

things. At the risk of giving too much space to Dr. Cadman, but as an example of much that passes for thought with the thoughtless, we cannot forbear quoting the following:

Q. Does not labor claim that the church, with its magnificent buildings and expensive pipe organs, is too capitalistic?

A. Labor is capitalistic. I'm a capitalist. You're a capitalist. Any man with \$50 is a capitalist. Labor is not only capitalistic but despotic. Russian labor has proved itself more despotic than any Czar ever thought of being, and British labor, given sufficient power, would have become equally so. Labor argues: "The feudal lords had their day, then came the industrial lords, and now it's our turn."

Q. Can we put more Christianity into industry?

A. We can, and it should emanate from the bottom as well as from the top. I believe in industrial co-operation. But when you ask labor: "Are you ready to share the profits?" "Yes." "Are you ready to share the losses?" "No."

Capitalism with all its faults of which I am too well aware, is the only system which history has proved workable. Now if any workingman could show me a better system I'd preach it from my pulpit to-morrow. But no better system has shown up yet, and until it does, I say:

"Why cut down Brooklyn Bridge if it's the only one we've got?"

Labor is always looking for short cuts. But whenever we take a short cut we get into trouble. Our chief fault is that we're always in a hurry. And God's not. That's the "diff."

Q. Would we listen to Christ if He should appear today?

A. Would Christ if He appeared to-day preach what He did 2,000 years ago? Times have changed. We live in an age of factories and railroads and crowded cities. Christ traveled from Palestine to Egypt many nights on a donkey. We make it overnight on a sleeper. We cannot predict what He would say to-day any more than I can go to Chicago and announce: "This is what Mr. Pearson would say were he here to-night." I prefer to let Mr. Pearson and Christ speak for themselves.

In the time to come (as indeed it is today in reality) it will be considered a mark of the economically ill-informed to speak of "capitalism" unless the one using the term stops to define just what it means. Does he mean the institution of private property? Does he refer to the large accumulations of wealth in few hands, used or not used in the production of more wealth? What *does* he mean, for "capitalism" as currently used by socialists and others may have a variety of meanings, but economically is without meaning.

"Capitalist" we understand. He is a man who puts his wealth to the production of more wealth. But that has been done since the time of Adam, who presumably did some spade work with some crude implement in the Garden of Eden. To call this "capitalism" as if it denoted some economic status, or institution like feudalism for example, is to talk vaguely and in meaningless terms.

"Any man with \$50. is a capitalist." Pardon, doctor; he may be nothing of the sort. The possession of wealth does not make a man a capitalist. Wealth and capital are quite distinct; capital, let us repeat, is wealth used in the production of wealth. It is conceivable that he may use that \$50. in the purchase of tools to be used in his trade as carpenter; it then becomes capital. The man is to that extent a "capitalist", but only in a very limited way, and we can imagine the righteous scorn of the socialist at the statement of the sapient doctor. Nevertheless, in the small degree indicated Dr. Cadman happens to be right, though he confuses wealth with capital, which no true economist should do.

We have to acknowledge our astonishment at the statement of the Doctor that Christ would not or might not have spoken as he did in Palestine—would not or might not have taught the same truths. We have always regarded these teachings as unchangeable, and supposed the church did. What real difference would it make in the "eternal verities" uttered by Jesus that we can now travel from Palestine to Egypt overnight in a sleeper? How can that fact affect the message and admonitions of the Man of Nazareth?

The fact is, Dr. Cadman is seeking to evade the consequences of Christ's teachings. It is a habit of the clergy. He is trying to accomodate his own conventional religion to the teachings of Christ. It is characteristic of him that he says, with his customary flippancy, that "he prefers to let Christ speak for himself." When will clergymen speak for Christ, taking the plain meaning of his message and seeking to apply it to the conduct of earthly institutions, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven?"

Have We Come To A Turning Point In Civilization?

THERE are changes and turning points in civilization. We are approaching the greatest of all. These changes are not of necessity sudden or cataclysmal, nor do they come with radiant sunburst. Frequently their progress is so slow as to be almost unobserved, but their full accomplishment marks the dividing line between one civilization and another.

