

the demand imperative for the influence and support of every respectable citizen. If public morals are corrupt, private morals will eventually and inevitably become so. The man who is not strong enough for his work or his duty should be tenderly placed in some Retreat for the Feeble Minded; while the religion that is unable to meet the requirements and necessities of life is valueless, unworthy the name of religion, and is a positive detriment to mankind; unless it is calculated to aid and strengthen, to ennoble and beautify, to elevate and embolden—and thus better fit the believer, not only for the quiet and secluded walks of life, but its stern necessities as well—there is something radically wrong with its principles.

There is little need in this world for a religion to qualify us for death merely—but rather to better enable us to live.

But the Friend, what is his position as a citizen? Has he in the past fulfilled his duties in this respect to a commendable degree? Is he doing it to-day? Do his religion and his principles teach and impress this necessity upon him? I would answer by asking if his religion and principles, properly interpreted and understood, teach anything else? Have not the Friends of the past, whose examples have been considered worthy of emulation, followed this line? Has the Society of Friends ever achieved anything on any other line? It is only in this direction that it ever has accomplished anything, and only in carrying out the idea already expressed, either directly or indirectly, that it has earned the right to an existence. If at any time the Society has not come up to the highest standard of usefulness, it has been due, in no small degree, to its failure to maintain an active interest in the welfare of those outside its own immediate fold, and to the development of a selfish exclusiveness, a politic retirement, which is fatal in its tendencies, alike to individual and public well-being.

Disregard for the feelings and the well-being of those about us, is dwarfing in its tendency, and fatal in its result to the community or body politic, none the less than to the individual character. To these facts may be ascribed much that we deplore in the past and present.

Recognizing these as truths, can a man neglect his birthright as a citizen, and at the same time truly fulfill his duties as a Friend? Most emphatically *no!* The true Friend is a true politician in its highest and best sense. He recognizes his duty to his country and to his fellowman, none the less than his duty to himself and his God. His duty to the one, is part of his duty to the other; the one is consequent and depending on the other; nor yet can he secure his own highest welfare and happiness without a proper recognition of both.

In these times, when the perils of corrupt influences, of greed, of avarice and bigotry, the spoils of office, and the unscrupulous ambition of more unscrupulous men; when the solid phalanx of vice, intemperance, and immorality, are all united into one vast and mighty host for the subduing and crushing of all that may oppose them, there is an imperative demand for the active enrollment of every man and woman to engage in repelling these forces; and the demand comes to none with more propriety, or with more imperative impressiveness than to the Friend. And just in proportion to the willingness he displays, and the energy, activity, and the effectiveness of his response and his service, will he prove to the world and to himself, the beauty, the strength, and the utility, as well as the sincerity of his professions and his principles.

To shirk duties and responsibilities at this time is a positive crime, and the degree is fixed in proportion to the opportunities and abilities of the criminal. Of none is this more true than of the Friend. It is not sufficient for him to stand by and criticize the conduct of