

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, JULY 2, 1903

NO. 27



“We are like the Israelites of old. They had the great prophet, and they had a great revelation, even the moral law that flamed from Sinai. But they were not content; they looked around, and saw other nations around them driveling and groveling before idols of stone and idols of gold, which their own hands had made, and they said: “Why can't we be like the other nations? Why can't we, too, have gods of stone and of gold like the nations which surround us?” And they forgot the God of Righteousness, who had chosen them for His own. So we are saying: “Let us, too, have gods of commerce and gods of expansion, like the nations that surround us; let us, too, bow before these idols.” And we forget the God of Righteousness, that has chosen us for His own.

See page 428.

Aristocratic, oligarchical tendencies already exist in our midst and are getting stronger and stronger. . . . Already, under the forms of democracy, actual oligarchy has developed in this country.

Many of our reformers are disposed to cure the ills of the state by tinkering at the machinery—a change in the ballot law, that will help; a new form of primary law, that will help; or some other little external change. Nothing of the kind will help; the evil is in the spirit of the people. There must come a spiritual change, an inner change, or we shall not be helped.

See page 425.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., 11 West 20th St., New York City
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA • SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA • KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

Entered January 2, 1903, at New York, N. Y., as second-class matter, under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

Set for the defense of human rights, especially the rights of conscience. The only periodical in the United States especially devoted to the maintenance of the Christian and American principle of complete separation of church and state. The Sentinel is not a periodical of abstractions and speculation; it discusses live issues that deeply concern every individual.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION

Single copy, per year.....	\$1.00
" " six months.....	.50
" " three months.....	.25
To foreign countries in Postal Union, one year.....	1.50

CLUBBING RATE.

	per copy.
5 or more copies to one address, one year.....	.70
Club rate for three and six months in proportion.	
Special terms to agents. Sample copies gratis. Correspondence solicited.	

Any one receiving THE SENTINEL OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY without having ordered it, may know that it is sent by some friend. Those who have not ordered the magazine need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

TO OUR PATRONS

Please be careful to write all names of persons and places plainly.

Remit by P. O. Money Order, Express Money Order or by Bank Draft on New York.

Make all Orders and Drafts payable to Pacific Press Publishing Company.

We will receive Postage Stamps in small quantities, and any kind of good money. Paper money or silver should be sent in a Registered Letter.

The address on the wrapper will always indicate the time to which your subscription is paid. In case of non-receipt of the magazine, or other irregularity, please notify us immediately.

When requesting change of address, be sure to give both old and new address.

Rates for advertising can be had on application.

Address all communications of a business nature, to

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

11 West 20th Street, New York City

FROM Pennsylvania comes the following good testimonial for THE SENTINEL: I certainly do appreciate THE SENTINEL. I could not do without it. It is one of my best friends. I trust that it may continue to exert an ever increasing influence for justice and right.



The Southern Watchman, of Nashville, Tenn., has been enlarged from an eight-page to a sixteen-page weekly. The subscription price has been advanced from 50 cents to \$1 per year, but the worth of the paper has more than doubly increased. Those desiring a good religious weekly paper would do well to send in a subscription to the Watchman.

The first number of the first volume of the Caribbean Watchman has reached our office. It is published at Port of Spain, Trinidad. In appearance it is very neat, and the workmanship is good. It is published monthly. Its mission is to proclaim Biblical truths of a practical nature which are especially applicable to the people of to-day. It cannot help but do much good in its field. We wish it success.



THE SENTINEL is in my opinion voicing the principles held and cherished by the framers of the Constitution, and which they embodied in that instrument.

—A reader in Savannah, Ga.



If you did not read the notice in last week's SENTINEL, headed "An Important Fund," please look up that issue and read it now. The money is needed immediately to help along this work. Let the friends of THE SENTINEL respond at once, sending contributions to

The Sentinel of Christian Liberty,

11 W. 20th St., New York City.

Negligence of its real meaning has come to generally mark the Fourth of July. . . . The fathers saw to it that the Declaration was read on the Fourth, and they invited their orators to expound its principles and to set forth what it conferred of larger rights and greater responsibilities. It meant the people's rule—the antithesis of privilege and those sinister rights, however acquired, which oppress the people. The man who sees no occasion to-day for such old-fashioned preaching is dull to the tendencies and perils of his time. No revival is more needed, in any sound consideration of American life, than a new understanding of and respect for the doctrines upon which the pioneers of 1776 planted the Republic.—Springfield Republican.

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 2, 1903

No. 27

Oligarchy is half way between democracy and monarchy.



The greatest menace to free government comes not from the unlettered poor, but from the selfish rich.



Loyalty to true democracy means far more than loyalty to any form of government; it means loyalty to humanity and to righteousness.



To promote the real welfare of individuals is to promote the welfare of society, and to promote the real welfare of society is to promote the welfare of individuals.



"As long as a part of the people within the jurisdiction of the United States are free and self-governing, the remainder of the people will never rest short of obtaining an equal station."



When imperialism declares that it has in three years' time trained and fitted for self-government a people who at the beginning of that time were "utterly and absolutely" untrained in and unfitted for self-government, it does not make good its pretended capability with regard to training people for self-government; it simply demonstrates the utter worthlessness of its pronouncements with respect to the fitness or unfitness of a people for self-government.

Much has been heard in recent years about the incapacity of people for self-government. A more dangerous incapacity is the incapacity of those who cannot extend to others the rights and liberties which they claim for themselves. And this is an incapacity that is most conspicuous in those who are most insistent upon the incapacity of other people for self-government.



