noblest movements to help the millions."

Naturally. Woman has been trained to feel that wealth, ease, dress, social prestige are the ends of life. Why should she not prize them ? She has been shut out from knowledge of and participation in large questions which touch the common weal : why should she not be politically ignorant ? She has lived and moved and had her being in a world of dolls : why should she not be

petty? She has been taught to pose rather than to think : why should she not be artificial? She has been shut up like a pet canary, in a gilded cage, and fed on the lump-sugar of compliment : why should she not be vain? She has been trained to look upon a new bonnet as vastly more important than a new truth : why should she not be frivolous? If an exceptional woman cares little for society, and thinks or writes, she is nicknamed a "blue-stocking." If she can neither think nor write, but devotes herself to dress, and dates time from ball to ball, she is sneered at as a dudine.

The influence of woman, which is so potent that it makes or mars man, and ruins when it might save, should be directed to wide ends, and be made to feel and prepare for its responsibility. Responsibility without power is outrageous. Power without responsibility is equally abhorrent.

The right to vote implies the right to hold office. This is a reason which is sometimes given for opposing female suffrage. Certainly, woman as an office-holder is no novelty. Did not Queen Elizabeth hold a political office? And has not Queen Victoria given her name to her age? Marie Therese was a great politician and a great ruler. Catherine, of Russia, put her stamp upon the empire of the North as ineffaceably as did Peter the Great? Even in Asia, Semiramis was

the acknowledged peer of any crowned head of any age — her figure looms colossal after thirty centuries. And in Greece, Aspasia was the intimate counselor of the greatest statesman Athens ever knew.

Certain fearful critics are sure that if woman had the ballot she would leave the stockings undarned and the cradle unrocked, desert her home, and do nothing but run for office day and night and night and day. This is not saying much for the attractiveness of her home. If man made it pleasanter for her, and himself frequented it more, perhaps she would not be so ready to leave it! Men vote. Do they neglect their homes? Or if they do, is it for that reason? The sailor, the mechanic, the merchant, the manufacturer, whose factories cover a township, the railroad magnate, whose system cobwebs the continent — all find time to vote without neglecting their affairs. Would it be quite impossible for a housewife to leave her kitchen long enough to drop a ballot without overbaking the bread in the oven? A bright woman of large means expressed a wish to vote. "Why, madam," exclaimed a friend, "who would take care of your baby when you went to the polls?" Her quick reply was: "The same person who takes care of him now when I go to pay my taxes!"

A much more serious objection to female suffrage is this, that the vote rests in the last analy-

sis upon force, and that it therefore presupposes military duty in case of need.

The inferior position held by woman through the ages has been due to her inferior physical prowess. The past was dominated by brute force. A man's only safety lay in the strength of his arm and the sharpness of his sword. By and by civil society was evolved. Protection was relegated to the courts; and armies were only mustered when the courts were set at naught. Every succeeding age made brute force worth less and brain worth more. Eventually ballots will supersede bullets. Character and conscience will be dominant. This time is not yet. Meantime woman is far from being useless, even in war. She makes it possible for her husband and son to enlist by assuming burdens laid on her by their absence. She supervises sanitary matters in camp. Who walks the wards of the hospital? Woman. Did not Florence Nightingale illustrate the Crimean war equally with the *Hospitars* who charged at Balaclava? Was not the work of Clara Barton, in our civil war, as vital as that of any general in the field? It is history that the Confederacy was long sustained by the heroism and sacrifices of the Southern women.

A distinguished thinker emphasizes the truth that military service does not consist in fighting alone. Whatever sustains and repairs the physi-

cal force enlisted is as essential as the force itself. Thus, in view of the moral service they render, the law excuses clergymen from the field. In active service ten per cent. of the army is detailed to serve the other ninety per cent. in various capacities about the camp. We recognize moral service as of equal value with physical even in war. Brute force must be fed, clothed, housed, nursed, cheered, and this is the peculiar sphere of woman — has ever been, must ever be. Until we deny all this, and disfranchise clergymen and soldiers occupied in camp duty, because they do not shoulder a musket, we cannot consistently deny the franchise to female citizens on that ground.

Some women can and do actually fight. Ask their husbands !

A bug-a-boo objection to female suffrage which formerly had far more terror than it has now, is that it is unwomanly to vote. It takes woman from her "sphere." It is laughable, this masculine assumption to tell woman what is womanly. How considerate it is in the average man to map down the orbit and designate the "sphere" of the Martineaus and the De Staëls, of Lady Somerset and Frances Willard. The test of sphere is success. Whatever God made man and woman able to do well, He meant them to do ; since He explicitly forbids us to wrap up our talents in a nap-

kin. If millions of women can successfully engage in business, this proves that they were meant for business. If they can cure diseases, they are fitted for medicine. If Harriet Hosmer can carve statues, God intended her to keep company with Angelo and Canova. If Maria Mitchell can read the stars, God created her to take her place beside Copernicus. If Lucretia Mott can edify a Quaker meeting, God touched her lips for exhortation. If Patti can rival the angels in song, God commissioned her to sing. Woman's sphere is not to be settled by man's ideas, or by antiquated conventionalities, but by her own gifts and desires.

Unwomanly to vote? Why is it any more unwomanly to vote than it is to sing in public, or to act on the stage? Yet woman does these things unrebuked. Nay, many people pay a high price for seats to hear the singer or see the actress, who are horrified at the thought of listening to a female citizen speak on the platform, or permitting her to vote at an election. Indelicate for woman to go to the polls? Who would she see there? Men! Well, she sees them now, occasionally. Walk up and down the streets; there are as many women as men afoot. Enter a place of amusement; the sexes are seated side by side. Get into a street car; the belle and beau are again side by side. Even in church, woman faces male

saints and sinners at every turn. Those who esteem it unwomanly to vote belong to the century of Tamerlane and Timour the Tartar, or to China, where woman's feet are distorted so that she cannot stray out of her "sphere."

Many women stoutly insist that they do not want to vote. Then they need not go to the polls. Some do desire to vote. The indifference of some should not abridge the right of even one. We are not to withhold from the female citizen the most precious and essential prerogative of citizenship until she demands it. "When natural rights, or the means of their defense, have been immemorially denied to a whole sex," remarks Geo. Wm. Curtis, "when this sex has been immemorially taught that it would be indelicate to claim or exercise these rights, does justice or good sense require that they should be called upon to vote upon their own elevation to perfect citizenship? It might as well be said that *Jack, the Giant-Killer*, ought to have gravely asked the captives in the ogre's dungeon whether they wished to be free. It must be assumed that women as well as men wish to enjoy their natural rights—as we assume that the lungs wish air and the eyes crave light. Did the government wait until the slaves petitioned for freedom before emancipating them? Or, when, in the State, thousands of boys reach the age of twenty-one, are they required to assure

the register that they wish to vote before being allowed to take the oath?" When a number of lads are met on the streets, is it customary to say to them: "You poor little ignoramuses, would you like a free school system?" The State established schools before dunces asked for them.

Women must be taught to want the ballot—precisely as they have been taught not to want it. Their stake in the commonwealth is as great as man's. The evils which afflict the body politic one sex is as much interested in remedying as the other is—for they bear upon the female more sharply than on the male. It has been aptly said that "we lose half our resources when we shut citizens of the female sex out from the influences which minister to civic growth and health. God gives us the entire race, with its varied endowments, equal yet different, man and woman; one the complement of the other, on which to base civilization. We mutilate ourselves by using, in civil affairs, only half the race—only one sex."

True, woman at the ballot-box is an innovation. But then all history, and daily life, are made up of innovations. Progress is a splendid panorama of innovations. The Pope pronounced the right of private judgment in religion a heretical innovation. The downfall of feudalism was an innovation. George III. was confident that the freedom of the press was a dangerous innovation; and that

the claims of James Otis, Sam Adams and the sons of liberty were treasonable innovations. Aristocratic Europe sneered that manhood suffrage was a heaven-defying innovation. When Sir Samuel Romilly proposed to abolish the death penalty for stealing a lady's handkerchief, the law officers of the crown contended that it would upset the whole criminal code of England. On the passage of the bill abolishing the slave trade, in the House of Lords, Lord St. Vincent rose and stalked out of the chamber, declaring that he washed his hands of the ruin of the British Empire. Co-education is an innovation. Female writers and readers are an innovation—the classics knew nothing of such "monstrosities;" which explains why they are so indecent. Every new invention is an innovation—the steamship, the railroad, the telegraph, the telephone, the X-ray, the typewriter and the bicycle. Yet the world stands. Nay, life is broader, sweeter, wiser, happier than in those "good old days" of which poets sing, but are glad they did not live in. America was clearly intended to be a disturber of somnolent traditions, and to leave nobler precedents than she found.

However desirable the presence of the female citizen may be in the civic arena, it is solemnly asserted that the Bible forbids her to enter it. It is contended that there are no scriptural prece-

dents ; no ecclesiastical legislation in that direction ; or, if there is any, it is prohibitory. This is a grave charge. If it were true it would be embarrassing, distressing, fatal to all believers in Holy Writ. Is it true? Let us see.

Are there not the same scriptural warrants for this change that there are for other changes in other directions? The Bible is a comparatively small volume. It were absurd to expect to find in it explicit injunctions covering the multitudinous and multifarious life of all the ages. No more can be looked for than a simple enunciation of comprehensive principles, with illustrative examples. These, when discovered, are in the nature of positive legislation. There is no direct prohibition of slavery in the New Testament. Nevertheless, the whole genius of the Gospel is against it ; and just as far and just as fast as the Gospel has prevailed, slavery has been abolished. The New Testament nowhere commands the replacing of the Hebrew Sabbath by the Lord's Day. Yet the practice of the Apostles, and of the primitive church, suffices to convince Christendom that the substitution is Biblical.

Precisely so with regard to the larger life and public position of woman to-day. St. Paul himself—who is always quoted as on the other side of this question—enunciates a principle which amounts to an enactment. In the Epistle to the

Galatians — iii : 18 — he says: “ There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.” Here, for ethical and spiritual purposes, he strikes out of the dictionary the words barbarian, slave, and woman. With regard to woman, the sexual relation stands on the physical side, of course ; but on the moral side it is abolished. Woman is “ one ” with man.

Such is the principle. What was the illustrative practice? In the First Epistle to the Corinthians — xi : 4, 5 — St. Paul says : “ Every man praying or prophesying with his head covered dishonoreth his head. But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head.” Here is a plain case in point. Woman might pray or prophesy in public. Her right to do so is recognized. Only with woman, as with man, there is a regulation of the right. The woman must exercise her right with her head covered ; the man with his head uncovered. Why? Because the social habit and custom of that age and country made those respective postures seemly and worshipful. The mandate was based on social rather than moral reasons. The Apostle wished to have believers, unpopular enough at best, avoid unnecessary scandal. But, incontrovertibly, there must have been a large exercise by woman of her right to pray and pro-

phesy in public, in order to call for this regulation of it.

What was this gift of prophecy which woman might exercise in the prescribed manner? It was the second office in importance in the Christian Church. In the First Epistle to the Corinthians St. Paul says — xii : 28 — “And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers,” etc. Elsewhere — viz., in 1 Corinthians, xiv : 1 — he puts prophecy first among spiritual gifts. Now, the prophet was one whose function it was to unfold the counsels of God to men as contained in the way of salvation through Christ — see Acts xiii : 1, 2. This necessitated publicity; for how could the counsels of God be unfolded unless men were addressed?

Accordingly, we find the prophetesses of the Old Testament exercising their gift in public. Deborah was a judge. Pray, how could a judge act officially in private? The very office compels publicity. Like a judge in our time, Deborah subpoenaed this and that man to appear before her. Even Barak sat at her feet. More than this. She left home and went away to camp with that rough soldier. In the book of Judges we read — iv : 9, 10 — “And Deborah arose and went with Barak to Kedesh.” So, if we turn back to Exodus — xv — we find, first, an account of the Song of Moses, public and formal; and then, fol-

lowing it, the Song of Miriam, apparently equally public and formal.

St. Paul's injunction that "women keep silence in the churches"—1 Corinthians, xiv: 34—is cited as settling the question of female participation in public religious services. Well, if this is the meaning of the passage, it is not now, and has never been, observed. In the Episcopal churches women join with men in the responses. Is this keeping silence? In all the churches women sing in the choirs. Is this keeping silence? If that injunction means what it is claimed to mean, then it must be obeyed literally—not broken in the matter of the public responses and sacred songs, and kept only in prayer and exhortation. The better view is that this was a local direction, intended to restrain incompetent women from public religious chatter, involving false doctrine and scandal; and not a command binding upon a whole sex through all time. Scripture is to be interpreted in harmony with Scripture. This interpretation harmonizes this passage with those other passages to which reference has been made, which teach the doctrine held and practised in our day.

'Tis said that woman loses her modesty in public life. This is not to be settled by opinion but by the facts. Are there any women more austere modest than the Quaker women? Yet among the Friends the majority of the preachers are women.

In the prayer meetings of the two more numerous of the Protestant denominations, the Methodists and the Baptists, the women have long taken part. Are these godly women immodest? Among the young people of the Christian Endeavor Societies, the Epworth Leagues and the Baptist Unions, women take their turn with men in leading the meetings; and their pledge obliges them to take some part other than in song. Are they immodest?

Now, if in the scriptural interpretation and practise of this age and land, women may and do participate in religious services, is it not rather late to affirm that the Bible excludes them from voting? If they are orthodox in praying and exhorting, they will be equally orthodox at the primary and ballot-box.

The right of the female citizen to the elective franchise in the United States is beyond controversy. Presently she will assume and exercise this right. She is sadly needed in politics. Her presence will do there what it has already done in religion, education, literature, and business—sweeten and purify the springs of American sovereignty. God made man and woman to go together and stay together; in the family, and also in the church and in the State. And it is Jesus himself who says: “What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.”²

Her enfranchisement would result in Wordsworth's ideal :—

“A creature not too bright or good
For human nature's daily food —
For transient sorrows, simple wiles,
Praise, blame, love, kisses, tears and smiles :
A perfect woman, nobly planned,
To warn, to comfort and command ;
And yet a spirit still, and bright
With something of an angel light.”

PART II.
CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP.

I.

WHY CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP ?

SOME object to the adjective *Christian* in connection with citizenship, as though there were hidden in it a menace of union between Church and State—that incestuous wedlock in which have been begotten the worst crimes that have bedeviled history. Others consider that *good* citizenship is a preferable expression, because the prefix *Christian* gives a common prerogative a sectarian aspect. If either of these objections were valid, it would be fatal. Americans do not believe in a union of Church and State, and are justly suspicious of any project which even squints towards it. Nor would they consent to narrow citizenship into sectarianism.

While sharing these views, we nevertheless plead for *Christian* citizenship. The adjective does not mask any purpose to perform a midnight marriage between Church and State. Nor is it conceded that the term *good* is preferable to *Christian* as a distinguisher of the best type of citizenship. Good is relative, *Christian* is positive. Good needs an interpretation. *Christian* is self-

explanatory. Good is a chameleon, taking color from environment. Christian looks and speaks and acts alike, always and everywhere—the word, that is, not the individual who assumes it. A jockey, a gambler, a libertine, may be “a good fellow” in the parlance of his cronies, and is often called so. Every retailer of liquor must be endorsed as good before he can secure a license to sell his liquid damnation. Could Christian be prostituted to such uses?

This aside, a man may be a really good father, a good husband, a good friend, a good neighbor, a good merchant, without being a Christian. So may he be a really good citizen without being a Christian. But we cherish ideals which are distinctively and aggressively Christian. As a father, or husband, or friend, or neighbor, or merchant is idealized by filling these relations in the spirit of Christ, so a citizen is perfected by animating his citizenship with Christian motives and purposes. Why choose a lower adjective when the highest may be had?

America needs not only righteousness, but that form of righteousness which is Christian. The golden rule should be the working rule of politics. The hopes of the founders of empire in this western world are to be realized. The continent belongs to Christ by discovery. When Columbus lifted the veil of waters from the sleeping face of

the virgin hemisphere, he did it as an act of faith. When the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock, they marked the sign of the cross in the December snow. When the Catholics pre-empted Maryland, they, too, stamped the symbol of religion on the soil. God himself has claimed the continent. Among the Rockies looms a giant called the "Mountain of the Holy Cross ;" and so named because two immense fissures, one perpendicular, the other horizontal, both filled with snow, form a natural cross, as tho the Almighty held it up in token of eternal ownership.

Our country was cradled in prayer. It was baptized in faith. Our colonial period passed under Christian guidance. The national era opened with the benediction of Christian sages, such as Washington, and Jay, and Henry. Chief Justice Marshall, Daniel Webster, and our earlier jurists, claimed, without dispute, that the Republic was Christian in its fundamental law. And Christianity has advertised itself in the homes, the habits, the expressions, the institutions, the jurisprudence, the very character of the American people. In recent years, and as the result of imported, alien influences, America has been measurably un-Christianized, so that it needs to be evangelized anew. But in the very patrimony of Jesus Christ shall we be ashamed or afraid to speak of *Christian* citizenship?

The perils which now confront the nation are precisely those which should be met, and can only be successfully met, by citizens who possess, and are possessed by, the spirit of Christ. Our Bible, the magna charta of civil and religious liberty, has been already driven out of the public schools, and is assailed in its place in the courts of law. Our Sabbath is widely profaned and notoriously secularized. In Mohammedan lands the Moslem says: "Great is Allah; and Mohammed is his prophet." In American communities the politicians shout: "Great is the Boodler; and Boodle is his profit"—and believe it, too. Tricksters are plotting night and day, across the continent, to juggle our Christian form of government into a corrupt, heathenish satrapy, ruled by the organized and allied vices, whose headquarters are in the grog shops, whose *houris* are the tenants of Cyprian chambers, and whose tax-collectors are the proprietors of gambling dens. The citizenship which grapples with ignorance and drunkenness, with harlotry and faro-banking, with "bosses" and boodlers, with political selfishness and moral obliquity, with anarchy and atheism, must be more than *good*—it must be avowedly and actively *Christian*.

Lovers of their country rejoice in the present revival of Christian patriotism. It may well be hailed as the most hopeful sign of the times that

preoccupation and indifference have been quickened into conscious political responsibility and conscientious interest; and that Christian young men, who now vote, and Christian young women who will soon vote, are taking an intelligent and aggressive part in public affairs.

We exhort the gathering clans of righteousness to acquit themselves as Christian citizens are bound to do. Let them arm themselves with the same puissant influence which has entered commerce and made it an agent of Jesus Christ; which has gone into literature and purged it of its old indecencies; which has directed the chisel of the sculptor, and made the white marble embody a whiter conception; which has mixed the colors on the palette, endowed the canvas with perpetual power to refine and elevate, and made Titian and Murillo and Raphael evangelists of art; and which has dictated free constitutions to despotic governments, and marshalled the jubilant forces of legislation on behalf of liberty and man.

Inspired by these examples, Christian citizens should lift the cross above the ballot-box, and by this sign conquer.

II.

POWER AND RESPONSIBILITY OF CHRISTIAN VOTERS.

RESPONSIBILITY is measured by power. Has American Christianity the means at its command to conquer the many-headed, many-handed, arrogant iniquity which confronts it and challenges it to battle? Wrapped up in this question is the hope of the patriot, the future life of the republic. "What king," asks Jesus, "going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first, and consulteth whether he be able?" It behooves Christian citizens carefully to inspect their camp and review their forces. True, we have God on our side, and one with God is a majority. The hiding of our strength is in Him: "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts." Yet God works through human instrumentality. What He has given us the ability to do for ourselves He will not do for us. Hence the question recurs: Have we the power? If we have not, we can push off the responsibility upon God. If we have, we must bear it, in reliance on His cooperation.

The most wonderful romance of modern times

is the last census of the United States. And its most striking chapter is that which records the religious statistics of the country. Study these in the light of a series of contrasts.

In 1783 Great Britain acknowledged the independence of the United States, and ceded to the infant republic 815,615 square miles — a territory which stretched from the Atlantic to the Mississippi; although our population of 3,000,000, in the words of the historian, actually “inhabited a narrow track of towns and hamlets extending, with many breaks, from Maine to Georgia, while 50 miles back from the shore line the country was an unbroken jungle.” In 1890 our flag covered 3,553,609 square miles; forming, according to Mr. Gladstone, “a natural basis for the greatest continuous empire ever established by man.” When the Louisiana purchase was made of Napoleon in 1803, Robert Livingston told the French emperor that “we would not send a settler across the Mississippi for 100 years.” The century is still running, and so is the center of population, which is now on the border of the Father of Waters.

The house of prayer was here earlier than the court of law; the clergyman sooner than the magistrate; the colporteur before the constable. And this precedence has far outstripped the growth of the country. Since 1800 population has in-

creased twelve-fold ; evangelical church membership has increased thirty-nine fold. Since 1850, population has increased 116 per cent. ; Protestantism, 185 per cent. ; Protestant churches, 125 per cent. ; Protestant ministers, 173 per cent. Since the century began, Roman Catholics have risen from 100,000, to 6,257,871 in 1890. Since 1850, the increase of Romanism has been 294 per cent. ; of Romish churches, 447 per cent. ; and of priests, 391 per cent.—the result of wholesale immigration. The last census returns a total church membership of 20,612,806, in a total population of 62,622,250.¹ Stupendous as these figures are, they do not disclose the whole truth. For there were 15,000,000 in 1890 under 10 years of age. Deduct these from 63,000,000 (in round numbers) and the remainder is 48,000,000. Communicants are above the age of ten ; and hence the church membership must embrace over 40 per cent. of the population. Nor is this all. In order to estimate the numerical sovereignty of religion, with a view to the discovery of those who are with but not of Israel, who attend divine services, and constitute the parishes, it is customary to multiply the communicants by 2, 2½, or even 3 — as is the Methodist method. Adopt the lowest multiple. Twice 20,612,806 is 41,225,612 ; which is the numerical power of Christianity in the United States, in a total population of 48,000,000

over ten years old. It is within the truth to say that there are not more than 5,000,000 people in the nation who have no connection, direct or indirect, with any church. In other words, almost every other person above the age of ten is a communicant, while seven-eighths of the people are in touch and sympathy with one or another form of Christian ritual. This is unprecedented. It shows that among us every day is a day of Pentecost.⁴

At the beginning of the century there were 365,000 evangelical church members. In 1890 there were nearly 14,000,000. It is impossible to estimate the wealth of those pioneers of faith. But we know that their successors to-day are worth thirteen billions — one-fourth of the whole national wealth. And these religious *Monte Christos* are growing richer every day. After paying their living expenses and benevolences, they lay up every year \$435,000,000. These figures make the \$10,000,000 contributed by them to home and foreign missions seem rather niggardly ; but they are built on rock-bed.

Christian citizens have not only overwhelming numbers and swelling wealth ; they also possess the means and fruits of intelligence. Ninety years ago there were 12 denominational and 8 undenominational colleges in the United States. To-day there are more than 300 of the former, and nearly 70 of the latter — and most of the whole number

were founded and have been sustained by Christian money. Of undergraduates, four-fifths are in Christian colleges ; and of these 80 per cent. are in institutions conducted under evangelical influence.

The activities of evangelism have been amazingly multiplied and organized. Whatever Christians desire to do they can now accomplish through one or other of a hundred auxiliaries. The entire encyclopedia has been covered. Within the last few decades there have sprung into existence societies denominational, inter-denominational and undenominational ; societies legislative, and philanthropic ; societies for young folks and men and women ; societies in behalf of special classes—prisoners, sailors, freedmen, Jews, Indians ; societies aimed at special sins—anti-slavery, anti-lottery, anti-dueling, anti-cruelty ; societies to meet special wants—to build churches, aid students, support the aged ; city and state and home and foreign missionary societies ; education and publication societies ; tract, Bible and Sunday-school societies ; academies, lyceums, colleges and theological seminaries ; ribbon clubs, King's Daughters ; Societies of Christian Endeavor, Epworth Leagues, Baptist Young People's Unions ; Christian Temperance Unions, Salvation Armies, Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, Christian Citizenship Leagues ; Evan-

gical Alliances ; chapters, circles, bands, guilds, university settlements ; — every imaginable kind of special agency for every kind of special work, to meet the liking of every kind of special workmen. And these multitudinous and multifarious auxiliaries are all operated by Christians in the name and spirit of Jesus Christ. Does it not read like a chapter out of *Munchausen* ? Yet the record is true.

