

# The Independent

Entered at the Post-office at New York, as Second-class Mail Matter

"EVEN AS WE HAVE BEEN APPROVED OF GOD TO BE INTRUSTED WITH THE GOSPEL, SO WE SPEAK; NOT AS PLEASING MEN, BUT GOD WHICH PROVETH OUR HEARTS."

VOLUME XXXVIII.

NEW YORK THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1886.

NUMBER 1979.

## The Independent.

This issue contains 40 Pages.  
For Table of Contents, see Page 24.

### AN AUTUMN ANNIVERSARY.

BY DANSKE DANDRIDGE.

O BEAUTY, Beauty, thou wilt drive me mad!  
Where shall I turn, or whither shall I flee?  
Thou dost oppress the very soul of me  
With hauntings of the dear delights I had.  
In all the red and orange pomp I see,  
In all the glory of the gold and green,  
Naught but what is not and what once hath  
been,  
And all the pain that is and should not be.  
Alas! Alas! by all our powers of bliss,  
By all the fleeting splendor of the day,  
By the last rosy cloud that fades away,  
There is no sadder loveliness than this.  
O mist upon the valley rise and rise,  
And draw the moon within thy silver fold!  
The day of my despair is dead and cold,  
And all the stars are shining in the skies.  
SHEPHERDSTOWN, W. VA.

### NATURE'S THRENODY.

(P. H. H.)

BY MARGARET J. PRESTON.

A MUMMUM, sad as far-off muffled bells,  
Goes faintly sighing through the shivering  
pines;  
The thrill as of a thousand kissed farewells  
Stir into tremors all the drooping vines.  
The trailing Muscadines  
Forget to take their autumn splendor on,  
And wring their hands with gesture of de-  
spair,  
Athwart the spicy air,  
Because the voice that sang to them is gone.  
Along the hemlock aisles the winds complain,  
Like chanting priests. I catch the measured  
tread  
Of weeping Oreads, following twain by twain;  
While Dryads bear the pale and silent dead,  
Couched on a fragrant bed  
Of pines, marsh-mallows, and the golden-rod;  
And reverently beneath the cedar shade,  
Where their his grave have made,  
They wrap him in the autumn's russet sod.  
I hear the whippoorwill within the vale,  
Tapping, in wan despair, his funeral beat;  
The mocking-bird sobs out a twilight wail,  
Most melancholy, most divinely sweet,  
Because the lingering feet,  
For whom it practiced its delicious strain,  
And crooned it hour by hour, till dayspring  
rose—  
Too well, too well it knows  
Those lingering feet will never come again!  
The clouds dissolve themselves in pallid mist,  
That clings like cere-cloths. In the Southern  
breeze  
All gladness dies, by solemn memories whist;  
The pattering of the rain amid the trees,  
Is like the moan of seas  
After the wreck. And all this silence shed  
O'er Nature, like a diapason pause,  
Has come to pass, because  
The poet, who has led the choir, is dead!

### BULGARIA SINCE THE ABDICA- TION OF PRINCE ALEXANDER.

BY GEORGE WASHBURN, D.D.,  
PRESIDENT OF ROBERT COLLEGE.

In some book which I read when I was a small boy, there was a picture of a poor man writhing in the folds of an anaconda, while two or three others stood around with guns in their hands. It is still an unsettled question in my mind whether the

guns were ever used or whether the poor man was crushed and eaten by the anaconda.

A similar picture may be seen now in the Balkans, and there also it is still a question whether the man is to be killed and eaten or the snake driven off. I can paint the picture, but I cannot finish the story in this case any more than in the other. Here, as there, the result depends upon the skill, the courage, and the speed of the men with guns. As to what the snake will do, if left to himself, there is no doubt.

When Prince Alexander was forced to abdicate he left the Government of Bulgaria in the hands of the Anti-Russian party. He could do nothing else, for this party represented the army and the great majority of the people who would gladly have retained their Prince, even by force. Up to the present time this government has maintained peace and order in the country under a mild martial law. Notwithstanding the great excitement prevailing, there have been no disturbances, and no illegal acts, except that persons in different places concerned in the conspiracy against the Prince have been soundly beaten by the Loyalists.

It must be acknowledged, too, that this government has done its best to conciliate foreign powers. It has renewed relations with Servia and maintained those with Roumania. It has treated the Turks with the greatest respect and tried its best to make terms with Russia. Its one object is to preserve order and get out of the present crisis as soon as possible without surrendering the independence of the nation. I need not add that it is looking anxiously all the while to the men with guns to see what they are doing. Everything depends in the end upon Austria and Germany.

