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PREFACE.

Without any apology for my lack of wisdom, or bluntness of speech, I dedicate this little book to the Tohee Industrial School, trusting that you will not think the twenty-five cents that I ask is too much, considering that the profits from this work will be used to put in a printing press and other fixtures that I need. Please send me twenty-five cents for this book. If not, send what you can, and keep the book.

Yours in Christ,

S. R. CASSIUS,

Tohee, Okla.
THE MOTHER'S BIRTHDAY.

BY MRS. GEORGINA WOOLLARD PELTON.

"Oh, mother, your birthday's to-morrow; To the village, oh, please let me go, For I haven't a present to give you!" But she said: "Little daughter, no.

"Come here, and I'll tell you a secret, A beautiful thing to do, A present that you might give me, Your brothers, and sisters, and you.

"There is no one besides you to do it, I have wished for it o'er and o'er; 'Tis not to be had for money, Not e'en at a city store.

"A beautiful day, my darling, You could give to mamma if you would; Just show me how much you love me By striving all day to be good."

As she tried to explained to her Winnie How to help make a lovely day, Her dutiful elder daughter Had felt what she sought to say.

So the birthday dawned on the morrow, All sunny within and without; The breezes had scattered the cloudlets, And banished were frown and pout.
Did mother but hint a direction,  
    Obedience was the rule;  
They all tried their best to show her  
    Their love ere they went to school.

A fairy guided their footsteps,  
        Another one hushed their noise;  
You scarce would have thought that they  
    could be  
The same little girls and boys.

Oh, happy at heart were the children,  
    And happy the mother too;  
The song of her heart in the morning  
    Made music the whole day through.

’Tis writ that the greater blessing  
    On the giver himself doth descend;  
But this mother was patiently sowing  
    Seeds of joy that might never end:

So she was both giver and gainer,  
    And they did both give and take,  
As they tried to make the birthday  
    A beautiful one for her sake.

Milford, Ohio.
TOO OLD.

BY O. J. BULFIN.

Yes, parson, give us something new;
Something sure to take;
Sermons folks won't listen to
Just for conscience' sake;
We want to line up with the times
And draw the young folks in;
Don't use the same old name for crimes,
Fix up the ancient sin.

We want to 'tract the higher class,
The folks that's got the cash,
To load the baskets as they pass,
So things won't go to smash;
The Bible stories ain't so bad,
But then they're getting old;
Was just a shaver of a lad
When first I heard 'em told.

We want to broaden out, you see,
And find the things that fit;
These oldish themes, it seems to me,
Don't always make a hit;
And—Hello! What's that? Johnnie's worse?
Won't hardly last till night?
Oh, Lord, they told me that the nurse
Would bring him through all right!
Your testament is handy, sir?—
This trouble makes me creep—
I guess you know the place in there,
The Shepherd and the sheep;
The Prodigal's another piece
That always took his ear—
I never thought my boy's release:
Had got so awful near.

And then, away on toward the back,
The city made of gold,
For them who never leave the track
Or wander from the fold;
You'll hunt 'em up and read 'em low,
The way you're 'customed to;
I called 'em old a while ago,
But now I guess they'll do.

Kimberlin Heights, Tenn.
In all ages and at all times the spirit of willing self-denial has been the test of religious fidelity. The very first idea of worship carried with it a personal sacrifice, and we find that God placed a difference between the two very first offerings on record. (Gen. iv. 4, 5.) Abel, believing that God was not pleased with man on account of his disobedience, sought to reconcile God by making a personal sacrifice of something he had and something he was proud of. He also believed that this sacrifice should not be connected with anything that God had cursed; therefore he sought for a suitable gift, among his flock for the best and purest lamb, and among his cattle for a young bullock without a single blemish, and a young red heifer without a single spot. In the selection care had to be taken that the very best had been found; otherwise there would be no sacrifice, because when a person gives something that is not the best they have, or something that they do not hold very dear, the gift does not constitute a personal sacrifice. Abel understood this, and he also understood that God would not accept simply what he felt he did not need. It being his object to please God, he knew that he must give up his way, his idea, his mind, and even his own self, in order that he might be full of the spirit of God, which is love, faith, hope and patience; for except we possess these things we can not please God.

