

There are many religious scriptures besides those of the Jews and Christians. Is there any more reason for Christian Churches using and canonizing Jewish scriptures than the Buddhist scriptures or the Zend Avesta? Mohammed certainly owed as much to the Old Testament as did the Apostles; but we do not find it bound up with the Koran as the bible of Islam. But Bible societies still continue to translate and circulate the Old Testament, despite the fact that the doubled and inconsistent two religions of the "Bible" make the Christian propaganda infinitely harder and less effective.

How illogical and inconsistent and also how disingenuous is the attempt of Christians to belong to two religions at once, and hold to two incompatible creeds! Christianity as it ought to be has been overlaid and obsessed by the Mosaic religion. All the criminal acts that in past times disgraced Christianity—persecutions, religious wars, witch burnings, and massacres are due to the teaching of the Old Testament; and it was its spirit, not that of Christ, that imbued such men as Calvin, Knox, Jonathan Edwards and the Puritans. Men that believed in a cruel and inexorable Lord of hosts, a God who was the model of an Eastern sultan—arbitrary and absolute, were themselves cruel and arbitrary. They taught that he who violated one small point of the law was guilty of the whole code, and that the dictum of the divine Ruler, no matter how unreasonable or immoral, could not be contradicted on pain of mortal sin; and they taught and practised this on the authority of the Old Testament.

Every once in a while we hear such expressions as "go back to Jesus," "return to the simplicity of the Gospel," "substitute the teaching of the Saviour for that of the Church," and "restore pure and primitive Christianity," etc., etc. But the reason why none of these schemes of reformation and betterment can be made effective is because those who suggest them hang on desperately to the Old Testament and persist in having a hybrid religion instead of a pure-breed Christianity.

The Old Testament should be relegated where it belongs, among the sacred books of the East, and churches, Missions and Sunday-schools should use and teach from the Christian Scriptures only.

WM. P. WHERY.

---

#### CHINA AND ACCADIAN CIVILIZATION.

In his article on "The Accadian Affinities of Chinese," referred to in the July *Monist* (p. 479), Prof. C. J. Ball proves the existence of a positive historical connection between the Chinese civilization and that of Sumer and Akkad. We see from the Hong Kong "Daily Press" of Saturday, May 29, 1909, that Col. C. R. Conder is of the same opinion. It would be thus interesting to discover that the ancestors of the Chinese are the founders of all the civilization on earth.

The Sumero-Akkadians are a branch of the Turanian race. Col. Conder says.

"Turan was the country beyond Persia—Turkestan—and that was the home from which this great race spread eastward. In China, then, there are now two great branches, the northern branch which is Mongolian Turkish, and the southern which is called Malayan, which perhaps in a softer climate became smaller, with smaller features, and which was more like what we consider typical of the Chinese of the present day. Both stocks have the short

head, lank black hair, a beard that does not grow till late in life, a peculiar double fold of the eye-lid and a slanting eye: those peculiarities are to be found in the physiognomy of the northern and southern branches alike. If you go back to the beginning of civilization in the West, 3000 B. C., there you find the same Turanian type. The Mongolian and the Turks are, however, nearest to the ancient Akkadian and Hittite or non-Semitic population of West Asia. But both the southern and the northern branches of the Turanians are certainly akin to this one original race. You find portraits of the Hittites, and of the Akkadians themselves, with slanting eyes, and pig-tails like those of the Manchus, who forced the pig-tail on China in our seventeenth century."

As to the language Col. Conder says:

"I do not know whether I am heretical in my views, but I have often heard Chinese spoken of as a mono-syllabic language, and I have not the slightest idea what that really means. Mono-syllabic would mean a language of words that are mono-syllables. No doubt the Chinese roots are all mono-syllables; so are the roots of a great many other languages—the roots of our own language originally, and the roots of other European languages and of all Turanian languages, are mono-syllabic. But although Chinese is in a very early stage of grammar, still I read in the dictionaries that they have "clam-shell" words to denote a particular meaning. If you want to say "to observe," you say "to peep-look" and use similar combinations that are not peculiar in principle to China, but belong to many other languages if you trace them back far enough. The Chinese also form words by putting the suffix—*ki* for the adjective or for the agent, and they form verbs by putting *tso*—before the root exactly as you find in Turkish and ancient Akkadian: and this even applies to the sounds themselves. It has also been stated in a very learned paper I once read that there is an evident connection between Chinese and Mongolian. If it is admitted that this is the case, you have a regular chain from the Mongolian which is most intimately connected with the Turkish, while the Turkish is the direct descendant of the ancient Akkadian. If the Mongolian and the Chinese have a connection you thus have necessarily a chain of language connecting you with Babylonia. The Akkadian, however, is much nearer to the Turkish, the pure Turkish of Central Asia, than it is to Chinese. I have had cause to investigate that matter and I have found that nearly half the vocabulary of the Akkadian is the same as modern Turkish, and the grammar is on exactly the same principles in the two languages. Of course, they are more advanced than is the Chinese. The Chinese is a more primitive language; but in many of its weak points such as the want of defining time for the verb, absence of gender, and so on, it has the same weakness that the ancient Akkadian had....

"So much in regard to language and race. In regard to religion there is no doubt that the general principles of native religion in China are exactly the same that you find in ancient Babylonia and Syria amongst the Akkadians and Hittites. For instance, the great sacrifices in China to Heaven and Earth, which were the two principle Akkadian deities. Then there are the middle sacrifices to the Sun and Moon and various other deities; and you find these gods coinciding with what were the old Akkadian secondary; and the inferior sacrifices are to the Clouds and the Rain, and the Wind, and the Thunder, and the Mountains, and the Rivers, and the Seas. Well, we have a treaty of the fourteenth century B. C. made by the Hittites—their great treaty with Rameses the Second—and in this they swore by the Clouds, Wind, Mountains, Rivers and Sea. So

you could not have a closer comparison of two systems of "animism" than that which is found in this ancient inscription and in the account of Chinese sacrifices."

### OUR NATION'S PREPARATION FOR EMERGENCIES.

In the July number of the *Journal Military Service Institute* there appeared an article on "Preparations for Defense," written by Lieut. Col. W. A. Glassford, of the Signal Corps at Fort Omaha. It was published also in the July 4th issue of the Omaha *World-Herald* and is one step in the direction of counteracting in the minds of the public that tendency of the peace movement which would discourage further equipment for war. The article was referred to the Washington War Department before publication and so bears the stamp of the highest authority in verification of its statements of fact.

Col. Glassford dwells at some length upon the insufficiency of the force of 100,000 men now available in case of emergencies. He thinks that although originally we had reason to feel secure, because of the time and difficulty required to transport large armies, the same reason for security does not now exist since the facilities have been so wonderfully improved. Although not a pessimist, he calls attention to the fact that whereas former stages in our territorial growth were not of a nature to cause any jealousy among European powers, now "for the first time in the progress of our acquisitions the event connected with the most recent were watched by the governments of Europe with intense interest. . . . Our advent as a colonial power in the East had not yet been fully established when European discontent began to be manifested in an unmistakable manner." Col. Glassford also notes the strategic difficulties of our immense coast line.

Col. Glassford is of the opinion that we need reserves of trained men amounting to several times more than our regular forces, and believes that "much can be accomplished in this direction by a short term of service without re-enlistment and by making the army a school for the training of reserves." Although a soldier's pay sounds small it is no smaller than many civil clerkships if the fact is taken into consideration that all the necessities of life are also included, food, shelter and clothing. Our author thinks it would be perfectly practicable to offer such inducements in the way of educative facilities, that besides military service the young soldier would also gain rather than lose in preparation for civil life. "In the infantry, for instance, men could be instructed in the common school branches; in the artillery, manual training; in the cavalry, horsemanship, equitation and notions of veterinary art. In the corps of engineers, instruction could be given in engineering; in the ordnance department, skill in mechanics can be imparted; in the signal corps, operators and electricians can be made; in the medical department, pharmacy and medicine taught; while in the quartermaster and subsistence departments, clerks and storekeepers can be trained. After a term thus spent in the military service, a young man would commence his career in civil life with acquisitions ranging, according to his aptitude, from those required of a skilled workman to a start in a liberal profession."

Of course in the emergency of war these trained men could only be procured for the army by volunteer service, but the government could well afford to offer them a special bounty as a recognition of their greater value. Moreover public sentiment would naturally point to them as those most suitable