The policy of Russia, so far as I can understand it, is to reduce the country to a state of anarchy, and then to occupy it. To go back no further than last August, it can hardly be doubted that Russia sought and expected a civil war in Bulgaria after the kidnapping of the Prince. Had she desired to maintain order and tranquillity, she would have made some provision for governing the country after the removal of the Prince; but she did nothing of the kind. Nothing was arranged. Everything was left to chance. The conspirators themselves, who were the agents of Russia, had no idea what was to be done after the destruction of the existing government. They waited for orders from St. Petersburg. They finally organized a government, which fell almost as soon as it was set up, and nothing saved the country from civil war but the unexpected weakness of the Russian party. They were absolutely lost in the sudden uprising of the people, and dared not raise their heads. When the Prince returned at the call of the people, Russia interposed to prevent the punishment of the rebels, and, with the consent of Germany and Austria, forced him to abdicate. She then refused to recognize the existing government, and commenced a crusade against it all over the country, putting every possible obstacle in its way. Finally she sent General Kaulbars as a sort of Russian dictator to attack the government openly and officially.

He first presented an ultimatum to the government, and then, in defiance of its orders, he caused a proclamation to be posted all over the country, making known to the people that it was the will of the Czar that no one concerned in kidnapping the

Prince should be punished, that martial law should be at once abolished, that the election of a general assembly to choose a Prince should be postponed, in spite of the Constitution, and in general that the people should humble themselves before their great benefactor, the Czar. He then started on a tour to rouse the country against the government; in other words, to stir up a rebellion in favor of Russia. If no one interferes, this is a game in which Russia is sure to win in the end. If the Bulgarians listen to him he will stir up a civil war; if they do not, they will be in rebellion against their great benefactor. In either case it will be necessary to send a Russian army to occupy the country. At last accounts General Kaulbars was having a hard time of it, and meeting with anything but an agreeable reception. The people are exasperated, and the partisans of Russia are looked upon as enemies of the nation. The army is still loyal, and General Kaulbars has failed to influence it.

Meanwhile the condition of Bulgaria is pitiable. There is no business and no confidence. Most of those concerned in the conspiracy against the Prince have either fled from the country or are under arrest. The Russian crusade is demoralizing the people and exciting the most bitter enmity between parties. The loyal people are almost in despair and many have given up all hope. They feel the folds of the snake tightening around them and hear no answer to their cries for help. They know that without help all their writhing will be in vain. It all comes back, then, to the simple question what Austria and Russia will do. If they have decided to give up Bulgaria and Constantinople to Russia, the sooner they make it known the better for all concerned. Why should Bulgaria be ruined first and given to Russia after all? Why should Bulgarian patriots be sacrificed for nothing? General Kaulbars has already warned them of the fate that awaits them when Russia takes possession. If they are to be Russianized, let them know it, that they may accept their fate with resignation and make the best of it.

But there is every reason to believe that Austria and Germany have determined not to give up Bulgaria and Constantinople to Russia. The Prince was sacrificed, and now the Bulgarians are sacrificed simply to postpone an inevitable war. The Prime Minister of Hungary has already announced to the world that Russia will not be allowed to occupy Bulgaria, while Russia is pursuing a course which must lead to an occupation, or to such a confession of defeat as would humiliate her before all the world. This means war, a great and terrible war, which every Christian man must bitterly regret. But the Bulgarians will not be in any way responsible for it. They have simply asked to be let alone. They have attacked no one, and injured no one. A Russian official lately said to a Bulgarian: "Either you will be our bridge to Constantinople, or you will be destroyed." When the war comes, it will be due simply to the ambition of Russia, not to any struggle for liberty on the part of Bulgaria.

I am not a prophet, and I must leave my picture unfinished; but it is my belief that the men with guns finally attacked the anaconda and rescued his victim in a damaged condition. I feel equally sure that Austria and Germany will stop the progress of Russia and save Bulgaria sooner or later; but it will be long, at best, before Bulgaria

recovers from the effects of the terrible struggle now going on.

She merits the sympathy of every man in the world who believes in the right of a nation to govern itself, and however little interest we may feel in Austria or other opponents of Russia, however we may incline to admire the grandeur of the great empire of the Czar, she can never have the sympathy of any true American in the present crusade against the rights and liberty of a brave, struggling Christian nation.

CONSTANTINOPLE, Oct. 11th, 1886.

### HIGH LICENSE WEIGHED IN THE BALANCES AND—

BY HERRICK JOHNSON, D.D.

This article is born of a desire to make intelligent opinion and get more men on our side. We wish to be fair. We want no false weights. Appeals to prejudice go for nothing in the final judgment passed upon a great public question. Our object is not anybody's discomfiture, but the capture of convictions.

Undoubtedly High License is having some most respectable and efficient advocacy. Men of unimpeachable temperance record and of high Christian character, lend it their sanction, and hail it as the best thing in the interest of law and order at present attainable. They deplore the evils of intemperance; many of them practice total abstinence, and many believe in the principle of prohibition, but they favor High License as the only measure now practicable.

Is this position defensible? We question both its political and its moral soundness. Your candid judgment, good reader, on this matter. Let the scales be held with judicial fairness. While everything is put into the High License side that can justly be claimed for it, we must be as fair in adjusting the weights for the other side. And then if High License is found wanting, "let us have done with it."

