

Chapter I

WHEN Moses led the Israelites from Egypt, he was determined to leave the system of tribute, slavery, and debt behind; henceforth his people should live under the rule of God. The children of Abraham were to pass from the land of affliction into Canaan, flowing with milk and honey, where no taskmaster would crack the slave-whip over their backs, where no brutal overseer would rival the sun in scorching their flesh. The days of bondage were to be forgotten in that land of promise the Lord gave to Abraham. For, according to the first covenant, Canaan was an everlasting possession bequeathed by God to the seed of Abraham; a territory extending from "the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates."

Oppression melted the heart of the stern God of the Jews, and he pitied them. Economic subjugation was always the offence which at last called for heavenly intervention and brought aid from the Most High. And on each occasion the chosen instrument for breaking chains, lifting the burdens, restoring the paths, re-establishing the law and covenant was one to whom God revealed himself and to whom God issued his commands: "The Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend." In each case of economic thralldom there is recorded direct action from God. To Moses he said: "I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt . . . and I am come to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians. The cry of the children of Israel is come unto me, and I have also seen the oppression wherewith

the Egyptians oppress them." When Moses asked what he should say to them, from whom he had received instructions, God told him to say: "I AM hath sent me unto you." Then, long before the Israelites reached Canaan, Moses began God's work of education, and instilled into the hearts and minds of those who had been taken from bondage the commandments of life and liberty. Before occupying the promised land all must know the conditions of re-inheritance. The law and testimony were the foundation-stones of settlement; no reconstruction of an enduring nature was possible without them. To build afresh with surety, every canon of the law must be known to all who had suffered in Egypt. There was to be no tribute, no debt through usury and spoliation, and no slavery.

Ten basic laws were sufficient, and at first the by-laws and regulations concerning production, social affairs, and health were comparatively few and simple. When, later, the priests were powerfully organized, the by-laws and regulations multiplied like weeds in an untilled field, for the years of bondage were then forgotten, and the conditions of the economic settlement of Canaan by Moses were ignored. For Moses, the ten commandments were enough; indeed, they covered all the chief delinquencies that man is heir to. As a law-maker he bequeathed to states and jurists as perfect a model of essential law as can be desired. He left no room for lawyers in his system, for each Jew knew the law so well that if need be he could be his own counsellor and advocate. Moses made the people "know the statutes of God and his laws." From morning unto evening he would sit hearing the complaints of the folk and answering their inquiries about God, until Jethro advised him to let others be deputed to decide and advise on small matters. Able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness, were then made rulers of thousands, rulers

over hundreds, rulers over fifties, and rulers of tens, and these rulers decided the small matters, taking to Moses only the hard causes—great matters calling for his wisdom—and so it came about that Moses shared the burden and made it easier for himself. "Be thou for the people to God-ward, that thou mayest bring the causes unto God," Jethro counselled, and Moses saved his strength for the greater tasks awaiting him at Sinai.

So it was in the beginning of the Mosaic system. Later all was changed. Why the system laid surely on divine economic foundations should be wrecked so soon after its founder passed away is no mystery. The evidence against Israel is complete, and it is sound in every particular. The Jews supplied it all, they hid nothing; they knew the penalty of economic sin; none had suffered so terribly as they the consequences of violating the principles of the covenant. Their history is unique; in it the fundamental is never quite forgotten. All the prophets down to Immanuel admonished, supplicated, and protested, according to the custom and method of Moses himself. The history of the Jews is the history of a folk suffering the penalties of violating fundamental laws.

After four hundred and thirty years in Egypt, the Israelites wandered in the wilderness forty years, during which time Moses prepared them for the inheritance he was to see but not to enter therein. From the height of Mount Nebo, God showed Moses all the land of Gilead, and told him it was the land which he gave to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, for their seed for ever. And having seen the land, Moses knew his task, appointed by God, was finished, and there in Moab, within sight of the great inheritance, he died, an hundred and twenty years old, "his eye not dim, nor his natural force abated." No sepulchre marks his place of rest. For him whose

life was devoted to the unceasing work of God, the world of Jew and Gentile is sepulchre enough.

The renewal of the covenant, the economic redemption of the Israelites, groaning under the bondage in Egypt, was the first reason God gave to Moses for coming to the aid of the oppressed. As he appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, so he appeared to Moses. As he established the covenant with the Fathers, so he would re-establish his covenant with Moses and give the people the land of Canaan. What could be more definite than the promise? "I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you of their bondage. . . . I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God . . . and I will bring you unto the land . . . and I will give it you for an heritage. . . ." This was the promise given before the Israelites left Egypt.