Abel was not satisfied with a proper gift, but it
appears from the reading of the account that he was equally as careful about his altar. A good gift can be ruined by not giving it in the right way, at the right time and in the right place. Some people believe their worship will answer in the place of their giving, and some think that their giving will answer in place of their worship. Some again think that any old thing will do to give. Not so with Abel. By some way not recorded in the narrative he had a pattern, and by it he was trying to approach God, for, saith the Scripture, Which is the greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift? In this day and time the house in most of our large cities is a work of art and man's devices. It has its reading-room, supplied with checkers, dominoes, and, in fact, all manner of games; its bathrooms, lecture-rooms, prayer meeting room, sewing-room, cooking-room, pastor's study, and somewhere in the midst of all these rooms is the worship-room. The rostrum has taken the place of the old altar; a ten-thousand-dollar organ has supplemented the songs of grateful praise that used to well up from true and honest hearts; the individual communion set has displaced the sacred cup of the Lord; the usher has taken the place of the deacons, who used to take pride in meeting each brother and sister at the door with a smile and a hand-shake, and who used to find a pleasant pew for the stranger. But, alas! alas!

The honest old deacon has vanished;
His pure life has come to a close;
He is sleeping in the silent old church yard,
Where soon I shall lie in repose.
"And in the process of time it came to pass that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord" (Gen. iv. 3).

As I said, it seems that the idea of worship was as characteristic in the days of Adam and his family as it is at the present time. Sacrifice and worship have always been inseparable; they go together, and are not interchangeable terms; that is, one will not answer for the other—they must go hand in hand; nor can they be made by proxy; every man must worship for himself and give for himself.

Cain understood this, and I have no doubt that he was just as earnest as Abel, and perhaps tried harder to make his offering, because he had a harder task. Fruits and vegetables being from 80 to 90 per cent. water, are naturally very hard to burn.

"But unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect, and Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell" (Gen. iv. 5).

Right here we learn a lesson. Neither giving, zeal, nor devotion or self-denial makes a gift acceptable. You might inclose a rattlesnake in a basketful of gold and diamonds and give it to your friend, and though he should much like to have the gold and diamonds, the snake would make the gift contemptible. So it was with Cain and his offering. He had made his altar and prepared his gift, but in his presumption he neglected to consider the kind of gift he ought to give. Being carnal-minded, he looked at worship with carnal eyes. He saw more beauty in fruit than in anything else, thinking, perhaps, that just so a man was in earnest that was all God desired. Undoubtedly Cain saw his mistake long before the Lord spoke to
him, when he saw Abel's sacrifice burn with a strong, steady glow and saw the smoke ascending in a bright, steady column, and then saw the water stewing and sputtering, putting out his fire, and throwing out an offensive odor and a thick black smoke. When he saw this he knew that he had done wrong, but instead of being sorry for the wrong and endeavoring to correct it, he did just what many professing Christians of to-day are doing. He got "mad," and instead of reasoning with his brother, he picked a quarrel with him and killed him, simply because his brother had done right and he had done wrong. It is hard for a selfish man to bear humiliation by seeing that which he tries to make right turn out wrong. Cain had an "idea," and he was trying to make his "idea" take the place of his religion. He was willing to give, and desired to give, but it seemed foolish to him to make no progress in the manner of giving; in fact, he desired to be up-to-date. Had he no commands on the subject? Yes; but then he reasoned that, as everything belonged to God, and God had pronounced them good, and that as God had given him a mind, he had a right to interpret what God meant, not what he said; hence, he was at liberty to follow the dictates of his own conscience, therefore just so he gave, it mattered not what, God ought to be glad to receive it, even as men do now. They give, and will give, as long as they can give, according to their "idea," and when they can not give as they please, and where and when they please, they will not give at all. Aaron's two sons attempted to bring an innovation in making the offering of incense, and it so displeased God that fire came out from the Lord and devoured them (Lev. x. 1, 3). So, you see,
it is not what we give, or what we desire to give, but it is what God desires us to give, that we must be careful about. Nor ought a man become the judge of his gift as to whether it will result good or bad. The only thing about which care should be taken is, is it the kind of gift that God wants? Is it given as God commands, and is it as much as God demands? A man had better not give at all if he can not be honest with God. I think it is far more commendable in a man to be honest with himself, and take all his money to hell with him, than for him to divide it and try to give God part and the devil part, because in that case he is a three-times loser. God won't have the part he offers him, and the devil won't thank him for the part he reserves for him, so he loses God's respect and the devil's confidence, and dies outside of the hope of God's love, or the devil's pity. Read Acts v. I, II.