There can be, therefore, no question as to the ability of Christian citizens to do anything, everything they are really resolved to do. They have the numbers, the wealth, the education, and the agencies. The community concedes to them moral leadership, and looks to them for initiative, and they are hallowed with prestige. If responsibility is measured by power, then the responsibility of the Christian citizens of America is wide as the continent, deep as its needs, high as its aspirations, solemn as the judgment day. There are 5,000,000 voters who are church members. These are reinforced by 4,000,000 more, who are Christians by birth, association, sympathy. They must and they do bear the responsibility for what is and what should be, before God and at the bar of public opinion.

Let the old day end when Christians divorced their citizenship from their religion. Let the new day dawn when Christians shall recognize

the truth that their citizenship is as much under the law of Christ as their church-membership is ; and that in America the primary and the ballot-box are as sacred as the prayer-meeting and the altar.

In succeeding chapters we shall point out the arena, and show where and how Christian citizens should act.

PART III.
THE ARENA.

I.

PRIMARY AND BALLOT-BOX.

WHEN the Christian citizen enters the arena of political duty, he straightway finds himself face to face with two agencies which are fundamental in our system, viz.: the primary and the ballot-box.

What is a primary? It is a ward, or precinct, or town meeting of citizens belonging to the party calling it, at which the first steps are taken toward the nomination of various candidates for political office. By whom is it called? By the local party managing committee, which fixes the hour and place. How is it composed? Nominally, all citizens of the party in the primary district are its constituents; in fact, it is made up only of those who attend it. Since it is for the interests of the party managers to keep the numbers small and manageable, the time and place of meeting are seldom published, only those being notified who are subservient. Should others appear, they are ejected on some plausible pretext of partizan irregularity, absence of name from the check list — which is presumed to contain all names of eligible persons — or as chronic “kickers.”

What are the functions of the primary? Here

representatives are elected to the municipal council — if it be held in a city — or selectmen are chosen — if it be in a rural district; local party managers or committees are selected; and delegates are elected to forthcoming assembly, or senatorial, or judicial, or city, or state conventions, called to nominate candidates for the offices respectively indicated by these titles. In brief, the primary is precisely what the name denotes — the starting point of the entire political machinery of republican government. So-called higher assemblies simply register in a formal, official way, what the star-chamber which controls the primary may decide upon.

This explains the eagerness of professional politicians to dominate it. And the fact of this domination accounts for most of the political evils which flourish among us — the permanency of “bosses,” the chronic presence of “boodle” aldermen in municipal councils, the quartering of officers, whose virtue is loose, in city halls, the gift for private consideration of valuable public franchises to bloated monopolies, the transformation of offices in the civil service from public trusts into party spoils, unfair taxation, and the reign of the saloon, the brothel, and the gambling hell.

Trace it a little further. Take an instance from city politics. The bosses manipulate the pri-

mary, while we hurrah for government of the people, by the people, and for the people! When the city convention meets, the nominations agreed upon by the bosses are "put through" by the delegates sent up from the primaries with that understanding. There is no deliberation. Everything is cut and dried. Like the figure in a confectioner's window which seems to turn the crank in grinding chocolate, but which is really itself turned by the crank, — so the convention seems to work, but is really itself "worked." After a perfunctory ratification of the will of the bosses, the convention adjourns. Hurrah for government of the people, by the people, and for the people! Next comes the election. The workers hurry here and scurry there to get out the voters. The polls are closed. At the proper time the new city officers are installed. Then comes the merriest, maddest day of all — the day when the offices are distributed; also according to a prearranged plan. And the powers that be wink and smile and shout, "Hurrah for government of the people, by the people, and for the people! *We* are the people. *E pluribus unum. Erin go bragh!*"

It is thus evident that the primary contains the promise and potency of the entire political system in America. Those who control it dominate everything that proceeds from it, as the cause conditions the result.

Civic reform must begin at the primary. There is no decent reason why Christian citizens, aided by good citizens, should not garrison this Gibraltar. It will take time. But free institutions presuppose that citizens will take time.* It calls for vigilance. But it is a saying as old as Demosthenes, that vigilance is the price of liberty — eternal vigilance. Citizens who refuse to exercise vigilance, should accept their slavery without a murmur. Citizens who will not take time should emigrate to Russia, where the Czar relieves his subjects of political responsibility. It is certain that if we do not hold the primary for good government, those who are patriots for revenue only, and whose version of the golden rule is, “*Do others, or others will do you,*” — will continue to hold it for bad government.

The primary is a means to an end. This end is the ballot-box. What goes in at the hopper of the primary, in case of party success, comes out in the trough of the ballot-box. The process needs guarding at both ends. But citizens who neglect the one are apt to slight the other. Hence, as nine voters out of every ten never go to a primary, so four voters out of every twelve never go to the ballot-box.

These absentees represent the best class — men of means, education, and social standing. They profess to be disgusted with politics, yet do not be-

stir themselves to remedy the evils of which they complain. The primary and the ballot-box are thus given over into the hands of men who make their living by politics, who, while wearing a party collar, trade in votes as tradesmen do in merchandise, and in moments of frankness confess that "there's no politics in politics" — it is business.

Out of this neglect on the part of the natural leaders of the community is evolved the boss and boodling. Some broad-shouldered, hard-knuckled rogue who is more adroit than the rest of the "boys," who "toils not neither does he spin," whose shirt-front is decorated by a diamond big enough for the headlight of a locomotive, and whose fingers are manacled with rings — manacles which ought to be worn on the wrists — is presently recognized as a boss. A number of local bosses get together and make a "combine," by pooling their interests for the purpose of filling as many offices as possible with their adherents, and thus controlling the municipality, or county, or state. This combination is called a "ring." In the ring there is usually a boss who is more skillful and influential than the rest. By and by he expands into a boss of the bosses. We have a Tweed, a McManes, a Croker, a Hopkins, a Cox, in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago and Cincinnati; and a Gorman, a Quay, an Altgeld, and a Platt in the wider arena of state and nation.

We must not conclude that these men are exceptionally bad. They are not. But seeing a door leading to wealth and power, left wide open by public neglect and indifference, they have walked in and made themselves at home. We must turn them out, and lock them out—and lock them up.

In view of the situation, is it any wonder that elections are often farces? Ballot-boxes in charge of thugs, guarded by policemen who club the innocent and protect the guilty, and count in or count out candidates, not according to the number of votes cast, but in obedience to the orders of the bosses, have ceased to be the palladium of liberty, and have become a Punch and Judy show of political sharpers. Yet the ballot-box is the ark of American freedom. Whoever lays an unhallowed hand upon it deserves to be smitten by the thunder bolt of enraged patriotism.

The sources of ring revenue are numerous and lucrative. There are, to begin with, the regular party contributions of partizans; next, the special payments of men looking for a job; then the percentage money of office-holders; then the sums "contributed" by wealthy contractors in expectation of fat contracts; then the amounts paid by monopolists for monopolies; and above all the enormous sums levied on the vices for "protection" or immunity. Bonaparte said "a tax on

alcohol would yield more revenue than a tax on Bibles." The experience of the ring proves it. Its members waste a fortune on a ball and hang up the salary of a judge in a chandelier. When they are short of funds they replenish by a new application of the political rule of three, viz.: subtraction, division and silence.

Controlling the primary and the ballot-box, the bosses also control the voters — or at least enough of them to retain their supremacy. For instance, they have the backing of the "regular" vote, and of the purchasable vote, and of the vote of the vices, and also of those in offices which they have filled, and of those who want to get in; a compact political army, disciplined, organized, skillfully led, and accustomed to victory.

The essential point of all this is the need on the part of Christian citizens of going into politics and of staying there. The Nathan of patriotism traces the prevalent political corruption back to every voter who is derelict, and says to him, "Thou art the man." When the primary and the prayer-meeting are held on the same night, the true prayer-meeting is the primary. When election day dawns, the Christian citizen is to recognize it as the Sabbath of patriotism, and to hear and heed the Commandment: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." A bad citizen can not be a good Christian. In a land of liberty the sons of

freedom are bound to subordinate personal and selfish interests to the common weal. Since Christians have the power to rule, they must, as our Methodist brethren say, "get religion" enough to lead them to the primary and the ballot-box, where, and where alone, their dominancy can be secured. The prostitution of these agencies of government is the first great cause of harm and mischief to the commonwealth. Their restoration to normal uses must be the first great remedy.

II.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

WE have seen how the primary and the ballot-box have been seized by "lewd fellows of the baser sort" and bent to unpatriotic ends. The civil service, municipal, state, and national, has been in like manner wrested from legitimate to illegitimate uses — a second cause of continental misrule. A brief recital of the facts in the case will show how and why.

What is a town? It is a civic corporation, of which all the citizens are members, and in which all have a proprietary interest. If the corporation is well managed, all gain; if it is badly managed, all lose. The objects for which this corporation exists should dictate its government. What are these objects? They are the preservation of order, the enforcement of law, the providing of elementary education, the securing of sanitation; in brief, the safe-guarding of life, liberty, and property. These are ends which concern all, and to secure which all should combine.

Now, the citizens of a cosmopolitan town are of every race, creed, calling, and party. These differences have their appropriate spheres. Whether

a man is an American or a foreigner is a fair inquiry, for example, when membership in a society based on nationality is under consideration. Whether a man is a Protestant or a Catholic, is a fact to be ascertained when the question is one of church preferment. Whether a man is a clergyman or a layman is relevant when fitness for a business or for an ecclesiastical position is in debate. Whether a man is a Republican or a Democrat, is important, when one or the other political party proposes to nominate or elect a congressional candidate.

But has politics any more connection with the mayoralty than with the directorship of a bank? What has the tariff to do with an inspectorship of buildings? What has free trade to do with a commissionership of public parks? What has the ratio of sixteen-to-one in the coinage of silver as compared with gold, to do with the office of corporation counsel? Is there any more relation between the Republican or the Democratic platform and the board of aldermen, than there is between such a platform and the selection by a railroad company of a conductor?

What has creed to do with municipal office? Why should all of our policemen be Irishmen — preaching home rule for Ireland and practising foreign rule in America? Is there any good reason why a native should be put at a disadvantage

by his race or his creed in his own country? Ought not citizenship to be the true qualification for interest and participation in city affairs? And is not fitness the only proper qualification for municipal office? To ask these questions is to answer them. To argue them is like debating axioms. Yet such is the absurd and intolerable situation, that the questions and the argument are alike necessary.

“Ah,” cries an objector, “such reasoning would disallow politics everywhere.” Not so. Politics is legitimate in national affairs; because the national policy is to be discussed and decided. Those officers whose functions require them to manipulate statecraft, ought to be nominated and elected on party lines, since government in a free country is by party. But even an election which turns on party issues, should put in or out only the superior officers who shape and dominate national policy, leaving untouched inferior officers whose duties are merely routine. This rule is recognized in the civil service of England, Germany, and France, where only the heads of departments are changed by a party victory, while the subalterns hold by the tenure of good behavior and efficiency.

So it was in the United States at the start.

It is true that the constitution vests the right of appointing to federal offices in the President,

and requires the consent of the Senate only to the more important positions. It is a fact that this clause also gives to the President a presumptive power of removal at pleasure and without cause assigned. But it is equally unquestionable that the earlier Presidents considered the tenure as being during good behavior.

When Washington began his administration, he said to a friend who importuned him to appoint to office one whom he believed to be incompetent : " My personal feelings have nothing to do with the case. I am not George Washington, but President of the United States. As George Washington I would do this man any kindness ; as President of the United States I can do nothing. "

Parties began to form as a result of the conflict of opinions regarding the adoption of the Federal Constitution. Toward the close of Washington's administration they were fully developed, and have lived, with varying fortunes, to this day. Yet the rise of parties did not vary the practice of Washington. His successor, John Adams, was a party president ; nevertheless he continued his illustrious predecessor's civil service policy. Adams' successor was Jefferson. He, too, was elected by a party. Yet he declared: " The only questions concerning a candidate for office should be — Is he honest ? is he capable ? is he faithful to the Constitution ? " Under Madison, Monroe, and

John Quincy Adams, these were the invariable tests. During the first forty-four years of our national history only seventy-three persons were removed from office — and these for cause.

But a change was at hand. When Jackson entered the White House, in 1829, it was distinctly announced for the first time, that public office was political spoil. To William L. Marcy, of New York, belongs the unenviable fame, not of the discovery but of the declaration, which he made in these words: "There is nothing wrong in the rule that to the victors belong the spoils of the enemy." Thus parties were ranged over against one another not as fellow citizens, but as foes; and their peaceful contests were thenceforth embittered by all the passions and greed of war. Jackson turned officials of the opposite political party, who answered the three famous tests of Jefferson, out, with the open avowal that he wanted his partizans in; and his successors have continued to do so ever since, with the mechanical regularity with which the ax of the guillotine falls at a French execution.

The change was not made without a protest at the time. Henry Clay, voicing the spirit of our early day and the conscience of all days, cried on the floor of Congress, in ringing tones: "It is a detestable system, drawn from the worst period of the Roman republic, and if it were to be pepe-

tuated — if the offices, and honors, and dignities of the people were to be put up to a scramble, and to be decided by the result of every presidential election — our government, and institutions, becoming intolerable, would finally end in a despotism as inexorable as that of Constantinople.”

From Clay down to our time, this protest has continued. Carl Schurz affirms that the spoils system “has already killed two presidents — one, the first Harrison, by worry, and the other, Garfield, by murder ; and more recently, it has killed a mayor in Chicago and a judge in Tennessee.”

But notwithstanding these protests, what Clay termed “the detestable system” was adopted, and has become the traditional policy of the country.

Thus in the land of Uncle Sam, the civil service is manned, not by merit and during good behavior, but as a reward for unscrupulous party-service on the nomination of party bosses ; and the incumbents, aware of the insecurity of their tenure, are impelled, not to perform their duties in a creditable manner, but to please the appointing power, serve the party, and use official position for personal gain. If the opposite party comes in they go out. Even though their party retains power, they are soon rotated out to make room for a new gang of incoming office-seekers. When expertness counts for nothing why bother

to become expert? Can any one conceive of a system better adapted to debauch character and destroy efficiency? The wonder is, not that there are so few, but that there are so many, honest men in the civil service.

Mr. Samuel Swartwout, a friend and partizan of President Jackson, describes the effect upon a participant in a graphic letter to a correspondent: "The great goers are the new men, the old troopers being all spavined and ring-boned from previous hard travel. I've got the bots, the fetlock, the hip-joint, gravel, halt, and founders—and I assure you if I can only keep my own legs I shall do well; but I'm darned if I can carry any weight with me."

"If this had been a true description of the manner in which the military and naval service of this country had been entered," during the rebellion, remarks Mr. George Wm. Curtis, after quoting Mr. Swartwout, "we may be very sure that no Grant with the bots would have emerged from the Wilderness, no hip-jointed Thomas would have pounded away at Chattanooga, no broken-kneed Meade have hurled back the rebellion at Gettysburg, no halting Farragut have forced his way to New Orleans, no spavined Sherman have marched to the sea, no foundered Sheridan have scoured the Shenandoah, nor graveled Winslow in the *Kearsarge* have sunk the *Alabama*."

Now, finding this abominable system in vogue, politicians have naturally adopted it, and extended it from the nation into the state ; from the state into the county ; from the county into the town, where the party discipline is most strict, where the offices are most numerous, and where the spoils are most valuable.

We see the results of this vicious system in the grist of personal and official corruption ground out by it. For one thing, it has tempted men to make politics a career. The management of primaries, conventions, and elections calls for constant attention. This can be given only by a class who make a living out of it. Hence, the professional politician. He is not even a party man, save as party ministers to profit. He serves God, just so far as not to offend the devil. Like *Ah Sin*, the "Heathen Chineese," he is an adept in "ways that are dark and tricks that are vain." He belongs to any party which he can "run ;" clamors for high tariff, low tariff, or no tariff, according to his estimate of the probable majorities one way or the other ; but believes religiously in a tariff levied *by* himself, *for* himself. Like the English wit, when asked what is meant by the greatest good of the greatest number, he would unhesitatingly answer, "Number one !"

For another thing, at every election and especially at every national election, as an eminent

advocate of civil service reform points out, " the country presents a most ridiculous, revolting and disheartening spectacle. The business of a great people, the legislation of Congress, are subordinated to distributing the plunder among eager partizans. President, secretaries, senators, representatives, are dogged, besieged, besought, denounced, and become mere office brokers. The heads of departments, who are virtually the appointing power, have no personal knowledge of the applicants. They have also their own hopes, ambitions and desires. They must depend upon Congressional brokers, who have also their own purposes. They, in turn, rely upon local committees and partizans at home—all intent on profit. Swift's contemptuous lines irresistibly repeat themselves :

' So naturalists observe, a flea
Has smaller fleas that on him prey :
And these have smaller ones to bite 'em,
And so proceed *ad infinitum*.'

"They all worry, and bargain, and buy, and plot. The country seethes with intrigue and corruption. The time is short. No man is sure of to-morrow. Make hay while the sun shines, and the devil take the hindmost. Economy, honesty, honor become words of no meaning. Here is an incompetent do-nothing who is always shiftlessly going behind in his affairs, and presto ! he plunges into

politics. He gets up clubs, meetings, processions, transparencies ; becomes an active 'worker ;' runs about posting placards, and procuring speakers and rousing the country for Jones and justice, or Jenkins and the rights of man. Observers are refreshed to behold a little pristine patriotism and devotion, and to see an honest man taking an active interest in politics. Alas ! the moment the election is over, he presents his little bill, and takes out his patriotic devotion in the biggest office he can get." *

Thus public office becomes a partizan spoil, conferred on the principle of *quid pro quo*. It appears to be caricature, but is sober truth, when Lowell makes a presidential candidate write to a friend in maritime New England :

" If you git me inside the White House,
Your head with ile I'll kinder 'nint
By gitting you inside the lighthouse
Down to the end of Jaalam pint."

How did this wretched travesty get itself adopted in the United States? Bryce in his exhaustive work entitled " The American Commonwealth "—perhaps the ablest analysis of our institutions ever penned—outlines the reasons in these words : " The politicians could hardly have riveted such a system on the country but for certain notions which had become current among the people. ' Rotation in office ' was, and indeed by most

men still is, held to be conformable to the genius of a democracy. It gives every man an equal chance of power and salary, resembling herein the Athenian and Florentine system of choosing officers by lot. It is supposed to stimulate men to exertion, to foster a laudable ambition to serve the country or neighborhood, to prevent the growth of an official caste, with its habits of routine, its stiffness, its arrogance. It recognizes that equality which is so dear to the American mind, bidding an official remember that he is the servant of the people, and not their master, like the bureaucrats of Europe. It forbids him to fancy that he has any right to be where he is, any ground for expecting to stay there. It ministers in an odd kind of way to that fondness for novelty and change in persons and surroundings which is natural in the constantly moving communities of the West. The habit which grew up of electing national, and state, and local officers for short terms, tended in the same direction. If those whom the people chose were to hold office only for a year or two, why should those in appointive positions have longer tenure? And the use of patronage for political purposes was further justified by the example of England, whose government was believed by the Americans of fifty years ago to be worked, as in the last century it largely was worked, by the patronage of the

Secretary of the Treasury in his function of distributing places to members of the House of Commons, and honors — such as orders and steps in the peerage — to members in the House of Lords, and ecclesiastical preferments to the relatives of both." *

These remarks explain but do not justify the spoils system. It is not strange that such abuses should have attracted attention. Indeed, as long ago as 1853 Congress passed an act requiring clerks appointed to the departments at Washington to pass a qualifying examination — although public officers, having no sympathy with it, failed to enforce it. It lay in the archives as a mere protest. Eighteen years later a public agitation began in the interest of civil service reform, and still continues. Progress has been slow and intermittent ; partly because of the conservatism of the people, but chiefly on account of the deadly opposition of professional politicians whose trade is endangered. Nevertheless a good beginning has been made. President Grant called attention to the subject and recommended action. President Hayes went further and aided an enactment, which failed through public indifference and official hostility. President Arthur named a commission under the Pendleton Act, which instituted a board of civil service commissioners, and directed them to apply a competitive examination

to a considerable number of offices in the departments at Washington, and a smaller number in outlying districts. President Cleveland did most of all, having in the last year of his second term swept all but seven hundred out of the 120,000 offices at his disposal, under civil service competitive rules.

At the same time, the States and cities have not been idle. In New York competitive examinations have been in vogue for several years. In Chicago, in 1894, civil service reform was adopted by a popular majority of 50,000 votes. Other centers have followed, or are about to follow, these wholesome examples.

Reform has aimed at two points; first, the securing competent officials by competitive examinations of such a character as to ascertain fitness; and next, at a reasonable security of tenure, while leaving with the appointing authority a discretion of removal for cause.

There is still widespread indifference among the voters to this vital rectification, and covert hostility among the gangsters. It is the special duty of Christian citizens to lend a hand in the struggle and assure the victory.

III

UNRESTRICTED IMMIGRATION.

A third cause of political misrule in the United States, is unrestricted immigration.

A narrow Americanism is un-American. We are a nation of immigrants. The only original American is the Indian — and he is disfranchised! From the outset naturalized foreigners have illustrated some of the most splendid chapters in our history. The strength and attractiveness of our civilization lie in the variety of strains in our blood.

But there are immigrants and immigrants. As some of the saints, smuggled into the calendar, should have been cannonaded instead of canonized; so many who immigrate ought to emigrate. Within the last few decades immigration has deteriorated. For many years those who came hither from across the sea were chiefly subjects of Great Britain and Germany, in essential sympathy with American ideals. The great proportion of them came hither with an intelligent and moral purpose to seek freedom in religious faith and political institutions. They were people of fiber, poor in purse, but rich in manhood and

womanhood. The ocean and the cost of transportation acted as a sieve to strain out the worst elements of Europe and let through only the more worthy.

All this is changed. The sea is abolished by steam and a reduced cost of passage. An ever-enlarging number of more recent immigrants comes from Russia, Poland, Bohemia, Italy, Hungary, Turkey — countries out of touch with us. Victims of ages of misgovernment, dwarfed in body, mind, and soul, soaked in animalism, slumped in disease, they lower our temper, add to our burdens, perplex our problems, and bedevil our daily life, without contributing anything to our stamina. Some years ago the attention of the government was directed to this public menace. Congressional committees were appointed to investigate and report. The United States consuls were also ordered to collect data. These official inquiries ominously confirm the worst anticipations. Reports made to the Fiftieth and Fifty-second Congresses show a striking consensus of opinion concerning the low character of our present immigration, and prove that Europe, Asia, and Africa, taking advantage of the looseness of our immigration laws, have combined to make the United States a Botany Bay for their criminals, an almshouse for their paupers, and a browsing pasture for their ignorance.

Nay, the Consular Reports give evidence of the existence of regular societies in Europe, protected and subsidized by their respective governments—notably in Bavaria, Prussia, England, Switzerland—for the deportation of criminals and paupers to America ;⁷ while the ignorance that lands upon our shores bears the brand of the four quarters of the globe, knows nothing in every color, and jabbars emptily in every tongue that Babel cleft our human speech into.

Between 1820, when immigration began rapidly to make its way hither, and 1890, 18,128,121 aliens landed in this country.⁸ There were living here in 1890, 9,249,547. An average of 500,000 have entered the country since 1880. Of this total of nearly 10,000,000, it is estimated that one third ought never to have been admitted because of ignorance, pauperism, or criminality.

