

But the Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where the man was, and when he saw he had compassion on him. And he went to him and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and brought him to the Inn and took care of him.

And when he departed he gave money to the Innkeeper and said unto him, "Take care of him and whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again I will repay thee." And he organized a Society to care in this way for all travelers.

And the owner of the Inn heard thereof and raised the Innkeeper's rent.

But another Samaritan, when this was reported unto him, said, "I must clear the road of thieves lest others be also slain." And this he did.

And the landlord raised the rent again.

Which of these, thinkest thou, was neighbor to him that paid the rent?

BOLTON HALL.



EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITIES, NOT OF INCOMES.

From Lincoln Steffens' Prize-Winning Answer in the February Metropolitan Magazine to Bernard Shaw's "The Case for Equality" in the December Number.

"When I speak of the case for equality," he [Bernard Shaw] says, "I mean human equality; and that, of course, can mean only one thing; it means equality of income." And . . . he adds: "The fact is you cannot equalize anything about human beings except their incomes." . . .

Mr. Shaw says every other kind of human equality is impossible. Scientists say no precise equality occurs in Nature; not even among crystals; and, as for incomes, the inhuman inequality between thrift and joyousness would spoil that arrangement, unless economic opportunities were equalized. He says most human beings get "equal pay" now; and he refers to the wages of labor, and the army, navy and civil lists. And he observes the leveling process of redistribution in pension legislation, in income and all super-taxation. There is no denying these facts; the tendency of political and social reform is toward the redistribution of wealth by force through confiscation. But all this makes, not for equality of incomes; not precisely; it makes only toward approximate equality. And in the wrong way; and here is where I take issue with Mr. Shaw on his whole case, whether he is for human equality, as he says, or for human inequality, as he also says.

Our evils are due, not to private wealth, but to excessive wealth and power in the hands of individuals. Equally bad, both must be prevented. Mr. Shaw would not prevent either. He proposes to redistribute accumulated wealth by some power greater than the state puts into the hands of states-

men now. This is implied in "precisely equal incomes," which only a highly organized governmental machine could establish. And even if that were done, it wouldn't stay done unless we had economic equality. And why attempt the impossible?

We can prevent excessive individual wealth by socializing the sources of unearned money. These are either natural resources or leaks through which social value flows into private pockets. In a word, we should abolish privileges; and, for the rest, let Labor democratize industry. These two courses would not increase centralized power; they would give us what Mr. Shaw wants: economic democracy; by giving us what he despises: equal opportunities—not to get rich, but to develop each his own gifts or inequalities freely. No man could get rich if he had access to no value except that which he produced, and I think that few would want to.

Men's activities and desires are determined, not only by economic conditions, but by resultant social ideals, and long before economic equality was reached; with the passing of the sources and example of distinguishing riches, we would be free; free from the fear of poverty and power; free to form some other ideal than money. The aristocratic few seek distinction or satisfaction now in service or skilful work. Some such ideal would soon spread through a free society, and free the sex instinct to further by natural selection, human, instead of economic, inequalities.



PROPERTY IN LAND.

A Doom Song.

There's Property in park and hall, in mining-plant and farm,—
In all that's wrought by human brain, skill'd hand or stubborn arm;
Exchange or gift or heritage—their title still will stand;
But there's no such thing as Property—in God Almighty's Land.
* * * * *
You say, "This land is mine; I work'd, and bought it:"—nay, not you.
You did but buy the claim to filch its Rent—the people's due.
You bought what ne'er was man's to sell; more prudent, had you scann'd
The signs, which doom that spacious lie—of Property of Land.

A. C. AUCHMUTY.



Returning from school the other afternoon, a little girl informed her mother that she had learned how to "punschate." "Well, dear," said her mother, "and how is it done?" "Why, when you write 'Hark!' you put a hatpin after it; and when you ask a question you put a button-hook."—Unidentified.