It is recorded by J. T. Trowbridge that in the days of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill an immense audience was one night listening to speeches on the question in Boston. The brilliant lawyer Rufus Choate with a cynical analysis, had brushed aside the great statements which have made the fame of the Declaration of Independence, and contemptuously styled them "glittering generalities." Emerson was one of the speakers. He quoted the phrase, and then, after a moment's pause, hurled to the remotest seats these words, like ringing javelins: "They *do* glitter! *They have a right to glitter!*" Choate was answered as far as that audience was concerned.



In some matters it is hardly necessary for THE SENTINEL to do more to-day than present the words of others. Evil tendencies are becoming so pronounced and dangerous that many are uttering warnings regarding them. We feel that what is said in the two articles in this

issue will carry far more weight than if the same things were said by THE SENTINEL. These things are the utterances of two men who are not only recognized as able and deep thinkers, but who are not inclined to exaggerate the evils of society; if anything, they would be rather inclined to minimize or ignore them, for their attitude with respect to society and the nation is such as to make them optimistic concerning them. Their position is that on the whole society is constantly progressing and improving, and they are not inclined with regard to the history of the nation to say that the former days were better than these. When such men speak as they do in the utterances given it can be depended upon that the evil tendencies of which they speak are very real and pressing and menacing. Of course THE SENTINEL does not necessarily coincide with every sentiment expressed. Perhaps some of our readers will take exception to some things. But if the attitude and viewpoint of those quoted be given due consideration every word given can be read with profit. We intended commenting on some points, especially on the point of the relation between Dr. Adler's conception of democracy and what he terms "the old Jeffersonian democratic formula," which he declares was "based on a falsehood." We do not believe that there is the conflict between the two that he sees. We most certainly believe that there is a conflict between the conception that he describes and that which he says is prevalent to-day—that government and freedom are simply for the purpose of enabling people to get rich and attain their own selfish ends regardless of the welfare of others. But we do not believe that this, which he rightly terms a base and degrading conception of democracy, was the conception that Jefferson and his fellow-patriots had. We believe that Jefferson was right

when he wrote his great declaration of human equality and we believe that declaration is living truth to-day; and we believe also that Dr. Adler is right when he declares that human beings are not equal, but that there are great inequalities. We believe that Jefferson was right in the idea that the object of government was to promote the welfare of the individual; and we believe that Dr. Adler is right when he says that its object is to promote the welfare of society. But we must leave this matter until another time.



In determining the capability of a people for self-government imperialism is guided not by principle, but by policy. It takes the view in each case which suits its purpose. An illustration: At the Arlington National Cemetery on the 30th of May last year President Roosevelt declared with reference to the Filipinos that they could not grasp in a day "the slowly-learned and difficult art of self-government, an art which our people have taught themselves by the labor of a thousand years." The idea was that the Filipinos were just beginning to take lessons in this art, and that as it was such a "slowly-learned and difficult art," having required for its mastery by a more capable race "the labor of a thousand years," they would need the tutelage of the United States for a long, long time to come. At the University of California on May 14 the President declared, in speaking of General Wood's work in Cuba:

He was put down there to do an absolutely new task; to take a people of a different race, a different speech, a different creed, a people just emerging from the hideous welter of a cruel war; to take a people down in the depths of poverty, in the depths of misery, just recovering from sufferings which make one shudder; to take a people *untrained utterly and absolutely in self-government and fit them for it. And he did it.*

And he did it in "three years." Now if one man could in three years fit such a people for self-government, why cannot the Americans in the Philippines fit the Filipinos for self-government in the same length of time? Why have they not already fitted them for it? Why assume that it must take generations and centuries to do for the Filipinos what has been done by one man for another people in three years' time? Surely the condition of the Filipinos is not and has not been worse than that of the Cubans as here described. Surely at the very worst that can be conceived they could not have been worse off with respect to fitness for self-government than was "a people untrained utterly and absolutely in self-government." Of course the idea that General Wood or any other American or any number of Americans could "take a people untrained utterly and absolutely in self-government" and fit them for it in three years' time is utterly preposterous. If the Cubans are to-day fitted to govern themselves, as admitted and declared, then they were essentially fitted to do so before General Wood undertook to train them, and the matter simply shows that a people may be fitted to govern themselves at the very time when in the estimation of imperialism they are utterly and absolutely unfitted for self-government. This is how imperialism stands in this matter: Four or five years ago there were two peoples utterly and absolutely unfitted for self-government. To-day one of these peoples is fitted to govern itself; the other is not, and cannot hope to be for a long, long time to come. Yet both have had the same national tutor. Why is this thus? Ah! in the one case the rule of the United States had to be withdrawn, the tutelage had to be discontinued, and it is to the interests of imperialism to have the benefits of that rule and tutelage appear wonderful and marvelous; in the other

case the rule of the United States does not have to be withdrawn, there is no troublesome pledge requiring it, and it is desired to keep the people and their country under the rule of the United States, and therefore the interests of imperialism require that the idea shall prevail that their term of tutelage in preparation for self-government must be a long and indefinite one.