"If thou doest well thou shalt be accepted, and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door" (Gen. iv. 7). In other words, if you do right you will receive the reward of righteousness, which is a good conscience, void of offense, and if you do wrong you shall receive the reward of disobedience, which is dissatisfaction with yourself, your neighbor, and, in fact, everything.

Right and wrong are the only two prime factors in worship, and in giving a person may worship right and give wrong, or give right and worship wrong. In either case, the wrong makes both wrong, but in no case does the right transform the wrong. One wrong act will destroy the good of a lifetime, but only one good act will not renovate the
wrong of a lifetime, any more so than will one drop of water destroy the strength of a bottle of ink; but one drop of ink will soil a glass of the purest water. Cain's worship was all right, but his gift was wrong, and that spoiled everything. If I only had a penny to give, that is as much as I ought to give; and if I should beg or borrow nine cents more and give it, my gift would be nothing, because I am commanded to give what I have, and not what I have not. On the other hand, if I can give $10, and only give $1, I am a robber. I have robbed God, and Paul tells us that God is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap (Gal. vi. 7). There never has been a time that a man's goodness was not measured by his charity, and God tells us that perfect love casteth out all fear. Who has the most to give—is it not he who gives the most? Did you ever hear of want in a home where the preacher and wayfaring man were always welcome, and where there was always a spare bed? No. And why is it? It is because God is in that home. I traveled and preached for ten years with (I think) more favors than are accorded many white preachers, and during that time I never had but two real rich families make me welcome in their homes, and I fared no better in these homes of the rich man than I did in the homes of the poor, or what might be termed those in good circumstances. Why? Because God blessed every right act, and God is in every well-ordered home, and pays the same wages to all his children. No man can become a pauper by making right sacrifices to God. And the man or woman who is afraid to give as God commands for fear of coming to want had better stop giving altogether until they have
overcome that spirit and have received that perfect love such as God had for the world. If every disciple that reads this would first provide his sacrifice, offer it, and then go and worship, (I don’t mean go off and grieve about what they have given; I mean worship God because they feel justified,) the Tohee Industrial School would get its printing outfit, poor Bro. John W. Harris would get the $50 he is pleading for; Bro. Myers’ debt would be paid; Bro. Officer would be made happy, and the Christian Leader would go into 100,000 homes, where the pure Gospel is not known.

If all of the lamps that are lighted
Shone steadily on in a line
All over the land and the ocean,
What a girdle of glory would shine!

“And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar” (Gen. viii. 20).

If Cain’s sacrifice represented all that was selfish and sinful, Noah’s sacrifice represented all that was unselfish and good, and shows us how faith worketh by love.

Just think, only one year before Noah had entered the ark with only seven of each kind of clean beast and fowl, and how every other living creature was destroyed. If there ever was a time when a man had an excuse for not giving freely, this seemed to have been the time, but Noah did not see it in that way. God had carried him and his family safe over death, and had brought him safe to earth again, and he knew that everything on the earth was his, and he knew
also that it would take time to refill the earth again
with beasts and fowls, yet in the face of these facts
Noah made the greatest sacrifice ever made by man,
because he offered some of every clean beast, and of
every clean fowl. His object was to please God, by
giving; and not only by giving, but by giving in an
acceptable way. There were other beasts there he
did not need for food. He could have offered them,
and they would have burnt just as well perhaps as
those he did offer.

But in his offering two things must be done. Noah
must be justified and God must be glorified. Noah did
not stop to ask himself how much he felt able to give,
or what he could spare, nor did he consult his taste in
the matter. From a human standpoint, he would have
said, “This flood has ruined me, and I don’t deem it
wise to kill the best heifer, that fine young ewe, nor
that perfectly developed male, nor in fact any of these
clean beasts. God knows that I can not spare them;
besides, if a man doesn’t provide for his own house-
hold he is worse than an infidel.” No, he used none
of these arguments; he gave God what he believed
would please God. So ought Christians do now. It
ought to be the pleasure of every child of God to please
God.