The distribution of immigrants is an interesting study. All but 530,346 of those now living reside north of Mason and Dixon's line. Formerly, on account of slavery, and now because of the preoccupation of the soil by negroes, immigrants have avoided, and continue to avoid, the South. Of the 530,346 residing there, 151,469 are in Texas. Some of the Southern States have less than one per cent. of foreigners. The purest Americanism is found in Dixie. True, the South has the negro problem to solve. Its colored belt

numbered 6,741,941, when the last national census was taken. But the colored people are natives, with American aspirations. They take kindly to education, are tractable, love sun and fun, speak English — colored English! and have no associations distinct or different from the whites. Christian citizens in the South can settle and will settle their race question by justice and kindness, long before the North has solved kindred ethnic problems. In what parts of the North are the immigrants found? In all parts: but chiefly in the strategic States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, the Dakotas, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Washington, and California. If to those who are foreign born are added their children — many of whom are quite as foreign in their ideas of social order as their parents — this element is numerically stronger than the native population in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas, Utah, Nevada, and California; while it is a close second in the remainder of the list.

Moreover, the birth-rate among the immigrants is higher than it is among the natives; who are thus worsted both at the adult and the childhood ends of life.

The distribution of our immigrant population is vitally related to the growth and influence of American cities. When the first census was taken in 1790 there were but 13 towns in the 13 States which then formed the Union, with a population of more than 5,000. The urban population was 3.3 of the whole. In 1890 there were over 500 towns with above 5,000 people, and the percentage had risen to 29.12. Evidently we are to be a nation of cities. The Atlantic seaboard is already urban. In the near future the shores of the great lakes, the valleys of the Ohio, Mississippi and Missouri, and the Pacific slope, will outrival in the number and power and splendor of their cities, the historic valleys of the Nile, Euphrates and Tiber, when the civilization of the ancients glittered at the zenith.⁹ Now, the cities are the Meccas of immigrants. There are fifty cities in the United States whose population ranges from 20,000 up into the millions. Of these 17 contain more foreigners than natives. In 38, foreigners with their immediate descendants are in the majority. And in 218 of the 375 towns which have a population of 8,000 or over, the foreign element exceeds the native — counting in the foreign element the children of aliens.¹⁰

The sociological bearing of these facts is obvious.

Municipal problems are intensified and night-

maled. The slums in which aliens burrow defy sanitation. The children of the slums go to school to the devil in the streets. The saloon, the brothel, and the gambling den are regnant. Liberty is defined as license. Law is tyranny. Property is theft. Religion is a fad of the well-to-do. God is a fiction invented by priests as a bug-a-boo to frighten silly folks. These atheistic and anarchistic notions are brought over here by immigrants and domesticated in whole sections of great cities. Everybody drinks in Europe—let everybody drink in America. Everybody recognizes the social evil as a necessity in Europe—let everybody tolerate it in America. Everybody gambles in Paris, Vienna, Berlin, Brussels, Budapest and St. Petersburg—let everybody gamble in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and San Francisco. Urban vices own and operate a vast purchasable vote which holds the balance of power in all elections; thus presenting to professional politicians an opportunity of which they eagerly avail themselves. The boodler and boodling root themselves in this dung-heap. Opportunity has been called the cleverest devil. Opportunity beckons and allures, debauches and damns at every turn. Our cities are thus un-Americanized.

The industrial effects are equally sad and serious. The aliens landed here within a decade

and a half number one-tenth of our whole population. Of this tenth 48 per cent. had neither training nor occupation. Those who had, were accustomed to the pauper wages of Europe. Entering this market they inevitably lower both the *morale* and the wage scale. The coal miners of the anthracite and bituminous regions, the miners of the precious metals in the West, are aliens in overwhelming numbers, and are ignorant of our very language. The mills and factories of the manufacturing States are manned and womaned in the same way. So with the unskilled labor of the country—mongrel, all of it. The trade unions, which ought to safe guard the interests of labor, are largely controlled by foreigners, who earn their salaries by precipitating strikes, to level down instead of up. Lowered wages drive women and children to manual labor, in order to eke out a livelihood. European conditions of industrial serfdom thus tend to reproduction in America.

Our pauper and criminal statistics bear appalling witness to the folly of admitting to this country the most incapable and irresponsible flotsam and jetsam of Europe. The census of 1890 shows that about three-fourths of the paupers in our almshouses are of foreign birth, or immediate descent. Nor does the burden end here. The proportion is the same in the insane asylums. Our Boards of Charities everywhere

groan under the intolerable incubus. American charity is at once burdened and abused. If we turn to criminal statistics substantially the same results stare us in the face. Although comprising, with their offspring in the first generation, but one-third of the population, these immigrants contribute more than half of the convicts in our prisons and penitentiaries.

The educational problem is similarly embarrassed. A large proportion of the foreigners amongst us can not read or write their native language, and 24.98 per cent. of them have no knowledge of English. Thus ignorant themselves, they can hardly be expected to be very solicitous regarding the schooling of their children. Those who are better informed are apt to be clannish. They retain their prejudices of race and creed, and demand schools at the public expense which shall perpetuate differences of feeling or tongue that destroy the homogeneity of American citizenship. Our free-school system aims at two things, viz., the fitting of the children of the commonwealth to earn an honest living, and their preparation for the fundamental duties of citizenship. Any interference with these ends is inhuman and unpatriotic, and should be opposed and stopped by the whole energy and force of the national will.

The facts which we have reviewed have their

national application. The importation, and especially the deportation by foreign governments, of undesirable elements, lowers the tone of the country — may fatally lower it. Ignorance, crime, and pauperism can not form the foundation of a nation which rests in its conception and continuance upon intelligence, obedience to law and industry. The elective franchise is imperiled not only by criminal and pauper voters, but almost equally by ignorant voters. Is it any wonder that foreigners have a poor opinion of the franchise, when we permit them to be ground out through the mill of naturalization into a grist of voters while ignorant of the constitution and language of the country? Nay, in some States they are enfranchised by a brief residence, without naturalization! And this while we insist upon it that no American youth shall vote under the age of 21, and no woman shall vote at any age! The laws governing the franchise should be amended to provide that no foreigner shall vote until he has resided in the country at least ten years; nor then unless he has qualified himself to read and write in the language in which our legislation is recorded and in which he must respond in every court of justice.

Happily, public thought is now turned to this whole subject. There is a rapidly growing sentiment in favor of a reconstruction of the laws of

immigration. Upon the following points there is large agreement : the total exclusion of the unfit ; the admission only of persons who have some visible means of self-support ; the return of those who, after landing, are discovered to have been criminals or paupers or anarchists in their native land ; a declaration on reaching America of the intention or non-intention on the part of the immigrant to become a citizen ; and the lengthening of the period of residence necessary before naturalization, with the demanding of some knowledge of the English language, together with a denial of the right to vote until the consummation of the act of naturalization.

Verily, here is a vast and needy field for Christian citizens to labor in !

IV.

THE LIQUOR APPETITE AND TRAFFIC.

IN the rank soil of the three capital abuses described in the three preceding chapters, grow the three great special vices—drunkenness, licentiousness, and gambling, to which we devote the three chapters that follow.

Commencing with the first of these master-vices, we emphasize the fact that races, like individuals, have special proclivities. Climate, heredity, and environment are the three strands in this cable of predisposition. The tropics, for example, heat the blood and breed languor. Tropical races, therefore, find their bane in idleness and licentiousness. The frigid and temperate zones, on the other hand, incite to gluttony and drunkenness. "If you would know what are the fundamental traits of a race," remarks Carlyle, "catch it and study it before Christianity and civilization have tamed it." Look at our race in the light of this maxim. Tacitus describes the ancient Britons as having ravenous stomachs, filled with meat and cheese, heated with strong drink. Taine, in his "History of English Literature," confirms the Roman from

other sources. And the Venerable Bede avouches the statements of both. The greatest of American orators, summarizing the classic authorities, shows that our German ancestors, before they streamed out of their primeval life, conceived of heaven as a drunken revel, and regarded the drinking of blood diluted with wine as a foretaste of Paradise. What is bred in the bone will come out in the flesh. England, Scotland, Wales, Ireland, Germany, and North America are the living witnesses. Drunkenness is in the Anglo-Saxon and Celtic blood.

Heredity cooperates with climate in the production of this taint. Recent biologists have shown that pauperism, criminality, insanity, and similar tendencies, are transmitted, and can be produced with as much certainty as plants and animals are bred and changed. Inebriety comes under the same category. It has been recognized as hereditary for ages. Take any one hundred inebriates. Forty per cent. will be found to be the children of parents who are either excessive or moderate drinkers. Of the remainder, 20 per cent. inherit their appetite from grandparents, more frequently on the maternal side, the heredity having thus skipped a generation; another 20 per cent. are the descendants of consumptive, epileptic, or feeble-minded ancestors—brain and nerve-exhausted persons. Only 20 per cent. are free from ancestral

taint. What a commentary on the solemn words of the decalogue, that God visits "the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation!" And what a motive this tremendous law presents to parents to live soberly!

The physiological explanation of these effects is, that liquor congests the cerebral blood-vessels and thus causes them to press upon the delicate tissues of the brain, producing confusion of ideas and stupor. When the stimulative fever subsides after the partial elimination of the poison, the brain is left weak. By frequent repetitions of alcoholic congestion the membranes of the brain become thickened and distorted — conditions which pass down to descendants. The immediate victims and their unhappy progeny are thus inclined to apoplexy, and disinclined to continued intellectual effort.

Climate and heredity are reenforced by environment. Inhabiting this zone, and with such blood in our veins, we have created an environment of temptation. The great centers of population are honeycombed with legalized dram-shops. Like the shipwrecked sailor who, when he saw a gallows, thanked God that he had been washed ashore in a Christian country, we recognize in the groggery a distinctive symbol of modern civilization. Long after all honest places are shut and barred, the groggery flames out to entice and engulf — a

“blazing lighthouse of hell.” It is the most obtrusive feature of city life, and is only less frequent and frequented in villages and hamlets.

As though climate, and racial inheritance, and environment were not enough, chemistry invents a new devil, alcohol, and makes it so cheap that anybody may have a familiar spirit. The Roman legions that trod the world into vassalage had no stimulant stronger than vinegar and water. To-day an incompetent can earn in a forenoon the means of getting and keeping drunk.

The stupendous outcome of the liquor appetite is the liquor traffic—cause and effect combined. Engaged in this nefarious calling as proprietors, employes or dependents, are 1,397,500 persons—all males and voters. The saloons they conduct number 200,000. Capital to the amount of \$1,000,000,000 is directly invested in the trade. Another \$1,000,000,000 is indirectly interested. The annual liquor bill of the United States is also \$1,000,000,000. We send up in tobacco-smoke every year \$600,000,000; and spend for bread in a twelve month \$500,000,000; for clothes a like amount; for meat, \$300,000,000; for shoes, \$200,000,000; and \$100,000,000 for schools. There is widespread complaint nowadays of hard times. Would not times be easier if the capital directly and indirectly employed in the liquor traffic, together with the sum annually expended on liquor,

were directed into the till of honest business? ¹² This inquiry is all the more pertinent when we reflect that we lavish hundreds of millions a year in policing the consequences of rum; and, what is infinitely more wasteful and wicked, create crime, 70 per cent. of which comes from this traffic, degrade 40,000 men and women every year from lives of industry to homes in the penitentiary, and distribute an annual quota of 319,000 idiots through the country, each of whom bears the brand of the saloon.

Why is not this curse of curses summarily dealt with by the religion and law of America? Because it is a colossal, defiant oligarchy, possessing, like Milton's *Satan*,—

“ Unconquerable will,
And study of revenge, immortal hate
And courage never to submit nor yield; ”

because it is entrenched in the appetite of millions, in the greed of other millions, in the habitual toleration of forty-five States, in the ambition of politicians; and because it is a thoroughly organized and disciplined political power, with ramifications in every primary district in the Union.

As a political evil it is impossible to over-estimate the liquor traffic. Taking advantage of the indifference of the better classes towards the primary and the ballot-box, of the spoils system, and of the presence of immigrants who bring here the

drinking habits of Europe, it goes into politics, turns every saloon into a center of organized influence, makes and unmakes laws, and law-givers, and interpreters, corrupts juries, and terrorizes 70,000,000 of people.

Statistics show that 75 per cent. of the brewers and maltsters in the United States are of foreign birth, while a large percentage of the remainder are of foreign parentage. Of the dealers in spirituous liquors, 63 per cent. are foreign-born, with a larger percentage of the balance of foreign parentage. In the North Atlantic division of the Union — from Maine to and including Pennsylvania — there is one liquor dealer to every 64 voters; in the South Atlantic division — from Delaware to and including Florida — one to every 117; in the North Central division — from Ohio to and including Kansas — one to every 70; in the South Central — from Kentucky to and including Arkansas — one to every 105; and in the Western division — from Montana to and including California — one to every 39. And each dealer is a political manager and magnate, holding the balance of power, belonging to any party which most favors his interests, and assuring success to that party.

A bad matter is made worse by the fact that European syndicates are largely and increasingly interested in the American liquor traffic. Hence, American politics are measurably controlled not

only by foreigners here, but also by foreigners abroad. Are we any longer, then, a self-governed people?

At the start the whisky trade in this country had no organization. It was conducted by a group of traders who sold liquor with other and more honest commodities over the counters of groceries and country shops, or in the tap-rooms of taverns. And drinking was universal. Cronies "treated" one another in the tavern; wine sparkled in the decanter on the sideboard in every home; even parsons got tipsy in orthodox fashion at religious conventions, and were more spirituous than spiritual. A remarkable change in public sentiment has made nearly all clergymen total abstainers, banished the decanter from private tables, driven it from groceries and country shops, and stamped the traffic as disreputable. To counteract this revolution, the liquor dealers have been compelled to organize. Their organization is really a tribute to the continental strength of the reform movement.

The ostensible occasion of the liquor federation was the Internal Revenue Act of 1862, which levied a heavy tax on domestic liquors to help meet the expenses of the civil war. Every year since then has contributed its quota towards a more effective organization, until whisky now lords it as that deposed majesty, slavery, used to do.

The trade, too, is at present carried on in places distinctively devoted to it, and called "saloons." By common acknowledgment they are manufactories of crime and criminals, trysting-places of vice, allies of the brothel, breeders of poverty, dealers at wholesale and retail in misery, the despair of law and order, the *raison d'être* of police and prison, a chronic assault upon property and life — organized anarchy ! It is fast coming to be felt that there can be no peace in this country until the saloons are repressed and placarded "For rent."

But before the saloons can be reached, the rum power behind them and operating them must be trampled down and trampled out. Who can be relied upon to do this save Christian citizens? Can the existing political parties? They are in a guilty partnership with it. Can State legislatures? They are filled with its creatures. Can the National Congress and the President of the United States? They are elected with an express understanding that they are to keep hands off. If anything is done, therefore, it must be done by Christian citizens acting outside of existing parties, framing drastic measures through new legislatures; and sending to Washington congressmen and presidents pledged to treat this insurrection against every legitimate interest of the Republic, as the first Congress and the first President treated

the whisky rebellion in 1794 in Pennsylvania — take it by the throat and choke the life out of it.

As to the plan of campaign there is as yet, unhappily, no consensus of opinion. The problem is vast and intricate, and suggests as many solutions as it has phases. Temperance workers must practise charity among themselves. Let there be no more reading out of the ranks of those who do not mutter a given shibboleth. Any and every contribution of any and every thoughtful student of the question should be welcomed. "Where no counsel is," saith Holy Writ, "the people fall; but in the multitude of counselors there is safety." Out of a comparison of views will come a final and successful plan.

Meantime, some things are already clear. Palliatives are not remedies. License, for instance, is a world-old and world-wide failure. The more it is thought of the less it is thought of. Were it successful it would yet be hateful to the Christian conscience. Bouvier, in his "Law Dictionary," defines license as "a right given by some competent authority to do an act which without such authority would be illegal." License, therefore, puts the State in the attitude either of denying the sinfulness of the liquor traffic, or else of compounding a felony. The thief — it jails him. The murderer — him it hangs. But the thief-maker, the manufacturer of murderers, it licenses.

Thus with one hand it strangles the victim, and with the other protects the victimizer. Will not the future Tacitus, when he looks back to paint our times, count this as the most curious of historical monstrosities?

In the forum of conscience it is without valid excuse. Is it said that a license is substantially a tax? The answer is, that a tax is a levy imposed on the members of society to pay the expenses of a common government; a license is the granting of permission to do what it would otherwise be unlawful to do. A tax requires something to be given; a license allows something to be done. A tax is for the public welfare; a license is for the benefit of an individual. There is no analogy. Is it pleaded that since the evil exists it were better to regulate it by a license than suffer it to go at will? The reply is that the same reasoning would lead to the licensing of all existing evils. Rape exists, and arson, and murder — shall these, too, be licensed? If not, why not? The State which licenses a sin becomes a partner in the guilt, if not in the profit. Is it urged that these scruples would deprive the community of a fat revenue? The response is, that it is an authentic statistic that for every dollar taken in by license, \$20 are expended to take care of the guilty consequences. Is license economical?

What is called the Gothenburg system is noth-

ing but restrictive license. The name comes from the Swedish seaport of Gothenburg, where, in 1864, to repress the terrible evils of drunkenness, the city council annulled all outstanding licenses, created a company — *Bolag* — and empowered it to operate a limited number of saloons, made over into restaurants, in which liquor should be drunk only with meals; to license a few groceries and private wine-merchants; and to pay over into the city treasury the accruing profits. It is perhaps the most honest license scheme ever devised. Nevertheless, it is open to all the ethical objections of any other method of license. It legalizes what God's law has declared to be illegal. It gives respectability to an essentially disreputable trade. And it is a failure. Town after town, after patient trial, has voted it out and replaced it with prohibition — the result of persistent agitation, aided by woman suffrage, which prevails in Sweden.¹³

So with the (in)famous South Carolina plan; which is only a modification of the Gothenburg scheme. While making the State a colossal liquor trafficker, it, too, stands before the country as a self-convicted failure. When men make a juggle and call it justice, the fraud is sure to appear in the results.

License, then, in any and every form, may be eliminated from the list of remedial agencies. It

lingers superfluous as a makeshift while we await a specific. Every church in America, Catholic and Protestant, has denounced it as "vicious in principle and powerless as a remedy." "Over the unholy door of the liquor traffic is written Dante's motto of the *Inferno*:—

"All hope abandon, ye who enter here!"

Christian citizens begin to understand that it must be met in its own aggressive spirit. There is a world of philosophy in *Hamlet's* reply to *Laertes*:—

"Nay, and thou 'lt mouth,
I 'll rant, as well as thou."

Charles Sumner, in pleading for the arming of the blacks during the rebellion, exclaimed: "We must not only carry the war into Africa—we must carry Africa into the war." Just so to-day; we must not only fight the liquor traffic—we must annihilate it.

V.

THE SOCIAL EVIL.

THERE is one sin which has ever been, and is now, frightfully prevalent; which is the chronic disturber of social life; of which the newspapers are full; with which the courts are forever dealing; which the Scriptures devote more attention to than is given to almost any other theme, and which they blast with Divine lightning; but which the pulpit, the school, and the home seldom touch; viz., the social evil.

The reasons for this reticence are obvious. The subject is delicate. It is, therefore, difficult. There is danger lest we teach the vice in condemning it, and suggest it in the very endeavor to make it infamous. But the difficulty is no excuse for the silence. Whatever the intention, a conspiracy of silence is usually a conspiracy of sin. A murmured hush-a-by is right in a nursery and wrong in a circle of crime. Many things are difficult from which we are nevertheless not excused. In war it is difficult to defeat the enemy; yet the attempt must be made, or the campaign must be abandoned. In social life some duty is difficult;

ought it to be dodged? A sin so common, so monstrous, and so continuously thundered against in the Bible, as the social evil is, must not be permitted to skulk off and sneak out of sight because it is difficult of treatment. It was not pleasant for the angels to denounce the judgment of God against Sodom, yet they did not hesitate. It was not easy for the three Hebrew worthies to enter the fiery furnace of Nebuchadnezzar, but they did not refuse. It was not congenial to St. Paul to reprove the Corinthian Church — organized by himself — for drunkenness and wantonness; nevertheless he delivered the rebuke. That ancient prophet who once tried to run away from a difficult task was not so successful as to encourage imitation. Jonah brought up in a more unpleasant situation than the one he sought to avoid could possibly have been. He turned the stomach of the whale, which threw him up; and after all he had to go to Nineveh. How much better had he gone by some other route than by the way of the whale's belly.

The essence of the social evil is that it transgresses the Seventh Commandment — "Thou shalt not commit adultery." This is a mandate based alike on physical and moral considerations. It is intended to conserve the individual and society. It carries with it the common consent of nations and ages.

For impurity is a kind of sacrilege. It converts

that which is sacred to a profane use. What says St. Paul? "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost?" Now, if it was sacrilegious to turn the temple on Mount Zion, which was composed of wood and stone, to inferior and secular uses; if our Savior's anger burned hot within Him, and found significant outward expression when He saw the sanctuary turned into a market, and the house of God made a den of thieves; how much more heinous is it to transform a living temple of the eternal God, even the body, into a house of prostitution. And the apostle deems this sacrilege so great an aggravation of the sinfulness of impurity that he says again: "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy: for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are."

In the Jewish temple whose sanctity Jesus vindicated by scourging forth those who desecrated it, there were certain secular uses which were constantly carried on without sacrilege; such as the preparation and consumption of food by those in charge of it, the slaughter of cattle for the sacrifices, and the general household conduct of the priests. In like manner there are certain uses of our appetites and passions which are innocent and permissible. When the bodily propensities are engaged in a legal partnership, at a proper time, and for ordained ends, their activity is legitimate.

In this case the temple of the body is not defiled. It is impurity — that is, a wrong use, in a forbidden partnership, for wicked ends, at stolen hours — that is sacrilegious. Here is a plain distinction which all should mark and may observe.

Impurity does not stop at sacrilege ; it involves the moral murder of two souls in one act. “ Other sinners,” observes old Dr. Watts, “ can perish singly. The swearer damns none by his oath save himself, and although he may curse others to the bottomless pit, yet shall he descend thither alone. The drunkard drowns but his own soul in perdition. Even the murderer kills the body of his victim only. And so, though their wickedness may prompt them to draw in associates — for all sin is social and loves company — yet all other sinners may be solitarily wicked and perish by themselves. But this sin necessarily requires partnership in guilt, and involves another in the same condemnation.” Physiologists tell us that printed on the retina of a murdered man’s eye is the image of the murderer on whom he last looked in life. How dreadful to be shut up through a conscious eternity in the company of those whom we have brought down to spiritual death, and who, pointing at us a skeleton forefinger, taunt us with “ the deep damnation of their taking off ” !

The consequences of this transgression are frightful. There is no other offense so debasing.

When purity is gone, manhood is gone, womanhood is gone. The image of God is turned into a human animal. The spirit, the rightful master of the body, is degraded to be a hewer of wood and drawer of water to the scavengers, who come up out of the sewers of the physical nature, to strut as lords over a heritage of woe. The eyes are now furtive, the old honest look is lost. What was a man or woman is now a sneak. The days are full of fears, the nights of jealousies. The hours burn with affront and palpitate with terror of discovery.

Moreover, the social evil entails the worst physical results. Look around. Observe the sharp contrasts. There goes a man of the noblest development — fine cut features, frank and open look, imperial dome of thought ; —

“ A combination, and a form, indeed,
Where every god did seem to set his seal,
To give the world assurance of a man.”

But who is this following in his track, under the same sky, surrounded by the same institutions? See the pinched features, the stunted form, the villainous countenance. “ Look here, upon this picture, and on this.” Behold uncleanness worked out, and bearing the visible stamp of violated physical law and moral neglect. Habitual impurity steeps the very senses it seeks to gratify in unresponsive apathy, and soaks the

body in the slump of disease. The hospitals are fetid with such wrecks, to whom death would be welcome—were it not the gate to hell.

Closely connected with the social evil, and a prolific feeder of it, is the maintenance by society of a double standard of morality for the two sexes. Tradition and custom encourage men to do what women are ostracized for doing. Prostitute is defined in the dictionaries as a noun of the feminine gender—proof of this looseness. For a male prostitute is as common and as bad as a female, and has less excuse. Women themselves, misled by ages of training in subjection, condone in men what they condemn in one another. They marry libertines who would themselves refuse to wed women guilty of acts which they habitually commit. And that mysterious human omnipotence called “society” simpers, coughs under its handkerchief, and says, “Men will be men, and must sow wild oats.” When a woman sins in the same way, she is cursed and stoned by both sexes.