"More revenue" is the first item claimed for the High License side. Very well. The claim is good. The item belongs there. And it is a big item in dollars. One is almost astonished at the figures. In Illinois the revenue from the saloon business has been increased by High License from \$700,000 to more than \$4,500,000. In the city of Chicago, from \$200,000 to \$1,500,000. Millions of dollars, you see, in one state! One and a half million dollars in a single city! That will repair a good many streets, build a good many sidewalks, adorn a good many public parks, provide for additional police.

"Fewer Saloons" is the second item for the High License side. The justice of this claim has been challenged. We believe it debatable. But an actual count would probably show a margin in its favor. Doubtless there are some fewer saloons in Illinois to-day than before the High License bill was passed.

In making this concession, however, fairness equally demands that we make it jibe with the facts. Four things are here beyond dispute. First, towns in Illinois having voted "no license," for years, are now, through the temptation of this large revenue, voting in favor of license. Secondly; of forty-nine men, selected at random from different parts of the state, without any knowledge of their political

rain or snow, or a cyclone; and thousands of our out-of-town readers would like also to know when to come to New York to do their winter's shopping, renew their subscription to THE INDEPENDENT, see the Brooklyn Bridge, etc.; and if Wiggins can tell us about these things we will all vote him a hearing at a special meeting, to be called for that purpose, but not at one called to promote the cause of missions. But Wiggins has failed us often, so often that we are becoming a little timid about believing in his weather "speculations." In the meantime we continue to have a great deal of respect and confidence in the old church weather-vane, which seems yet to be very truthful in what it says about the weather. At this writing, therefore, we vote for the prophet on yonder steeple.

But what shall we say about the Chicago grain speculators, who, by the way, like some others, speculate mostly in "futures"? What do they know about next year's droughts, or next month's prairie fires, or next week's Charleston earthquake, or a possible cyclone, or—what may scare them more—a powerful combination of "speculators" which may possibly be arrayed against them? They have no special "revelations" in regard to what may happen in the "future"; and, therefore, the "wheat speculators," "not knowing what a day may bring forth," are by no means the infallible sort of men who are safe to follow.

But let us not overlook the grand army of stock speculators, bond speculators, oil speculators, mining speculators, blind pool speculators, and last, if not least, curbstone speculators. What shall be said, what can be said, with safety, about this countless "horde of speculators," who live, move, and have their being by speculation? What do they know more than theologians, or other men, about the "future," particularly of the money market; or what big bank or other corporation will fail; or when and where another Chicago fire will destroy a hundred millions in a day; when Russia will pounce upon poor Bulgaria, or Turkey, or Italy, or all of them put together? Don't let us, therefore, put too much confidence in New York—Wall Street—speculators; for a great cloud of reliable witnesses will tell you it is very dangerous thus to do. What, we ask again, do our financial speculators know "in regard to the future"? Practically nothing!

Now and then, we come across those who believe in dreams, and who sometimes are greatly troubled about their own "free thoughts" during the night season. They reason about, and speculate a great deal about their dreams, because they think that, in some very mysterious way, they relate to the "future" of their well-being. Nearly akin to this class are those who believe in signs—such as the dangers which will surely happen to some one "of thirteen at a table," or to him or her who sees the moon over the wrong shoulder. They "speculate" a great deal about these matters, and sometimes scare people in telling them what will happen in the "future." Don't trust such speculators, much.

Now and then, also, we hear of women "speculators," who, in engaging to marry a German prince, or an Italian count, or a lazy English duke—of noble blood—against the protest of parents and friends—expecting a happy "future" by so doing—find, in a very near "future," that they hardly could have made a worse speculation, of any sort, if they had tried.

Speculation in matrimonial affairs is not much more dangerous, however, than in the often bad, very bad, speculation of uniting one's self in business with one who, at heart, is an unprincipled scamp, taking the great risk because he is reputed to be rich and influential in certain quarters.

Colleges and seminaries, banks and insurance companies often speculate rashly in making their official appointments. They look more for men who can, in the future, control endowments or financial success, than for men specially adapted, by training and integrity, for the position to be filled. Such speculators, usually do more harm than they dream of.

We have shown, we think conclusively, that speculators, of any sort, should not be classed among our wisest and best men, and that speculating, in any way, is not, on

the whole, a very safe and profitable business to follow. And, therefore, we advise our readers not to indulge much in that direction—the less the better. Life is too short, and time too valuable to be spent in that way. We had better keep on the safe side—in matters of religion, particularly. The plainly revealed truths of the Bible should be our guide. It is always safe to follow them. Prying into matters not revealed, debating about such things, and, worse than all, attempting to preach and teach the world about them, is overstepping the bounds of wisdom, propriety, or safety. To do such things, and, by your example, influence others to spend their time in "mere speculation," is to engage in very dangerous business. Remember, ye speculators, therefore, that you know not what the end or result of such dangerous work may be.