It is plain that the "dependencies" of the United States are to be kept in a state of perpetual subjection if those whose counsels have hitherto prevailed with regard to them can have their way. In March the judiciary committee of the Executive Council of Porto Rico made a report on a memorial which "prayed for the formal extension of the Constitution of the United States to Porto Rico by Congressional enactment, and for the erection of the island into an 'organized Territory' of the United States, in order to 'establish the possibility of its transition into Statehood.'" On the general ground that Porto Rico was better off as she was, the committee "strongly disapproved of the proposals, and recommended that consideration of them be indefinitely postponed." The *New York Tribune* at once declared that the committee was "well advised," but declared that the one fault of the report was that it did not "go far enough"; "it should have carried its cogent arguments to their logical conclusion, and have pointed out the desirability, indeed *the necessity, of dismissing all thoughts of Statehood.*" In its issue of June 22 the *Tribune* had this to say in an editorial headed, "Not a Part of the Nation," with reference to a memorial that has been addressed to Congress by the Ponce branch of the Chamber of Commerce of Porto Rico:

The view is taken in the memorial, in an unqualified manner, that Porto Rico is, or is considered, economically an integral part of

the American nation, since the island has the same tariff, immigration, postal and other laws as the United States. *That view is, we must insist, mistaken.* To cite a proverbial example, there is a river in Macedon and a river in Monmouth, but Macedon and Monmouth are not the same, nor parts of the same realm. It is true that certain United States laws have been extended to Porto Rico. *But the Constitution and laws as a whole have not been,* and those that have been thus extended have been thus extended *as a matter of expediency and policy, not as a matter of natural and perpetual right.* Congress is quite free to withdraw those laws, or to enact others, as may seem good to it in its government of that island. Porto Rico has been, for certain purposes, in certain respects conformed to the United States. But it has not thus been made a part of the United States, and it is not thus considered.

Again, the memorial speaks of Porto Ricans as being deprived "momentarily" of American citizenship, and mentions, as one of the chief arguments in favor of the protection asked for coffee, that "it would contribute to remove the obstacles toward the attainment of the constant dream of our fellow-citizens," to wit, the admission of Porto Rico into the Union as one of the United States. *The fact that a certain step would be in the direction of Porto Rican admission to Statehood is one of the strongest reasons for not taking it.* Our friends at Ponce would have made their case much stronger if they had urged that the granting of protection would not encourage, but would rather discourage, the Statehood sentiment, and would create another barrier against the island's admission to the Union. *If Porto Rico is really dreaming of Statehood in this Union, the best thing she can do is to awaken to a realization of the truth that there is no Statehood for her, and that her inhabitants are excluded from American citizenship not only "momentarily" but permanently.*

The italics in this we have supplied. The *Tribune* has repeated the same sentiment in a later editorial. For comment we cannot do better than quote from the *Springfield Republican*:

The editor of the *Tribune* was one of the leaders in the annexation of the island. He would have the country hang on to it permanently. He is therefore in favor of keeping the Porto Ricans permanently or forever in a state

of political subjection or servitude. He would not allow them to become free and self-governing outside of the United States nor under the jurisdiction of the United States. He would hold them forever in allegiance to the American government, and forever deny to them American citizenship. We are forever to govern them as we please, and they are forever to have no voice in that government.

This is of course the attitude of a cold-blooded absolutism. It is the position of a man who has his foot on the neck of a prostrate fellow and who tells him that while he is privileged to look up he must never hope or expect to get up. This is imperialism, and as bald a brand of the article as ever existed... One thing is certain—if Porto Rico continues a part of the United States, it will one day become an American State or American Statehood will cease to stand for self-government.



Alas! there are more ominous tendencies manifesting themselves in American life than even those pointed out by Dr. Adler. The growing tendency to violence is one of them. This tendency is a menace to all government and order, but it is preëminently a menace to democratic government, for it is the repudiation of *government* by the people themselves. It produces anarchy, and anarchy brings on despotic government. As Dr. Savage says, groups of men are getting less and less inclined to take peaceable, lawful methods in accomplishing their ends. Labor disputes are almost invariably attended by violence; organized labor seems to regard this as a legitimate means of accomplishing its ends. And more and more is mob "law" coming into vogue. Already this year there have been about twenty-five lynchings in the United States. Between 1885 and 1900 there were more than 2,500 lynchings in the country. More than fifty of these victims of lynching mobs have been women. There are now only four States in the Union in which there have not occurred mob executions during the last seventeen years. The United States is

the only country in the world to-day in which men are burned at the stake—the United States, which regards itself as the leader of the world in humanity and enlightenment! Along with the epidemic of strikes that has prevailed of late there seems to have come also an epidemic of what is appropriately termed the “lynching madness.” The instances are almost too numerous to take account of. A negro was stoned to death by an infuriated mob in Pennsylvania a few weeks ago for nothing else than defending himself in a quarrel; a short time afterwards a negro who had shot a white man, but had not killed him, was openly lynched in an Illinois town, the lynching including hanging, shooting and burning. A few days later occurred the case in Indiana, mentioned by Dr. Savage. And about that time at another point in Indiana, for no apparent reason whatever, a negro street-car conductor was assaulted and driven from the town, and warning was given that all negroes coming to the place would be treated in like manner. And there are many more such instances that might be mentioned. The latest mob execution at this writing has taken place in a State which has hitherto been free from anything of the kind—Delaware—and in a city of eighty thousand inhabitants, within twenty-eight miles of Philadelphia and a little more than one hundred miles from New York. And it is one of the worst that has yet occurred in the country. The matter is briefly covered in this paragraph from the *New York Evening Post*:

A horrible crime more horribly avenged, are the only words for the Wilmington lynching. Let us recall that the colored brute stood legally charged with his crime, and that there was no reasonable doubt that he would pay the penalty with his life. But the processes of the law, upon which the father of the murdered girl had begged his fellow citizens to wait, were too slow for the maddened mob. The spectacle of law defied, a prison stormed, and a human being burned at the stake dis-

graces the State of Delaware, and again calls into question the reality of our religion and the efficacy of our civilization. Possibly the worst effects are to follow, for a community that has combined to override law is like a man who has once yielded to criminal fury. Morale is permanently impaired. Prison doors may be repaired, ashes swept from the high-road, and all may look as before, but that community has acquired an insidious contempt for law, has committed the unpardonable sin against the state.