“When I said to women in France and Italy,” remarks Miss Frances E. Willard, “that I was confident a large majority of the men in my own social circle in America were as chaste as women, the statement was invariably received with shouts of laughter, and some such pitying comment as *L’Américaine* has clearly spent her life with

books ; she does not know the world.' ” Montaigne said that there were no virtuous men in France in his day. Women are skeptical regarding male virtue in any day or country. They accept the absence of it as a matter of course, while holding themselves, and permitting men to hold them, to stern accountability.

Not only are men known to be lewd welcomed in decent social circles,—in Europe the social evil is licensed, and a stated medical examination of the women engaged in the traffic is made, so that the male partner in a dual sin may be protected from nature's penalty, and the female partner be left to bear it all. Thus does society make it easy and safe for man to sin, and shift the crushing burden on the shoulders of the weaker sex. How chivalric man-made laws are ! Attempts have been made again and again to introduce this custom into America, with only partial success as yet. There is still too much of the Puritan spirit in the country to tolerate such a gigantic defiance of God and such a degradation of womanhood. It was this feature of the social evil which first attracted the attention of Miss Willard to the whole subject, and led her, like a new Peter the Hermit, to preach a crusade which is overcoming the silence and reserve of centuries, and stirring Christendom to loftier thinking and more becoming conduct. “ In the year 1869,” she says,

“ while studying in Paris, I used often to see passing along the streets great closed wagons, covered with black. When I inquired of my landlady the explanation of these somber vehicles, she answered sorrowfully, ‘ It is the demi-monde, who go to be examined.’ I then learned for the first time that in Paris fallen women have a legal ‘ permit ’ to carry on what is recognized as a business, but must remain secluded in their houses at certain hours, must avoid certain streets, and must go once a week, under police escort, to the dispensary for examination and certificate that they are free from contagious disease. Always, after that, those awful wagons seemed to me to form the most heart-breaking funeral procession that ever Christian women watched with tear-dimmed eyes. If I were asked why there has come about such a revolution in public thought that I have gained courage to speak of things once unlawful to be told, my answer is, ‘ Because law-makers tried to import the black wagon of Paris to England and America, and Anglo-Saxon women rose in rebellion.’ ”

The existence of the double standard is further evidenced by outrageous statutes — which might properly be entitled laws for making seduction safe and easy for men — prescribing the age at which a girl may, in case of seduction, be held to have consented to her ruin. And what is this age of con-

sent? Surely it is fixed at such a point in the girl's life as shall insure the maturity of her judgment and the certainty of her knowledge of the consequences? In some States of this Union the age of consent is fixed at 10 and 12 years — an age, in either case, when a girl is a mere child, without experience, and hardly with a knowledge of good and evil. She can not inherit or dispose of property until she comes of age; but at 10 or 12 she may consent to the ruin of her body and her soul for time and for eternity! Nay, in case of her seduction, the law presupposes her consent; makes it impossible for her to prove the contrary by holding that a child's testimony shall not be put in evidence unless she understands the "nature of an oath." By this ingenious contrivance the ravisher, whatever *his* age, goes scot free; because if his victim is under 10 or 12 she seldom understands the nature of an oath. Can anything more diabolical than this be imagined? We borrowed these laws from England. The French code puts the age of consent at 15 — better than 10 or 12, but absurdly low. In his "Moral History of Women," Legouvé remarks:

"If we should be told that there exists a land where chastity is set at so high a price among women that it is called their *honor*; if we should be told that the loss of this honor brands not only

the guilty one but her family, and that daughters have been put to death by their fathers for this fault alone; if it should be added that this error, when the woman is married, will bring her before the courts; if she is a servant, will cause her to be expelled from her place; if an operative, will often expel her from the workshop; if she is rich, will consign her to celibacy — for the man who should dare to marry her would be accused in his turn of selling himself; if we should be told, besides, that in this country women are considered so frivolous in mind and so feeble in character that they remain minors during the whole period of their marriage; if we should be informed that among these people the young men have but one aim — to rob women of their treasure; that all, poor and rich, handsome and plain, plebeian or patrician, urged some by sensuality, some by *ennui*, others by vanity, throw themselves into this pursuit like bloodhounds on a trail; that, in short, by a singular contrast, the same people who load women with curses when they yield, elevate to a sort of heraldic distinction those who induce them to yield, and honor their success with a title reserved for the most glorious actions — the title of *conquest*; truly, if such a picture were presented to us, and we were asked to pronounce upon the character of the laws of that country, we would say: The law-maker should have but one thought

—to protect the women against the men and against themselves; seeing on one side so much weakness, so much exposure, so much expiatory suffering, on the other so much power and impunity; he should throw himself between the seducer and his victim; armed for those who are unarmed, he should energetically reestablish the rights of justice and chastity; every yielding maiden should be punished, but every seducer should be doubly punished, for he did the evil or caused it to be done. Such is the language that every honest man would put in the mouth of the law-maker. And here, on the other hand, is what the French code says: 'The maiden from the age of fifteen is alone responsible for her honor—seduction shall not be punished—promise of marriage made with a view to seduction is void—illegitimate children must be reared at the expense of the mother.' Such abandonment of public decency is not to be found among another civilized people, not even among barbarians."

Legouvé's natural indignation hurries him into inaccuracy. The same abandonment of decency was found in England, until recently, and is found to-day in the United States.

Suppose a girl has just past her tenth or twelfth birthday. She is now competent to consent to her dishonor. Against all legal usage, she is not presumed to be innocent until proved guilty; the

burden of proof is laid on her ; she must show to the satisfaction of a jury of men that she resisted to the utmost; otherwise the seducer, however he may have accomplished the seduction, whether by threats, or gifts, or cajolery, or affection, or authority — escapes unwhipped of justice. While girlish purity is thus made legal game for wily *Lotharios* of every age, a boy is excluded from prosecution for this crime under the age of fourteen — the common-law age of puberty, but by no means the invariable law of nature. The legislature of Ohio, some years ago, raised the age of protection for boys to seventeen years, and in the same statute fixed the age of consent for girls at ten years!

Such inconsistency, such partiality, such discrimination against the more exposed and more suffering victim, and in favor of the less exposed but guiltier betrayer, is to be expected under a double standard of morals. But this is hateful to God. Religion knows no dual code. Judaism prescribes a single standard in the decalogue. The law of Moses presupposed violence on the part of the ravisher and resistance on the part of his victim — “The maiden hath cried and hath not been heard.” Christianity has adopted the Seventh Commandment. Jesus, going further, condemns the adultery of the eye and desire: “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, thou

shalt not commit adultery ; but I say unto you that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." The canon law defined defilement, even without violence—*volente virgine*—by the name of *stuprum*, and the *stuprator* was condemned either to marry the girl so corrupted by him, or to bestow a dowry upon her, according to the decision of her father. In default of fulfilling one or other of these two conditions, he was beaten with rods, excommunicated, and imprisoned in a monastery, there to perform perpetual penance.

Outside of religion the old laws erected ramparts to safeguard the fresh youth of the maiden and the purity of the wife.

The Jewish law condemned the adulterer to death. Abimelech to the men of Gerah made it death to meddle with the wife of Isaac. Among the Egyptians this offense might never be condoned, and was punished by a fearful mutilation of the male offender. The Greeks and Romans, in their best days, equally abhorred and banned this vice. Among the ancient Germans the price of an outrage committed on a virgin was two-fifths more than that for a warrior. Every free man who touched the hand of a free woman was fined 600 deniers—a small Roman coin ; he who touched her arm, 1,200 ; he who touched her

bosom, 1,800 ; merely to dishevel her hair entailed a considerable penalty. They held a woman's person to be sacred — as indeed it is, since it is a fountain of affection and life. The ancient Franks in like manner called down terrible penalties upon abduction and rape. Old Saxon laws punished seduction with death, until William the Conqueror mitigated the penalty to emasculation and the loss of the eyes. Several centuries later ravishment was made a felony, the penal consequences of which were death and forfeiture of lands and goods. Thus religion, Jewish and Christian, canon laws and civil laws, Greeks, Romans, Germans, Franks — all agreed in protecting the purity for which women are held to such strict account, the loss of which is the ruin of families and of the State itself ; and they agreed, too, in the wish and effort to root out so dishonest and shameful a crime as the exposure of the victim and the shielding of the seducer, from under heaven.

The double standard, then, is a modern device — and *vice*, without the prefix. Out with it from among men ! Away with it into the limbo of other discarded villainies !

Some years ago, Miss Ellice Hopkins, the daughter of a former president of the British Scientific Association, and a cultured member of the English Church, had her attention turned,

through Christian work in London, to the exposure of young girls under the existing laws fixing the age of consent. In association with others, she caused the criminal reform bill, which raised the age of consent to sixteen years, to be introduced in the House of Commons. For years it lay there pigeon-holed or buried in the tomb of some committee. This brave lady, by a happy inspiration, enlisted in the cause that fearless editor, Wm. T. Stead—whose name should be lengthened to Steadfast. One morning the first of those earthquake disclosures, which shook London and the world, appeared under the startling caption "The Maiden Tribute to Modern Babylon, in the *Pall Mall Gazette*. Instalment succeeded instalment, uncapping hell. The public learned with amazement, and horror, that English law put a premium on libertinism; that female virtue was an article of actual traffic; and that the most elegant saunterers in aristocratic London clubs were the traffickers. As a consequence of these exposures, the criminal reform bill was passed triumphantly. Under the impetus of this success, the White Cross Army, a male organization founded by Miss Hopkins, in England, and practically pledged to war against the double standard, and replace it by the single standard of Christ—invaded this country. At the same time Miss Willard organized the White

Ribbon department of the Women's Christian Temperance Union for the special protection of female virtue. While much remains undone, much has also been done in recent years, through these and kindred bodies. In many States the age of consent has been raised. Laws bettering the general condition of women have been passed—a hopeful beginning has been made. Certain it is that the double standard of morals is doomed.

Any discussion of the social evil necessitates at least a reference to the proper treatment of Magdalens. With the abrogation of the double standard of morals, a more considerate spirit towards these unfortunates will prevail. The words of the Master when they "told him of the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices," apply here: "Suppose ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans because they suffered such things? I tell you, nay; but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Like any other sinners, abandoned women may be saved on the common terms of penitence and faith. They have been drawn away from virtue, many of them, by a false love; a true love must draw them back to it. Let those erring sisters remember Mary Magdalene, and hope. In Milton's "Mask of Comus" there is inspiration in the beautiful words with which the attendant

spirit closes the poem, while poised for upward flight :

“ Mortals, that would follow me,
Love virtue ; she alone is free ;
She can teach ye how to climb
Higher than the sphery chime ;
Or, if virtue feeble were,
Heaven itself would stoop to her.”

But, after all, prevention is better than cure. Sociologists are more concerned to stop the social evil at its sources than to save a few victims here and there. “ From what sources are the ranks of female profligacy recruited ? ” asks Wendell Phillips. We commend his answer to the careful attention of our readers : “ A few mere giddiness hurries to ruin. Their protection would be in that character and sound common-sense which a wider interest in practical life would generally create. In a few, the love of sensual gratification, grown over-strong, because all the other powers are dormant for want of exercise, wrecks its unhappy victim. The medicine for these would be occupation, awaking intellect, and stirring their higher energies. Give everyone an earnest interest in life, something to do, something that kindles emulation, and soon the gratification of the senses sinks into proper subordination. It is idle hands that are tempted to mischief ; and she is emphatically idle half of whose nature is unem-

ployed. Why does man so much oftener than woman surmount a few years of sensual gratification, and emerge into a worthier life? It is not solely because the world's judgment is so much harder upon her. Man can immerse himself in business that stirs keenly all his faculties, and thus smother passion in honorable cares. An ordinary woman, once fallen, has no busy and stirring life in which to take refuge, where intellect will contend for mastery with passion, and where virtue is braced by high and active thoughts. Passion comes back to the 'empty,' though 'swept and garnished' chambers, bringing with it more devils than before. But, undoubtedly, the great temptation to this vice is the love of dress, of wealth, and the luxuries it secures. There are many women, earning two or three dollars a week, who feel that they are as capable as their brothers of earning hundreds, if they could be permitted to exert themselves as freely. Fretting to see the coveted rewards of life forever forbidden to them, they are tempted to shut their eyes to the character of the means by which a taste, however short, may be gained of the wealth and luxury they sigh for. Open to a man a fair field for his industry and secure to him its gains, and nine hundred and ninety-nine men out of every thousand will disdain to steal. Open to woman a fair field for her industry, let her do

anything her hands find to do, and enjoy her gains, and nine hundred and ninety-nine women out of every thousand will disdain to debase themselves for dress and ease." Are we not led by such thoughts to applaud the larger life of women in our day, and to hope from its ever-widening scope to reap a harvest of virtue in the near future?

Amid these moral reflections, however, we must not lose sight of the political danger-signals that are hung out by the social evil. As the saloon and the brothel are next door neighbors on the street, so are they in the caucus. As the law frowns upon both, they are alike interested in tampering with the law. As the police are the normal agents of the law, they are concerned in a common corruption of the police. Finding a dirty bonanza in these twin filth heaps, law-makers and police are, in their turn, ready to be tempted and to give immunity for so much cash in hand. It was in this way in New York, before the late reform, that Tammany Hall "worked" the saloon and the brothel for political revenue. The social evil in that city was actually built up abnormally by the very authorities paid to suppress it. Dr. Parkhurst in describing the fight with Tammany, observes that "the social evil was so protected and encouraged by the filthy officials who controlled the police department, that the number of

abandoned women and disorderly houses in New York was no measure of what it would be with a police force, from top down, which conceived of sexual crime as an evil to be suppressed, not as a capital to draw dividends from." "

In like manner, an eminent writer, in speaking of Chicago before the recent partial — too partial — civic purification, says: "With almost universal agreement, the foreigners who came back from the Fair, declared Chicago to be as irreligious as Paris, as licentious as Vienna, as much engaged in gambling as Monte Carlo, and more drunken and lax in the administration of its statutes than any city in Europe."

Charles Bonaparte, in an article in *The Forum* on "Political Corruption in Maryland," tells of a young lawyer in Baltimore who aspired to be a school commissioner, and who was told by the politicians that he could not have the nomination, as "the bawdy-house interest demanded recognition on the school board."

With the saloon "recognized" in the city council and on the police, and the brothel deciding what our children shall study through its representative on the school board; with the one nullifying law, and the other expurgating the Seventh Commandment, we are curious to know where and how the gambler figures in the comic-tragedy. But we reserve him for another chapter.

VI.

GAMBLING.

THE liquor seller and the prostitute, whether male or female, are two persons of a diabolical trinity, of which the third person is the gambler. To describe him one needs the pen of Dickens ; to paint his arts, the pencil of Hogarth ; to flay his vice, the satire of Pope ; to write his epitaph, the judgment of Solomon, who says—“The memory of the wicked shall rot.”

The British equivalent for our gamble is game, and our gambler is their gamester. The words are derived from the same Saxon root, and have the same meaning.

A history of gambling would be a history of human depravity. That is to say, gambling is a universal vice. The savage and the civilized, the illiterate and the learned, the poor and the rich, the male and the female, are alike susceptible to its guilty thrill, and captivated by its illusive promise to give wealth without work. A gambler will gamble with anything, but his favorite implements are dice, cards, and horses. Dice are as old as civilization. Two cubes, supposed to be Etruscan dice, but marked with words instead of pips, have given ground for the theory that the

Etruscan was a Turanian language, the words being assumed to be numerals—the only useful service ever known to have been rendered by dice. Dicers, in the act of throwing dice, are pictured upon the most ancient monuments of Egypt. The Greeks gave the names of their gods to the different throws—a kind of pantomimic profanity. Dicing was popular in ancient Rome, and now-a-days the dice-box rattles around the globe.

Cards came from Asia, and were originally used only for fortune-telling. The Saracens brought them into Spain and Italy, whence they soon spread through Europe. At first, cards were used as a pastime in fashionable circles, where the art of conversation had been lost, or never acquired, and where a panacea against *ennui* was eagerly welcomed.

Pope, in one of his "Moral Essays," pictures the faded dowagers of his day as thus employed :

“ See how the world its veterans reward !
 A youth of frolics, an old age of cards ;
 Fair to no purpose, artful to no end,
 Young without lovers, old without a friend ;
 A fop their passion, but their prize a sot ;
 In life, ridiculous, and dead, forgot.”

Later, cards were seized by blacklegs, in and out of society, and identified with the worst phases of sporting life.

As for horses, from time immemorial they have

been used and abused for betting purposes; and all betting is gambling.

As drinking and harlotry have houses devoted exclusively to them, so also has gambling, although frequently all three are domesticated under the same roof. From the middle ages down to Louis Napoleon, such places existed in France, and were patronized alike by court and people. In 1775 gambling was licensed in Paris—that capital of pleasure, whose unhappy destiny it seems to be to set the pace of wickedness. The great French Chief of Police, Fouché, received \$640,000 from this source — a thrift successfully imitated by police officials since on both sides of the Atlantic.

Famous gambling houses used to exist in Germany, at Baden, Homburg, Wiesbaden, Aix-la-Chapelle, and at Spa, in Belgium. These towns combined every attraction of nature and art. To the mineral springs, which first made them places of resort, were added gardens, walks, drives, public music, reading-rooms, balls; the climax of attraction being the palace of fortune, nightly crowded with gamblers of both sexes and every degree, and kindled like Milton's Pandemonium,

— “ with many a row
Of starry lamps and blazing cresets, fed
With naphtha and asphaltus, yielding light
As from a sky.”

A consensus of opinion exists among moralists and legislators regarding the abhorrent character of this vice. The first denounce it, and the others prohibit it. One after the other, the great luminaries in the pandemonium sky have been forced to quench their baleful fires. In Paris gambling is now illegal and secret. Throughout Europe it is under the ban. Monaco is the only gambling hell now open there. In America it is equally tabooed by law. Our great cities have recently closed every public door — may they remain shut!

What is gambling? It may be defined as the staking of anything of value upon mere hazard. It differs from business in this, that business rests upon a fair exchange — gives value for value received. The merchant sells his merchandise, the laborer sells his labor, the physician sells his medical services, the attorney sells his knowledge of the law, the farmer sells his produce, the mechanic sells his skill—each for so much money; and in each case there is an exchange. Gambling returns no honest equivalent. It exacts value, and gives back nothing but a chance; a chance attenuated into invisibility by the dishonesty of the gambler. Gamester and cheat have been synonymous terms in the English language since the time of Ben Jonson and Shakespeare.

Under this definition of gambling, we are bound to condemn the wide-spread habit of betting, the

mania for speculation which infests the country, and, above all, certain transactions of the stock exchange. There is a legitimate business of the brokers' board, and there are honest brokers. But the organized conspiracies to corner the necessities of life, and to swindle and plunder outside investors, which exist side by side with those legitimate transactions, and under the eyes, though without the connivance, of honest brokers — are fitted to stir righteous indignation. "It is not one of the least perplexing anomalies of modern life and manners," affirms Edward Everett, "that, while avowed and thus far honest gambling — if the words may be connected — is driven by public opinion and the law to seclude itself from observation within carefully tiled doors, there to fool away its hundreds, perhaps its thousands, in secret—discredited, infamous, blasted by the anathemas of deserted, heart-broken wives and beggared children, subject at all times to the fell swoop of the police—the licensed gambling of the brokers' board is carried on in the face of day; its pretended sales of what it does not own, its pretended purchases of what it does not propose to pay for or handle, are chronicled in the public prints to the extent of millions in the course of the season, for the cruel and dishonest purpose of frightening innocent third parties into the ruinous sacrifice of *bona fide* property, and thus making a

guilty profit out of the public distress and the ruin of thousands."

The main source of this vice is a depraved craving for excitement. "The body," observes Henry Ward Beecher, in the famous discourse on "Gamblers and Gambling," in his "Lectures to Young Men," "is not stored with a fixed amount of strength, nor the mind with a uniform measure of excitement; but both are capable by stimulation of expansion of strength or feeling almost without limit. Experience shows that, within certain bounds, excitement is healthy and necessary, but beyond this limit exhausting and destructive. Men are allowed to choose between moderate but long-continued excitement, and intense and short-lived excitement. Too generally they prefer the latter. Gambling is founded upon the worst perversion of this powerful element in human nature. It heats every part of the mind like an oven. The faculties which produce calculation, pride of skill, of superiority, love of gain, hope, fear, jealousy, hatred, are absorbed in the game, and exhilarated or exacerbated by victory or defeat. These passions are doubtless excited in men by the daily occurrences of life; but then they are transient, and counteracted by a thousand grades of emotion, which rise and fall like the undulations of the sea. But in gambling there is no intermission, no counteraction. The

whole mind is excited to the utmost, and concentrated at its extreme point of excitation for hours and days, with the additional waste of sleepless nights, profuse drinking, and other congenial immoralities. Every other pursuit becomes tasteless; for no ordinary duty has in it a stimulus that can scorch a mind which now refuses to burn without blazing, or to feel an interest which is not intoxication."

These considerations explain the inveteracy of this vice. Few gamblers ever cease gambling. Its victims have been among the otherwise mighty of the earth. Henry IV., of France, was one; the courtly Knight Duguesclin was another; Cardinal Mazarin was a third. The English statesmen of the reign of Queen Anne, and under the four Georges, were deep players. And some of the earlier lights in American history are likewise stained. The Chinese play night and day, till they have lost everything — then hang themselves. The Siamese sell their possessions, their families, themselves, to satisfy this craving. Among the Malays a gambler, after losing everything, loosens a certain lock of hair, which indicates his desperation and purpose to slay all whom he may meet, and thus "runs amuck," as it is called, and may be lawfully slain in turn. The ancients were not less addicted to gambling. In the decline of the Empire, a wealthy Roman would fre-

quently stake his whole fortune on a single throw of the dice. D'Israeli, in his "Curiosities of Literature," recites the story of a French physician, who wrote the oldest treatise against gambling among the moderns, in order to convince himself of its folly, yet who, despite his solemn vows and prayers, and quotations from his own book, thrown at him by his friends, remained a gambler to his last hour. Few gamblers have the sense of old Montaigne, who says he stopped because when he lost, whatever good countenance he put on it, he felt anger and malice burning none the less fiercely in his heart.

Obviously, a mania like this must be a menace to society. Every gambling-hell is a college of deceit. Cheating is reduced to a science. Honest industry becomes disgusting. Dishonest in itself, it is the inevitable cause of dishonesty in those who practice it. The prisons are full of criminals who graduated into these institutions from the card-table and the race-track. Nay, it is an axiom that a decline in private decency and public honesty is in exact ratio to the prevalence of gambling. Hardly a home which has not been shadowed by it.

Nor are its political aspects less somber and threatening. For is not a practice which destroys individual character and public honor a menace? As has been said, the gambler is invariably in

league with the saloon-keeper and the harlot, has the same interests, the same exposures, the same bad influence. It is his "pull" which saves him from being "pulled."

This alliance of the vices must be kept in view by the friends of law and order ; and repressive measures must close upon them all and equally, as the fingers do upon the hand.

VII.

THE DEVIL IN INK.

As art, science, politics, and poetry have their literary propaganda, so also have the vices, which seek their justification and demand their glorification in a lying philosophy and a corrupt and corrupting literature. Thus we have the devil in ink. 'Tis one of the most curious, perplexing, difficult of compound facts, this inter-play and close alliance betwixt the evil forces in modern society, so that each strengthens all, and all each, with a literary annex both for defense and aggression.

In the fourteenth century an experimenting monk in a corner of Europe—at Freiburg, in 1330—put niter, charcoal, and sulphur together. The result was gunpowder, which revolutionized warfare. A century later—at Strasburg, in 1450—John Gutenberg carved movable types out of blocks of wood. Civilization came into possession of its mightiest secular agent, printing. Well do the statues erected in honor of the immortal inventor at Strasburg and at Mentz represent him as leaning on his press, whence streams forth the light. Thenceforth literature was popularized,

and learning, in the phrase of Lord Bacon, "lights her torch at every man's candle."