**KEEPING THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT.**

WE have already noted the fact that the "unity of the Spirit" is not to be found in uniformity of thought, organized church life, or in forms of worship. It lies deeper than all these things. It is to be found in the central life of God's people, in the bond that binds them all alike to God by Jesus Christ. It will be observed that the Apostle's injunction is not to "find" the unity of the Spirit, or to "come" to the unity of the Spirit; but to "keep" it. Later on in the chapter (Eph. iv.) he tells us that the object of keeping "the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace" is that, under the ministry of the gifts provided by Christ, we might "all come into the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God." We have erred in making the "unity of the Spirit" and the "unity of the faith" convertible terms; whereas, they are quite different. The unity of the Spirit has to do with the common life by which all God's people are animated, while the "unity of the faith" is the common apprehension of the truth as revealed in Christ. Surely it must be apparent that one reason why we have been so slow and so long in coming to a "unity of faith" is because we have failed in the meantime to keep "the unity of the Spirit."

Our first and chief business in the matter of fellowship with each other is to recognize the fact of spiritual unity, and then keep it. Unless this is done, the grace of God is frustrated in so far as the true edification of the body of Christ is concerned, and our divergences of thought will necessarily lead to heresies and conflict. This, indeed, has been the result of our failure in respect of this great exhortation.

Every Christian has the "one Spirit" by which he was baptized into the "one body" of Christ. He does not have to get that Spirit after he becomes a Christian. He is only a Christian because, through the presence and operation of that Spirit, he has been enabled to see and confess Jesus Christ as Lord. For, "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." This, then, is the starting-point and basis of Christian unity and union. At all hazard, we must keep that unity.

It may be interesting and helpful to note some of the particulars in which that Spirit is manifest, which ought to be signs to us by which we may recognize each other as members of the household of God, and so always maintain fellowship with each other in spiritual bonds of peace, however much we may diverge (for the present) in intellectual apprehensions of the truth.

The first certain manifestation of the presence of the Spirit of God in any soul is in his confession of Jesus Christ as Lord. There may be signs of spiritual life in conviction of sin and in earnest anxiety concerning his salvation, but we cannot certainly say that any man is really indwelt by the Holy Spirit of God until he confesses Jesus Christ; for, says the apostle (I. Cor. xii. 3): "I give you to understand that no man, speaking by the Spirit of God, calleth Jesus accursed, and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." It seems clear that our first bond of unity is in a common recognition and confession of Jesus as Lord. Where this confession is, there we must claim fellowship and demand it, and that in bonds of peace.

The second test of spiritual oneness must be found in the "fruit of the Spirit." If a man confess Jesus as Lord, and yet is not bringing forth the fruit of the Spirit, we are morally sure that his confession is not by the Spirit; for it is the scriptural test of the sincerity of our confession of Christ that we be "filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ unto the glory of God." (Phil. i. 2.) Now we know what those fruits of righteousness are. They are "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance; and such things, against which there is no law." This, then, is the second sign of the presence of the Spirit in a man: That he is animated by faith in Jesus Christ to a new and holy life, which shows itself in righteousness and the gentle graces of the Spirit. Where these are, together with a confession of Jesus Christ as Lord, we are bound to keep unity, no matter what the communion is, according to outward organization, in which such an one is found. He may be Roman Catholic, or he may be Quaker. He may differ to any extent with me as to many doctrines of the Bible; nevertheless, if he confess Jesus as his Lord, and is bringing forth fruits of righteousness, we are bound to recognize and fellowship him in the spiritual bond we are bidden to keep.

Another mark of the Spirit's presence in a man is, that he is kindly-affectioned toward all who bear the name of Christ, and solicitous for their spiritual welfare. If such an one is seen to be going astray, or has been overtaken in a fault, the truly spiritual man will "seek to restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering himself, lest he also be tempted." (Gal. vi. 1.) The unity of the Spirit is often lost by our not thus meekly and lovingly watching over each other. When one falls, or goes astray in doctrine, it is too often the case that other Christians avoid him, or take up an evil and uncharitable testimony against him. Such a course breaks spiritual unity, by alienating the erring brother, and by grieving the Spirit in those who have not manifested brotherliness toward the weak one. "To bear each other's burdens is to fulfill the law of Christ"; to fail in this direction is both to grieve and endanger the unity of the Spirit.

Once more, the presence of the Spirit of God is always manifested in those who are born of that Spirit by an immediate desire to see others brought to a knowledge of Christ and salvation. A desire for souls, therefore, is one of the infallible marks of the Spirit's presence. We must, therefore, keep the unity of the Spirit with all those who are seeking to save men and bring them to Christ. Christ would not allow his disciples to forbid those who were not following with them while they were casting out devils in his name. Paul insisted on rejoicing that Christ was preached, even by those who seemed to be doing it "of envy, strife and contention," so tenacious was he of keeping fellowship with all who even named the name of the Lord Jesus to others. It seems plain, then, that all who love our Lord Jesus Christ should, by "keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace," "stand fast in that one Spirit, striving together for the faith of the Gospel; and if in other things we be otherwise minded, God will reveal even such things unto us."