Not long ago I read of a woman who was old and
rich. She had no relatives, and was incapable of invest-
ing her riches, so that she could live in plenty and still
keep rich. If she put her money into the hands of an
agent he might rob her, so she contributed $100,000
to a missionary society, to be used as a special fund,
to be invested to raise money for the spread of the
Gospel. Not a cent of the principal must be touched; only the profits must be used, but the Society had to give her $3,000 a year as long as she lived. Then, at her death, she would give it all to them. Did she give anything to God? No, not a cent. She simply used the Church as a sort of bank, to take care of her property, and pay her 3 per cent. But you say at 6 per cent, the Society realized $6,000, thus giving $3,000 to carry the Gospel. Still, I say the woman during her life did not give a cent, because you can not give that which you have not, and when she died what she left was still unprofitable to her, because she only parted with her gift when death compelled her to, so during her life she did not glorify God, and in her death she failed to justify herself. The word "sacrifice" means to give up something we can not spare, else it is no sacrifice. Noah gave until God smelled it, and was pleased with it. So well did Noah please God that God made him a promise, and talked with him. Brother or sister, did you ever get close enough to God to talk with him? If not, sin lieth at the door. You have either given too little and prayed too much, or you have prayed too little and given too much. Your prayers and alms must be equal; both must be right. The letter says give, but love must set the limit; it is far better to pray to the Lord for strength to carry one hundred pounds of flour to your suffering neighbor than it is to pray for the Lord to send your neighbor one hundred pounds of flour. In fact, I believe it would be better still to carry the flour first, and then thank God that you had a chance to do it.
“And he said, Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of” (Gen. xxii. 2).

Certain tests are used to find the difference between the good and the bad, the right and the wrong, the false and the true, the pure and the impure. It is not enough to profess faith. A person may imagine that he has faith, and be honestly deluded. Some people imagine that they would gladly do anything that God demanded of them, but without a test it would be impossible to say what they would do. Take, for instance, Peter. He was sure he believed in and loved Jesus to such an extent that he would die rather than deny his Lord, but read Luke xxii. 31-62, and you will see he only thought he believed in and loved Jesus.

God desired to know how much Abraham believed in him, and how willingly he would obey him, and above all, God desired to know how much Abraham loved him. So God demanded of him sacrifice and worship. The second was easy to give, but the first was hard. If God had demanded his sheep and his cattle, he could have given them in abundance and not missed them, but that would not be sacrifice. It would have been liberality, and right here let me light a red lantern and place it at this pit, and mark “Danger!” on it, because thousands are rushing headlong toward the pit of liberal giving. Men are to-day building churches, endowing colleges, and all manner of institutions, who have never made a sacrifice. Mr. Andrew Carnegie last year gave away over $3,000,000 without
sacrificing a cent, because his income during the same year was over $21,000,000. Or, do you think that Mr. Rockefeller, the Standard Oil King, made any sacrifice by endowing the great Baptist College in Chicago, or that General Drake made a sacrifice by making Drake University what it is to-day? I tell you Nay. It has never yet been proved that they even respect God, much less love him. These men give simply because they choose to give. The letter said to them, Give, and they give; the Spirit said to them, Give until you feel it. Did they do it? No; they threw that Spirit down and choked the life out of it, then got up and gave what they pleased, and to what they pleased. Do you think God had respect for them or their offering? Not if the Bible is God's revealed will to man. Let God be true, and every man a liar. Then I say to such men: "Poor men, no hope, no God, and no rest beyond the grave."

Abraham stopped not to reason when God said to him to take his only son and offer him as a burnt offering. He believed God and showed his faith by his works. The only reasoning he did was to reason that God could, if he saw fit, give him his son back again from the dead, so he prepared everything needed and started out following God, because God had said, "I want you to make this sacrifice on a mountain that I shall show thee." And when he came in sight of the place he left his servants, and he and his son went on alone. In other words, he separated himself from the world in order that he might be alone with God. He was preparing to make a sacrifice unto God. In it he was giving up all he had that was dear
to him, but what was that to him? He wanted to please God.