The mob was “composed apparently of the whole available population,” at least several thousand people were active or passive participants in its acts. “Representative citizens” were its leaders. *Boys* were prominent in it, and took an active part. A minister virtually counselled the lynching in a sermon to a large gathering of people, and did much thereby to incite to the deed of barbarism. “Public sentiment generally approved the lynching,” and there is no likelihood that any of its perpetrators will be called to account. The matter has called forth vigorous condemnation by the press of the country for all such deeds, but, alas, these oft-repeated remonstrances against barbarism and in behalf of the supremacy and dignity of the law seem to have no effect in staying the evil. In spite of all the protests, as stated by the *New York Evening Telegram*, “this ‘blot on our civilization’ is becoming more common and increasing in barbarity.” “Each lynching buys the rope or lights the fire for another one,” says the *Sun*. “The primeval savagery, the thirst and craze for blood, have been stimulated by each new barbarity.” The *Tribune* demands that lynching mobs be resisted and suppressed by the authorities at any cost, and says:

Our whole civilization is threatened. It is not alone the community where an outrage occurs which suffers. Toleration of the evil in one place prompts imitation in others until law is everywhere brought into contempt. The mania spreads, and the lynchers become more and more reckless. Those who at first would

be stirred only to lynch some fiendish wretch soon find it easy to put violent hands on anybody who offends them, and thus this becomes a government, not of settled law, but of capricious passions.

The New York *Evening Post* is inclined to regard the evil as a sort of infectious general madness which passes from one part of the country to another. However that may be, there are two points plainly, but none too plainly, presented in the following that can be relied upon absolutely. One is that class or race prejudice is at the bottom of these ferocities, and the other is that there is no security but that any day it may suddenly be declared, and adopted in practice, that some other class of people are beyond the pale of the law and "fit only for lynching":

The madness of the mob is worse than that of the single man, because it is infectious. One crazy band bent on murder incites another to bloody-mindedness. In these days of quick communication, impulses pass swiftly from one section of the land to another. It is like the inmates of adjoining padded cells in Bloomingdale stirring each other up by the example of shrieking and foaming at the mouth. A mob at the South bellows, and presently another in Belleville, Ill., takes up the hoarse cry. Thence the mania passes on to Indianapolis, only to break out later with redoubled fury and with every refinement of cruelty at Wilmington. We almost seem to be beholding an entire nation losing its reason.

This conception of the passion for lynching as a vast wave of madness, inundating people by the thousand, is one, it seems to us, which is fitted to heighten our sense of public peril, as we confront the startling phenomenon. Where it will declare itself next, no man can tell. It is the instant and urgent duty of all sane men, and of every community not yet bedlamized, to gather up all the resources we possess against this threatening evil which has already become a stinging national disgrace. For there is method in this madness. It takes its origin, as everybody can see, in the notion that there is one class of men beyond the pale of the law. Mind, we say class of men, not class of crimes. Not all bestial outrages or ferocious murders are punished by mob law,

and with every circumstance of atrocity, as was the horrible crime by the more horrible lynching in Delaware. The trembling brute who was burned to death spoke the simple truth when he told his tormentors that he would not have been dealt with in that savage fashion had he not been a negro. Not all monsters of depravity are black; yet where do we hear of the red fury of the mob turning upon white fiends? No, the idea is abroad that "niggers" may be hunted like wild beasts. Beginning by attempting to de-citizenize them, we have passed on to considering them de-humanized. We deny them the inalienable rights of every human being under our laws. For the white criminal the orderly processes of the law, the court, the sentence, the noose; but for his fellow in crime—that is all he is—the colored man, there is nothing but the howling of the mob and the leaping flame.

This is the first and great warning which the lynching mania speaks to every man who will hear. *Class prejudice is at the bottom of these ferocities.* In Bessarabia it is the Jew who is the outlaw, and who may with impunity be massacred because he belongs to a hated class; in America it is the negro for whom the most sacred guarantees of the law simply do not exist. Discrimination against a man because of his race or color shows us, in the insensate mob at Wilmington, into what wild animals it turns human beings when it does its perfect work. *And we have not the slightest security that such class prejudice, erected into the controlling passion of the mob, will stop with any particular race or color. Any day it may suddenly be declared, and adopted in practice, that other classes of men, other races, other colors, are fit only for lynching.* When once you depart from the principle that all men as such have fundamental and equal rights, or from the duty of doing justice even upon the vilest under the strict forms of the law, you cannot tell to what fearful and bloody consequences you may be driven.

That is really the alarming aspect of this invasion of old communities by the lynching habit. It threatens to burst the social bond itself. "Rough justice" lynching has been called by its apologists. We perceive the roughness, but not the justice. Society exists at all only because individuals agree to put their private griefs into the hands of the ministers of the law; and every attempt by individuals or by mobs—be they "mobs of gentlemen"—to wreak vengeance on their own account, is a stab at the life of society.