**A SUNDAY REST FOR THE UNITED STATES ARMY.**

It may not be generally known that Sabbath-breaking is enforced upon all soldiers in the service of the United States by the regulations now in use. The regulation is as follows:

"Paragraph 1822, A. R.—Captains will inspect their companies every Sunday morning. No soldier will be excused from Sunday inspection except the guard, the sick, and the necessary attendants in the hospital."

And the practice is known to be worse than is ordered. Sunday is made in many posts the day for sham parades, military ceremonies and battalion drills. The matter has been under discussion of late in the *Army and Navy Journal*, and it is to be devoutly hoped that it may be found that a free Sunday is not above the American soldier's deserts, not to say rights. The text of the first editorial in the *Army and Navy Journal* (September 18th, 1886) was taken from

some remarks of General Merritt, Superintendent of the Military Academy at West Point, which were called out by the occurrence of a court martial at that post on a Sunday. "The trial by court martial," said the General, "of an enlisted man on Sunday, there being no certified nor apparent necessity for such trial, is irregular, if not illegal. It is a rule among the Christian nations that no military duties not necessary to the well-being of a command shall be performed on the Sabbath day. It is not proposed by the commanding officer of this post that at the National Military School, in this least busy season of the year, shall the first step be taken to violate a principle which is as sacred as it is venerable." The *Army and Navy Journal* points out that no illegality results from the trial having taken place on Sunday, but suggests that something ought to be done to protect, in the Army, the liberty of those who desire to be free on this day from business and work of all kinds. The spirit governing the observance of the day, it suggests, ought to be that which animated the admirable proclamation of President Lincoln, issued in the midst of the Civil War:

"EXECUTIVE MANSION, }  
WASHINGTON, Nov. 15th, 1862 }

"The President, Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, desires and enjoins the orderly observance of the Sabbath by the officers and men in the military and naval service. The importance for man and beast of the prescribed weekly rest, the sacred rights of Christian soldiers and sailors, a becoming deference to the best sentiment of a Christian people, and a due regard to the Divine will, demand that Sunday labor in the Army and Navy be reduced to the measure of strict necessity.

"The discipline and character of the national forces should not suffer, nor the cause they defend be imperiled by the profanation of the day or name of the Most High. 'At this time of public distress,' adopting the words of Washington in 1776, 'men may find enough to do in the service of God and their country without abandoning themselves to vice and immorality.' His first general order issued by the Father of his Country, after the Declaration of Independence, indicates the spirit on which our institutions were founded and should ever be defended: 'The General hopes and trusts that every officer and man will endeavor to live and act as becomes a Christian soldier defending the dearest rights and liberties of his country.'

"ABRAHAM LINCOLN."

The *Journal* continues:

"This order came from the highest military authority known to our law; it has never been revoked or modified; is there any reason, then, why it is not still binding upon the services? . . . 'What is to prevent weekly inspection being held on Saturday afternoon, the Sunday grand mount at the place and hour of undress grand mount, and all offices and storehouses closed, except for actual and pressing needs, on Sunday, and dress parades, reviews, artillery salutes and band concerts prohibited on this one day of the week?'"

Why, indeed? we may echo. And the echo comes very strongly from the Army itself, whose Christianity and liberty are directly struck at by the present regulations. In the *Army and Navy Journal* for Oct. 2d, 1886, the matter receives new attention, and strong opinions of several correspondents in favor of the proposed change in the direction of Sabbath-keeping are given. One officer writes:

"I believe you express the best and majority sentiment of the Army. . . . I hold that freedom from all work and duty, except guard and police, on Sunday, will be in the interest of good order and military discipline."

Another follows in similar strain, and a third inquires why the Army cannot obtain a re-issue of President Lincoln's proclamation, embodied in an order from Headquarters of the Army, forbidding labor, parades, etc., on Sunday, except in cases of imperative necessity. "Let us who desire to enjoy its hours in quiet have that privilege."

Now the point in our civilian mind is this. If the Sabbath-breaking that is at present enforced in the Army is not really necessary, and if many of the officers and men do desire to be allowed to keep the Sabbath day, why cannot something be done to help them? We propose it as a question to the Committee on Sabbath-breaking everywhere; to Church courts and to individual Christian men of influence: Cannot something be done to help our brethren in the Army and Navy to obtain this very modest boon? Now is the time to do

whatever can be done. The question has been raised by the Army itself. Is the Christian sentiment of the people at large not strong enough to have the Army regulations of its own forces so framed that Christian men may enlist and serve with a good conscience? We do not know what to propose; but surely every pressure should be brought to bear upon the authorities, I will not say to Christianize, but to depaganize the Army regulations. Is it true, as one correspondent of the *Journal* suggests, that "the things that benefit or demoralize the soldier seem apt to be treated by authority as too insignificant or interesting for discussion or action." Are they too insignificant for the Christian people to consider, too? Certainly those who have busied themselves in obtaining such improvement in the regulations governing public institutions for the restraint and government of men already vicious, may find an even better field for their labors in obtaining some improvement in the regulations governing our soldiers, lest they be made vicious—that they may serve their country without being forced, in Lincoln's words, "to abandon themselves to vice and immorality."