You will also notice that Abraham separated himself from his servants just as soon as he saw the mountain upon which he was to worship and offer his sacrifice. When a man approaches God with his gift he ought to be alone, for we have no record of God ever having communed with a man in a crowd. Men used to take their gifts in their hands and approach God first with their gifts, and then worship, because before a man worships he must be reconciled. The gift is the basis of the atonement, and must be given by the one who is in need of the reconciliation. Never but once has atonement been made by "proxy." That was when Christ gave himself for the world. Now conditions are changed. People go to church, and if the preacher is able to edify them, they give something; if not, they give nothing. You say we raise more money and spread the Gospel more now than they ever did before. Be careful. In about sixty years after the resurrection of Jesus the Gospel had been preached in Europe, Asia and Africa, and those that were obedient to the Gospel were found amid all the walks of life. Kings, princes, great men, and men in the common walks of life, even slaves, were added to the Church. How many were there? I don't know. Do you? You see then there were no corresponding secretaries and no great conventions; then they did not need men to enthuse them with grand and glowing speeches concerning the growth of the Church; the early Christians cared not to know how many; their object was to save sinners and please God. So it
was with Abraham. He left the world behind him, and approached God alone with his gift.  
"But when thou doest thine alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth" (Matt. vi. 3).

"For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him need not perish, but have everlasting life" (John iii. 16).

No gift of God ever had a string tied to it. It was always an absolute, outright free gift, and it was always given for a direct purpose, with the object of working some lasting good to the receiver, and it was always given directly to the object it was intended for. In our entire study of the Bible we do not find a single instance where God gave his gift by proxy, nor where the gift was inferior or insufficient. In all the gifts that God gave the gift exhausted the resources of the giver.

It is true that giving does not impoverish God. It is also true that no one has ever been known to become impoverished by giving as God gave. God's gift can not be computed in dollars and cents; neither can any right gift be measured by its money value. A person who so reckons his gift had better keep it, as far as God is concerned, because God does not justify such persons nor receive their gifts. A gift must be free and without a single worldly reservation, for, saith the Scripture, "The gift of God is without repentance." A gift that does not show the whole mind and intent of the giver does not, and can not, please God. The question of wealth or poverty
should cut no figure in a gift to God, because it cuts no figure with God in his gift to us.

I have often heard people say, "I would give anything in the world I possessed to save the life of my child." Yet God gave his Son to save us. I have heard women say, "I would not hurt my child for all the money in the world," and you know money is the best earthly friend, yet God gave his only Son to suffer and die, not to save his friends, but to save his enemies.

This is giving indeed, when God's only Son is given to save those who neither loved, obeyed nor respected him. God not only desired to show that he loved man, but he was determined to show how much he loved him. Some people give a gift in such a way that the receiver feels condemned and mean by receiving it. God "sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." (John iii. 17.)

Some people show that they love to give because it is a custom; others because it is popular. Some give because they wish it to be understood that they love God. And there are some that give because they do love God.

Now, dear friend, stop and think to what class of these givers you belong. Surely that piece of money that you have laid aside does not represent your love for God. If it does, go look at that piece of money again, and then ask yourself: "Does this gift satisfy my desire to please God, or does this gift represent enough of privation to meet the approval of God?" If not, let me beseech you, for the sake of your own eternal happiness, keep piling up on that gift until it
gets so high and broad that the world will be shut out, and only yourself and God will remain. Then, and not until then, will your soul say "I am satisfied."

When I go to a place to preach, and ask them to help me, it makes me feel sorry for my wife and children when I hear some pious member of the church start this song: "Lord, I care not for riches, neither silver nor gold." I know that there is nothing in it, not even good sense. It is one of those poetical lies that rhyme so well that it makes a person feel liberal without giving a cent. Neither do I like to hear them sing—

"When we asunder part
   It gives me inward pain,
   But we shall still be joined in heart,
   And hope to meet again."

It seems too true, especially when they are passing the hat. Whatever their influence may have on the mind, one thing I am sure of, very little money changes hands while these songs are being sung. There is one thing sure, you will never catch me asking a congregation to sing either of these songs if I need money.