Ours is preeminently the age of the omnipotence of printers' ink. Satan has been quick to recognize and act upon this fact. He has immersed himself in the ink bottle. On a certain occasion Luther is said to have flung a bottle of ink at the devil. Taking the hint, the devil has been busy ever since in flinging ink. He has be-deviled the fluid until millions of pages reek with damnation.

Unfold the average newspaper. In many ways it is a miraculous achievement. Its telegraphic nerves stretch over the land and under the sea to click the news of the world into its pages. And what stouter exponent of civilization is there in all the arena? Duguesclin, or the Black Prince, did no mightier deeds of valor. Sad, that this knight-errant of to-day should demean its sword in the championship of vice in any form. The paper is white, but the print is black in more senses than one. Notice the disproportionately large space allotted to reports of murders, arsons, burglaries, divorces, assaults, prize-fights, even bull-fights, telegraphed all the way from Spain or Mexico, until horrors pass before the reader as the ghosts trooped in the midnight vision of Richard III. on the eve of the battle of Bosworth. The sheet reads like a daily bulletin of the pit.

Our friends in the editorial sanctum tell us this is "news." Suppose it is, why print it? Who is made the better or the wiser by it? Does not the spreading of these nauseous details over columns and columns, day after day, demoralize the public? What imaginable importance is attached to squabbles in saloons, the deeds of profligates, or the opinions of criminals? If mentioned at all, why not merely mention these occurrences? Why those startling headlines and sensational paragraphs? Is not vice taught in this way, while it is seemingly condemned? Wickedness is infectious. The recital of it always impels imitators to go and do likewise. If it be a study in morbid anatomy, better relegate it to the physicians.

The tone of newspaper treatment of these themes is objectionable. A depraved custom prevails which leads reporters to attend trials and paint pre-Raphaelite pictures, in which minute incidents, the pose, gestures, tones of those arraigned, are emphasized, while family skeletons are ruthlessly dragged out of close-locked closets and galvanized into hideous movement to amuse a morbid public taste. Occurrences grim and grewsome are turned into ridicule; as in England poets used to address jocular lines to highwaymen on the way to Tyburn to be hung, and advise them to mount the cart cheerfully and "kick the bucket" with grace; and as in this country reporters re-

peat the sayings of "lewd fellows of the baser sort" with gusto, and treat their doings as a good joke.

Consider what it is that is thus made a stuffing for newspapers and coined into an income by penny-a-liners—the disgrace and despair of honest relatives of malefactors, the wreck of character, the death of hope. For crime is a cannibal which eats up all the youth and inexperience it can lay hold of, and gormandizes upon its own sons and daughters. The spot where manhood dies, where womanhood is lost, is too black for crape and too sad for cypress—the saddest spectacle the pitying eye of heaven looks down upon. Did Christian sentiments prevail among us, the courts would be peopled with soul-savers, as dangerous coasts are with body-savers, and the shipwreck of character would be a signal to "throw out the life-line." Criminals should be punished; the safety of society demands it. But crime is not a joke; it is a horror of common concern, and all should combine to deal out to it a treatment at once punitive and remedial.

If we turn from the sanctum to the book-store, we go from bad to worse. What the journals do incidentally, and as a matter of news, certain meretricious publications do purposely. They exist for the propagation of immorality. On every news-stand periodicals stare decency out of coun-

tenance with pictures as nearly nude and as suggestive in posture as a careful study of the statutes in such case made and provided, leads the publisher to consider on the safe side of the danger line. The city of Pittsburg, in Pennsylvania, not long ago tabooed these sheets, and they have vanished. Why not make every town a Pittsburg in this respect? Anthony Comstock has chased transparent cards, and similar implements of corruption, out of the open market, yet they continue to circulate *sub rosa*, and even penetrate into decorous schools to poison youth of both sexes, who by handling these wares of sin become rotten before they are ripe.

How many trashy and flashy novels there are, *décolleté* novels, whose self-evident design is to make vice attractive. In these the appeal is to the lowest elements — to the devil and not to the angel in human nature. Often the story is breathlessly told, and the style, suggesting rather than disclosing sin, completes the diabolical enchantment. A gentleman in India was once reading in his library when he felt a sharp prick at the end of his finger. Glancing down he saw an infinitesimal snake between the leaves. Shaking it to the floor, he watched it squirm out of sight. Presently his finger began to swell, then his arm. In an hour he was dead. Beware of books read on the sly, locked away out of view, passed from hand to

hand under the handkerchief. There is a serpent hidden in the pages whose sting is death. Rénan, uttering the thought of the whole French infidel school, has said that "nature cares nothing for chastity." In reply, Matthew Arnold affirms that however it may be with nature, human nature does care for chastity, and that the worship of the goddess Lubricity is against human nature. "For this," he adds, "is the test of its being against human nature, that for human societies it is ruin."

It has been well said that impurity is not the only vice, but, more than any other, it stunts and disorganizes what is high and harmonious in man, robs the mind of noble thoughts, the heart of sweet love, leads to hardness and insolence, dishonesty and brutality — feeds the beast and starves the soul. Poor Burns — who knew — confirms this :

" But och! it hardens a' within,
And petrifies the feeling."

Whoever will watch the bill-boards in our cities, reeking with vulgarity and obscenity, the proceedings in divorce courts, the dramas produced in the theaters, the advertisements in widely-circulated newspapers, the books drawn out of the libraries, and the street scenes at night, will be persuaded that the sense of chastity is dying or dead among the American people.

Defenders of bad books are not lacking. A young Italian scholar, Guglielmo Ferrero, has recently published an ingenious argument, which may be thus summarized : In our neurotic, overstrained society a large number of persons are subject to abnormal, morbid tendencies, which under favorable circumstances may develop into positive wickedness. Abnormal, morbid books of the Ibsen, Zola, Tolstoi, Du Maurier type quiet these latent tendencies by creating a literary satisfaction. Ferrero continues : " I do not deny that, regarded from an unconditional point of view, such books can call forth evil results, particularly on excitable and susceptible minds ; but whatever effect a book of this sort may produce in an impressionable brain, it will always be less than if the reader had come in personal contact with the warped mental condition from which the book sprang. Hence the book is the best defense against the dangerous physical epidemics, which, not yet existing as a derivative of literature while the ages were crude and ignorant, were a powerful cause of social disturbance. Like the anti-toxine injected to protect the sick from the bacillus which produces the anti-toxine, it is transformed into a remedy against the contagion that proceeds from it."

Max Nordau, whose remarkable work " Degeneration " aroused the country, answered Ferrero

in the July number, 1895, of *The Forum*. To recommend degenerate books to neurotic or hysterical readers — and he believes that every human mind contains every species of aberration and delirium in the germ — Nordau declares, is not to vaccinate but to inoculate them. He says: “ Could I but relate the moral devastations traceable to the reading of Nietzsche and Ibsen which I have seen in actual life ! It is the selfsame influence which, in the last century, was produced by Goethe’s ‘ Werther.’ For it is a well-known fact that as a result of reading this romance numerous young fools put bullets through their heads. Those who considered the book responsible for the suicidal epidemic were answered : ‘ The case of those young men is hardly worthy of commiseration, since they destroyed themselves after reading ‘ Werther.’ They were irresponsible and useless. Their case was hopeless long before the first word of ‘ Werther ’ was written.’ That may be. Certainly no well-balanced man would shoot himself as the consequence of reading ‘ Werther.’ It is, however, equally certain that many an exalted fool, many a young neurotic, did destroy himself in a state of momentary depression, as an act suggested by ‘ Werther,’ who otherwise might very possibly have continued in long years of wholesome usefulness, if that book had not come into his hands.”

He adds this further illustration: "Take a hysterical woman controlled by her lower nature, experiencing not without pain the constraints of duty; those whom she esteems and trusts have taught her the creed of modesty and resistance to temptation, lest, yielding to impulse, she lose sobriety and her own esteem. She now makes the acquaintance of a dramatist and novelist, who demonstrates that as a girl a woman has the privilege to yield to her erotic impulses, and when married to break her vows, presupposing she feel the inclination and pleasure; and that such behavior under these inclinations portrays a strong and interesting character; while, on the other hand, she shows herself stupid, unprogressive, and slavish if she denies herself all this. With what joy will she not profess herself a disciple of this charming moralist!"

In a thoughtful editorial on this controversy between Ferrero and Nordau, the *Chicago Tribune*, August 4th, 1895, remarks: "Nordau is waging a glorious battle and he deserves reinforcement. He has arrayed against him the solid ranks of degenerates, lunatics, and madmen, of morbid men and hysterical women, of fashionable faddists, of yellow books and green books, of Bradleys and Beardsleys, with their hideous distortions, of Manets and Monets, with their yellow women and green men, of maudlin, fash-

ionable young women, of Ibsenites and Tolstoiites. of notoriety seekers, of symbolism and mysticism. of neurotic and erotic creatures in a state of exaltation which finds its gratification in the works of the degenerates in literature, music, and art. It is a long, hard battle he has to fight, but he will win in the end. Degeneracy does not, as Ferrero claims, inject an antitoxine into the reader's mind. On the contrary, as Nordau insists, it poisons and ruins it. The proof lies in the fact that immorality was never so rampant and crime so abundant as they are to-day."

Here, then, is testimony both from a scientific specialist and a layman of the press, confirmatory of the position of the moralist. Nay, Jesus himself anticipated this conclusion more than eighteen hundred years ago, in these memorable words: "Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth corrupt fruit. A good tree can not bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

Why read unwholesome literature when there is so much within easy reach which is wholesome? Read history, which, according to Lord Bacon, makes men wise. Read biography; there

is a moral tone in it. Horace Greeley said that Franklin's autobiography first fired his ambition to be and do something. Franklin himself asserts that two books in the slender library of his father, viz., Defoe's "Essay on Projects," and Dr. Mather's "Essay to do Good," gave him a turn of thinking which had an influence on some of the principal future events of his life. Read the standard novels—Scott, Dickens, Thackeray, Charlotte Brontë, George Eliot. "A good book," said Milton, "is the precious life-blood of a master spirit embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."

Christian citizens should combine to say to the unclean devil in the ink—"Come out!" Deprived of their literature, the vices would "dwindle, peek and pine." Letters would become an inspiration. The myriad leaves, like the leaves of the tree of life, would be for the healing of the nation.

VIII.

THE AMERICAN SUNDAY.

THE allied abuses which have now been described as encamped in the arena where Christian citizens are called upon to combat them, with their literary annex, are always reconnoitering, with a view to discover the surest point of attack. They find in the American Sunday the Gibraltar of law and order. Hence the battle rages around this rampart.

God commands us to set apart a seventh portion of time to religious uses. These consecrated hours are named *the Lord's Day*. This day is the old Jewish Sabbath transferred by the authority of inspired apostles and the practice of the Apostolic Church to the first day of the week, and it carries the selfsame sanction of the Decalogue, which hallowed the seventh day under the Mosaic dispensation. Our Christian forefathers incorporated it in the public law of America. In legal language it is *dies non* — does not exist for secular business and pleasure. On the Lord's Day the National and State Legislatures hold no sessions, the higher courts do not sit, the exchanges are closed, the banks are shut, places of amusement

are, as a rule, barred and bolted. It is God's *stop day* for mankind. Enter a factory just before the dinner-hour. The whizzing of wheels, the rattling of shuttles, the rumble of heavy machinery — these sounds, with the rapid motion of everything around, are overwhelming. The building shakes as under the tread of an earthquake. Suddenly, on the ringing of a bell, the engine stops, and all is still. Such is the Lord's Day in the great factory of human toil. Its sanitary value is unspeakably great. It acts as an equalizer of the disturbed system. Its moral value is even greater. Overtaxed worker, thou may'st pause! Anxious brain, tranquilize thyself! Exhausted nature, recruit thy powers! Poor groveler, look up and worship!

Such is the Sabbath in the purpose of its institution. Such it was in the practice of the earlier Hebrews. It was a sacred pause in the ordinary labor by which bread was earned. The curse of the fall was suspended for a day. Nay, one-seventh part of time was redeemed and new-consecrated to human welfare. Having spent this Divine space in the remembrance and recital of God's mercies, the Hebrew had a fresh start in his course of labor. Joy was the keynote of the Mosaic Sabbath. It was a day of special religious worship in the sanctuary. It was a day of special ethical instruction in the home. Later,

the Pharisees invented a legion of restrictions respecting the Sabbath, of which we find nothing in the original institution and observance. The Pharisaic Sabbath was fantastic and arbitrary — a burden “grievous to be borne.” Unhappily, the Puritans — moral giants, the saviors of liberty in England, as even Hume, the Tory historian, admits, in most respects ahead of their age, yet here in fault — borrowed their conception of the Sabbath from the Pharisees. They resurrected and revitalized many of the old dead prohibitions which Christ himself had condemned; and these unscriptural, man-made restrictions they enacted into law, and imposed on the neck of reluctant men and women as a yoke. In this way the Lord’s Day was obscured and discredited in England and in New England, nor has it yet recovered from the misconception created by the sad mistake of those good people.

We are to go back to the Mosaic institution, and, above all, to the precept and practice of the Lord of the day and of His disciples, for our methods of observing the Sunday. In doing this we discover that four points are involved.

1. The Lord’s Day is to be an occasion for public worship. The Jews so regarded it. This was Christ’s own practice; “And, *as His custom was,*” affirms St. Luke, “He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath Day.” After the change from the

seventh to the first day of the week, the Apostolic Church was equally scrupulous not to forsake this assembling together.

2. Sunday is a home day. This is implied in the very name — *rest-day*. Households come together. The husband and wife leisurely enjoy the gifts of God. The father, whirled away through the work-a-day week, on Sunday gathers his children around his knees. A large part of the time may be rightly devoted to domestic reunion and intercourse.

3. Worship and the family being provided for, the kindly offices of friendships and neighborhood justly claim attention. There can be no valid objection to an hour of sober recreation among friends and neighbors, to the interchange of thought, to a comparison of experiences, to the cultivation of our social nature, if we do not neglect other and more important interests.

4. Since on Sunday we are set free from cares and duties which absorb our time and attention through the other days of the week, we should be eager, like our Lord, to run upon errands of peace and good will — to visit the sick, instruct the ignorant, succor the needy, and do works of mercy.

A Sunday thus spent, partly in God's house, partly in our own dear home, partly among friends and neighbors, and partly in good works, will

provide enough for us to do that is fit and decorous, and will leave little time and less inclination for sinful, or even questionable, practices. A habit of so passing the day, when once formed, will make us happy in it, and a source of happiness to others. It would supply us with occupation, but of a different kind from, and of a higher kind than, the bread-and-butter hunt of the other days. Soon we would find ourselves anticipating its advent with enthusiasm. The pernicious notion would be banished forever that this day is a restriction set upon our liberty, an unwelcome invasion of our time, a sacrifice to be offered, and a cross to be borne. The Lord's Day would be recognized as one of God's best gifts to man — as the couch of toil, a truce with care, the sunshine of the week, poverty's birth-right, and the soul's market-day.

The practical question is this: Possessing such a day by the Divine commandment, in the settled custom of the nation, and in the long-established recognition and sanction of public law, are we ready to surrender it, or essentially to change its character? Of course, legislation can not, and should not, bind indifferent or hostile people to the Christian observance of the Sunday. But it does, and ought to, secure for all an opportunity so to observe it, and to defend all observers in their observance.

The assault upon the American Sunday is made by four very different but co-operating classes. The first class consists of the vicious, who covet this day above all other days for vice, because it is the common day of leisure ; and it follows Saturday, which is the usual pay-day, so that the masses are more likely to have money on Sunday than on any other day in the week.

The second class is composed of that part of our population which is of foreign birth and breeding. Cradled in a civilization antagonistic to ours, brought up to look on Sunday either as a work-day or as a mere holiday, they are restless under the wholesome restraints which distinguish it in the United States. Some of them wish to use it for pleasure, others for business. And because our customs and laws discountenance such abuses, they hate a legalized Sunday.

The third class is made up of recreant Americans of wealth and social position, who ape French manners. When they die these Europeanized Yankees think they will go to Paris — like a certain cardinal, who said he had rather have his part in Paris than in Paradise. Accustomed to borrow the fashions of their raiment and the seasoning of their food, as well as such dubious literature as they are capable of mastering, from a land in which the Lord's Day is conspicuously disesteemed, as Bishop Potter, of New York,

pointed out some time ago, they have recently taken to borrowing its Sunday customs. With abundant leisure all the week to do nothing, they think they can not better employ the Lord's Day than by making it the occasion of their most ostentatious pleasure-seeking.

The fourth class, very small but very noisy and very active, is congregated in a knot of infidels and agnostics, organized into a propaganda called "The American Secular Union," one of whose avowed objects is the destruction of the Lord's Day.

Unhappily, these four classes are powerfully reenforced by the daily press of the country. The Sunday editions of the newspapers constitute the most formidable and the most insidious peril of the day. Even church-goers are often beguiled by the attractive display they make as they are served up hot with the Sunday breakfast — the largest and the most interesting of the week — into skipping Divine service, in order to learn about the world, the flesh, and the devil. Aside from their practice, the journals openly array themselves against the American Sunday, sometimes in the way of direct assault, oftener by innuendo. Some newspapers profess to be indifferent — like the priest of whom Luther tells, who, when the Papists told him to pray in one form, and the Protestants in another, ended by repeat-

ing the alphabet, and begging the Lord to frame a prayer agreeable to himself. But this affected neutrality reveals the unfriendliness.

We do not write this in the way of complaint. It is to be expected. As it is the function of the stage "to hold the mirror up to nature," so it is the function of the daily press to reflect time and sense. A newspaper is an instantaneous photograph of the world at the moment of publication. A photographer might as well be expected to be a leader of thought as a journal. In the one case, as in the other, the business is picture-taking, not leadership. The press borrows its tone from its readers. Earl Russell used to say that it was with a politician as with a snake — the tail moves the head. When a newspaper seems to lead it resembles that captain of militia in the Civil War who ordered his men to charge, and then got behind the nearest stone wall to see how it worked.

No one denies the ability and influence of the great dailies; nor can it be said that they are not, as a rule, edited in the interest of good government. But they are necessarily worldly. They speak of the world, to the world, for the world. When the world is Christian, they will be Christian. Until then we must expect them to mirror the prevailing sentiment of their constituency.

Fretting under the mild restrictions of the

American Sunday, and seeking for some decent pretext for an attack upon it, the four classes described, aided by the daily press, have hit upon a taking war-cry. For a number of years past they have been demanding the opening of the public libraries and museums. Are not these public institutions? they ask triumphantly. And is not Sunday a public holiday? Then why not allow the poor people, over-worked, and without opportunity six days in the week, to feast their eyes on the master-pieces of art, and to improve their minds by reading the great writers, on their one day of leisure? Such is the reasoning of these "friends of the people." Misled by its speciousness, a number of towns have thrown their museums and libraries open on the Sunday.

Christian citizens oppose this policy, because the fourth commandment forbids it: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy 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."

A Syrian convert was urged by his employer to work on the Lord's day. He declined. "But," said the master, "does not your Bible say that if a man has an ass or an ox that falls into a pit on

the Sabbath day, he may pull him out?" To which the convert replied: "Yes; but if the ass has a habit of falling into the same pit every Sabbath, then the man should either fill up the pit or sell the ass."

Patriotic citizens, whether Christians or not, ought to withstand these insidious assaults. For they are directed against immemorial American usage and tradition. Our observance of Sunday is as distinctively American, as the public schools and the ballot-box. Imagine the indignation that would blast the man or woman who should propose the abolition of the free-school system; or who should lay a sacrilegious hand upon that ark of political liberty, the ballot-box. Yet the American Sunday is just as distinctively an American institution.

Philanthropic citizens should rally to the defense of the Sunday. It is a sanitary rampart. This phase of it concerns every one—Jew and Gentile, believer and agnostic. The religious aspect of the day depends for its maintenance upon the individual Christian. The Sunday, as a rest day, appeals to the whole community. One of the oldest and purest of Supreme Court Judges, Justice Field, has forcibly said: "Laws setting aside Sunday as a day of rest are upheld, not from any right of the government to legislate for the promotion of religious observances, but from the

right to protect all persons from the physical and moral debasement which comes from uninterrupted labor. Such laws have always been deemed beneficent and merciful laws, especially to the poor and dependent, to the laborers in our factories and workshops, and in the heated rooms of our cities; and their validity has been sustained by the highest courts of the United States."

The opening of the museums and libraries would deprive the custodians of these institutions of their Sunday relief from labor, and chain them like galley-slaves to the oar. The reply sometimes offered, that it would be no hardship, if these institutions were closed on another day of the week for as many hours as they might be opened on the Sunday, is unsatisfactory for two reasons: first, because it would hurt the conscience of Christian employes to work on the Lord's Day, and next, because, presumably, to all the employes, as to other people, Sunday has a value possessed by no other day. Then only can they meet all the members of their own households, then only can they join in the public worship of God, then only can they share in a common boon. To say to these employes — We can not give you Sunday, set apart by the laws and custom of the land as a common rest day; we really must work you on Sunday, but you can have a slice off of Thursday — this is manifest injustice and oppression. It

can only be justified, as the Sunday opening of the drug stores, or the work of the physician is justified, on the ground of public necessity.

Those citizens who, for any reason, value the Sunday, may well oppose this scheme, because it has failed always and everywhere. The Mercantile Library, and the Cooper Institute reading-room, in New York, were opened some years ago. They were poorly patronized. In the case of the Mercantile Library it was found that books drawn on Sunday could be drawn on Saturday without serious inconvenience. At the Cooper Institute it was speedily discovered that the reading-room was made a bummers' roost by loungers, who turned into it to get out of the cold, and nodded and dozed while pretending to read.

The Columbian Fair, in Chicago, was opened on Sundays against the protest of the Christian public, in breach of public law, and after accepting a congressional donation conditioned upon its closure. The opening was, as it deserved to be, a complete failure, both in attendance and in profits. The poorer classes, on whose behalf the greedy directors professed to open the doors, preferred to spend their Sundays in the beer gardens of Chicago, or in the open fields beyond the city. The beautiful grounds of Jackson Park, and the vast aisles of the buildings, so animated on other days, were peopled only with solitude on those

open Sundays. Indeed, wherever and whenever such experiments have been tried, they have begun in fraud and ended in failure. Why aggravate these frauds and multiply the failures?

It has been contended that the museums and libraries should be opened on Sunday in the interest of popular education — meaning intellectual and esthetic development. But education is a comprehensive term. It properly includes the moral as well as the mental faculties — the whole being. Intellectualism alone is awry and dangerous. It should seem that every scholar must know that the study of art does not necessarily promote morality. Neither does literary proficiency. We all know, or know of, artists and *litterati* who are more heathenish than the heathen — more Philistine than Goliath of Gath. The very chief of the esthetes in our day, Oscar Wilde, was imprisoned for a crime too base to name. In Athens the artistic and literary period was precisely the epoch of grossest degeneracy. Demosthenes thundered, but the people quailed and surrendered to Philip. They knew which way a Greek accent ought to slant, but neither knew, nor cared to know, how to keep the perpendicular themselves. They worshiped pictures and statues, poems and orations, and despised men and women. What is true of Greece is equally true of ancient Rome — which was ener-

vated by what moderns call culture. And so in the Middle Ages. The dreariest midnight of immorality occurred when art and literature were most flourishing under Pope Leo X. and the Florentine Medici. Take Paris to-day. 'Tis a beautiful body without a soul — like Hawthorne's hero in "The Marble Fawn." Art and literature are lofty as Mont Blanc ; morality is as low down as the Vale of Chamouni. Art labors to decorate vice, and literature exists to pen *bon mots* against virtue.

What, then ! Shall art and literature be done away ? Not so. Both may be, and often are, handmaids of morality. But as substitutes for morality, or as teachers of morality, they are the detected frauds of history. What Sunday should teach is religion. When it is proposed to open the museums and libraries as rivals of the churches, and to preach estheticism and intellectualism instead of Christianity on Sunday, it is time to point out the defects of such a scheme of education.