**THE SECRET THINGS OF GOD.**

"The secret things," said Moses to the children of Israel, "belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children, forever, that we may do all the words of this law." The secret things of God are things not revealed, and not lying within the natural range of our faculties. They are, consequently, unknown to us, not by reason of perversity and depravity, but by reason of the limitation imposed upon our mental powers. It is not our duty to know them. They belong to God, and not to us.

It is true that God is, to some extent, made known by his works, and more fully revealed in his Word; yet when considered in the eternity and infinitude of his being and attributes, in the exercise of his creating power, in his moral government over men, in the vast scheme of his providential appointments, in the mystery of divine incarnation in the person of Jesus Christ, and in the reasons of his conduct, God himself is to human thought a most stupendous secret. He does not to that thought, in either nature or revelation, give a complete account of his matters. He does not submit his secrets to our review. He is so great a being alike in himself and in his relations to the universe, that no one can "by searching, find out God," and no one "finds out the Almighty unto perfection." "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts, than your thoughts." The more one really knows, the more sensibly will he be impressed with the limitation of his own faculties, especially when the eye of his mind is turned toward the great Being who made him.

An occasion is thus furnished for trusting God where we cannot trace him. Indeed, one of the best tests of piety toward him consists in the cordial, cheerful, hopeful, filial, unhesitating and confident assumption that all things, however mysterious and perplexing to us, and how ever afflictive to our natural sensibilities, are in every particular appointed and managed wisely and well by him, and that they would so appear to us if we could see as he does the end from the beginning. This assumption is not more devout than wise. We can safely refer what we do not know to the God who does know, and who, in creating this world, and then in governing it after the counsel of his own will, never made a mistake. Much better is this course than that insolence and temerity of the head, and that impiety and rebellion of the heart, which, without knowledge, presumes to arraign God, and put him on trial at the bar of mere human reason. It is enough to know that he is on the throne of universal being, as the great originating, ever-present, guiding and infinite Spirit, and to leave with him all the "secret things" which we do not and cannot understand.

This is the only disposal of such things that can bring to the human mind repose of thought and quietude of feeling. He who declines thus to dispose of them, is in a sad predicament for his own comfort. He will not thereby enlarge his own wisdom, but will make his whole life a continuous scene of intellectual perplexity. He will be constantly chased, haunted, and tormented with mysteries which he cannot explain, and which God has not chosen to explain. While not securing the comforts of knowledge, he will deprive himself of those comforts that come from a trustful and hopeful faith. He may rebel against his own limitations, yet he cannot extricate himself therefrom.

The plain truth is that God himself, though not fully comprehended by men, yet, considered as existing at the head of the universe, and there ruling in absolute supremacy, is the polar star of our earthly life. We must sail under the guidance of this star, or our thoughts will be stranded on a shoreless sea. Accepting his infinite wisdom as the compensation for our ignorance, and his power as the protection of our weakness, we must cheerfully consent that "the secret things" shall "belong unto the Lord our God." He understands them, if we do not. And this is quite enough for that philosophy which has its basis in the exercise of confiding and unquestioning faith.

**Editorial Notes.**

The eminent scholar, De Wette, who has been spoken of as a sort of universal doubter, says in his last commentary: "Only this I know; in no other is there salvation, except in the name of Jesus Christ and him crucified, and for the human race there is nothing higher than the Godman realized in him, and the kingdom of God planted in him." This accords with what Peter said to the Jews soon after the ascension of Christ into Heaven. Referring to Christ, the apostle remarked: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Jesus, on one occasion, said unto the twelve disciples: "Will ye also go away?" Peter promptly replied: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." A wiser answer could not have fallen from the lips of a Saviour. Those who do not like Jesus Christ as a Saviour, and prefer to cavil with his Gospel rather than to accept it as "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," would do well to consider what they are going to do without this salvation. Sinners they are, under the condemnation of the law of God, and needing salvation, whatever they may do with the Gospel of Christ. Die they must, and the great issues of eternity they must meet, whether they accept or reject Christ. What he presents to them is a plan for their salvation, in virtue of what he has done, and will do in their behalf upon their compliance with its terms; and if they decline to accept this plan, what will they substitute for it? Rejecting Christ, and God's salvation through him, to whom will they then go? What system of religious teaching can, in the probability, yea, the moral certainty of its truth, be compared with that of Christianity? What other system have we so many reasons for accepting, and so few for rejecting? It seems to us that not to be a Christian is, to say the least, the most awful imprudence that one can perpetrate upon himself.

