

"Well," said Mr. Dooley, "if 'twas up to me, I'd eat what was r-ripe an' give what wasn't r-ripe to me inimy. An' I guess that's what Mack means."—Chicago Journal.

A BRAHMIN TURNS THE TABLES ON MR. KIDD.

If a learned Brahmin could be found to review Benjamin Kidd's "The Control of the Tropics" (Macmillan), the result would undoubtedly be a most amusing production. The humor of the situation ought to upset the dignity even of a Brahmin. He could easily apprehend the policy of taking everything in sight because you want it and happen to be stronger. That is the law of the survival of the fittest as the Brahmin comprehended it ages ago. But to take everything in sight and call it "holding the tropics as a trust for civilization" ought to excite mirth in the Orient. . . .

Suppose that the humorous Brahmin who reviews Mr. Kidd's book should be moved by its enticing sophistry to stir up his own people to apply its fine principles? It's a poor rule that won't work both ways. The Brahmin might be inspired to discourse as follows:

"Dearly Beloved Brethren! A famous English pundit named Kidd has discovered a great law of the universe, and I am incited to call upon you to try a practical application of it. The world is rapidly growing very small and over-populated. We people of the tropics send millions of rupees of products to England. These things we raise very cheap and sell very cheap. I'm told that over there in England they sell these things at a great profit, and certain of their wise men are enabled to live luxuriously upon this profit. Would it not be better for the half-starved millions of India if we could keep this extra profit for ourselves? We are strong in numbers; let us invade the country of the Englishman and seize it, and force the people to do things our way, and pay us our own price for the products of our soil and industry which they need. Thus shall we prosper abundantly at home. The astute pundit Kidd proves that this is the right course of action. For, by seizing England and governing it according to our own ideas, we shall be able to raise the standard of living here at home. The world is growing so small that there isn't enough to go 'round, and we must get all that we can while yet there is a chance. This is the great law of social evolution. It is not robbery or aggression or national bullying—it is simply seizing a weaker nation and holding it as 'a trust for civilization.' The tropics where we live are,

as Mr. Kidd well says, the hope of the world for material things. Eventually we must feed and clothe most of their surplus population. If that is the case, do not we, brethren, hold the trumps? And if we are strong enough we certainly ought to play them for our own good. Mr. Kidd thinks that England and the United States can play them better for us. But we know a thing or two. We have watched our English brethren play the game out here in India, and we have learned a few things that are not printed in this lovely essay by the facile pundit. Blessed are the strong, for they shall inherit the earth!"—Droch, in Life.

THE COMING FREEDOM.

An extract from a commencement oration, given at the Kansas state agricultural college, June 9, 1898, by Prof. George D. Herron.

Did God create our world and race in order that the strong might heap up wealth out of the forced labor of the millions, and is such an order of things the destiny that man must accept? By what device and by what right do the sons and daughters of God go daily to the task of creating supplies out of nature, whilst their needs of body and spirit go unsupplied, and they have only toil and bare existence for their portion? Who gave this earth to the profit-makers, and by what authority do they set the children of the earth to making gain for them? By what process of alchemy have the resources of nature passed into the hands of the strong, and how comes it that human life is practically treated as mere grist for the capitalist mill? Is it the end of our civilization that industry should develop into a monstrous, universal, profit-making machine, into which the multitudes are fed to be ground out as increased capital for private owners? Every nation, every conscience that has a right to be called Christian, searches for the answer, and every reform waits for it. "Now at last," says Prof. Marshall, "we are setting ourselves seriously to inquire whether there should be any so-called lower classes at all; that is, whether there need be large numbers of people doomed from their birth to hard work in order to provide for others the requisites of a refined and cultured life, while they themselves are prevented by their poverty and toil from having any share or part in that life." It is thus that the social problem is the problem of human destiny.

Some of us believe that the public ownership of the resources and means of production is the sole answer to

the social question. In order that each may have according to his needs, and be secure in the private property wherewith to express his individuality, the resources upon which the people in common depend must by the people in common be owned and administered. The common ownership of the earth, with industrial democracy in production, is the only ground upon which personal property and liberty can be built, the only soil in which individuality can take root.

In freedom alone does the soul thrive and blossom. Every sort of freedom, religious and intellectual, political and social, rests back upon economic freedom. Private ownership of public resources is private ownership of human beings. He who sells his labor-power under the compulsion of necessity sells his life for the mere means of existence. So long as the resources of the people are privately owned, so that people are obliged to sell their labor-power to the owners for sustenance, they are not free members of society or the state; they are not even free to worship God according to their own light and intuitions. "He who owns my sustenance," says Alexander Hamilton, "owns my moral being." A system which makes one human being dependent upon another for the opportunity to earn his bread and develop his life is a system, which enslaves bodies and souls; it is inherently immoral, destructive of life, wasteful of spiritual and material forces. Faith and love as social forces, with liberty a social fact, mean communism in natural resources, democracy in production, equality in use, private property in consumption, social responsibility in all relations and things. A civilization in which all shall work for the common good, and each receive according to every sort of need, is the practical realization of the idea of the kingdom of heaven on earth; it is the organized love which is the manifest destiny and liberty of man.

THE MAROONS OF JAMAICA.

When England, in 1655, took Jamaica from the Spaniards, there were some two thousand slaves on the island, most of them pure Africans, but a few the hybrid offsprings of negroes and the aboriginal Arawak Indians, whom the Spaniards had found in possession of the island, and, in the course of a century, had managed to exterminate. These slaves—known in history as Koromantyns, or, more commonly, "Maroons"—sided with their masters,