The severity of the by-laws and regulations must be judged by no modern standards, for the penalties were prescribed for a people who had been in bondage for over four hundred years. Moses knew his people, characteristically stiff-necked and amenable only to harsh sentences. The text proves over and over again that the severities of punishment were not heavy enough to make the people observe the ordinances. They were like children reared without guardians of any kind, without knowledge of right or wrong, ignorant enough to injure others as well as themselves. Therefore, extreme penalties for disobedience were essential. Born in the school of bondage, they could be restrained only by the harsh laws of slavery. They were now to be acquainted with an invisible God, one in direct communication with Moses, one bitterly opposed to all the gods they knew in Egypt. Now, one, only one, who exacted obedience, who gave them duties to perform every day was their God; and this new God redeemed them,

brought them out of bondage, and remained with Moses during the journey to the border of the land of promise. In a short time, three months, so it is told in Exodus, Moses changed hordes of slaves into a people prepared to obey the commands of God. At Sinai, "all the people answered together and said: All that the Lord has spoken we will do." Strict obedience was the great demand of the Lord of Israel, and obedience meant the end of suffering and slavery. "If ye will obey my voice," is the basic condition, and after the announcement of the commandments Moses said unto the people: "Fear not: for God is come to prove you, and that his fear may be before your faces, that ye sin not." There was nothing left undone in law and regulation. It cannot be imagined what other restriction could be added which would make it harder to fall into sin. All legislation was decreed before all the people, and the acceptance of the laws was unanimous. Moses took the book of the covenant and read in the audience of the people, and they said: "All that the Lord hath said will we do and be obedient."

Nevertheless, there were some among them who were not content in union with one God only, and they provoked Aaron to make one of the old gods they knew in Egypt. For this they sacrificed their ear-rings and golden adornments, melted them down, and cast a calf before which they danced and made obeisance. Three thousand men were killed for the offence, a mere precautionary measure to stop the spread of idolatrous desires. To God and Moses disobedience was a serious matter, and they knew sin spread in the ranks, swift as a forest fire, and drove men into slavery. No penalty was too extreme for the disobedient. There was only one way to be united with God: Keep the law! Who can be wiser than God and Moses? They knew man, they loved man, they did all to save him

from pain, but they never underestimated their task. Their severities were commensurate with their belief in man's power to overcome temptation; therefore, they made it hard for the transgressors, hoping man would realize his God-likeness and use his powers to make the earth his heaven, defiling naught, so that the land should not spue him out, "as it spued out nations that were before him." They did not abolish slavery merely by pasting over it a political label, franchise, and that way make the labourer think he was any the less a slave.

Disentangling the main story of Moses and the Israelites from the first five books of the Bible is not a simple task. No serious attempt has been made to present the story of Moses stripped of all priestly accretions, mostly of a very late period, which clog and cloak the real object and purpose in leaving Egypt for Canaan. The priests after Ezra almost succeeded in removing the original Moses from the record. The man to whom God revealed himself, and whom he set to perform a definite task, is almost lost in a maze of affairs denoting a fairly high civilization. Out of the chaos of the tradition itself, the legend, the inventions of the priests' code, early and late, the story in all its wonderful economic significance can be brought to light. This can be done by ruthlessly expunging from the Pentateuch all that is not directly concerned with divine economic aid. Such a course by no means implies that the rejected portions are valueless; they have their own worth, but they contribute nothing to the understanding of the mission of Moses set by God. In the Pentateuch there are two distinct Moseses: one of late creation by the priests; the other, the original Moses, the man of God who led the Israelites from out of bondage and for forty years in the wilderness prepared them for settlement in Canaan. The fundamental

of the incomparable story—there is nothing like it in any literature—has been smothered by the accumulations of rabbinical regulations, through periods long after the settlement, when the priests established themselves in power and authority. So it should appear to all Gentiles who will take the trouble to find the many contradictions of policy and conduct. There is little to show Moses was a ritualist. The decalogue itself requires no priest to interpret it. All the people understood it, all the people agreed to obey it. Indeed, it is quite clearly shown that the duties of the early priests were concerned with religious, social, and hygienic observances only, and that the fundamental conditions of the settlement, save that of tithes, escaped their notice.