CHATTANOOGA UNIVERSITY was formally dedicated last week, and Bishop Walden, one of the speakers of the occasion, in his history of the enterprise, referred to the refusal of the authorities of the institution to receive the two colored men who applied for admission, showing, in the first place, that the Freedmen's Aid Society exists for whites as well as Freedmen, secondly, that its funds are collected avowedly for both whites and blacks, and thirdly that the last General Conference gave two utterances on the subject of mixed schools and churches, the first declaring that the question of separate or mixed schools is one of expediency, to be left to the choice and administration of those on the ground, and the second providing that no student shall be excluded from any school under the supervision of the Church on account of race or color. The Bishop did not attempt to reconcile these utterances, nor to show how colored men could be excluded from Chattanooga University under the second and latest declaration of the General Conference. No one seems to have raised a protest against the establishment of the institution on a caste basis. Bishop Mallalieu was eloquent on other points, but silent (so unlike the old New England Dr. Mallalieu) on this. And the Church press for the most part are silent—silent as the grave. Only the *Northern*, of all the large *Advocate* family, has had anything to say, so far as we have noticed, about the dedication of the Chattanooga University to caste. Our Chicago contemporary utters these brave, noble words:

"We lament and condemn the Chattanooga action. By whatsoever conspiracy induced, when those colored men knocked at those college doors they ought to have been admitted even if it emptied the school of whites and reversed the draught of every chimney in the building. One chief Northern errand to the South is to protest against every reminiscence of caste among Christians. If the Faculty had any appeal to the colored applicants it ought to have been uttered to actually admitted, and not to waiting, colored students. We clearly and fully realize and deprecate the mortification to be felt by reason of the 'ruin' wrought by installed colored students, but the smash and crash and defeat thus caused are not comparable to those brought by closing those doors of learning when God's poor apply for admission. If the school had been apparently ruined by doing right, sympathy and cash would have rewarded the noble consistency and loyalty to principle. Even if sent by the very Devil, the applicants should have been regarded as there through the divine providence that never fails to rebuke human conspiracy against truth. To narrow whites born in the South we owe a demonstration that it is as safe to be manly and true as it is ridiculous and weak to be governed by traditional and irreligious caste prejudice."

It is a great satisfaction to turn from the disgusting exhibition of the spirit of truckling cowardice in Chattanooga, to the Christian and manly way Dickinson College has adopted in treating a similar question. Dickinson is also a Methodist institution, with a number of students from the South. Recently a colored boy, son of the janitor, was admitted to the preparatory department, whereupon some of the students grew indignant and threatened to leave. Instead of yielding to their boyish bravado the authorities gave notice that those who intended to leave should hand in their resignations at once. Dickinson we honor; Chattanooga is caste, and we cannot honor caste.

We are now informed that the South Carolina Presbyterian Synod, at its recent session at Cheraw, requested Professor Woodrow to resign. Professor Woodrow has made a great deal of trouble at the South, by his persistence in publicly re-asserting and defending his teachings and opinions in regard to Evolution. The recent action of the Synod as noticed above, asking the Professor to resign his office, was, we think, a very wise and judicious step to take. Proper and safe religious instruction in our colleges, theological seminaries and other institutions of learning, does not, in our judgment, make it either wise, necessary or permissible for those in office, in such influential places, to thrust their "free thoughts" and "speculations" into the lecture-room. Some teachers and preachers seem never to be easy a moment unless they have on hand "some new views of their own" to present to the public—always claiming the right to air their "peculiar notions" and "speculations" on every public occasion. Put a thousand such restless "speculators" into the field, as religious preachers, and woe be to those active Christians, at home and abroad, who are attempting to teach the plainly revealed truths of the Bible. Teachers and preachers of the class named are not the kind now wanted anywhere; for peace and good will on earth does not, never has, and never will follow in their footsteps.

The Brooklyn ministers have had a first-rate chance this last week to take part in local politics. District Attorney Ridgway is the Democratic candidate for re-election. He has been guilty of notorious neglect of his duties, and has stood in the way of the indictment and conviction of notorious gamblers and pool-sellers. They are all his friends, and have done all they could to re-elect him. Dr. Cuyler spoke clearly the voice of all good men in his sermon last Sunday:

"Saratoga has been the headquarters of the worst kind of gambling. In late years another city has been our own Brooklyn. It has been a common saying that the City of Churches was changing into a den of gamblers. Pool-selling in this County of Kings has become a conspiracy against morals and against homes. Within the last few years pool-selling on our race tracks has become a stupendous evil. Deep and widespread agitation against it is now going on in this community. Every pure-minded citizen should help on this agitation."

