

judge a play by reading the criticism on it in a reliable paper. M. H.

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA,
11th mo 29th, 1895.

The regular meeting of our Association, was held at the Y. W. C. A. rooms, 12th and N. sts., 11th mo. 24th. A very good review of the lesson from the Quarterly was given by Addie C. Garlock. In the teaching it speaks of Friends and the anti-slavery movement. It was thought that there are as grave questions before us to-day as that, and that we should arouse to action. She also said that it has often been said that we should not bring our religion into politics, but she thought that we should not separate the two, that our religion is needed *everywhere*.

A paper upon the 4th query was read by Hamtonetta Burgess. The thought that Friends of all branches are nearly free of the use, etc., of alcoholic liquors and tobacco, but that we must still work everywhere where opportunity is given, was expressed in the paper, also, that we should not go where we cannot say that God is present with us, for He is not found in places where evil is; but only in the good. The question was asked why God approved of one person doing a thing and not another one the same. It was thought by others that it lies with the individuals, what was wrong for one was wrong for all, only our ideas change as we come nearer to God, more under his Divine Spirit. The question as to how we could introduce more philanthropic work into our school, etc., was answered by Martha Davis and others. It was thought by the use of literature more than any other way in which we could work under our circumstances. Current Topics was given by Edward Y. Porter.

"The Little Maid's Sermon," was recited by Leonel Garlock, followed by sentiments, the Secretary's report, and programme for next time.

HAMTONETTA BURGESS,
Correspondent.

"RIGHTEOUS INDIGNATION."

This subject was suggested by a short article on it, and a foot note thereto, which appeared in the *Friends' Intelligencer and Journal* of Eleventh mo. 30th. In the article the writer took the stand that there is no such thing as "*righteous indignation*." The foot note suggested that it might be possible.

In my understanding of the two words they can no more be joined together than light and darkness, or than fire and snow. They make a phrase that is simply contradictory. It errs in one of two things. It either attributes to God a wrong nature, or it violates the English language.

I can easily imagine how their association gained usage. It was in the time and belief that God was looked upon as capable of wrath, of anger. The phrase could never have been conceived if God's true nature, being that of love, had been understood.

I find in the dictionaries to which I have access, both general and theological, that the word "indignation" always implies anger. "It is produced by acts of treachery, abuse of confidence, base ingratitude, etc., which we cannot contemplate without being provoked to anger, and feeling a generous resentment," says one standard authority. The whole list of synonyms given by Webster is, "Anger, ire, wrath, resentment, fury, rage." Immediately following it says "see anger." And turning to "anger," in the different uses of the synonyms it says: "Indignation is a generous outburst of *anger*, in view of things which are *indigna*, or unworthy to be done, etc. Please note the word *anger* here.

In looking back at the list of synonyms, I believe, and trust that Friends generally believe, that God never indulges in any of these human weaknesses. The idea of a God who is *always love* is one of the blessed testimonials with which Quakerism is en-