The truth is that this whole claim is dishonest. Those who make it, instead of seeking to befriend the people, would, in fact, deprive them of their Sunday altogether. Their real purpose is self-advantage. They intend to introduce here and naturalize the Sunday of continental Europe — the Paris and Vienna Sunday. Some of these

special pleaders want to push their business on Sunday, and to get an extra day's work out of their employes for the wages they now pay for the labor of six days. Others desire to *Coney-Islandize* the Sunday — to fuddle it with beer and desecrate it with the clatter of glasses clicking an accompaniment to the coarse melodies of the *opera bouffe*. On this ground Archbishop Corrigan, of New York, one of the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church, in a letter written some time ago, did not hesitate to condemn the attempt. "As I understand it," he said, "the movement for opening the museums and libraries on Sunday, though advocated in the interest of the working classes, is really the entering wedge of a larger and insidious design, which aims at throwing open also on that day the theaters, drinking-saloons, and other places of amusement, and so gradually to do away with everything that gives Sunday a sacred character. To destroy the general religious observance of Sunday would be a national calamity."

'Tis a significant fact that these appeals never issue from the working classes. They are shrewd and intelligent enough to understand that the existence of Sunday as a *rest-day* depends upon the continued recognition of its *sanctity*. Destroy this and the Sunday would soon be lost in the huddle of secular days and concerns. First,

pleasure would degrade it, then greed would put an end even to pleasure. Such is the history of Sunday secularization. Therefore, those laborers who value the rest which Sunday brings, look with suspicion upon these attempts to secularize the day. "When the true conception of the Lord's Day yields," remarks the Rev. Dr. C. S. Robinson, "everything religious seems to glide away down stream with it. A curious mixture of laxity and levity perverts even names and things into grotesque forms of presentation. In Paris there is one street called the *Rue de Paradis*—street of Paradise, and there is another called *Rue d'Enfer*—street of Hell. On every Sunday both of these are thronged with miscellaneous hosts of thoughtless people who have apparently just bought their gay garments at a store called *a l'Enfant Jésus*—the infant Jesus, or, at the rival store opposite, called *au bon Diable*—the good devil. There they promenade and exhibit themselves, and laugh and drink and sing, while the four-cent candles that they furnish to do their vicarious Sabbath worship in the vacant churches, burn and flare and smoke before the image of the neglected Virgin Mary. Does anybody want this hollowness and confusion domesticated in America?"

It is urged that the Sunday is already largely secularized; that Sunday travel, Sunday excur-

sions, Sunday concerts, Sunday journals, Sunday bicyclists, abound. Well, two wrongs do not make a right, any more than one virtue and two vices make a saint. Is the fact that the American Sunday is desecrated in some directions a reason why we should fall to and dishonor it in all directions? Is not this like saying that because one member of the family has the small-pox, therefore the entire household should be infected? When one member of the family has the small-pox, the Board of Health steps in and enforces a quarantine. Precisely so the fact that the Sunday is already widely secularized is a fresh argument to impel Christian citizens to use every possible means, moral and legal, to maintain and strengthen the sacred barriers that remain. Commanded by God, grouted in the habits and in the statutes of the nation, shall we not prize the Sunday, both as a divine and as an American institution? As, under God, our fathers gave it to us, so let us hand it down unimpaired to our children. In the past it has been, in the present it is, and in the future it will be, the creator and conservator of the noblest features of individual and national character.

IX.

RELATION OF YOUNG PEOPLES' SOCIETIES TO CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP.

As Wellington, at Waterloo, sighed for the coming of Blucher, and when he came speedily won the battle, so have the veteran fighters for civic righteousness longed for the appearance of the gallant young soldiers of the cross, who are now rushing into the arena with ringing hurrahs and waving banners, and with this timely reenforcement they too will conquer.

When Francis E. Clark solved the problem of setting the young converts of the Williston Congregational Church, in Portland, Maine, at work, he solved it for all America. To-day there is hardly an individual church which has not its Young Peoples' Society. And these local societies are compacted into vast state and national organizations, denominational and inter-denominational, which are a recognized power at present, and which will dominate the future. Most of these local societies — Christian Endeavor Unions, Epworth Leagues, Baptist Young Peoples'

Unions, Westminster Leagues, and others, a goodly and ever-swelling list—already have Christian Citizenship Committees, or will soon have them. Their existence presupposes an interest in civic affairs. The practical question is, along what lines shall this interest move into action?

The first step must be study. Each committee on Christian citizenship ought to make itself a center of civic intelligence. Little can be done, and nothing effectively, without knowledge. The literature of Christian civics is as yet small; but such books and chapters, such periodicals and pamphlets as bear upon this new science should find a place on the shelves of a convenient library, and be summarized at the meetings from time to time in addresses or essays. Lectures, too, by acknowledged experts should be made a feature of the winter's work—lectures which should instruct and inspire not only the local body, but the community.

The sub-topics for thought and action comprehend:

1. MUNICIPAL REFORM.—Since the partial redemption of New York, Chicago, Boston, Pittsburg, and other populous centers, public attention has been directed to the increasing importance of cities, to their peculiar perils, to their domination by the worst classes through the neglect of the

better classes, to the possibility of their political salvation — which many have doubted until recently — and to the continental necessity for municipal reform.

Young people who object to going into politics can and should exert their influence to take town matters out of politics, to defeat incompetent or corrupt candidates, to create a healthy public opinion, and to put this warmly and executively behind a faithful, unsectarian and non-partizan administration of affairs.

LAW AND ORDER.— Every saloon, even though licensed, is a frequent and flagrant offender in one way or another against the law. Every house of ill-fame is illegal. Every gambling den is banned by statute. All need watching, not only by officers, who are often in collusion with them, but by incorruptible friends of law and order. If a town were divided into small districts, and each district were put under the supervision of one or more Christian citizenship committees, a vigilant patrol would be possible and easy.

2. **SOCIAL CONDITIONS.**— Here, again, attention should be paid to proper territorial divisions. Take only so much ground as can be effectively covered. Riddle this with light. Let Christian influence radiate out to help and heal in sanitary, economic and domestic ways of work.

What ignorance does not know, what indifference does not care to ask for, what poverty can not get, Christian workers, well-informed and determined, and with proper backing, can command. As the laws now stand, there is no reason, save a criminal public preoccupation and indifference, why child-labor should be allowed, or why sweating-rooms should exist as sources of epidemic disease, or why the homes of the poor should not be as wholesome as those of the rich, or why rascally employers should not be compelled to pay deserving employes, with the addition of the cost of collection to the sum owed, or why the young should not be taught in manual training-schools how to make an honest living, or why public parks should not be opened in congested quarters of great towns, so that poverty shall be able to breathe, or why working people of both sexes should not be provided with cheap but decent lodgings, or why cooperation in a hundred directions should not be encouraged — cooperation, which, as some thinkers believe, contains the promise and potency of a satisfactory solution to all concerned of the vexed problem of capital and labor. Much could be done through local centers of consecrated effort to secure public baths and lavatories, outing clubs for sickly mothers and children, fresh-air funds, and, in general, the best available facilities for building up a sound body.

Christians who possess this knowledge are trustees, and hold it for the benefit of those who have it not.

The important thing is to personalize duty. The measure of responsibility is power. Christians are responsible for the continued existence of abuses and nuisances which they can abate or abolish with proper effort. The question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" did not condone Cain's sin against his brother, nor will it condone ours. Bread-riots and work-riots, labor outbreaks, and the revolt of those who have nothing against those who have everything, shaking the social fabric as by an earthquake, and imperiling the possessions and safety of men and women who sit in high places — are rude but necessary interruptions which compel inquiry, and press home upon us the truth of human solidarity, our common relationship, and our common concern in the social state.

Sanitation will cure many ills of the body politic. Authorities assert that forty per cent. of the distress among the poor is due to drunkenness. But drunkenness itself is a result of bad environment. Overcrowded and stuffy homes drive men to the saloon for room and recreation. The saloons are the club-rooms of the poor — one secret of their vitality. A number of years ago a New York legislative committee confessed that "cer-

tain conditions and associations of human life and habitation are the prolific parents of corresponding habits and morals," and recommended "the prevention of drunkenness by securing for every one a clean and comfortable home." Against dangers from without our system of government offers safe shelter and defense. Against dangers from within it can only protect itself by uniting all hearts in a common brotherhood of love, based on justice and contentment. Lowell's question, put long ago, repeats itself in deeper tones to-day —

“ — Think ye that building shall endure
Which shelters the noble and crushes the poor? ”

Whoever would have an answer may find it in the French revolution.

As Mordecai is persuading Esther to undertake the salvation of the Jews imperiled by the king's decree, said to her, "Who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?" so we would ask whether the young people's societies have not been divinely raised up to meet present emergencies? Older Christians are chained in prejudice, bound to party, habituated to the existing situation, and callous through custom. The juniors are filled with the new spirit of the new day, and are fired by its larger hope. They are free from prejudice, care nothing for party,

save as an instrument, and are sympathetic with the sin and sorrow around about them, both through youth and through principle. Facing the questions of the day, may they grapple with them as Elijah grappled with the questions of his day, and answer them with the answer which Christ would give.

X.

ORGANIZATION —BASIS, OBJECTS, AND METHODS.

IN every age Christianity demands a special application to meet characteristic conditions. The Apostolic Church was occupied in laying Christian foundations. At the period of the Reformation the doctrines of religion needed a Biblical statement as against prevailing heresies, which masqueraded in the garb of orthodoxy. Under Wesley and Whitefield a new demonstration was given of the power of the Holy Ghost to revivify dead forms of faith. In our day, the mission of the church is largely sociological.

The first and great commandment, love to God, has not been over-emphasized, but the second, love to our neighbor, has been under-emphasized. They go together. Either alone is a half-part. The first results in pietism ; the second produces humanitarianism. When they are combined we have Christianity. An oarsman using but one oar, rows in a circle, with both oars, he pulls straight and forges ahead. Those churches which are based too largely on the love of God, and those other churches which are founded exclus-

ively on the love of man, must marry and beget good works towards God and man.

Dean Hurlbert, of the Chicago Theological Seminary, in a passage of rare power, remarks that "the evangelical church, numbering 13,500,000 communicants, stoutly denies that unaided human power can save this country, and as stoutly affirms that Divine power present in Christianity can perpetuate it. In her criticism and rejection of other agencies, she provokes a challenge of her own. The enemy of the church, appealing to Christian history, seeks to discredit her claims by showing that she is weakest to-day in her original strongholds, and strongest in lands which were then unknown; that in the Roman Empire she was herself submerged in a baptized heathenism; and that, after a trial of two thousand years, church formality and spiritual deadness are the blight of modern France, Italy, Spain, and Germany. What assurance is there that history is not to repeat itself in the Western world? The Americans are inclined to 'prove all things,' Christianity included. She does not go unchallenged. Certainly, never was there a fairer chance to show her power and prove her claims. No obnoxious restrictions are put upon her. She labors under no arbitrary and unnatural disadvantages. The State suffers no interference with her faith or worship. The Constitution pro-

vides that 'no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under the United States,' and that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' A code of ethics whose truth and worth are manifest to enlightened reason constitutes that 'general Christianity,' which the courts have held to be the common law of the land. Milton said: 'Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose upon the earth, so truth be among them, we need not fear. Let her and falsehood grapple. Who ever knew her to be put to the worst in a free and open encounter?' In free and open America Christianity is thrust into this 'free and open encounter.' Satanic forces are seeking the nation's ruin; Christian forces are set for her defense. Force faces force. The issues are joined. The conflict is on, and is irresistible—it is a life-and-death struggle. Christianity herself can not escape. She has no option—she must fight. Retreat means defeat. This momentous encounter will decide whether Christianity is stronger than the opposition. Christianity is on trial—she will never have a fair chance. Numbers, wealth, intelligence, social standing, manifold resources are on her side. She is trying to win the most unprejudiced, open-hearted, clean-skinned, clear-brained people on the face of the

earth. Now is the time, and here is the place, to vindicate her august, transcendent claims. If she can not triumph here, where on earth can she triumph? 'If she has run with the footmen and they have wearied her, then how can she contend with horses?' If she can not rule her own house, and have her own children in subjection, how can she take care of the rest of the world? The challenger of our faith meets us with the inquiry: How is it that Christianity, decrying all other remedies, is failing to apply her own? What means this degeneracy in modern times which Christianity seems incapable of arresting? Why is it that vices and corruption are spreading with terrific rapidity — to which Christianity is offering only a feeble barrier? All sorts of direful evils are on the increase — the political powers of the saloon increasing; discontent among wage-workers increasing; the misuse of ill-gotten wealth increasing; the breach between the classes and the masses increasing; the estrangement between capital and labor increasing; the suspicion and hatred of the churches increasing; pauperism and crime, the social vice and gambling, skepticism and materialism increasing; the membership in the evangelical churches increasing; Christian intelligence and respectability increasing. Why in the world is not the political salvation of this nation increasing? What is the matter with Christianity that

it stands impotent in the face of these corrupting and destroying forces?"

The answer to these thunder-clap questions is, that hitherto Christianity has lacked organization. It has wrought in a sporadic way, through individual churches, fighting

" A battle, whose great aim and scope
They little care to know ;
Content, like men-at-arms, to cope
Each with his fronting foe."

It has lacked the power which comes from the synthesis of church-life and activity. The generalship has been on the other side. The evils which assail the nation are organized and allied. So are all the great factors of civilization — war, commerce, business, politics, education, everything, except religion. Is it any wonder that increase of numbers, and wealth, and culture have not insured to Christianity a victory when it has never federated for great common offensive and defensive purposes? Discipline is mightier than numbers. Have we not seen in our generation little Japan, with a small, but disciplined army, skilfully led, put to rout the innumerable, but unorganized forces of colossal China? The vital need of the hour is church union, not a union of outward forms, but of spirit and endeavor. Whether we shall ever have, or had better have, a common formula to express our faith, or one

liturgy to embody our worship, is a question. But if Christianity is to dominate this continent, nay, if it is to survive at all, it must bind its adherents together in triumphant cooperation, and swing them into line to fulfil the aspiration of the Lord's Prayer, "Thy kingdom come."

In searching for an acceptable basis of union, we find it in the fact, of common acknowledgement, that Jesus Christ is the Savior not alone of the individual, but of society through the individual. Every saved man, and every group of saved men in every church, is to be a savior — each for all and all for each. Christians agree in believing that all efforts at social amelioration should be made tributary to the bringing all men under the law of Christ, and into vital relations with Him. For, while it is important that men be well-housed, well-fed, well-clothed, well-employed, and well-governed, it is essential that they be bound through brotherhood to the heart and service of the all-Father. Therefore, Christian citizenship is not the end, but only a means to the end.

As to the objects of this union, the first is the regeneration of America — because this means the regeneration of the earth. It begins to be evident that the Anglo-Saxon character and language are destined to rule the world. A century ago as keen an observer as Franklin thought

the French people and tongue would dominate. Then 42,000,000 spoke French, and only 18,000,000 spoke English. To-day 120,000,000 speak English, and 150,000,000 understand it, and the foremost of philologists, Prof. Max Müller, contends that within two centuries English will become the universal language.

Already, according to Dr. Clark, "the English language, saturated with Christian ideas, is the great agent of Christian civilization throughout the world, and is molding the character of half the human race." By common consent, America is the coming custodian of the Anglo-Saxon character and language. Listen to a few authoritative voices on both sides of the Atlantic. Alexander Hamilton has said: "It is ours to be either the grave in which the hopes of the world shall be entombed, or the pillar of cloud that shall pilot the race onward to millennial glory." Matthew Arnold has said: "America holds the future." Herbert Spencer has said: "The Americans are producing a more powerful type of man than has hitherto existed," and "may reasonably look forward to a time when they will have produced a civilization grander than any the world has yet known." John Fisk has said: "The world's center of gravity has shifted from the Mediterranean and the Rhine to the Atlantic and the Mississippi, from the men who spoke Latin to the men

who speak English." Emerson has said : "America is another name for opportunity. Our whole history appears like a last effort of Divine providence in behalf of the human race." Ought we not, therefore, to push Christianizing agencies with overwhelming urgency ?

The second object of Christian union is the bringing conscience to bear on the civic life of the nation. "A quickened and enlightened conscience," observes Dr. Josiah Strong, "is the great need of the times in the relation of employer and employe in all private business, in all public trusts, in politics, and in legislation, municipal, State, and national. In whatever sphere men *ought*, there it is the right and duty of the Church to urge the dictates of the Christian conscience. But in the unorganized condition of the churches there is no medium through which the Christian conscience of the city, the State, the nation can utter itself. For lack of this saving salt, municipal government has rotted, and legislatures have become corrupt. Every year needed reform legislation fails and laws are enacted which do violence to the Christian conscience of the State, because there is no medium through which that conscience can be brought to bear. By such an organization, as is proposed, a legislature could be flooded with hundreds of thousands of names in petition or protest in a single week."

On the basis of this general recognition of Jesus Christ as the Savior of the social order, and with the two-fold object of regenerating America, and of bringing the Christian conscience to bear on civic life as the means of regeneration, what are the proper methods of organization ?

Happily, the political framework of the country supplies us with a suggestive model. The national Union is composed of forty-five States. Each of these is distinct and independent in local affairs, while in matters of common concern each is reinforced by all the rest. Thus their individual autonomy is jealously guarded, and at the same time the overwhelming power of national unity is secured. Just so the churches exist in various denominational relations. The individual churches are like the towns or counties of the State. The denominations are like the States themselves. Both churches and denominations are proud of their independence, and set upon the maintenance of self-government. Without parting with these prerogatives of sovereignty, they might come into some form of federal union, which should enable them quickly to converge their separate influence into a unit of power for defense or attack. It is not the province of this chapter to sketch in the details of such a compact. These can be easily manipulated and all discordant interests adjusted, when once the desire for inter-denominational

federation takes possession of the Christian heart.

Meantime, we call attention to the fact that some good beginnings have been already made. "The National Christian Citizenship League" was incorporated some time since, and has auxiliaries in a number of States. It is locally an unsectarian, non-partizan league of individuals; nationally, a league of leagues. Since neither the churches nor the young people's societies can, as such, take political action, the members are under obligation to enter some outside related body through which they can make their Christian influence and votes tell for civic righteousness. "Christian citizenship," remarks Mr. Edwin D. Wheelock, the founder and first president of the League, "maintains the supreme right of Jesus Christ to rule municipal, State, and national life, as well as private life. These should be governed on the principles laid down by him. Upon the application of these principles depends the final solution of every present-day problem. It believes our government to be appointed of God, and therefore sacred — too sacred to be left in the hands of corrupt men, whatever their party name. It believes that the dangers which threaten our country arise less from the strength and activity of bad men, than from the apathy and cowardice of good men. It believes that Christian citizens

are called to put their loyalty to Jesus Christ into their politics, to serve Him at the primaries, and to vote as He would have them vote. It believes the Bible to teach obedience to law, and that the office of a law-maker or administrator is so sacred that to put a bad man into it is sacrilege. The presence of a corrupt governor, legislator, mayor, alderman, or judge ought to fill every Christian citizen with such an intensity of grief that he will 'cry aloud and spare not' until the evil be corrected."

The platform of the League is as follows :

1. "To prevent by personal effort the nomination and election of corrupt candidates, and the enactment of corrupt laws in city, State and nation.

2. "To secure fidelity on the part of officers entrusted with the execution of the laws.

3. "To exterminate the saloon as the greatest enemy of Christ and humanity.

4. "To preserve the Sabbath.

5. "To purify and elevate the elective franchise.

6. "To promote the study of social wrongs and the application of the remedies.

7. "In general, to seek the reign of whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report."

A suggestive constitution for local leagues may be found in the Appendix.

“The Evangelical Alliance,” an older and stronger organization, has recently symmetrized itself, by adding to its original spiritual purpose, which was the cultivation of Christian fellowship and the forwarding of evangelization, a correlative social department, covering the whole field of civics. It is thus the most complete agency in existence for all kinds of Christian work, and a possible nucleus of continental Christian union. Dr. Josiah Strong, its secretary, is specially concerned at present in pushing the Christian citizenship phase of the Alliance. A copy of its constitution may also be seen in the Appendix.¹⁶

We turn now from these methods of organization to consider some related matters. The experience of a hundred years has revealed certain characteristic defects in our political system. We boast of “government of the people, by the people, and for the people.” In reality we have government of the majority, by the majority, and for the majority. And no matter how small the majority may be, it is dominant. Nay, what is yet more unfair, we are not unfrequently governed by a minority. Suppose, for example, a State to be divided between three or four parties, and suppose one of them to have a preponderance of votes over each of the others, although in a minority as against the combined ballots of the opposition. As things now stand, the first party would control

legislation. This is government not by majority but by plurality. Not only so, but the actual majority, because of its divisions, is misrepresented; public policies, hateful to it, are adopted and administered. Small parties have no representation in legislative bodies, and therefore no voice in the discussion of pending measures. Size, if it be small, operates as perpetual disfranchisement.

To remedy these defects, *Proportional Representation* has been advocated by eminent writers on government on both sides of the water — by John Stuart Mill, in Europe; and by Prof. John R. Commons, in America. To illustrate the working of this scheme, Mr. W. D. McCracken supposes that “an imaginary State is to elect ten representatives by means of 1,000 votes. Then every party which can muster one-tenth of the total, or 100 votes, ought to be entitled to one representative. If this imaginary State contains 400 Republicans, 300 Democrats, 200 Populists, and 100 Prohibitionists, its legislature should be composed of 4 Republicans, 3 Democrats, 2 Populists, and 1 Prohibitionist. Under present conditions, the Populists and Prohibitionists could not elect their candidates at all, while the slight plurality of Republicans would probably allow them to sweep the State.”

Proportional representation has been introduced

into certain Swiss cantons, and here it is in use in Illinois, in the election of members to the lower house of the State legislature ; in Boston, in the election of aldermen to the city council ; and it was employed in New York, in 1867, in the election of delegates to a State constitutional convention.

The practical difficulty in this country has been to find an electoral substitute for the existing division into electoral districts, based upon territorial apportionment — an arrangement which has led to, and encouraged, continental “ gerrymandering.” Several feasible methods have been elaborated — Hare’s plan, the limited vote, the cumulative vote, etc. One or another of these is in actual use : the limited vote, in Boston ; the cumulative vote, in Illinois. We lack space to describe these methods — those interested are referred to books on the general subject.

Another undemocratic feature of our government is the alienation from the people of a direct voice in legislation, and of the power authoritatively to propose it. We have, indeed, the right of petition. But the powers that be are under no obligation to do anything with a petition beyond receiving it, and, practically, this is all that is ever done. There is hardly an instance on record of legislation introduced by petition.

With a view to democratic government, two

methods of direct popular legislation have been recently suggested, viz., the *Initiative* and the *Referendum*. The first may be defined as an institution by which a certain percentage of voters may initiate laws ; and the second, as an institution by which the whole body of voters may vote "yes" or "no" upon the proposition introduced by the initiative. In the last analysis, the process is simply this. So many voters — in Switzerland, where these institutions are in vogue, 50,000 — are authorized to propose such and such legislation, through the medium of the government ; which is then obliged to submit the matter thus initiated to a direct popular vote.

The special advantage claimed for these measures is that they make it possible for any considerable number of voters to secure the verdict of the people upon any measure which the legislature might not be willing to act upon, or might act upon adversely to the wishes of its proposers. It is difficult, for instance, to get from any legislature a favorable response to a petition for a prohibitory law. The initiative and the referendum would enable a given number of the friends of temperance to demand an expression from the people at large, independently of the legislature. On the other hand, in prohibitory States, like Maine or North Dakota, the saloons could pursue the same course for the purpose of overturning

temperance legislation. The larger number of the Swiss cantons have adopted the initiative and the referendum. Their experiment is being watched with eager interest. Meantime it must be acknowledged that there is not a consensus of opinion among political economists regarding the real value of these measures. Perhaps it is too early to decide.

An ingenious theory, which is held by its friends to be a panacea, is the *Single Tax*, elaborated by Mr. Henry George. By this expedient, it is proposed, at one stroke, to obviate all existing evils by destroying the vicious principle which, it is claimed, begets them — land monopoly; and to abate the nuisance of multiform taxes, by empowering each community to collect rent upon the lands within its limits, in lieu therefor, thus securing a fund warranted to be more than sufficient to pay all communal expenses.