There has been, so far as modern history records, but one such event in the world of which we have definite knowledge—that was the birth and life of Christ and the advent of Christianity. A new civilization took the place of the old and the entire world was changed. Whatever may be our theological or religious beliefs, the world could never be the same to any of us. No problem could again be regarded in the same way. Though Christian nations went to war as pagan nations did, though slavery continued for a time, though men were and are still divorced from the land, from that minute, when the old epoch

rolled away and the so-called Christian epoch took its place, slavery and private property in land were doomed.

This does not mean that the world was to become Utopia—it merely means that certain institutions impeding the progress of civilization are inconsistent with continued progression. It does not mean that humanity has become any better, though that may be assumed, but that the social consciousness has changed in response to the need for further advance. We cannot go on without destroying a lot of venerable and out-grown institutions in the path, and we have to go on, for we cannot halt for any length of time, and we cannot go back. That is the law of progress.

Chattel slavery was banished not because of any new idealism, though that helped, but because it was something in the way. Civilization had arrived at a point in development beyond which it could not pass unless slavery were destroyed. The same must soon be said of war and landed privilege.

Political leaders do not greatly count. The movement for land restoration is the great slumbering giant which when it begins to stir will wreck every political party that stands in its way.

"If this faith fail
The pillared firmament is rottenness
And earth's base built on stubble."

Witty And True

AT the annual dinner of the Academy of Political Science at the Hotel Astor, on the evening of March 9, Mr. Donald Richberg, who was introduced by the toastmaster as a writer, educator and general expert in economics, speaking of what has been called the New Proprietorship, said it recalled to him a parable:

"The owner of a gas plant used to go to his home in the evening, with a headache and general indisposition, due he told his wife, to the continued demand of his employees for more wages or of his customers for lower gas rates, and between the two he was in a constant state of turmoil.

"His wife desiring to help him made the suggestion that when the employees wanted more money, he should give them a little stock of which as she said, he had plenty which had cost him nothing, and when the consumers wanted lower rates, he should treat them in a like manner.

"While the idea was attractive he could not see just how to put it in practice until one day he hit upon the plan of selling some of his stock to the consumers with the explanation that any increase in the price of gas would come in part to them as stockholders and also selling some of his stock to his employees, explaining that while he could not pay more wages they could share in the profits, which would be the same thing.

"Of course, he was careful to have in hand enough stock to ensure control of the company. Then when the con-

sumers asked for lower rates, he referred the matter to the employee stockholders saying "if we grant lower prices your profits will be cut, and when the employees asked for a raise the matter was turned over to the consumer stockholders, their attention being called to the fact that higher wages meant lower dividends.

"Arriving home one evening with a smile only equalled by that on the face of the cat who has swallowed the canary, he said to his wife, "That was not a bad suggestion of yours; out of it I have evolved a scheme by which I have Capital and Labor fighting each other and I am now able to sit down and enjoy the fruits of my toil."

What The Vote In Ohio Shows

THE recent vote in Ohio for the Commonwealth Land party (formerly the Single Tax party) is noteworthy as showing that there are over one thousand persons in that state who will vote the Single Tax ticket under all circumstances and another one thousand not so rock-ribbed who will vote the Single Tax when not attracted by some big hurrah for a third party ticket. Macaulay's vote for president in 1920 was 2,153 while Wallace's vote in 1924 fell to 1,246, half of the 1920 Single Tax vote drifting to LaFollette who polled an enormous vote in the state, 357,848. The rock-ribbed Single Tax vote of over one thousand proves that there is a respectable nucleus for party organization.

But this is not all the vote proves. There are nearly twelve thousand persons in the state who will vote for the Single Tax now and are not afraid of it. They are ready to "throw away" their votes for a nominee having no chance of election but standing for the principle. 11,776 votes were cast for Virgil D. Allen, the Commonwealth Land party's candidate for governor. On the whole it looks as if Ohio was a mighty good state for the party managers to work in.

This Man Was One Of The Many We Were Asked To Follow

Says the *Fairhope Courier*:

Wm. Jennings Bryan, apostle of light and leading, lecturer from a thousand platforms on the "Prince of Peace"; excoriator of the oppressors of the people piling up their ill-gotten gains by various non-productive devices; idol of the down-trodden; friend and admirer of Henry George and Tom Johnson, has degenerated into a "barker" for a big real estate agency at Miami, using his conceded ability as an orator, and the confidence reposed in him by people scattered all over the United States to lure victims to the gilded palace of the land speculators to be mulcted if they lose and demoralized if they win.

A five column advertisement in a recent issue of the *Montgomery Advertiser* headed with a large cut of the