"During the three years Mr. Ridgway has held office this pool-selling has reached stupendous proportions. During nine-tenths of his holding office he has shirked his duty. His record has been a lamentable failure. It is generally believed that money, influence, and votes are united in his support. Nay, more; he has openly bid for the support of the saloon-keepers by saying that when a saloon-keeper has his front door shut and locked he has a right to entertain his friends inside, and any one going around by the back door for evidence is a 'sneak.' That principle is the very principle to suit gamblers. No more demoralizing one could have been uttered by the District Attorney of Sodom in its worst days. Before the people of Brooklyn I impeach our District Attorney for a principle so dangerous and so damnable."

Other ministers spoke as plainly, and we trust

Brooklyn will have elected a District Attorney who will prosecute gamblers and saloon keepers as he would o her thieves and robbers. If the culprit cannot denounce such officials as Mr. Ridgway, and bid the people vote against them, then the pulpit is degraded below the level of decent respect.

WHEN Leonard Woolsey Bacon goes out to do battle he isn't content to use such arms as other men use; he wields the lightnings, like Jove for his deadly purposes, whether the enemy be mighty as an army or no more formidable than a bumble-bee. It's a mercy that his lightning bolts do not always strike. There would be some demotion that is not desirable, else. We do not remember ever to have seen a grander display of the destructive fluid by this modern master of language lightning than is given in the article in the *Forum*, "Prohibition, so-called." He has flung his bolts at this imagined enemy in times past, but never with such terrific force and such vengeful purpose as now. We were prepared for his denunciation of prohibitory law as inefficient; we ought not, we suppose, to be surprised that he should contend that it proceeds from "fundamentally vicious moral conceptions," or even that he should insist that it is an "active purveyor of vice"; but we are almost stunned by the shock of such words as these, hurled at all who believe, as we do, in prohibition and who try, as we try, to secure and enforce it:

"That their alleged object, the total eradication of the liquor traffic, is a false pretense; that the claim of absolute and exclusive righteousness for their form of law is fraudulent; and that their reports of the practical efficiency of their law for good are so garbled by suppression and fiction as to be worse than worthless; that, in short, their law, instead of being an ideally excellent law, which would be practically successful but for the fault of society, is an intrinsically vicious and mischievous law, founded on false moral conceptions, and ocated with false pretenses and under false names, with systematic misstatement and principles."

Where are the Prohibitionists now? Are they not scattered and peeled, meted out and trodden down? Rumsellers, look upon them, your old foes, and see what a miserable set they are, as described by a minister of the Gospel! You would hardly like to change places with them, would you? It is not often that worse things are said of you. Wouldn't you think they would shrink away and bury themselves, now? But they are a very persistent people. They may, for the moment, feel a little less confident; but after the shock is over you will hear them saying, though, it may be, only in a whisper: "We still believe in Prohibition."

There is a remote sense, we suppose, in which prohibitory law is, as Dr. Bacon asserts, a "purveyor of vice." If, for example, prohibition had not been adopted in Atlanta, there would have been no occasion for liquor men to indulge the vice of lying about its effects on trade, on property, and on drinking. They have told us over and over again how it has paralyzed business in Atlanta, driven capital away, diminished the freight receipts of railroads, depreciated property, increased drinking and drunkenness, and given rise to a large "juq" trade, by which liquor is brought to Atlanta from other places. These reports are all mendacious, as our readers already know from our own columns. The mayor of Atlan, a Mr. Hillyer, has given, in *The Voice*, testimony that is worth columns of special and general dispatches from the Georgia capital. We set a few of his statements:

"The figures in the express office show that hardly one jug or demijohn is shipped per one thousand inhabitants."

"Trade in all branches, except the whisky traffic, is prospering."

"Scores and hundreds of facts prove the efficacy of the law. Atlanta now has peaceful streets, and happy homes, with sober husbands, sons and brothers, with plenty to eat and to wear."

"There is not one-tenth as much intoxicated drunk in Atlanta now as there was a year ago, possibly much less than that. Formerly the advocates of bar-rooms were numerous and powerful; now nobody advocates their restoration."

Mayor Hillyer says, in conclusion, that the "our room nuisance has gone out from Atlanta forever," and he wishes the "outside world could see the truth as we have demonstrated it here." But, of course, the liquor men don't want the truth to be known.

We very cheerfully give space for the following:

TO THE EDITOR OF THE INDEPENDENT:  
Will you allow me to supplement the article on "The American Missionary Association" in THE INDEPENDENT of last week. Because of a misunderstanding on my part no mention was made by me, in that article, of the very able paper by the Senior Secretary of the Society, the Rev. Dr. Strieby. It is not necessary to explain the cause of the mistake, but I do crave the privilege of adding to that article a word of appreciation of Dr. Strieby's paper, and his services in behalf of the oppressed races. I have often heard it said that no more profound or correct discussions on these subjects are to be found than in the papers of Dr. Strieby. I heartily concur in that opinion, and I will also add that among all the workers for the