

United States steamer *Adams*, and the citizen volunteers as special constables, besides the whole police force.

There were, however, no attempts at incendiarism. There were plans, the programme said, to have been formed by Wilcox. One report was to the effect that he intended to secure the person of King Kalakaua and compel him to abdicate in favor of his sister, Liliuokalani, heir apparent, and to demand a new constitution and a new cabinet. Honolulu papers state that this was probably the plan proposed either in the whole or in a modified form, but matters were kept so very secret that the exact reasons are yet unknown.

Commenting on the insurrection, the Honolulu *Commercial Advertiser* says: The insurrection, although long premeditated and planned, was one of the most silly and hopeless attempts to overturn the Hawaiian government that could be attempted.

Nothing but ignorance of the situation could have prompted any such attempt, and had the rioters been white men, a lunatic asylum or a hempen cravat would have been the most suitable punishment that could have been meted out to them. The opera house, palace, government buildings, and many private dwellings were more or less damaged by the bombs.

The inquest was in progress on the bodies of those killed in the riot when the steamer *Alameda* left Honolulu on August 2. A cabinet meeting was held, but the officers declined to state the result of their conference as regards the probable fate of the instigators of the riot.

From the remarks of passengers on the *Alameda* it seems that it had been arranged to have 400 or 500 more persons participate in the insurrection, among them some men of the best standing both among the whites and natives. Letters were taken from Wilcox which led to the arrest of several well known people. Among them, it is said, is J. E. Brown, editor of the *Hawaiian* newspaper. The general impression is that the leaders of the riot will never be convicted, as they will demand a jury trial by the natives, and a majority of those are in sympathy with the movement.

#### RELATION OF FOOD TO MORALS.

The following is a sermon upon this topic by the Rev. J. F. Clymer, of New York:

"If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, which will not obey the voice of his father or the voice of his mother, and that when they have chastened him will not hearken unto them, then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him unto the elders of his city, and unto the gates of his place; and they shall say unto the elders of his city: *This our son is stubborn and rebellious; he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton and a drunkard.*"—DEUT. xxi, 18-20.

A remarkable fact, in this day of advanced science and revelation, is that Christians and moralists in their work of reform have paid so little attention to the influence of the body on the soul. Jesus Christ more than any other teacher or reformer

recognized the demoralizing and debasing influence of bad bodily conditions. Hence he almost healed maladies of the body before he entered his principles upon the soul. It is true that his many miracles on the bodies of men were primarily intended to reveal his divinity; yet divinity in its manifestations always runs over the whole line of the natural before passing into the supernatural; therefore Christ's miracles on the bodies of men had a sanitary side to them. The man with the leprosy was in the poorest condition bodily to hear favorably any talk about moral sweetness; hence Christ healed his diseased body, in connection with his moral teachings. His example with the blind and hungry and deaf in this respect ought not to go for nothing with those of us who seek to save men in our day. Philanthropists and Christians for the most part have overlooked the power of a debased body on the soul. They forgot that Paul likens a body that has sinful habits to a thing of death, as compared with the soul that seeks to live the new life in Jesus Christ. Therefore good men have labored to create in themselves and those whom they seek to reform, certain emotional conditions of the spirit, by a tenacious adherence to creeds, or the patient performance of a set round of religious duties, and all this regardless of bad physical conditions begotten by bad habits of eating and drinking. While they have been struggling to bring their own souls and the souls of others into holy attitudes, all the basilar forces of the body have run riot within, and perhaps beyond, the pale of human customs and human laws. If you want to empty a boiler of steam, it will not help you much by lifting the safety valve if you still keep water in the boiler and fire in the furnace. Prayer, Bible reading and psalm singing will not help a man much to get rid of his sins, if he keeps up a set of bodily habits which fire the body and inflame the soul to continue its sinning. That you may see the connection more clearly between the vice and virtuous, let me show you how food may damage our bodies and demoralize our souls.

I am fully aware of the difficulties I encounter in entering this thought on your minds. Because religion has been considered as having nothing to do with the body, I shall encounter the settled opinions of good men to this effect. Because our popular methods of eating have the sanction of custom and the defense of long established habits, I may not criticize them without losing the favor of those who are content with things as they are. Because I shall call in question many indulgences of appetite hitherto considered sinless, I shall run the risk of being called a fanatic or fool. Because I shall preach the New Testament doctrine of self-denial many will say this is a hard saying—"who can bear it?" But with the hope that I may unfold to you a glorious realm of liberty from the bondage of bodily propensities, I cheerfully do my duty and leave the consequences for God to look after.

Very few of us are aware of the great physical demoralization and spiritual wickedness, brought on us and our children, by bad habits of eating, as to the kind of food, the mode of its preparation, and the manner and times of taking it. We refuse to think of our indulgences of appetite as the cause of our physical ailments and premature death, and much less will we allow ourselves to believe that these indulgences have anything to do with forming our morals or shaping our characters or determining our eternal destiny.

And yet I aver, without the fear of successful refutation, that three-fourths of our bodily ailments or diseases, and many of our immoral acts, are the legitimate results of improper dietetic habits. If these habits do not affect us directly, they do so indirectly by lowering the tone of the whole system, physical and moral, causing us to break down prematurely into some disease or devilry, under the pressure of legitimate toil or immoral provocation. How is it possible to account for the death of one half the human family before five years of age, unless we trace it to the violation of physical laws in some way connected with the eating habits alike of parent and child? Many children enter the world with such a low state of inherited physical vitality, and so little moral tone, that they are unable to resist the attacks of bodily disease or throw it off when on them, and much less able to throw off moral disease and rise above their immoral heritage if spared to pass through childhood to years of maturity. Such children not only carry in their little bodies the physical weaknesses of their parents, but also the specific immoral tendencies found in the conditions of their parentage. And more than this, should their endowment of vitality be sufficient to carry them over the death line for infants, they are subject to such unnatural relations to dress and diet that it becomes a natural impossibility for them to live. In this way many children die prematurely, not by the arbitrary edict of God, but by the violation of law. And if God should save their lives by special suspension of his laws, more damage would be done to the moral harmony of the universe than to let them die. I know it is a common custom to ascribe all sickness and death to the direct and arbitrary action of Divine Providence. That is, if one overeats, or eats innutritious food, or at improper times, making himself sickly, so that he becomes an easy prey to disease, and dies suddenly or at the noontide of life, all the good people say—"What a strange Providence!" As if God had anything to do with such a death, and the deceased had little or nothing to do with it. I incline to the opinion that Divine Providence has little or nothing to do with such deaths only in so far as Divine Providence is in the laws of life violated. The primary cause of all premature deaths is violated law. God does not arbitrarily kill anybody. Most of those who die in infancy or in early life, come