*Anti-Democratic Tendencies in American Life**

WHEN I speak of anti-democratic tendencies in American life, I mean aristocratic or oligarchical, not monarchical. Any attempt to go back to monarchy would be absurd. The proposition to establish a dynasty, a kingdom of the United States, sounds so ridiculous that if it were made in public it would be met with storms of derision. Nevertheless, aristocratic, oligarchical tendencies already exist in our midst and are getting stronger and stronger. I do not speak as an alarmist or a pessimist, but I do want to speak frankly to-day, to tear aside the mask, that we may see things straight, as they are, and not deceive ourselves with names.

Already, under the forms of democracy, actual oligarchy has developed in this country. Sometimes in a republic for centuries the outward forms of liberty are kept up, and the people fooled because these outward forms are intact; they are led to believe that nothing is changed, while the heart is already eaten out of the old freedom. Things have not yet come to such a pass, but I wish to speak of these tendencies, and to make a few statements which I believe will shed light upon the cause, the deeper cause.

Many of our reformers are disposed to cure the ills of the state by tinkering at the machinery—a change in the ballot law, that will help; a new form of primary law, that will help; or some other little external change. Nothing of the kind will help; the evil is in the spirit of the people. There must come a spiritual

change, an inner change, or we shall not be helped. Now, this is the point upon which I wish to lay the stress of my remarks. . . .

[The speaker here at some length set forth what he conceived to be the fundamental cause of "the oligarchical tendencies now asserting themselves." It was contended that the tendencies brought to view were "due to a false conception of democracy, and that the cure must be the substitution of the true for the false conception." The wrong conception, which was the prevailing one, was that "which assumes that already all men are equal," and that each is to seek his own welfare and happiness, by which is "generally understood material happiness or enrichment"—that "democracy is a form of government in which all men are equal, and the object of it is to make everybody rich as far as possible." A condition of equality among the citizens of the United States "did approximately exist in the days of Jefferson" and for a time thereafter, but "it does not exist to-day." "Nothing is more patent than the inequalities among the population, among our people—inequality in race, in nationality, in intellectual development, and above all, inequality in possessions, in fortune. . . . On the one side is a vast accumulation of fortune in certain places; on the other hand the gathering of a black sediment of pauperism in the slums of the cities, with all the menace which it implies. In a condition of things in which inequality is the most startling fact, the old statement, that the end of government is the prosperity of the individual, becomes a source of the most grievous moral aberration." The true conception of democracy, it was declared, is "based on the recognition of the fact that men are *not* equal, and the duty and function of

*From a lecture delivered in Carnegie Hall, New York, on January 18 last by Dr. Felix Adler, Founder and Leader of the Society for Ethical Culture in New York, and Professor of Social and Political Ethics at Columbia University. We are indebted to the Society for Ethical Culture for the privilege of publishing portions of the lecture, which has not as yet been published in any form.—EDITOR.

democracy is to make them equal, or more equal." The speaker thus gave expression to this conception:

In an unequal society the true democrat is not the man who says the end for which government exists is my prosperity and the prosperity of all these other individuals; but the true democrat is the man who sees in the democracy a new chance for the lower orders of mankind, who sees that the essence of democracy is not the starting with equality, but, on the contrary, the recognition of inequality, and that the object and aim of democracy is to make the unequal more equal, to make the unfit more fit; recognizing initial unfitness, to make the inefficient more efficient. The true democracy is that in which the strong spend themselves on the weak, in which the intelligent give of their intelligence to the unintelligent, in which the efficient bend down to the inefficient, in which men of independent thought and political ripeness think it their highest duty and privilege to go to the unripe and the politically immature and help them to ripen.

Certainly this is a noble and exalted conception of democracy. As to whether it conflicts with the conception which was embodied in the Declaration of Independence we comment elsewhere. Our purpose here is simply to present the substance of a portion of the lecture which we are obliged to omit.—EDITOR SENTINEL.]

And now I proceed to some illustrations to show how this false notion of democracy, especially of the individual's prosperity being the aim of government, has led us backward along the paths that lead to oligarchy. In the political field, for instance, there is the great fact that already the power to choose our rulers, and to a large extent the positive power of making our laws, has slipped from our hands. Why is it that American citizens endure it? Why is it that we permit two kinds of oligarchs to combine and take the power out of our hands—the political oligarch called "the boss," and the commercial and industrial oligarch called "the mon-

opolist"—these two supporting each other and bringing it about that the people do not nominate any more their candidates, but have only the choice of selecting between the candidates of the rival oligarchies; that the people do not directly make the laws, but have only a certain influence, a certain repressive, moderating influence; that, in fact, these great powerful interests, represented by the oligarch called "the boss" and the oligarch called "the monopolist," are able to write upon the statute books, to a very large extent, the laws which are intended to reënforce and to confirm and to perpetuate their oligarchical power.

Call a spade a spade, and then see to what a pass we have come. True, there is the power of the American people to rise in its majesty and might and sweep these oligarchs from their places; but there is also the power of these oligarchs, after they have been swept away, to creep back to their places, as they always do. The great freedom, the great power, which we exercise as a free people consists largely in the fact that we have kept a way open, through frequent elections, of punishing the public enemies. From time to time there are great explosions of public wrath; there are great upheavings to punish and repress; so that we may say that our government has become an oligarchy tempered by popular uprisings.

