

tasteful visitors. The emperor, though he possibly retains much of the pride of his house, and feels acutely his defeats and the barbarian extortions, has evidently no initiative remaining sufficient to dictate that removal of his capital which must be the prelude of any attempt to assert his independence. The dowager empress, who has such influence, uses it to prevent a change of capital, and any attempt to form an active army. The counsellors, we imagine from the recent accounts of Prince Kung, differ violently among themselves, are almost all corrupt, and all engage in a perpetual warfare of intrigue, ending in this result, that they acknowledge almost tearfully their hopelessness of any resistance to any demand from any power. . . .

No one can help China, unless China can help herself, and China can do no more than a man stretched on a bed in a cataleptic fit. That trembling of the emperor as he shook hands with Prince Henry is a fatally suggestive sign.—The London Spectator.

PHARISAIC SAVIOURS.

Very few persons who are members of a richer and better educated class can really influence their poorer neighbors for good. The little differences of manners, and even dress, form an aloofness which chills the atmosphere of free familiarity in which alone the deeper individual facts emerge, and which is the only medium of transference of best moral influence from one person to another. A single breath of suspicion, the unconscious omission of a class point of view, the betrayal of some little difference in feeling, and all hope of influence is lost. A sense of superiority is nearly always discovered and resented. I know that many charity organizations' society visitors disown this sense of superiority. Doubtless they do their best to conceal it. But the uneducated classes are preternaturally keen in perceiving it, and it has numberless opportunities for oozing out. Now, if this sense of moral superiority were justified its existence would be, to some extent, admitted by the poor, and it might act as a moral lever. But, though they haven't reasoned the matter out, the poor feel and know that they are not fairly matched in opportunities with their friendly visitors; they feel it is all very well for these well-dressed, nice-looking ladies and gentlemen to come down and teach them how to be sober, thrifty and industrious; they may not feel resentment, but they discount the advice and they discount the moral superiority. In a blind, instinctive way they

recognize that the superiority is based on better opportunity—in other words, upon economic monopoly. There is a sense in which he who would save the soul of others must lose his own. This saving power is vigorously expressed in a little poem by Edward Carpenter, which, for its plain-spoken truth, might well be pondered by the charity organization societies.

Who are you that go about to save those that are lost?

Are you saved yourself?

Do you know that who would save his own life must lose it?

Are you then one of the lost?

Be sure, very sure, that each one of those can teach you as much as, probably more than, you can teach them.

Have you then sat humbly at their feet, and waited on their lips, that they should be the first to speak?

And been reverent before these children whom you so little understand?

Have you dropped into the bottomless pit from between yourself and them all hallucination of superiority, all flatulence of knowledge, every shred of abhorrence and loathing?

Is it equal, is it free as the wind between you?

Could you be happy receiving favors from one of the most despised of these?

Could you yourself be one of the lost?

Arise, then, and become a saviour.

—J. A. Hobson, in Contemporary Review.

THE HANGING GARDENS OF BABYLON.

It is an old device of city life to increase the precious square feet of standing room by introducing house stories as multipliers. The herdsman and the farmer lead, perforce, a one-storied life; they have no use for mother earth except they be admitted on the ground floor. But the city man uses area over and over again. Compactness is the demand, and now that he has discovered the elevator he threatens to go up until horizontal distances are matched by vertical.

Such multiplication of areas has thus far in the world's history been applied to private holdings rather than to the public space in streets and squares. The old Greek house, with its adobe walls, rarely essayed more than a second story; but Babylon was early famed for its three and four-storied houses. In Rome, before Nero's conflagration, the buildings rose to altitudes unworthy of their slender foundations and narrow streets they faced, and Augustus was obliged by edict to fix their height at 70 feet. Martial tells of a poor sinner who had to climb 200 stairs to reach his lodging-room. In Tyre, so Strabo says, the houses were taller even than at Rome.