Jethro advised Moses to appoint rulers of thousands, of hundreds, of fifties, and of tens, to judge small matters. All great matters were to be brought to him. How can this disposition be reconciled with the injunction in the next chapter: "And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests . . ." ? What, then, was there for priests to do? All references in Deuteronomy to priests can be deleted without making the slightest difference to the value of the record. The references are merely incidental, and many so obviously thrust into the narrative that they break the continuity of the main story. Aaron is mentioned only twice: once when the Lord was very angry with him; again, when he died and was buried. When the priest is mentioned, he merely looks on, save once, on the occasion of addressing the army before battle, but then he did and said nothing which could not have been as well done and said by a captain. Most of the by-laws and ordinances concerning food, health, family and social affairs must refer to civilizing periods long after the settlement, when the portion allotted to Levi was increased, and the vested interest

in the multiplication of tithes became all-powerful. In the Haggadah a story is told of a rebel, Korah, who said: "When we were given the ten commandments, each of us learned them directly from Mount Sinai; there were only ten commandments and we heard no orders about 'offering cakes' or 'gifts to priests' or 'tassels.' It was only in order to usurp the dominion for himself and to impart honour to his brother Aaron that Moses added all this." There are many such remarks scattered about the Hebrew records. But this criticism of Moses is not justified. Korah must refer to times long after the settlement, when the old tradition was forgotten, and a new one had been invented to support quite other conditions. Anyway, Moses was long dead; Aaron, too, when the priests added to the grant made to the tribe of Levi. There must have been a folk tradition of Moses, which was, in part, set aside by the "new" covenant. New covenants usually consolidate privileges gained by infringing the rights of the old one. At any rate, if it was the original intention to raise a kingdom of priests (whatever the phrase may mean), how came it that Joshua was nominated successor to Moses, and no kingdom ever thought of until Saul was made king to be an affliction and to scourge the Hebrews for their sins? But the contradictions abound, and to pursue them would lead far afield, and make confusion worse than it is in the Pentateuch. Higher criticism must be more deeply concentrated on such tangles, and unravel what it can.

In Deuteronomy there is repeated over and over again the conditions of the resettlement of the Israelites in Canaan. During the wanderings they were taught by Moses the commands of God to be observed in the land they were to occupy, so that they might prolong their days upon the earth which the Lord gave to Abraham and his seed for ever. "O that

there were such a heart in them that they would fear me and keep all my commandments always, that it might be well with them, and with their children for ever," is the hope of God as expressed to Moses, who taught the commandments, "that they do them in the land which I give them to possess it." And in that land "that floweth with milk and honey," where they were to increase mightily, they were to fear God, fear to break his commandments, fear to offend him, which is the fear of every heart which loves truly. On this nothing can be clearer than the great injunction: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." "Love God and fear to break his commandments." "Do that which is right and good in the sight of the Lord." And in the days to come, when a son shall ask his father the meaning of the testimonies and the statutes, say to him: "We were Pharaoh's bondsmen in Egypt . . . and he brought us out from thence, that he might bring us in, to give us the land which he swore unto our fathers." All good things were to come to them, all the promises of the covenant would be fulfilled, if they obeyed the commandments. The faithful God "will love thee, and bless thee and multiply thee: He will also bless the fruit of thy womb, and the fruit of thy land, thy corn and thy wine, and thine oil, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep. . . ." All the tribulation of the past was a trial, the forty years in the wilderness a humbling process, a proving ordeal; all suffered to learn what was in their heart. The giving of manna when they were hungry was a lesson teaching them that "man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord man doth live." The schooling was none too severe for the boons to be regained. "For the Lord thy

God bringeth thee into a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills; a land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig trees, and pomegranates, a land of oil olive, and honey; a land wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness, thou shalt not lack anything in it; and whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass. When thou hast eaten and art full, then thou shalt bless the Lord thy God for the good land which he hath given thee."

An economic paradise in exchange for keeping the commandments. What was forgotten? Nothing! No tax, no tribute, no material debt, no Egyptian slavery. To God, pay tribute in love and thankfulness; to him, pay the everlasting debt for his bounty; to him, all labour freely bestowed on the land of their inheritance. And that the power to produce wealth comes from God and not from capital is made as clear as noonday. "And thou say in thine heart, My power and the might of *mine* hand hath gotten me this wealth. But thou shalt remember the Lord thy God: for it is he that giveth the power to get wealth, that he may establish his covenant which he sware unto thy fathers, as it is this day." How a Jew of any period since Moses could misunderstand the economic meaning of the term wealth is a mystery. No bonds, no preferred stock, no common stocks, no consolidated debt, just the simple God-arranged process whereby the labourer enjoyed the fruit of his toil, giving in tithe a tenth to the tribe of Levi, because they had then no inheritance.