We quote a few characteristic sentences on this subject from an eminent exponent of the single tax:

“The most glaring sign of our national corruption is the rapid growth of economic inequality.

“Magnates manipulate all the unparalleled natural opportunities of the country, independent workingmen are losing their individuality in the great army of the employed. Of course, this wretched and unnatural state of things is not con-

fined to America ; it is characteristic of this latter end of the nineteenth century, and is found to a greater or lesser degree all the world over. But as Americans are of all people the most sensitive to the spirit of the age, its tendencies are necessarily exaggerated with us. Our millionaires at one end of the scale, and our tramps at the other, are more pronounced specimens of their kind than can be found in Europe. The former seem more extravagantly luxurious, the latter more abjectly miserable, because our State is founded upon the assumption of equality.

“ Economic inequality reacts upon legislation. The magnates control the markets, and, therefore, make the laws. Special interests require special bills. Bribery becomes the ordinary, every-day method of law-making. Every corrupting cause is followed by its natural effect in a vicious and infallible sequence.

“ But there is one principal injustice which lies at the base of this decay of democracy, — the monopoly of land with everything that that term implies. The great unearned fortunes of this country are based on the increment of land values. Real estate magnates, oil, mining, lumber, and railroad magnates are primarily monopolizers of land. They deal in some form of the crust of the earth. It is upon this part of their business interests that they make the most successful specu-

lations and accumulate fortunes. Improvements, such as houses, mining, and railroad plants deteriorate with use ; land alone increases in value, because its supply is a fixed quantity.

“ Mere land owners do not perform any proper economic function. They are simply preemptors of rights, collectors of toll or rent. It is only in so far as they improve their land that they become useful members of society. Private property in improvements is, therefore, just and logical, but private property in mere land bears in its train a long series of abuses and tyrannies.

“ Every succeeding generation requires the use of the crust of the earth for all its material needs, as it also requires air and water. Food, clothing, tools, etc., must all be wrought from land by labor. But if some inhabitants arrogate to themselves exclusive rights to the earth's surface, it is evident that the rest must make terms with them before they can satisfy their simplest wants. Private property in land, therefore, tends inevitably to divide men into masters and slaves, no matter how carefully political equality may be guarded.” The single tax seeks to vest the ownership of the land in the people, and to award merely the use of it to individuals— to make it unprofitable to hold without improvement, and subject to a tax for revenue graduated by the degree of such improvement.

Yet another *fin de Siècle* method of reform is *Arbitration* — national, for domestic controversies; inter-national, for differences arising between foreign states. This, if generally adopted, would supersede war, unburden nations by disarmament, and put an end to strikes on one hand, and lock-outs on the other, by compelling both capital and labor to appeal to a Board of Arbitration for a friendly settlement of disagreements.

A question increasingly mooted, nowadays, is the public ownership of public franchises — light, water, railroads, wharfs, etc. In a previous chapter we have spoken of the prominence of cities in our day. The trend of civilization is urban. Hence, whatever increases the comfort, promotes the health, and widens the horizon of life in cities, is of foremost importance. Two-thirds of the Scotch people, and three-fourths of the English, are now townsfolk. Forty per cent. of the French, forty per cent. of the Germans, and nearly as large a proportion of the Hollanders, Belgians, and Italians are grouped in cities; while the urban tendency is as marked in the valley of the Danube as it is in the valley of the Mississippi. The dawn of the industrial era has caused this state of things, and made the science of the modern town the most vital of any in the encyclopedia.

Singularly enough, the most radical of people

must go to the most conservative, the United States must go to Great Britain for instruction on the subject of municipal collectivism. Manchester and Birmingham in England, and Glasgow, in Scotland, are easily the model municipalities of the world. They have housed their populations in the best tenements, municipalized the gas supply, and reduced the cost to 50 or 60 cents per 1,000 cubic feet ; provided municipal lodgings for men and women ; purchased the water-works and doubled the per capita supply ; absorbed the street railways — called tramways there — reduced the hours of the employes, and of the cost of fares ; transformed the problem of sewage from a menace to the public health into a source of revenue, by a system of filtration which makes garbage a fertilizer ; and increased the happiness while decreasing the burdens of their denizens. Glasgow has deepened the Clyde from a fordable stream into a river capable of floating vessels of heaviest draught ; lined its banks with the greatest shipyards in the world, and municipalized the whole harbor — wharfs, ferries, and all, thus securing a princely revenue.

Before we could go safely into such business here, we would need to reform our civil service. The putting of millions of positions into politics, and filling them at the will of party bosses as a reward for party service, would plunge this nation into chaos.

We catalogue these various projects of reform without indorsing them. Since they are urged by reputable men, they are entitled to a respectful hearing. Christian citizens need large heads, and should carry generous hearts hospitable towards anything, everything which promises to advance the public welfare. St. Paul's dictum applies to this whole subject of methods of reform : " Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."

XI.

“HITCH YOUR WAGON TO A STAR.”

THE curse of our age is materialism. We kindle only within the sphere of material interests and pursuits. On higher subjects we are cold as ice-fields on Alpine breasts. There is an apotheosis of dirt among us. Men only half believe in what they can not see and touch. They group around them the trophies of their skill — steam-engines, railroads, telegraphs, sewing-machines, and worship these as the ultimate good.

Since we are infected with this grovelling tendency, we need to be reminded that the controllers of the present and the molders of the future are not the babblers who plead for an unreal realism, but are the exponents of moral earnestness — idealists, heated to enthusiasm by glowing ideals. History is made and vocalized by heroes, like our patriot fathers, who pledged their “lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor” on behalf of truth and progress; or the Pilgrims, who made New England, when, clad in her sparkling snow, and crowned with her evergreen pines, the glory of her brow was justice, the splendor of her eye was liberty, the strength of her hands was industry,

and the whiteness of her bosom was faith ; by men, like Paul, who said " I can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth me " ; or Luther, who set his feet on the rock of principle, and said : " Here I must stand — God help me ! " or Knox, who prayed " Oh God ! give me Scotland, or I die ! " and got it ; or Wesley, who said " I desire a league, offensive and defensive, with every soldier of Jesus Christ " ; or Wilberforce, who, as Brougham said, " went to heaven with 800,000 broken fetters in his hands " ; or the Earl of Shaftesbury, who illustrated in his own person his own assertion that " the best greatness is goodness " ; or Phillips, who said " I found my country half slave and half free — I left it without a fetter. "

In the " good fight " to which we, as Christian citizens, are called, let us cheer our spirits and nerve our souls with these high ideals and brave examples. Realizing the fact that America is to be won for Christ, we must be content with nothing else and nothing less. When once America is His, the world will be His.

Hebrew prophet and Christian seer agree in fortelling the reign of Christ among men. The one affirms that " whether they be thrones or dominions or principalities or powers ; all things were created by Him, and for Him " ; while the other asserts that " the earth is the Lord's, and the

fulness thereof.” Our Lord Himself opens His model prayer with the supplication, “Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.”

The wonderful and inspiring truth is that Christ is to have a second incarnation. We are familiar with His first one. The New Testament is the radiant record of it. The second is yet to come, not in a human body, as before, but in the body of human society. The first incarnation was a revelation; the second will be a transformation. In the past, He was one man; in the future He is to be all men. In Galilee He taught on the outside of affairs; in the millenium He is to fill all in all—all governments, all laws, all policies, all administrations, all industries, all economies, and to dominate civilization.

This unfolding of Christ in all and over all, blessed forever, is to be a development. It will follow, it is following, the order of the first incarnation. We are told that the infant “Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man.” The word “stature” may be taken as referring to the physical side of His growth. Since He was the model man, He must have had a perfect body. Just so, in the second incarnation, there is to be an ideal development of physical conditions. The race is as yet in childhood, nay, worse, in ignorance and sin; and in the forlorn physical conditions which they pro-

duce. The stronghold of iniquity to-day is the body — its very Gibraltar, garrisoned by the vices. Until the body is redeemed little can be done for the soul. The greater part of the human race is at this moment near starvation — never has enough to eat. Physiologists teach that unless the body is properly fed, clothed, and housed, it can do no justice to the brain. The human vermin that swarm in the slums and scramble in the tenements, live only a bestial life, and lack the elasticity to make mental and moral progress. And they are where they are and what they are largely as the result of inherited proclivities to evil ; their ancestors were like them. In the good time coming, the body shall be nourished. Children will be begotten in righteousness and trained in righteousness. It has been well said that the devil can breed sinners at the childhood end faster than the Almighty can make saints at the adult end of life. Hence, by-and-by, marriage will be put under conscience rather than passion. Heredity will be understood. As sinners are now bred, so saints will be bred. The start will be right, and therefore the growth will be symmetrical. Malformations will no longer offend the eye and perplex the mind of observers. The rule will be health.

And Jesus grew in “wisdom” as well as in “stature.” The word “wisdom” is to be inter-

preted in its comprehensive sense as significant of mental and moral growth. And here, too, we may expect the second incarnation to resemble the first. With a sound body, freed from the tyranny of inherited or acquired weaknesses and vices, the mind and conscience of the race will have a fair chance to develop. Inventions will multiply; the physical globe will be brought under human domination more and more; and the law of kindness, of mutual helpfulness, will lend its aid in producing an unimaginable increase of leisure, comfort, knowledge, and power. Wealth will be distributed. Corporations will be cooperative. Society will domesticate the liberty and equality of the ideal home under the dome of its state-house. The law of the social order will be the angelic overture at the Nativity — “Glory to God in the highest; on earth, peace, good will toward men.” The earth will no longer chant a requiem, but will sing hallelujahs as it swings around its joyous orbit.

These are the ideals which should inspire Christian citizens. True, they are poetry to-day. Faithfulness on our part may turn them into prose to-morrow. When Shakespeare made *Puck* say,

“I’ll put a girdle round about the earth
In forty minutes,”—

it seemed the wildest poetry; yet now the electric

cable hoops the globe, and men whisper messages back and forth in forty seconds. "According to your faith," said our Master, "be it unto you."

What a privilege! what an honor! to be made co-workers together and with God in the accomplishment of these gracious and splendid purposes. Christian citizens are now surrounded by multi-form discouragements. Evil is rampant. Satan is as yet the god of this world. No matter. When the battle appears to go against us, we must trust the more utterly and fight the more desperately. Let us ask great things of God, and expect great things from God. Trust and act, should be our watchwords. "In the theater of man's life," says Lord Bacon, "God and His angels only should be lookers-on." We are not here on earth to have an easy time. "There remaineth, therefore, a rest to the people of God;" not now, not here, this is the battlefield; but in halcyon days to come. When the splendid promises of Holy Writ are fulfilled, and, throned in honor and cushioned in ease, we look back from the glory-land to our part amid earthly tribulations, in the majestic consummation, each of us may cry: "I was troubled on every side, yet not distressed; perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; because I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision."

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

¹ Citizen, from the Latin *Civis*, French *Citoyen*, from *cité*, originally denoted one who enjoyed the freedom and privileges of a city. In modern law the term is broadened to include all persons who owe an indefeasible allegiance to a State, and are entitled to certain rights and privileges appertaining to freemen.

² In view of the agitation in favor of woman's suffrage in the United States it may be of interest to know that in nearly all the countries on the globe women have had some form of suffrage for years. We are somewhat slow in extending to them this privilege.

In England, Scotland, and Wales women vote for all elective officers, except members of Parliament.

In France the women teachers elect women members on all boards of education.

In Sweden women vote for all elective officers, except representatives.

In Norway they have school suffrage.

In Ireland they vote for the harbor boards, poor-law guardians, and in Belfast for municipal officers.

In Russia women householders vote for all elective officers.

In Finland they vote for all elective officers.

In Austria-Hungary they vote, by proxy, for all elective officers.

In Italy widows vote for members of Parliament.

In Hindustan women exercise the right of suffrage.

Women have municipal suffrage in Cape Colony, which rules one million square miles.

Municipal woman suffrage rules in New Zealand.

Iceland, in the North Atlantic, the Isle of Man, between England and Ireland, Pitcairn Island, in the South Pacific, have full woman suffrage.

In the Dominion of Canada women have municipal suffrage in every province, and also in the northwest territories.

In the United States twenty-eight States and Territories have given women some form of suffrage. In Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah, they have full suffrage.

³ There are proportionately more church members in the cities than in the country. In the entire United States one person in every 3.04 is returned as a communicant, while in the cities one out of every 2.64 is. This is due partly to the fact that it is much easier to organize and maintain churches where the population is compact than where it is scattered, and partly to the fact that the Catholic Church has its great strongholds in the larger cities. About one-half of the Catholics are in the 124 cities of a population of 25,000 and upwards. Over a million are in the four cities of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Brooklyn. The figures for those cities are as follows :

	Total Communi- cants.	Catholic.	All Others.
New York.....	556,954	386,200	170,744
Chicago	388,145	262,047	126,098
Philadelphia.....	335,189	163,658	171,531
Brooklyn.....	309,610	201,063	108,547

The strength of the Protestant denominations is in the country, and that of the Catholics in the cities. Thus in Illinois, outside of Chicago, there are but 213,427 Catholic communicants, while the other denominations foot up 601,014. But if the number of Chicagoans who go to Protestant churches with more or less regularity, and who contribute to some extent to their support, were added to the Protestant church membership, the latter would not fall so very much below that of the Catholics. The Chicago statistics are as follows:

Catholic.....	262,047	Presbyterian.....	11,831
Lutheran.....	34,999	Congregational.....	9,704
Methodist.....	17,950	German Evangelical....	8,252
Baptist.....	12,634	Jewish.....	9,187
Episcopal.....	9,741		

Though the population of New York in 1890 was much larger than that of Chicago, it had a much smaller membership of many Protestant sects. Chicago had more Congregationalists, German Evangelicals, Lutherans, and Methodists, but it had only one-fourth as many Jews, half as many Presbyterians, and less than a quarter as many Episcopalians.

⁴ The denominational families having more than 100,000 communicants each are as follows:

Catholic.....	6,257,871	Reformed.....	309,458
Methodist.....	4,589,284	United Brethren.....	225,281
Baptist.....	3,712,468	Latter-Day Saints.....	166,125
Presbyterian.....	1,278,332	Jewish.....	130,496
Lutheran.....	1,231,072	Friends.....	107,208
Episcopal.....	540,509	Christians.....	103,722

⁵ Geo. Wm. Curtis. *Oration and Addresses*, vol. ii., 12, 13. The ablest discussion of Civil Service Reform to be found in any single volume is contained in this book, the whole of which is devoted to this subject.

⁶The quotation is from "The American Commonwealth," vol. ii., 99, 100. Chapter XV. discusses the spoils system lucidly.

⁷Mrs. Rena Michaels Atchison, in a remarkable brochure on "Un-American Immigration," summarizes these reports. See pp. 14-40. Her book deserves the careful attention of students of sociology.

⁸ TABLE SHOWING THE TOTAL NUMBER OF IMMIGRANTS WHO HAVE ENTERED THE UNITED STATES FROM 1820 TO 1892, INCLUSIVE.

Years Ending	Annual Total	Years Ending	Annual Total	Years Ending	Annual Total
1820	10,311	1845	119,896	1869	429,203
1821	11,644	1846	158,649	1870	419,998
1822	8,549	1847	239,482	1871	415,155
1823	8,265	1848	229,483	1872	498,823
1824	9,627	1849	299,683	1873	483,459
1825	12,858	1850	380,904	1874	325,913
1826	13,908	1851	408,828	1875	259,339
1827	21,777	1852	397,343	1876	230,774
1828	30,184	1853	400,982	1877	141,857
1829	24,513	1854	460,474	1878	138,469
1830	24,837	1855	230,476	1879	177,826
1831	23,880	1856	224,096	1880	457,257
1832	61,654	1857	271,558	1881	669,431
1833	59,925	1858	144,652	1882	788,992
1834	67,948	1859	155,302	1883	603,322
1835	48,716	1860	179,469	1884	518,592
1836	80,972	1861	112,604	1885	395,346
1837	84,959	1862	114,301	1886	334,203
1838	45,159	1863	199,743	1887	490,109
1839	74,666	1864	221,531	1888	546,889
1840	92,207	1865	287,390	1889	444,427
1841	87,805	1866	359,940	1890	455,302
1842	110,980	1867	339,627	1891	560,319
1843	56,529	1868	326,232	1892	374,741
1844	84,764				
				Total....	18,128,131

TABLE SHOWING THE INCREASE OF URBAN
POPULATION FOR 1880, 1890.

DIVISIONS.	Total Population.	
	1890	1880
United States.....	62,622,250	50,155,783
North Atlantic.....	17,401,545	14,507,407
South Atlantic.....	8,857,920	7,597,197
North Central.....	22,362,279	17,364,111
South Central.....	10,972,894	8,919,371
Western.....	3,027,613	1,767,697

DIVISIONS.	Urban Population.		No. of Cities, and Per Cent. of Urban to Total Population.			
	1890	1880	1890		1880	
United States.....	18,235,670	11,318,547	443	29.12	286	22.57
North Atlantic.....	8,976,426	6,254,096	195	51.58	137	43.11
South Atlantic.....	1,420,455	942,387	36	16.04	23	12.40
North Central.....	5,971,272	3,024,679	152	25.90	95	17.42
South Central.....	1,147,147	673,708	37	10.45	20	7.55
Western.....	900,370	423,677	23	29.73	11	23.97

¹⁰ TABLE SHOWING THE NUMBER OF MALES IN 19 CHIEF CITIES (1) OF NATIVE PARENTAGE, (2) FOREIGN BORN, (3) AND OF FOREIGN PARENTAGE.

CITIES.	Native Parentage.	Foreign Born.	Foreign Parentage.
New York.....	138,457	314,481	285,992
Brooklyn.....	108,101	128,672	152,191
Boston.....	67,447	72,792	72,889
Philadelphia.....	202,046	131,762	158,355
Pittsburg.....	35,553	39,978	44,206
Cincinnati.....	39,915	35,509	63,833
Cleveland.....	30,621	51,040	49,225
Chicago.....	118,230	237,523	204,147
Detroit.....	21,444	39,951	38,192
Milwaukee.....	13,325	50,906	46,263
Minneapolis.....	28,613	34,222	23,985
St. Paul.....	16,412	29,085	23,172
St. Louis.....	60,096	61,586	93,185
San Francisco.....	33,413	57,687	53,189
New Orleans.....	33,207	16,474	34,850
Buffalo.....	29,209	45,839	52,218
Jersey City.....	20,967	27,290	32,635
Louisville.....	31,066	11,990	22,208
Washington.....	52,354	6,680	13,719

¹¹ Both here and in Europe there is an increasing appetite for morphine—the worst and most hopeless form of intoxication. In Paris this craving has become a mania. It prevails among all classes and both sexes. An article on this subject in the *New York Herald*, Nov. 22, 1896, says:

“The question which the French people are asking is, How are we to account for this strange epidemic, which is evidently spreading among all classes of society? To this question a startling reply has been given by an eminent French specialist and physician. Here is what he says:—

“‘I do not desire my name to be mentioned,’ he began, ; because what I have to say is not very flattering to a certain number of my colleagues, and while I have noth-

ing to conceal, I have neither the time nor the inclination to take part in any paper war on the subject.'

"It may be stated here that this specialist is one of the best known living authorities on nervous diseases.

"'The mania for morphine,' he continued, 'is growing daily and among all classes. Statistics on the subject are not easily obtainable, because morphine fiends are very crafty, and because no exterior symptoms condemn them in public, as is the case with drunkards and epileptics. From what a number of pharmacists and physicians have told me, however, I estimate that there are not less than fifty thousand persons in Paris who use morphine secretly and almost constantly. Most of those who belong to this army of degenerates are women; indeed, I should put their number at not less than thirty thousand.

"'More instructive, however, than this general statement are the following statistics, which have been carefully compiled, and which show how the vice has spread among persons of the various professions. Here is a table of 230 morphine fiends who belong to twenty-two different professions or trades. You will see—and this is the most startling point—that the first rank on the list is occupied by physicians and their wives, the number of victims among them being sixty-nine. In the second rank we find army officers and their wives, the number of victims among them being twenty; in the third, pharmacists and their families, and in the fourth workingmen and workingwomen, the number of victims among them being eighteen. Among members of the other professions, namely college professors, magistrates, literary men, artists and others, the number of victims varies from two to ten.

"'Now, the amazing fact is that physicians, who, from

their knowledge of the danger, ought to be most of all beyond the reach of contamination, should actually be at the head of the list of morphine fiends. To many the reason will seem obvious. The explanation is that physicians become addicted to the drug through weariness and through their disgust with the most ungrateful of all professions. In other words, being often disappointed and obliged to struggle unsuccessfully for their daily bread, they have sought in the discreet and comparatively silent intoxication of morphine that oblivion which the workingman finds in raw brandy.

“Pharmacists are quite as often to blame as physicians. If they were to strictly obey that law which prohibits them from selling drugs except on a regular prescription, which must be renewed at the time of each purchase, the facilities for obtaining morphine would be much diminished. Certainly, those persons who could not get physicians to help them out of their difficulty would find it very hard to get the drug. A druggist was recently punished for having sold in one month 1,500 grammes of morphine without any formality to one of his lady customers.

“It is just as easy to procure syringes as it is to procure the drug itself. Any one who wants them can buy them at stores where surgical instruments are sold, and also at certain second-hand stores. Jewelers even deal in them. I know one who was on the point of becoming a bankrupt when he conceived the happy idea of manufacturing these deadly little weapons. His customers were mostly women, and he knew well what they wanted. Instead of filling his store windows with bare, unadorned syringes, he hid them deftly in scent bottles, fans, bracelets, and even in parasol handles. The result was, that

he soon paid his debts and is now on the high road to fortune.

“ ‘There are four periods in the evolution of the disease — that of initiation, that of hesitation, that of morphinomania, and that of cachexia, the end of which is death. How long does it take to pass from the initiatory stage to that of morphinomania? That depends on the temperament, those persons who are most nervous being most amenable to the disease. As a rule, however, after a month and a half of injections at the rate of from two to five centigrams per dose, a desire is created which is horribly difficult to conquer.

“ ‘Many so-called remedies for the disease are being tried. In Germany, where the scourge rages with even more intensity than in France, special asylums have been established, in which are employed different methods of treatment, such as the Levinstein or abrupt method, the slow, or progressive method, and the Erlummeyer, or semi-rapid method. This last seems to have given the best results. Here in France we still use the individual and persuasive treatment. Do what we will, however, the incontestable fact remains — and it is a sad confession — that of all known voluntary diseases for which a treatment has been found, morphinomania is one of those, if not the one, which is most rarely cured.’

“ ‘This terrible arraignment of physicians is causing much talk in France, and many are wondering whether the great medical societies will take any notice of it. That they can utterly disprove the grave charges made against physicians is not believed to be possible, but they may be able to show that the statistics on the subject are insufficient and misleading. Possibly they may preserve a dignified silence.’”

What is said above of Paris, applies equally to New York. Another of the metropolitan journals recently had this to say :

“If all the men and women in New York who are victims of the opium, morphine, and cocaine habit were gathered together, they would outnumber the entire population of Troy. In Troy at the last census there were 60,000 people, and an uptown druggist in New York, who has kept in pretty close touch with the sale of these drugs for a number of years back, estimates the number of people in New York who habitually use them medicinally but for their intoxicating effects, at easily 65,000.

“The same authority estimates an annual expenditure of twenty-five dollars a person for the drugs, making a total of \$1,625,000.

“It has long been notorious that the law governing the sale of these poisons is flagrantly violated, and that it requires but a very moderate degree of tact for any person to purchase as much opium, morphine, or cocaine, as he or she wishes, and that from New York drug stores which are considered among the most reputable in the city.

“The druggist who furnished this information to a Sunday World reporter admits that he sells every year 150 ounces of opium, about 10,000 half-grain pills for smoking, and that he has about two thousand customers. But this, of course, has nothing to do with the cocaine trade.