The famous pensile gardens of Babylon were built in the midst of the crowded city, and were so constructed as to leave a part, at least, of the space

at the ground level beneath them open to traffic, or available for rooms and offices.

The monstrous structure, 400 feet square, stood by the bank of the Euphrates, where it flows, a furlong wide, through the midst of the city. Divided into four terraces, each 100 feet wide, the highest adjoining the river, it rose in four mighty steps of 20 feet each to its topmost grade, from 80 to 100 feet above the level of the ground. Massive piers of brick, 22 feet thick, supported it, and between them ran, entering from each side, 12 vaulted passageways, each ten feet wide. The ground space was thus, as patient arithmetic will show, equally divided between piers and passages.

Over the piers great architrave blocks of stone, 16 feet long and four feet thick, were laid to support the mass above, and these were joined by meshes of reeds set in cement, above which were layers of tiles, also set in cement; and again above these great sheets of lead, carefully joined so as to protect the walls of the building from the moisture that oozed through the soil above. Over all this was spread deep, rich loam, and therein were planted, after the manner of garden and park, rare shrubs and flowers that delighted with color and perfume, and "broad-leaved" trees that grew into stately dimensions, and clung to the breast of the nurse as trustfully as had it been that of old mother earth.

Through a shaft reaching down to the river water was drawn up to reservoirs in the upper terrace by some mechanism that Diodorus, surely an anachronism, speaks of as a sort of Archimedes screw. Thence came the supply for the various fountains and rills that decorated and refreshed the gardens.

This truly was a wonder of the world; for in the vaulted corridors below the politician and the money changer plied their crafts, but the husbandman and the farmer were for once on top.—Benjamin Ide Wheeler, in Century.

THE RUSSIAN PEASANT'S CAPACITY FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT.

Extract from an article on "The Czar's People," by Julian Ralph, published in Harper's Magazine for June.

The muzhik, who possesses self or popular government in its purest and simplest form in the management of his village—which is all the world to him—has always shown remarkable skill and moderation in the use of this right. He has seen his own and his village rights shorn and invaded from time to time in ways and to an extent which must have seemed monstrous; but then, as always, he has proved himself the

patient, amiable, simple and docile creature that he is. He believed, for instance, from the beginnings of his nationality that, though he was a chattel of the nobles, yet the land was his irrevocably. But when serfdom was abolished the land was partitioned, and the villagers got only a portion, which is now seen to be generally less than is actually necessary for the support of the inhabitants, whose numbers have greatly increased. New abuses have crept in, owing to the muzhik's simplicity, his lack of ambition, and the vices of drink, gaming, laziness and aboriginal disregard for the morrow, so that the nihilist writers declare his present state as a freeman a worse and more hopeless one than his former serfdom. And the calmest men—even in official life—admit that the condition of agriculture is desperately bad.

His government of his villages suggests the capacity the Russian peasant possesses, sadly rude and undeveloped as it is. His "artels" prove that this capacity is strong enough for him to govern himself, which we are taught is a mightier thing than the taking of a city. They show that he can make himself industrious, honest, thrifty, foresighted, responsible (nearly everything, in fact, that he is not—until such combination gives him the chance to redeem himself). The artelshik is a muzhik revolutionized—a beast of burden in man's guise transformed into a full-fledged man, or woman, for the women make good artelshiks also. They are developed out of the familiarity with and training in cooperative management which the peasants get in the little communes or village governments. To a certain extent the artels follow the same line. They are an institution peculiar to Russia, and of great interest to all mankind. In a foreign office report of Great Britain they have recently been most carefully studied and explained—a task which the Russians have never undertaken for themselves. It seems that an artel is simply a company or association of peasants for the prosecution of a certain kind of labor or trade in a certain place, or for the performance of a single task. The custom of forming these companies has obtained there since the fourteenth century, though it grew out of a habit of certain Cossacks formed four centuries earlier. These Cossacks were fighters and brigands, who continued their warlike organizations in peaceful times for the division of their labor and of the spoils of hunting and fishing, and for the sale of their war booty and plunder. They carried their trade up the Dnieper, and so taught the boatmen of that river the