Such was the covenant—a purely divine economic promise. Trust God, keep his commandments, and "thou shalt eat bread without scarceness." Moses was more than a great law-giver; he was an all-seeing economist whose system still inheres in the fairest constitutions down to this day, no matter

how overgrown they be by injustice, folly, and greed. Somewhere—sometimes dormant, sometimes forgotten—the principles of his system are discovered in the early customs of a people; sometimes in charters, never really abrogated. It may be more than a mere resemblance some students find between the laws of Alfred of Wessex and those of Moses of Sinai.

Even emergencies, such as the fate of the sluggard and the spendthrift, the fate of borrowers and strangers, the fate of widows and orphans, were cared for by Moses. There is not an instance of overlooking the probability of economic dilemma, such as appears suddenly in a crisis and bewilders modern statesmen. He knew men and their instabilities. Some, he knew, would labour consistently well; others, he knew, would tire, shirk, waste, or gamble. Moreover, he knew the danger of borrowing, how the system of mortgage, unchecked, tends to lay the borrower under the burdens approximating bondage. Hence, every seven years the release—"and this is the manner of the release; every creditor that lendeth aught unto his neighbour shall release it; he shall not exact it of his neighbour or of his brother, because it is called the Lord's release. Of a foreigner thou mayest exact it again, but that which is thine with thy brother thine hand shall release." They must open their hands to the poor, and their hearts must not grieve when they give; they must open their hands wide. Under the conditions of the settlement, who would be poor but the blind, but the crippled, widows, orphans, incapables, and sluggards? "And if thy brother, an Hebrew man, or an Hebrew woman, be sold unto thee and serve thee six years, then in the seventh year thou shalt let him go free from thee. And when thou sendest him out from thee, thou shalt not let him go away empty. Thou shalt furnish him liberally out of thy flock, and

out of thy floor, and out of thy wine-press." In all these things concerning the release and welfare of servants, never should it be forgotten that God brought them out of the bondage of Egypt. "Thou shalt not oppress an hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren or of thy strangers . . . at midday thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it." Strangers, widows, and orphans were not left to chance: at harvest, when the field was cut, forgotten sheaves, corners, and fringes were for them. So, too, were second beatings of fruit trees, gleanings of the vine. These customs brought the poor face to face with the producers.

The most important economic law is that against land encroachment, laying field to field, and reducing the dispossessed to slave conditions: "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour's landmark." This is the fundamental law, which establishes firmly man's relationship to God, and the violation of this ordinance was always the cause of disasters which fell upon Israel, the woe of the tribes, and the sin which stirred the prophets to utter their deepest condemnations, whether the landmarks were removed by Jew or Gentile. Its violation brought the third curse: First, the curse of idolatry; second, the curse of setting light by his father or his mother; and the third, "cursed be he that removeth his neighbour's landmark." This law is found in Chapter xix of Deuteronomy, tucked away among orders and regulations concerning the criminal code of a date much later than Joshua. The verse 14 is in no way connected with what goes before or after it. Obviously, it is out of place. Its importance cannot be overestimated. Essentially it belongs to Chapter v. It ought to be the last binding word, stamping each command with the signet of the Creator. It should follow verse 21, Chapter v:

Neither shalt thou desire thy neighbour's wife, neither shalt thou covet thy neighbour's house, his field, or his manservant, or his maidservant, his ox, or his ass, or anything that is thy neighbour's.

Then should follow the eleventh commandment, as it is in Chapter XIX, verse 14:

Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour's landmark, which they of old time have set in thine inheritance, which thou shalt inherit in the land that the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it.

Clearly, the basis of the covenant was love of God and equality of opportunity: "And the Lord thy God will make thee plenteous in every work of thine hand, in the fruit of thy body, and in the fruit of thy cattle, and in the fruit of thy land, for good. . . . I call heaven and earth to record this day against you that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing, therefore choose life that both thou and thy seed may live. That thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and that thou mayest obey his voice, and that thou mayest cleave unto him; for he is thy life and the length of thy days; that thou mayest dwell in the land which the Lord sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give them."