The idea of a Christian with even a good living income putting a nickel or a dime into the cause of the Lord and saying that they love God. It is false. They have no more love for God than a hog has itself. They love!—why, they don't even respect God! If they did they would not give him pennies which they are ashamed to spend at the stores at which they deal. Yet they will take these same pennies and try to work them off on God.
I have been often asked if I believe in music in the church. My answer is, Yes and No. Yes, if it is the music of the soul poured forth in grateful songs of praise, welling up from true and honest hearts. Praise must consist of the gifts that the grace of God had bestowed upon us. As God has freely given us grace and all things else that are right, pure and good, so ought we to give God our money, our life, our thoughts and our voice in prayer, song and exhortation. No, if it means a braying box, that drowns the sound of pure songs of praise, deadens the mind and causes the individual to lose the art of singing, thus robbing God of his song of grateful praise.

Again, I am asked what are my views on “church societies”; am I for or against them? I answer that I am both for and against “church societies.” I am for them if they really act as an aid to the local congregation, and are under the control and direction of the elders and deacons, and have for their purpose the spread of the Gospel among those around them, the feeding of the hungry, clothing of the naked, visiting and caring for widows and orphans, the study of God’s Word, and the stirring up of the gifts that are in them. Under these conditions I believe in the Y. P. S. C. E., C. W. B. M., Ladies’ Aid, Willing Workers, Sunday-school, and any other society that might be formed within the local congregation, whose sole aim is to give more praise, labor and money to the cause of our blessed Master. I am against any and all of these societies if they have for their purpose the union of thought and action among other denominations, the spreading of the Gospel from centers not found in the local congregation, the recognition of leaders outside
of the elders and deacons, the honoring of heads not found in Christ, and the obedience to laws not found in God's Word. I am opposed to all church societies that support such national societies as the National Christian Missionary Society, the Foreign Christian Missionary Society, the National Christian Woman's Board of Missions, the Church Extension Society, the Ministerial Relief Society, the Colored National Christian Missionary Society, and, in fact, every invention of man that is calculated to rob God of the direct free gift of the individual. Then, again, there is another reason why I am opposed to these societies inside the church that do all their work outside of the local congregation. It is because it places the congregation in the wrong light. They appear to be doing nothing, when, in fact, they are doing a great deal. The cause of this misunderstanding is the result of scattering their gifts over a vast territory that ought to be given in a compact form and direct to the cause to which it is dedicated. By this manner of giving, God, instead of man, would receive the glory. It is true, this would do away with these great big $250,000 conventions, and it would do away with our general secretaries and their well-arranged offices and their little army of trained workers. It would also make it unnecessary to "blacklist" the preachers who dare to speak against the "methods" of the secretaries. At present many of our preachers are not mentioned in the Year Book of the Church, simply because they do not approve of the way that the gifts intended for God are disposed of by men.

Some claim that the way that some give has no method, and does very little, if any, good to the cause
of Christ. I think so myself, and it is to correct this error that I write this article. I believe that every cent paid out for the spread of the Gospel should be credited to the local congregation to which the person that makes the gift is attached. Thus the whole body could rejoice in the act of one of its members. And I believe the elders ought to be brought in counsel with the individual with regard to the worthiness of the cause for which the gift is intended. I don't mean that they should judge, but that they should see, as far as possible, that the members of their family, i. e., their children, are not imposed upon.

The great work of the elders of a congregation should be to teach its members how to serve God acceptably, and that sacrifice and worship must go hand in hand. James says: "Show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works" (James ii. 18). In fact, read the whole chapter and then turn to 1 Cor., Chapter 13. Read it carefully and prayerfully, then ask yourself: "What am I giving to God, who gave so much to me?"

"For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him need not perish, but have everlasting life." Amen.
THE RACE PROBLEM.

I have been asked to give my views on the present condition of the colored race in America. I hardly know how to answer, but I will say that the past two years have convinced me that the "negro" in America has at last reached a limit beyond which he can not go without causing serious national disturbance, and perhaps it may result in other nations stepping in and demanding that the American negro be given a fair show. You may say that the United States would not tolerate any meddling in regard to the way in which she treats her citizens, but you must remember that it was said that Spain would not allow any nation to interfere with her in regard to the way she was imposing on her subjects, but the United States not only interfered, but made war against Spain, and whipped her and took Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands. What she will do with these islands remains to be seen.