advantage of forming the artels, which they still maintain. The system is to-day applied to the work of hunting, fishing, farming, mining, banking, custom house, post office and railway work, and there are artels of laborers, mechanics, porters, factory hands of many sorts, pilots, bargemen, stevedores, herders of every sort of cattle, musicians, beggars, and even horsethieves. It is impossible to say how many artelshiks, or even artels, there are, because no statistics upon the subject have yet been published. It is certain, however, that in the higher fields of labor the institution is vigorously extending, though in the simpler relations of unskilled labor the practice of hiring individual muscle in the ordinary way is elbowing out the simpler artels of laborers.

Until recently the government has practically closed its eyes to the existence of the artels (except as it has employed them in certain works), regarding them with disfavor as being socialistic institutions, and yet refraining from opposing them because they confine their energy to the industrial purposes for which they are formed, and because they undeniably tend to the improvement of the muzhik, his work and his value to the state.

"THE EARTH HATH HE GIVEN TO THE CHILDREN OF MEN."

An extract from "The Two Great Commandments in Economics," by James E. Mills, issued as a supplement to the April New Earth, and reviewed in The Public of June 4th.

The relations of God to man, of which the first great commandment is the generalized law, are relations of giver and receiver of life within and world without. The sense-world is the first of God's gifts recognized by the developing of man, and the response of the sense-world to the needs of both body and soul is the foundation of love to God. And although the superstructure rise far above sense until finally sense and all that responds to sense becomes incidental, still, on sense are life and love and wisdom based; and when the individual loses his sense-life of earth through death of the material body, his love still rests on the sense-world, now the sense-world of heaven, through the senses of the spiritual body. For without a basis in sense, or, in other words, without environment, there can be no life. The environment of earth is the means of union in love with God during the years when senses are keenest and sensuous delights are most engaging, and power for physical effort most efficient. In these early years

of a healthy life, the prayer for daily bread is, of necessity, prayer for the blessings of outer life.

If the economic conditions were shaped—as shaped they must be before God's kingdom can come on earth as in heaven—to the two great commandments, the youth on leaving the home of his childhood would be welcomed to his larger home in the world with the smile of God. He would feel his birthright to an equal share of God's love and God's loving gifts of earth. "Here my Father has placed me. I am equal heir with all my fellows to this fair earth about me, and to all its opportunities; heir to my place where I may stand upright and free, and may live out to its fullest and best the life he gives me, and may do my share of the world's work as he gives me to do. Here on this inheritance from our Father in heaven, the wife he gives me and the children he gives us shall live and grow with me to the full stature of the manhood and womanhood he made us to obtain, and here we will thank him and love him."

This, or such as this, is the attitude of youth and early manhood to God, to fellow-men, and to the earth, which the two great commandments contemplate.

But the youth who would stand in this attitude to-day would be called a dreamer of dreams; and if he tried to enforce his claim to an inheritance of God's earth, he would come into conflict with human laws, traditions and customs and habits of thought. He would find his place on earth held by other men, his claim of equal rights of access to the earth annulled, and he himself dependent upon other men for what his Father gave him outright; his sense of the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man referred to the realms of sentiment, and the whole system of relations between him and his fellows and their common Father which follows inevitably from the spirit and letter of Christ's teachings, treated as impracticable idealism.

The mutual relations of the Divine Giver and the human recipient are confused and obscured by the intrusion of perverse human institutions between the individual and his Maker. The struggle of the ages has been to remove such intrusions. The still, small voice of the conscience of the people—persuasive voice uttering spiritual perceptions—amid the clamor of selfish interests is saying: "Stand aside from between me and God; let me come before him as he made me to come, in the full stature of manhood." And privilege is always talking back with grandiloquent assertions of its own importance and