And Moses saw that all was just and well conceived. God's work of providence, the source from which his children were to produce their sustenance, was perfect: "He is the rock, his work is perfect; for all his ways are just: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he." And to man the choice was given: life or death. He was free to decide for himself. Endowed with a dual nature, he was placed in a world in which every day he would be forced to choose the better or the worse, and learn what made for life and what made for death, to choose animals that he could tame to serve him, to choose plants that could nourish him, to choose pursuits that

would elevate him. The power of choice was given him because he had to rely on his own resources to protect himself. Without this dual nature, this power of choice, creation is unthinkable. The creation of a ready-made, perfect mankind would be a work of supererogation—far beyond the necessities of the scheme.

The evidence of the purpose of creation lies revealed on every hand. Work is the order called to every man, of every race, in every clime. The command is: Make the best of it! The seasons are perfectly fitted for the calling of man. Produce, subdue the earth, learn to satisfy your desires and needs with the least exertion. Learn how to gain leisure so that time can be gained for spiritual needs. The seventh day, the day of rest, means far more than respite from labour; it means that the worker should have time to review the result of his toil, and see that it is very good, a day to enjoy the work of his hands.

This injunction—to enjoy the work of his hands—is basic in old Hebrew law. It must have been a law or command of the old covenant. It is perfectly clear that, if a man is to enjoy the work of his hands, no one, as landlord or other tax-collector, can stand between him and the produce of his labour. The economic terminology of the Bible is sound. Labour meant then what it does now, namely, all human exertion; and service meant then what it does now: rendering service to labour, and being paid for by labour, as labour enjoys, gains, benefits, or profits. The services indispensable to men were then what they are now: the priest's, the poet's, the physician's, the musician's.

As the earth evolved by God's direction out of darkness into light, so man must evolve. The pattern is complete. God created the earth; man must produce his food from the earth.

God gave light; man must give light to his soul. Struggle there must be for man; how could he realize his mighty endowment without struggle? Without it, no subsistence, no enjoyment of leisure, no spiritual development, no artistry. And this last phase of man's struggle here may be the goal for which he was destined, beginning as a producer and ending as a creator. Unable to create the raw materials from which he must produce his needs, he may complete his God-likeness by creating beauty in stone, and in wood, and in sound. So the divine cycle of God's work may come whole, and the dual nature of man, through which he shall learn to exercise the power of choice, shall fit him to conquer evil and perfect his life. Where, in this system of equality of opportunity, can there be found a God of anger? When man makes a choice and commits sin, he chooses the penalty which always follows the misdeed, sometimes soon, sometimes late. Can a world in which sin could be committed without penalty be imagined? Small wonder the people of old time attributed sin and its penalties to the anger of God; the sins were so heinous, the penalties so terrible, they seemed superhuman. But what is more human than the sin of shifting responsibility? It is one of the oldest tricks of mankind. Anyone but himself is to blame: a neighbour, a cabal, an enemy, ill-luck, the devil, anyone, anything but the sinner himself. That is how it came about that God was pictured as a sin-sowing, pain-afflicting God. God! who in all his works reveals his love for his creatures.

As an example of the bewilderment of a really scientific mind when it attempts to consider the why and wherefore of disease and pain, take Bertrand Russell's *The Scientific Outlook*. Russell says: "For aught I know to the contrary, there may be a Being of infinite power who chooses that children

should die of meningitis and older people of cancer; these things occur and occur as the result of evolution. If, therefore, evolution embodies a Divine Plan, these occurrences must also have been planned." The suggestion has the ring of old-time Hebrew lamentation. But do meningitis and cancer occur as a result of evolution? What proof is given by the scientific method that they do so occur? Surely the scientific method in quest of the origin of disease should consider what civilizations of economic dislocation have done to break down mankind's powers of resistance and make man the prey of disease. It is frequently said that it is not the business of pathologists to study the economics of the conditions under which the poor exist; true, they know the slum is not a health resort, but that is about all they do know of the economic causes of the slum. Is it in order to ask the scientist: What would man have been if there had been no slavery? He might have bred a healthier race. Who knows? When will the scientific method be applied to the economic causes of the tragedies of existence, viz. poverty, crime, and disease? And who is better fitted to pioneer in that work than Bertrand Russell?