One thing is sure: The white people of America will not accord to these islands the same right that other portions of territory under the American flag enjoy. Why? Because there are too many dark faces there. It would give African blood the control, and thus offer an asylum for the oppressed colored people of this country. Ever since the war with Spain closed the United States has been trying to form a government in these islands that would disfranchise the dark-skinned people who are in the majority, and give the government to the white people, who are hopelessly
in the minority. I believe that there would be no war in the Philippines at present if it was not that the United States is determined that the dark-skinned people shall not be in control.

Even in this last census that has just been taken, it seems to be the purpose of the government to keep out of sight the figures that will show how many negroes are in America.

The cause for this race hatred is to be found in but two places—one is in the South, the other is in the Church. The South has a natural inbred hatred for the negro, because he is not still a slave, and because his numbers are so much greater than that of the Southern whites, that to give him equal rights would give him control of every Southern State in the Union. For this reason the rope, the torch and the gun are used freely. Property and educational qualifications are also used to keep down negro control. Educational tests are put to the negro that would disfranchise nine-tenths of the white men in the United States. One is that the negro shall answer any question in the Constitution of the United States, and that he must read the Constitution of the United States intelligently; and another is, that he shall pay taxes on three hundred dollars' worth of property. That would not be so bad if it were not for the fact that white men have to make the appraisement; and a negro who has enough property to reach that amount would in the North be worth about thirty thousand dollars; and a white man, to be worth that much, would not, in the North, be worth more than thirty dollars. They give as a reason for this, that it is needed in order to protect the wives and daughters of
white people in the South; but I have noticed that in the South the white women, as a rule, so conduct themselves that, as a rule, colored men respect them; while, on the other hand, as a rule, white men so conduct themselves that no colored woman is safe from their brutal lust, it matters not how upright she may try to carry herself. Investigation has shown that it is not true that colored men are as brutal in their inclinations as white men are, and only when led on by the example of white men, or spurred on by the brutal acts of white men, do they sometimes forget themselves and commit acts for which the whole race is blamed.

But let me sound a word of warning right here. Unless the colored people are let alone and treated as other nations within the confines of this country, the time will come when the fires that now burn the quivering flesh of unfortunate negroes will be transferred to the homes of their oppressors, and so fearful will be the movement that arson, murder, and rapine will reign from one end of the South to the other.

The Church is also playing a great part in this race hatred drama, not in the South only, but in every State in the Union. Every denomination in America has given the negro to understand that his presence is not only not desired, but will not be tolerated, except he is willing not to have a single ambition or desire beyond being counted in the aggregate number. As long as the pulpit teaches that one man is not as good as another, and that Christianity does not wipe out all racial lines and make all one in Christ, just so long will colored men hate white men and white men hate
colored men. During my trip to the North I found ministers of my own faith so full of prejudice that they did not hesitate to tell me that I could not speak to their congregations because I was a negro. Never, since I have been a Christian, have I seen so much real race prejudice in the Church as exists at the present time. Men may preach about the goodness of God, and pray about loving one another, and being one in Christ, but as long as they scorn me on account of my race or color, and tell me that their people will not tolerate me as an equal, I am compelled to say to all such, "Thou hypocrite!" Do you believe the Bible, when it says that God is no respecter of persons, or that God made of one blood all men, for to dwell upon the face of all the earth? If you do not believe this part, what part of it do you believe, if any?

There is no such thing as "a race problem," outside of a disordered mind, because a well-ordered mind believes that God is the Father of all mankind, and that there is no difference in color, and no superiority in race; that every perfectly developed child born in the world—white or black, rich or poor, high or low, great or small—is subject to the highest degree of intelligence, or the lowest depths of depravity, in accordance with the kind of education it receives.