“Cocaine, which is about as deadly as any of the intoxicant drugs, was extensively advertised during Gen. Grant's illness. It was used constantly from the time the cancerous affection of the General's tongue became fully developed, to relieve the constant pain, which with-

out some alleviating drug would have been at times almost unendurable. The papers were filled with cocaine stories, and the soothing effects of the drug were widely proclaimed, but unfortunately without a correspondingly earnest warning that its use was full of peril. Until then it is safe to say that thousands of people, who since have become its victims, never had heard of cocaine.

“The New York druggist above mentioned estimates that there are quite 15,000 victims in New York alone. The sale of the drug is nearly as great as the sale of morphine. The woman known as Eva Ray Hamilton was in a cocaine frenzy when she committed the act which brought out all the wretched scandal, which sent one of the most promising young men in New York to his death.

“The doctors and the hospitals are constantly treating victims of the habit. Only a short time ago a man, well known in New York, after unavailingly trying to break the habit by his own will-power, went to a medical institution. There literally was not an unpunctured spot on his body where he could introduce a hypodermic syringe. He was a mass of ulcers from head to foot, no less than 137 of them being in a painfully aggravated condition.

“Quack throat and catarrh medicines are often mere vehicles for cocaine, and through their use many people are innocently and unconsciously led into the fatal snare. As an alleviator of pain, by benumbing the gums in dentistry, cocaine is often recklessly used by practitioners, and that is another fruitful source for the production of cocaine ‘fiends.’ The malady, moreover, is steadily on the increase.

“There are plenty of laws in the statute books of New York to stop all this, but of what avail are laws unless they are enforced?”

¹⁹ Hon. Louis C. Hughes, ex-Governor of Arizona, has lately written an able and convincing article presenting the claims of Prohibition. After noting the universal admission that there is something wrong in the machinery of government, and stating the remedies presented by the Republican, Democratic, and Prohibition parties, Governor Hughes says:

“The drink traffic annually consumes an amount equal to more than 60 per cent. of the total gold, silver, and paper currency in the United States. A sum equal to nearly twice the capital of all its national banks; four times greater than the total income of the United States government; more than one-third as much as the total value of gold and silver produced in the United States during the last 35 years, and more than one-half the value of the total gold and silver produced in the United States during the last 20 years.

“Where is there a trust or an aggregation of capital, so powerful, so destructive to the prosperity of the people, so threatening to the safety of the government? Why do not these political parties make battle against this giant trust, this octopus which strangles and sucks the life out of every industry in the land, tenfold more than all other trusts and monopolies combined? Instead, they license and protect this evil by federal and State laws.

“The Democrat and Populist insist that the free coinage of silver is of all others the one thing which will dissipate the ills complained of. Yet while our annual drink bill is \$1,237,828,000, the total silver product of the United States for the last 22 years was \$1,214,751,000, or \$23,000,000 less than the drink traffic for one year. Consider the striking contrast as to the relative importance of these two issues. It will take more than 22

years to produce an amount of silver equal to one year's drink bill.

"No! No! Free coinage of silver will not bring the relief as long as we have free rum. We may increase the volume of money indefinitely, but as long as it courses through the saloon, it will prove a greater curse than blessing.

"The Republican party pledges restoration of prosperous times by increasing the tariff. This may protect the manufacturer, but where comes the benefit to the farmer, the working classes, the consumers? They will have to pay more for their manufactured goods, their farming utensils, and while the manufacturer will grow richer, the consumer will grow poorer.

"But in the triumph of Prohibition the hundreds of millions of dollars which now go to the dram-shops will go for food, clothing, the necessaries and comforts of life. The farmer, the builder, the factory, and every industry will thrill with new life, generated by this vast volume of money coursing through their veins, adding vitality and stimulating every industry in the land, creating consumption beyond production, thus advancing the price of labor by creating a demand therefor."

¹⁹ A writer in the London *Times*, referring to the Gothenburg system, says :

"The British Vice-Consul at Skensfiord in his latest reports states that during the last year the time expired for which two of the towns in his district—Skien and Brevig—had the right of having the Gothenburg system of Bolags, or Samlags, for the sale of spirits as a monopoly. According to the new liquor-law the inhabitants of towns have the right of vetoing the further existence of any Bolag in their town. Both Skien and Brevig voted

by large majorities against it, so that they have no longer those Bolags, which were so warmly advocated by the Norwegian press, when the question of the Gothenburg system was fully ventilated a short time ago. The fact of the Bolags having been voted down in several other towns in Norway, besides Skien and Brevig, shows that they are not so popular as might be supposed. But it should be stated that it is mainly owing to the persevering agitation of the teetotal element, aided by the women's votes, that the Samlags are being ousted. In towns where these institutions are thus abolished, and where no privileges for the sale of spirits are still held by private individuals from former days, spirits can not now be bought in smaller quantities than 250 liters, which practically means the non-sale of spirits in such towns.

¹⁴ "The celebrated declaration of the Methodist Church, in the General Conference of 1888, may now fairly be said to represent the opinion of the most enlightened and religiously earnest portion of Christendom at large, so that in citing this we summarize scores of equivalent declarations from other religious bodies: 'The liquor traffic can never be legalized without sin. License, high or low, is vicious in principle and powerless as a remedy!'"—JOSEPH COOK. Art. on License, in "Cyclopedia of Temperance and Prohibition," 362.

¹⁵ A SUGGESTED CONSTITUTION.

OF THE

CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP LEAGUE OF

ARTICLE I.—NAME:

This organization shall be known as the CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP LEAGUE of the (city or county) of _____ auxiliary to the National Christian Citizenship League.

ARTICLE II.—OBJECT.

The object shall be to EDUCATE THE PUBLIC CONSCIENCE; and to secure a more GENEROUS support for ALL MOVEMENTS, which make for the PUBLIC WELFARE.

ARTICLE III.—MEMBERSHIP.

ANY PERSON, in sympathy with its object, may become a member of the League upon the following conditions:

1. By making application through a member.
2. By subscribing to this Constitution.
3. By the payment of——

Membership in the League is continued by the payment of —— per year.

ARTICLE IV.—OFFICERS.

The officers of this League shall consist of a President, Vice-Presidents, Recording Secretary, Corresponding Secretary, and Treasurer. These officials shall hold office for one year, shall perform the duties usually devolving upon such officials, and shall constitute the Executive Committee of the League. The Treasurer shall be required to furnish such bonds or security for the faithful performance of his duty as shall be satisfactory to the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE V.—THE WORKING COMMITTEE.

The working committee shall consist of one representative (or more) from each church or young people's society; at least one from the pastors and one from each other organization in the city (or country) in sympathy with the work of the League. It shall be their duty, under direction of the Executive Committee, to aid in carrying out the plans of the League and to secure as far as possi-

ble the cooperation of all the members of their own organizations to that end.

ARTICLE VI.—MANAGEMENT.

The Executive Committee shall consist of the officers of the League, . . . of whom shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. This committee shall manage the affairs of the League, and make rules for its government not inconsistent with this Constitution. An annual business meeting shall be held on the first — after the first — in — at such place as shall be found convenient. At this meeting shall occur the election of officers.

ARTICLE VII.—AMENDMENTS.

This Constitution may be amended at any regular or special meeting of the League, ten days notice of such amendment having been given ; and providing the same shall be approved by two-thirds of the members present and voting.

1^o THE CHURCH ALLIANCE

of.....

It is not at all necessary that constitutions be uniform. This is only suggested as a form that has been found helpful.

CONSTITUTION.

ARTICLE I.—NAME.

This organization shall be known as The Church Alliance of, auxiliary to the social work of the Evangelical Alliance for the United States of America.

ARTICLE II.—OBJECTS.

Believing that Jesus Christ is the only Savior of society as well as of the individual, it shall be the object of this Alliance to apply the principles of Christ's teachings to the solution of social problems, with a view to aiding the churches in the accomplishment of their social mission.

This Alliance shall seek to prove the deep, practical interest of the allied churches in whatever concerns human welfare.

It shall aid such directly religious efforts as it may approve for united action, and further such moral and civic movements as it may deem to be of large importance.

Its object shall include the aid, in all practical ways, of such existing organizations as, in its judgment, are wisely seeking the common well-being.

The Alliance shall stand in the name of Christ on the side of practical religion, good citizenship, the enforcement of law, the promotion of sobriety, the prevention of cruelty, the alleviation of suffering, the correction of injustice, the rescue of the unfortunate, the reformation of the depraved, and for such kindred ends as pertain to the true social mission of the church; it being understood that all activities of the Alliance shall be subservient to spiritual results, which must always be the supreme object of the churches.

In the furtherance of such objects it is distinctly declared that the Alliance shall not attempt to exercise ecclesiastical or administrative authority over the allied churches. It shall be the servant of the churches, recommending such united action as it deems most wise. It shall be a purely voluntary association, which leaves

the churches, with all their diverging views of doctrine and polity, absolutely unsolicited either to worship or to fellowship which would contradict their independent convictions. Nor shall it lay the churches under any financial obligations.

ARTICLE III.—MEMBERSHIP.

SECTION 1.—All persons in sympathy with the objects of the Alliance and purposing to co-operate with it may become members by signing the Constitution.

SEC. 2.—Any church in sympathy with the objects of this Alliance and purposing to cooperate with it may join the same by electing two of its members to the Board of Managers.

ARTICLE IV.—MANAGEMENT.

The management of the Alliance shall be vested in a Board of Managers, to consist of the pastor of each co-operating church, and two of its members, elected by said church prior to the last Monday of October.

The President, Secretary, and Treasurer of the Alliance shall be *ex-officio* President, Secretary, and Treasurer of the Board of Managers.

ARTICLE V.—OFFICERS.

The officers of the Alliance shall be chosen by the Board of Managers. These officers shall be a President, a Vice-President from each cooperating denomination, a Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee consisting of the President, Secretary, and Treasurer *ex-officio*, together with seven other members.

ARTICLE VI.—AMENDMENTS.

This Constitution may be amended at any regular or special meeting of the Alliance by a two-thirds vote of the members present, provided the amendment shall have been previously approved by the Board of Managers.

¹⁷ Read the chapter on "The Social Evil," in Parkhurst's "Our Fight With Tammany," where this charge is proved.

INDEX.

- Adams, John, 70.
Adams, John Quincy, 71.
Adams, Sam, 36.
Alcohol, 93.
Altgeld, ex-Gov., 63.
Angelo, Michael, 33.
America, described, 20.
American Citizen, defined, 14.
American Citizenship, Essential principle of, 14; bought
with a great price, 22.
American Republic, basis of, 13.
American Secular Union, The, 148.
Anne, Reign of Queen, 128.
Appetite, racial, 91; legitimate and illegitimate uses of,
104.
Arbitration, 184.
Arnold, Matthew, 136.
Athens, 154.
- Bacon, Lord (quoted), 132, 140, 192.
Ballot Box, prostituted, 56, 59.
Baltimore, The moral condition of, 121.
Baptist prayer meetings, 41.
Baptist Young People's Unions, 160.
Barak, 39.
Barton, Clara, 31.
Bede, The Venerable, 91.
Beecher, Henry Ward (quoted), 127, 128.
Birmingham, Eng., 185.
Black Prince, The, 132.
Body, care of the, 189.
Bonaparte, Chas. J. (quoted), 121.
Boodling, 63.

- Boss, Evolution of the, 63.
 Bosworth, The battle of, 132.
 Brontë, Charlotte, 141.
 Brougham, Lord (quoted), 20, 188.
 Bryce, Prof. Jas. (quoted), 76.
 Buckle, The historian (quoted), 25.
 Bull fights, 132.
 Burns, Robt. (quoted), 19, 136.
- Canova, The Sculptor, 33.
 Cards, 122, 123.
 Carlyle, Thos., 18.
 Catherine, of Russia, 29.
 Catholics in Maryland, 47.
 Census, U. S., romance of, 51.
 Chamouni, Vale of, 155.
 Chicago, Moral condition of, 121.
 China, 170.
 Christian Citizenship League, The National, 175, 176;
 platform of, 176, 177.
 Christian Endeavor Societies, 159, 160.
 Christianity, The fundamental law of U. S., 47; should
 be sociological to-day, 171; opportunity of, 169, 170;
 weakness of, 170.
 Church Membership in U. S., 52, 53; wealth of the, 53;
 relation of to education, 54, 55.
 Cities, growth of in U. S., 84; abroad, 184, 185.
 Citizen, meaning of, 11; right of female to vote, 23.
 Citizens, preoccupation and indifference of good, 20.
 Citizenship, Christian, 45-47.
 Civil Service, The, degraded, 69; practice of England,
 Germany, and France regarding, 69; early American
 practice, 70, 71; change in, 71; reform of, 78, 79.
 Clark, Francis E., 159.
 Clark, Dr. (quoted), 172.
 Clay, Henry (quoted), 71, 72.
 Collectivism, Municipal, 185.
 Columbian Fair, The, 153.
 Columbus, Christopher, 46.
 "Combine," described, 63.
 Committees, Christian Citizenship, 160.

- Commons, Prof. John R., 178.
 Comstock, Anthony, 135.
 Constitution, The U. S. (quoted), 13, 23.
 Convention, The City, 59, 60.
 Cooper Institute, 153.
 Copernicus, 33.
 Corporation, Cooperative, 191.
 Croker, Boss, 63.
 Curtis, Geo. Wm. (quoted), 34, 35, 73.
- Dante (quoted), 101.
 Deborah, 39.
 Defoe, Dan'l., 141.
 Demosthenes, 62, 154.
 Dice, 122, 123.
 Dickens, Chas., 141.
 D'Israeli, The Elder, 129.
 Drunkenness, hereditary, 90, 91; physiological explanation, 92; influence of environment on, 92, 93.
 Dugesclin, 128, 132.
 Du Maurier, 137.
 Duty, Personalized, 163.
- Economic Inequality, 181, 182; reacts on legislation, 182.
 Election Day, the Sabbath of patriotism, 65.
 Eliot, Geo., 141.
 Elizabeth, Queen, 29.
 Emerson, R. W. (quoted), 173.
 Epworth Leagues, 159.
 Europe, contrasted with America, 18.
 Evangelical Alliance, The, 177.
 Evangelical Church membership in U. S., 52, 53.
 Everett, Edward (quoted), 126, 127.
- Ferrero, Guglielmo (quoted), 137, 138.
 Field, Justice, 151, 152.
 Fisk, Prof. John (quoted), 172.
 Franklin, Benj. (quoted), 141, 171.
 Freiburg, 131.
- Gambling, 122; universal, 122; implements of, 122;

- houses used for, 124, 125; banned, 125; defined, 126; source of, 128, 129; inveteracy of, 129, 130; menace to society, 130, 131; political aspects of, 131; alliance of with other vices, 131.
- Garfield, Pres., 72.
- Gates, Gen., 22.
- George, Henry, 181.
- George III., King, 35.
- Glasgow, Scotland, 185.
- Gorman, Boss, 6.
- Gothenburg System, 99, 100.
- Greece, 11.
- Greeley, Horace, 141.
- Greene, Gen., 22.
- Gutenberg, John, 131.
- Hamilton, Alex. (quoted), 172.
- "Hamlet" (quoted), 101.
- Harrison, The first, 72.
- Hawthorne, Nath'l, 155.
- Henry IV., of France, 128.
- Herodotus, 11.
- Holland, 12.
- Holy Cross, Mountain of the, 47.
- Hopkins, Boss, 63.
- Hopkins, Ellice, 115, 116.
- Horses, used in gambling, 123.
- Hosmer, Harriet, 33.
- Hulbert, Dean (quoted), 167-171.
- Hume, The historian, 144.
- Ibsen, 137.
- Ideals, value of, 187, 188.
- Idealists, 187, 188.
- Immigrants, number of, 82; distribution of, 84; birth-rate among, 83; urban tendency of, 85; bad influence of in cities, 85.
- Immigration, welcome, 80, 81, 89; deterioration of, 81; consular reports on, 82; industrial effects of, 85, 86; connection with pauper and criminal statistics, 86, 87;

- effect on educational problems, 87; national influence, 88; need of restriction, 88, 89; methods, 89.
- Incarnation, The second, 189.
- Initiative, The, 179, 180.
- Innovation, Uses of, 35, 36.
- Italian Republics, 12.
- Jackson, President, 71.
- Japan, 170.
- Jay, Chief Justice, 47.
- Jefferson, Thomas, 70.
- Johnson, Benjamin, 125.
- Knowledge, importance of in a republic, 17, 18.
- Knox, John (quoted), 188.
- Law and order, 12.
- Legouve (quoted), 110-112.
- Leo X., Pope, 155.
- License, failure of, 98, 99; distinguished from a tax, 99.
- Lincoln, A. (quoted), 19.
- Liquor dealers, percentage to voters, 95; nativity of, 90, 91.
- Liquor traffic, numbers and wealth engaged in, 93, 94; evil effects of, 94, 95; controlled largely by foreigners, 95; European syndicates interested in, 95, 96; organization of, 96; must be dealt with by Christian citizens, 101; denounced by the churches, 94.
- Literature, pernicious, 135-139; wholesome, 140, 141.
- Livingstone, Robert, 51.
- London, 116.
- Lord's Day, The, 142, 143; an occasion for worship, 143, 144; home day, 145; neighborly uses of, 145; day for good works, 146; God's best gift to man, 146; assaults upon, 147-151; defence of, 151-158; an American institution, 156, 157; sanitary value of, 151, 158; opening of museums and libraries on, 150, 152-156; position of working classes regarding, 156, 157; largely secularized, 157.
- Louis XIV., King (quoted), 20.

- Lowell, James R. (quoted), 76.
 Luther, Martin, 132 ; (quoted), 188.
- Madison, President, 70
 Magdalenes, treatment of, 109, 120, 121.
 Malays, as gamblers, 128.
 Manchester, England, 185.
 Marcy, W. L., 71.
 Marion, General, 22.
 Marriage, 190.
 Marshall, Chief Justice, 47.
 Marshall, Tom (quoted), 21.
 Martineau, Harriet, 32.
 Materialism, curse of, 187.
 Mather, Dr. Cotton, 141.
 Mazarine, Cardinal, 128.
 McCrackan, W. D. (quoted), 178.
 McManes, Boss, 63.
 Medici, The, 155.
 Mentz, 131.
 Methodist prayer-meetings, women in, 41.
 Mexico, 132.
 Mill, John Stuart (quoted), 26, 178.
 Milton, John (quoted), 118, 141, 168.
 Mitchell, Maria, 33.
 Montaigne (quoted), 108, 129.
 Mont Blanc, 155.
 Monroe, President, 70.
 Morality, double standard of, 107, 108 ; male transgressions of condoned, 107 ; female sinners unpardoned, 107 ; statutes concerning, 110 ; the double standard a modern device, 114-115.
 Moses, law of, on seduction, 113, 114.
 Mott, Lucretia, 33.
 Muller, Prof. Max, 172.
 Murillo, 49.
- Napoleon (quoted), 24.
 Nation, The, perils of, 48.
 Newspaper, The modern, 132 ; Sunday editions of, 148 ; worldliness of, 149, 150.

- New Testament, little positive legislation in the, 37.
New York City, 120, 160.
Nordau, Max (quoted), 138, 139.
Novels, décolleté, 135.
- Offices, distribution of, 61.
Officials, public, made distributors of party spoils, 72.
Opera Bouffe, 156.
Organization, needs of Christian, 170, 171; basis of, 171; objects of, 171, 172; methods of, 174, 175, 176.
Organizations, varieties of in U. S., 59, 60, 61.
Otis, Jas. (quoted), 27, 36.
- Pall Mall Gazette*, The, 116.
Paris, The City of, 147, 155.
Parkhurst, The Rev. C. H. (quoted), 120.
Parties, formation of, 70.
Patriotism, Christian revival of, 48, 49.
Patti, Adelina, 33.
Paul, St., 38, 39.
Pennsylvania, whisky rebellion in, 98, 135.
People, responsibility of the in U. S., 20.
Peter, the Great, 29.
Pharisees, The, 144.
Philip, of Macedon, 154.
Phillips, Wendell (quoted), 16, 26, 118-120, 188.
Pilgrims, The New England, 47, 187.
Pittsburg, The City of, 135, 160.
Platt, Boss, 63.
Political system, our, defects, 177, 178, 179, 180.
Politician, The professional, described, 63, 64.
Politics, The sphere of, 60.
Pope, the poet (quoted), 123.
Potter, Bishop, 147, 148.
Power, entails obligation, 21.
Primary, The, defined, 59; functions of, 59, 60; dominated by the vices, 60; connection of bosses with, 60; reform must begin at, 62.
Prophetesses, Old Testament, 39.
Proportional Representation, 178, 179.
Puritan, The, 144.

Quay, Boss, 63.

Raphael, 49.

Referendum, The, 180, 181.

Reform, Municipal, 161, 162.

Rénan, E. (quoted), 136.

Reporters, Methods of, 132, 133.

Richard III., King, 132.

"Ring," revenue of the, 60, 61.

Robinson, C. S. (quoted), 157.

Rome, 11, 12.

Romilly, Sir Sam'l., 36.

Russell, Earl, 149.

Sabbath, The Jewish, 143; the Pharisaic, 144.

Saloons, 93, 94.

Sanitation, 163, 164.

Schurz, Carl (quoted), 172.

Scott, Sir Walter, 141.

Seduction, age of consent, 109-112; sin of, defined by canon law, 113, 114; Jewish law regarding, 114; ancient law regarding, 114; English law, 115.

Semiramis, law, 29.

Shaftsbury (quoted), 188.

Shakespeare, 125; (quoted), 191.

Siamese, The, as gamblers, 128, 129.

Single Tax, The, 181-183.

Social Conditions, 162-164.

Social Evil, The, reticence regarding, 102, 103; essence of, 104-106; sacrilege of, 105; involves two in one sin, 105; effects of on individual and society, 106, 107; European treatment of, 107-112; attempts to introduce European methods in America, 109; sources of, 118-120; political dangers of, 120, 121.

Society, The ancient, theory of, 11, 12; modern ideal of, 190-192.

Somerset, Lady, 32.

South Carolina, another liquor traffic, 100.

Spain, 132.

Sparta, 11.

Spencer, Herbert (quoted), 172.

Spoils System, The, 71-73; used by bosses, 74, 75; rea-

- son for the, 76, 77 ; contrasted with English patronage, 77, 78.
- Staël, De, Mme. (quoted), 24, 32.
- Stead, Wm. T., 116.
- Stock Exchange, gambling on the, 126.
- Strasbourg, The City of, 131.
- Strong, Josiah (quoted), 173, 177.
- Suffrage, manhood, 13-15 ; morality and education the guards of, 15-19 ; educational value of, 16, 17 ; female, objections to, considered, 23-42.
- Sumner, Chas. (quoted), 101.
- Sumter, Gen., 22.
- Supreme Law, The, 16.
- Swartwout, Sam'l. (quoted), 73.
- Switzerland, 180.
- Tacitus, 90.
- Taine, the historian, 90.
- Talleyrand (quoted), 17.
- Tamerlane, 34.
- Temperance workers, charity among, 98.
- Thackeray, William M , 141.
- Therese, Marie, Queen, 29.
- Timor, the Tartar, 34.
- Titian, 49.
- Tocqueville, de A , 17.
- Tolstoi, Count, 137.
- Town, the defined, 59-62.
- Tribune*, the Chicago (quoted), 139.
- Tweed, Boss, 63.
- United States, the growth of, 50-54.
- Victoria, Queen, 29.
- Vienna, the city of, 155.
- Virtue, male, 107-112.
- Votes, bought and sold, 18, 19 ; controlled by bosses, 59, 62.
- Washington, 47, 70.
- Waterloo, the battle of, 159.
- Watts, Dr. Isaac (quoted), 105.
- Wealth, distributed, 191.

- Webster, Daniel, 47.
Wellington, the Duke of, 159.
Wesley, John, 166, 188.
Westminster Leagues, 160.
Wheelock, Edwin D. (quoted), 175.
White Cross Army, 116.
Whitefield, the Evangelist, 166.
Wilde, Oscar, 154.
Willard, Frances E. (quoted), 32, 107-109.
Woman, pagan, mediæval, and modern, conceptions of
23-25.
Women, in young people's societies, 41.

Yankees Europeanized, 147, 148.
Young people's societies, relation of, to Christian citizen-
ship, 159-165.

Zola, E., 137.