In other parts of his book are scattered numerous references to the wonders of science in conquering disease: typhus, rickets, tuberculosis, smallpox. The change in sixty years in the infant death-rate from 160 to 74, Russell says, "is attributable almost wholly to scientific technique." But our scientist searching for truth and justice does not stop to enter on the credit side of the old ledger, items: Being of infinite power—infant death-rate reduced; Divine Plan of evolution—less typhus, smallpox, etc. For all Russell knows, scientific technique is the Divine Plan of the Being of infinite power. Why give all the cures to science and all the diseases to the Divine Plan? Anyway, as science is very young, trying honestly to make a re-

spectable showing, why overburden it with a reputation for certainty which might in years to come depend on superstition for its support? Russell says: "To lose faith in knowledge is to lose faith in the best of man's capacities." . . . True enough, but there are many kinds of knowledge, and the knowledge which is called scientific would not fill a very large volume if it were divested of hypothetical aids and heuristic fictions. The situation today is interesting and amusing to the mere layman looking to scientists for knowledge. Even Russell, opposed to Jeans and Eddington, cannot resist the temptation of finding parallels for the latest revolt in physics. It seems like searching for encouragement and finding a renewal of rational optimism in the defeats of Plato and Descartes. But nearer his time he might have found consolation in the fact that Faraday and Maxwell got along amazingly well with Tyndall and Huxley. Still, this ghost of creation haunts the mind of the physicist and will not be laid. Russell must have it out and argue with it. He must assure himself, and fall not into the ways of Eddington or Jeans. He accepts provisionally the hypothesis that the world had a beginning at some definite, though unknown, date. Then he asks: "Are we to infer from this that the world was made by a Creator? Certainly not, if we are to adhere to the canons of valid scientific inference. There is no reason whatever why the universe should not have begun spontaneously, except that it seems odd that it should do so, but there is no law of nature to the effect that things which seem odd to us must not happen." So he remains baffled, and admits: "Creation out of nothing is an occurrence which has not been observed." A Pyrrhic victory is all he gets out of his bout with the scientific rebels. But he completely misses the point of his own exception to the idea of spontaneous creation. "It seems odd." Of course it does. Every discovery of

science seemed odd at some time or another. The odd stage of many things is with us still, and perhaps it may tempt mathematicians and physicists to apply their teaching to the question of creation, but if they fare no better in solving that problem than they have in solving those which have engaged their minds in recent years, what can a hungry layman hope for from the experiment? Strangely enough, it is the odd, disposed of so lightly by Russell, that worries the wretched man-in-the-street to a shred. The great big odd of a hungry man in a world of plenty is more than a scientific fact. Wheat at two shillings and sixpence a bushel and millions of unemployed merely existing on charity is a condition so odd that every statesman in the world is shocked and mystified at the frightful anomaly. Yet, the creature born in superstition has an idea that, whoever created the earth, it is the only source from which food can be produced, and that the odd thing about it all is this: that the easier labour-saving machines tend to make production, the harder it becomes for labour to make a living. Creation is an undeniable fact in an economic sense, and, notwithstanding the results of the playful experiments of Jacques Loeb and Hogben, science is obliged to use created things before it can set to work on tadpoles and newts, and the mechanists are as far from guessing the answer to the riddle of creation as ever.

It is high time scientists stopped joy-riding into the unknown. It is high time theologians dropped their girdings at scientists. Both have been engaged in a futile conflict. It is high time plain man had an innings. None of the discoveries of physicists could save him from the disasters of the past twenty years; the churches utterly failed to warn him of the coming catastrophes. Now neither Church nor laboratory has discovered a way out of the economic mess. Man has been

forgotten and left alone, without spiritual or economic guidance; he has become a positive danger to himself. And, as no Moses has appeared on the scene to lead him to a land of promise, his plight is extremely serious. The Israelites in Egypt were sure of slave rations, but the politically free man in want today is sure of nothing to support him. The bread-liner at the tail end of the procession often finds supplies give out before his turn to receive comes. And with all the doles, all the charity, private and municipal, the demand for relief increases daily, and not one single suggestion comes from those in authority as to how the awful problem might be solved. Every expedient is to be tried: higher tariffs, lower tariffs, gold standard, off gold standard, less gold ratio to deposits, unfreezing bank assets, inflation, higher taxation, and the hundred and one "thimblerrigging tricks of statesmen and financiers," but no fundamental change, nothing to alter the system, only such aids as will prop it up and save it from immediate collapse. How fortunate the Israelites were in finding such a leader as Moses! Small wonder so many turned from the idols of Pharaoh to the worship of Jehovah. Who would not feel inclined to worship a God who provided a land flowing with milk and honey, in which there would be no scarceness? Even in this age of scientific technique, were such a promise held out, the most hardened rationalist might take God for granted.