And yet how stupid we are! How excited we become over these candidates which the rival oligarchies force upon us; how blindly we go to the polls, as if we were exercising the rights of free citizens, when we are only exercising a repressive and moderating force upon an oligarchical power, which is really ruling us. But why do we tolerate it? Because the end and aim of government is to get rich, because we are too busy trying to get rich, too busy attending to our own business to give attention to the

public business. We give spasmodic attention, and then we turn to the real interests of life—*our* interests. And, therefore, at the bottom of our hearts, we do not take it so very much amiss that these gentlemen who undertake to rule us should also seek to attain what is the true end of life—enrichment—though it be by somewhat crooked means.

[At this point the speaker discussed as "another instance of the aristocratic tendencies that are arising amongst us," "the large and increasing number of marriages with members of the foreign nobility." "The fact that our men of wealth in increasing numbers are marrying members of their families into the families of the European aristocracy, shows as clearly as anything can show the aristocratic tendency that prevails among our men of wealth, at least among certain classes of them." In connection with this was the increasing disposition of these men of wealth "to transplant themselves, their hearths and their household goods to foreign countries." The speaker regarded it as great unfaithfulness to the country for "these sons and daughters of America, who have received all the bounty America can give, to turn their backs upon their country without a scruple," and to expatriate themselves "with the same lightness as if it were to change an ornament." This was due, the speaker said, to the base conception that "the object of democracy is to enable men to get rich"—to enable the individual to pursue "his own selfish good, according to the ignoble understanding of what is one's good." "After a man has got rich, and democracy has served its purpose, he does not need these United States any more; he has climbed the ladder, and he can thrust it away from him. The object has been attained, he is wealthy, fabulously wealthy. But wealth leads to further desires—rank,

title, outward distinctions that mark off the great of the earth from the little; and as he does not find rank or title or such outward distinctions in his country, it is but natural that he should turn to the older countries of Europe, where these distinctions exist."]

But there are two far more important instances which I would like to submit to you. One is the rise of imperialism in the United States. This came upon us overnight. The people at first, in a dazed, groping, uncertain sort of way, stared at the new thing, the new policy, hardly understanding it; by and by they became used to it, and in a dumb sort of way, I fancy, they have accepted it.

Now what is the meaning of this general rise of imperialism? We are told that imperialism means war, and that a republic needs war, that military government is necessary as an antidote to commercialism, that war shocks us out of ignoble needs, teaches us to face hardship, and develops the manlier, chivalrous qualities. One of the most curious facts in our recent history is this doctrine of militarism and the strenuous life. I will say in passing that it is perfectly true that war develops the generous and chivalrous qualities among a few finer natures; but that on the whole, and among the average who take part in it, the soldiery and even many of the officers, it develops the opposite qualities; it blunts their finer feelings; it gives the leash to all the coarser passions of human nature, to rapine and murder and lust; and that it inevitably degrades. We saw the evidence of that a few years ago in China where the soldiers of European nations went on a mission of civilization, as it was called, and where they indulged themselves in the most obscene and iniquitous practises, at the expense of the unarmed, inoffensive natives, looting by the wholesale, and so forth. We have

seen evidence of that recently again in our own conduct of the Philippine war, which, despite the assertions and declarations of our officials at Washington, has not been carried on in a spirit of humanity, but, on the contrary, has been carried on by not a few in a spirit of barbarism. Witness the water-cure and its horrors; witness the death of Father Augustine; witness the torture of the mayor of Jalo, and other incidents without number. Witness the case of Major Glenn, who recently in his court-martial, according to the telegraphic dispatches, is reported as saying that the order to make a howling wilderness of Samar was issued with the knowledge of the commanding general of the forces, and that it was stated at the time that the commander did not wish to have reports from Samar. If this be true, there will be another item to add to the burden of shame we are carrying. Well, this is one of the fruits of the strenuous life we are leading in the Philippine Islands; one of the fruits of militarism.

Another reason why we are asked to go on this policy of adventure is that we are to cut a figure in the world. We are not to take a seat in the rear, a back seat, any longer; we are to be in the front; we are to take part in the struggle for the mastery of the Pacific, for the dominion of the world—as if the dominion of the world consisted in land-grabbing, and in subjecting the brown man and the yellow man and the black man, so as to make him toil for us like a human beast; under the pretense of bearing “the white man’s burden” throwing the white man’s burden upon him, the brown man and the yellow man, as if that were what can be called securing the dominion of the world!

We are like the Israelites of old. They had the great prophet, and had a great revelation, even the moral law that flamed from Sinai. But they were not

content; they looked around, and saw other nations around them driveling and groveling before idols of stone and idols of gold, which their own hands had made, and they said: “Why can’t we be like the other nations? Why can’t we, too, have gods of stone and of gold like the nations which surround us?” And they forgot the God of Righteousness, who had chosen them for His own. So we are saying: “Let us, too, have gods of commerce and gods of expansion, like the nations that surround us; let us, too, bow before these idols.” And we forget the God of Righteousness, that has chosen us for His own.

And the worst of it all, the intolerable, inconceivable thing of it all, is that this sort of policy simply drifts into our national acceptance, without any clear discussion of it before the people, without any decision at any election, any genuine, fair, frank decision of the question, Shall we have it or not have it? It simply insinuates itself in, gets itself accepted; because, forsooth, the majority of the people have not yet made up their minds, have not yet thought it out, and the few who insist on it, therefore, are allowed to have their way.