Here let me give you an object lesson: John Quincy Adams was the son of a struggling grocer. Andrew Jackson was born in a log hut, in the poor pine district of North Carolina. James K. Polk was the son of a poor man, and had to help clear up a new farm. Abraham Lincoln was the son of one of the poorest kind of ignorant white men. General Grant
was a common village boy, such as you will meet in any village and never give a second thought. James A. Garfield was born in a log house, worked on a farm, and when a young man was a common, ordinary Christian preacher. Yet all of these men became the greatest men in American history, and ruled this nation. All of these men rose from the low, common walks of life, while it might be shown that others with every advantage of money and books, sunk from the higher to the lower walks of life. This shows us that, as far as white men are concerned, there is nothing in rank or station; it is all in the kind of training one gets.

Now let us look at a few negroes who were born slaves:

Fred. Douglass was born a slave; made his escape from slavery; picked up an education, and finally became the greatest negro in America, if not the world.

B. K. Bruce was born a slave in Mississippi, from which State he was finally sent to the United States Senate, where he so far showed himself a man that he was made Registrar of the United States Treasury, and the money of this nation, which is considered the best and most stable in the world, was not worth the paper on which it was printed until the name of this ex-slave was placed upon it.

Bishop Allen was a slave, yet he laid the foundation of the A. M. E. Church, which is one of the most powerful religious organizations in the colored race.

Robert Elliott was a full-blood African slave. After the war he picked up a little education and was sent as United States Representative from North Carolina.
It was on the passage of the Civil Rights Bill that he made a speech that stamped him the Webster of the negro race. We are told that when he rose to speak the Democrats rattled papers, snapped their fingers, calling pages, and sending messages, and in fact did everything to interrupt him, but he continued to speak, using as a theme, "Thy people shall be my people, thy God shall be my God; where thou livest there will I live; where thou diest there will I die, and there will I be buried." Before he got through his speech every member on both sides had left their seats and gathered around this one black man. They forgot he was black, and was once a slave—they only knew that they were in the presence of a great man, listening to a great thought, well put forth. When he ceased and sat down, every member of the House came and shook hands with him; ladies sent great bouquets of the rarest flowers to him, and made great dinners in his honor, and the bill passed without a dissenting vote.

Any of these men that I have mentioned could have been President of this Nation if it had not been for the prejudice that the pulpit cultivated against them.

I mention these two classes of men to show that in no race does the greatness of its men depend upon race or color, but in every race those that fear God are accepted of him.

May God help each and every one of us to love each other, and help each other, and trust each other. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, amen.
THE NEGRO'S COMPLAINT.

[Written by the Poet Cowper for "History of Slavery and the Slave Trade."

Forced from home and all its pleasures,
   Africa's coast I left forlorn,
To increase a stranger's treasures,
   O'er the raging billows borne.
Men from England bought and sold me,
   Paid my price in paltry gold;
But, though theirs they have enrolled me,
   Minds are never to be sold.

Still in thought as free as ever,
   What are England's rights I ask,
Me from my delights to sever—
   Me to torture, me to task?
Fleecy locks and black complexion
   Can not forfeit nature's claim;
Skin may differ, but affection
   Dwells in black and white the same.

Why did all creating nature
   Make the plant for which we toil?
Sighs must fan it, tears must water,
   Sweat of ours must dress the soil.
Think, ye, masters, iron-hearted,
   Lolling o'er your jovial boards,
Think how many backs have smarted
   From the sweets your cane affords.
Is there, as you sometimes tell us,
Is there One who rules on high?
Did he bid you buy and sell us,
    Speaking from the throne in the sky?
Ask him if these knotted scourges,
    Fetters, blood-extorting screws,
Are the means which duty urges
    Agents of his will to use.

Hark! he answers. Wild tornadoes
    Strewing yonder sea with wrecks,
Wasting towns, plantations, meadows,
    Are the voice with which he speaks.
He, farseeing what vexations
    Africa's sons should forego,
Forced the tyrants' habitations
    Where the whirlwinds answer "No."

By our blood in Africa wasted
    Ere our necks received the chain;
By the miseries which we tasted
    Crossing in your bark the main;
By our sufferings since you brought us
    To the man-degrading mart,
All sustained by patience taught us
    Only by a broken heart—

Deem our nation brutes no longer,
    Till some reason you shall find
Worthier of regard and stronger
    Than the color of our kind.