[The speaker here declared that “the gist of imperialism is the aristocratic, the oligarchical view of human nature”—“the disposition to treat the lower races as if they were hopelessly inferior” and to utilize them for purposes of profit. As a striking and pertinent illustration of this disposition attention was called to “the desire of the commercial interests that are back of this adventurous policy to utilize the labor of the Asiatics to get quick returns,” as exhibited by “the proposition to introduce coolie labor into the Philippine Islands,” which had been made in an official document of the War Department and was “supported by capitalistic interests.” The speaker conceived this proposition “to be the most

glaring illustration of the oligarchical tendency now asserting itself," and proceeded at considerable length to discuss it. He showed conclusively that the coolie labor system is "a qualified form of slavery," and declared that the proposition in question was "a proposition to re-establish, in a modified form, human slavery in the territory of the United States, forty years after we went through the struggle and bloodshed of the Civil War in order to banish human slavery from the territory of the United States, as we thought, forever."]

We have gone into the Philippines with high moral professions, to do a work of ethical culture on a national scale. Duty sent us thither; we must elevate and develop a great people. But there has been all along another wish in our hearts, and I am afraid that that, as the event shows, was the primary wish—to make money out of these Philippines. And that is the reason, friends, why we cannot wait to develop the islands with free labor, the free labor of the Filipinos; that is the reason why we cannot allow the schools to do their perfect work for ten or fifteen or twenty years, and train industrial laborers; that is the reason why we are insisting, or at least some of us who are following anti-democratic tendencies are insisting, that Chinese coolies should be introduced into the islands; that is the reason why we do not shrink, at least some of us do not shrink, for the sake of commercial greed, from reopening on the body politic the cicatrized wound of human slavery.

I have said what I wish to say now in substance. I want to add just one word more. I found my hope for the future of the country on the condition that this blinding storm of imperialism will pass, and that manhood and strength will rise in majestic proportions on this continent. But if there is to be such a fulfilment, I warn you that we must ourselves be

active, because the most fatal mistake we could make is to suppose that there is any fatalism in the destiny of nations; that we are foreordained to a good end by Providence or fate. We are not. Our destiny rests with us, for good or ill, and whether the better destiny will be ours or not depends, in my opinion, altogether upon whether the false view of democracy can be excluded and the right view take its place: the false view, which is that the individual and his prosperity are the aim, and that men are already equal, and which leads to oligarchy in politics, and to gathering with the aristocracies of Europe, and to the rise of imperialism, and the attempt to utilize and to abuse the brown race or the yellow race—these are the fruits of the false view. And in its place we must have the true view, which is that men are not equal as yet, but that democracy is the means of making them equal; that democracy is a great new outlook and hope for the disinherited of this world; that it is a means of challenging the strong to spend themselves on the weak, the efficient on the inefficient, the ripe on the immature.

Let us then do what we can to instil this view, this true view of democracy, among the people, in the schools, and in the colleges, and in the universities, and on the public platform, that our people may be baptized anew, baptized in the spirit, that is in the social spirit, of democracy. And then, too, it will come to pass, what the imperialists have dreamed of, but ignobly dreamed of, that we shall rule in the world; that we shall have dominion in the world; but in the only sense in which such rule and such dominion is desirable, namely, in the hearts and in the respect and admiration of men, because of the justice and the sublimity and the truth and the humanity of the ideals for which as a nation we stand. Then it will come to pass that we

shall be like a city that is set upon a hill, whose light will penetrate far and wide; that we shall be like those who culti-

vate a sweet garden, the garden of Liberty, whose fragrance will be wafted to the ends of the earth.

Another Ominous Tendency*

THERE is a growing tendency towards violence North and South, East and West, not only in the relations between the whites and the colored people, but in the relations between workmen and their employers, not only among grown people, but even among the children.

If the matter has been accurately reported, there was a strike the other day in Albany on the part of the messenger boys. They have a perfect right to strike; they have a perfect right to devote themselves to arguing with and persuading other boys not to interfere with the success of the strike; they have a right by every peaceable method to carry out their purpose—but even the boys have taken to violence of late. They stoned the police; they interfered in every way with other boys who proposed to take their places.

The point is this: When a group of men wishes to have its way, they who constitute the group are getting less and less inclined to take the peaceable method of persuasion or of appealing to the law or of trying by the ballot to accomplish their end, and are reverting to barbarism; for that is simply what it means. If half the stories of what occurred at the mines in Pennsylvania during the last year be true, there was violence there that should not be permitted for an hour. If half the stories that come to us from the South be true, there is mob violence there that should not be permitted for an hour. If half the stories that come to us from the West be true, there is mob violence there—violence as between the whites and the

colored people in the Northern States as well as in the South; when you reproduce the conditions the same old qualities of this human nature of ours are likely to make themselves apparent and felt.

I can understand violence in Turkey, in Russia, in a good many other parts of the world; for there the people have no rights which are allowed and respected. They have no voice in the government; they have no peaceable method of redress or change. But there is not the shadow of a shade of an excuse for violence under ordinary conditions in a republic like ours. Who rules this republic? You do; I do. Each man has a share in it. He is at liberty to write and print; he is at liberty to talk in private and to preach in public. He is at liberty to do everything he possibly can to change public opinion, to get new laws passed, new ideals accepted, new methods established. Anything is open and is possible in a republic where all the people have a vote; and under such conditions as these there is absolutely no possible excuse for violence.

And we shall not be civilized, we shall not have a right to claim that we are civilized, until mob violence anywhere and for any cause is immediately, ruthlessly, stamped out. It is barbarism, pure and simple. And yet, if the stories that come to us are true, it is increasing; and the danger is that the people will get accustomed to it, become tolerant of it; and, when they do, they share in the barbarous nature of that which they permit and condone.

We are getting altogether too indifferent to such matters. If things had

*From sermons preached within the last nine months by Dr. Minot J. Savage at the Church of the Messiah (Unitarian) in New York.

happened during the last five years in Bulgaria, or Rumania, or anywhere else in Europe, which have happened in these United States, we would have been on fire with indignation; but we are getting indifferent to it—people mobbed, assaulted, burned at the stake, while hundreds congregate to see the horror. These things are getting common, so common that the cheeks of American citizens ought to tingle with shame, that we ought to rouse ourselves, and every power which we possess, and cry until these things are stopped. If we cannot maintain order, protect life, liberty, property, freedom of activity, then what is the use of the forms of law or the maintenance of the Republic?

[The following was spoken on June 14.]

It is said that the government of the United States ought to issue an indignant protest to the government of the Czar. I wish we could. But would not the Czar have a right to retort, "Physician, heal thyself"? Is not our house made of glass rather too brittle to encourage us to engage in throwing stones? Let the government of the United States, and the governments of the separate States, send protests first to the barbarism that exists here in America.

At a great public meeting Dr. Lorimer has suggested that we appoint a great committee of notable citizens and send them to Russia to lay the case before the Czar. I have no objections to any procedure of that sort, but I would like first to send a committee of notable citizens down to Louisiana to protest against the mobbing and murdering of Italians; out to California to protest against the mobbing and murdering of Chinamen; to Georgia to protest against the mobbing and murdering of negroes; to Kentucky and many another Southern State to

protest against the condition of things that turns a whole family into murderers while they fight out, generation after generation, a feud, until the last man of the line is extinguished.

I would like to have this delegation go to Illinois and Indiana. In Indiana a negro is seen talking to a young girl thirteen or fourteen years of age. Somebody, without knowing anything about it, suggests that he is insulting her. A crowd gathers, of these purifiers of society, and the negro is shot, and the young woman has not been hurt at all, and so far as anybody knows no crime has been committed. Until we in this country can cleanse our skirts a little our lips should be closed so far as protest against any other country is concerned.

This is flag day. I love the flag; I am ready to bow in its presence as being the symbol of liberty, of brotherhood, of humanity, of law. Oh, this is what it ought to be, but is it? Is it, so long as these things I have been hinting at are true? Let us cleanse our own flag, make it pure and white and sweet; then start, if we will, a crusade round the world for the suppression of inhumanity and barbarism. But meantime we need to be a little humble about protesting to other nations. We must work for education here in this country; educate the people of both races, of all nationalities; we must work for the love of God and the love of man; create noble and true and fine ideals.

But meantime, friends, let us, so far as this country is concerned, insist on justice, insist on equal laws for all people, of every nation and every clime; fight for equal opportunities; let us strive for that civilization which takes the legal, though slower course, instead of joining in the madness of the mob that clutches at justice, but really grasps anarchy and disgrace.

A Study of Principles

In Alonzo T. Jones' book entitled

"THE TWO REPUBLICS"

is a comparative study of the underlying principles of the two greatest Republics—Rome and the United States.

"The principle of Rome in all its phases is that religion and government are inseparable. The principle of the government of the United States is that religion is essentially distinct and wholly separate from civil government, and entirely exempt from its cognizance.

"As it was Christianity that first and always antagonized this governmental principle of Rome, and established the governmental principle of the United States of America, the fundamental idea, the one thread-thought of the whole book, is to develop the principles of Christianity with reference to civil government, and to portray the mischievous results of the least departure from those principles."

Rome occupies one extreme and the United States the other. Which is right? The question interests every reader of THE SENTINEL, for in its solution and the correct application of the principles lies the salvation of individual as well as nation.

"Two Republics" contains 895 octavo pages and is substantially bound in cloth. Price, postpaid, \$1.75.

Complete catalog of publications mailed on request. Address

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
11 WEST 20th STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

Easy Washing

We have a preparation that will remove dirt and stains from clothes with very little work. **Practically no rubbing, and POSITIVELY without injury to the finest fabric.** It is far ahead of washing powders or any other preparation.

We will send you postpaid

Sufficient for **THREE WASHINGS FOR 10c**
Stamps or silver.

WE WANT AGENTS in every town. Full time or spare moments. Send at once for our liberal terms.

We have sold most of the 2½ gross of Tablets and am afraid we shall be out of them before we can get another lot at the rate they have gone the past few days. Quite a number who have had one bar before have liked it so well that they have taken a dollar's worth this week. Enclosed find Postal Order for another 2½ gross.

We have sixty or more regular customers here and I have not had time to do much with the Tablets either.
Mrs. C. W. P., Lewiston, Maine.

Address

ALFRED MALLET,
NYACK, - - - - N. Y.

THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE

or, Civil Government and Religion

A thoroughly practical treatise by Alonzo T. Jones, showing the relation of civil government and religion. Shows what the Christian should render to God and what to the State, the province of the "powers that be," and is therefore of great value to

EVERY LAWMAKER

as well as to every citizen, Christian or not.

The book contains 378 pages and is furnished in cloth at \$1.00 per copy. Paper covers (a 40 cent book) for 25c.
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
11 West 20th Street, New York City.