

between church people and others, but between the churches themselves. When churches are exempt from taxation, rich congregations are favored in far greater degree than poor ones; and the members of poor ones have to help make up the difference.

One of the Washington correspondents has discovered in the record of American exports and imports from the beginning, what he naively calls "an interesting showing of stupendous prosperity." According to this exhibit, the people of the United States, from the adoption of the constitution to the present time, have exported more than they have imported, to the amount of \$972,241,493 in merchandise, and \$1,460,473,261 in gold and silver—an aggregate excess of exports of \$2,432,714,759. That is called "stupendous prosperity"! But in what does the prosperity consist? If we have sent out more than we have taken in, for a century, it can hardly be argued that a debt has been accumulating abroad in our favor. For if our foreign debtors do not balance accounts in a hundred years, but "get into us" in that time to the lively tune of \$2,432,714,759, we have no reason for ever expecting a settlement. And as to having the balance paid to us in gold and silver, why, of gold and silver as well as of merchandise, we have been sending away more than we have been getting back.

The truth about our exports and imports is that our excess of exports goes largely to pay dividends, interest and rents to foreign owners of American stocks, bonds and lands. Instead of implying that we are growing prosperous, our excess of exports goes to prove that we are being drained. For 100 years our wealth has been flowing to Europe in a steady stream at the rate of nearly \$25,000,000 a year in excess of the return stream; and our business men tell us that therefore we are prosperous! If this indicates the quality of business brains, it is not strange that 95 per cent. of our business men fail every generation. Men

who think that they prosper by their outgo instead of their income might be expected to fail.

It is observed in Washington official circles that a strong sentiment in favor of annexation to the United States is spreading through Cuba. Washington official circles would be the most likely place for observing the Cuban pulse in such a matter. Let us hope, though, that the Manila method will not be adopted at Washington for promoting the Cuban sentiment.

THE MENACE OF HERRONISM.

In George D. Herron, professor of applied Christianity at Iowa college, plutocracy recognizes a dangerous character. He says too much, writes too much, thinks too much, and worse than all else stimulates too much thought among the impoverished people. Therefore plutocracy sets out to silence him.

Before we speak of this in detail, however, let us stop to explain what we mean by "plutocracy." We do not mean the rich merely because they are rich. It is quite possible for men as rich as Croesus to be democrats; and it is certain that there are men as poor as Job's turkey who are plutocrats. Plutocracy means not the rich class, but government by or for the rich; and he is a plutocrat, be he rich or poor, who gives aid and encouragement to that idea of government.

It is, then, not to the rich that we allude when we say that plutocracy has set out to silence Prof. Herron. Far from it. There are among the rich those who sympathize with his work, just as 19 centuries ago some of the rich stood by the Carpenter whose message Herron bears. But rich men who regard their wealth as giving them authority to govern, in state and college and church, together with a host of middle class and even impoverished worshipers of wealth, do fear the effect upon disinherited mankind of Herron's searching moral probe and his bold social diagnosis. It is to them that we refer. They are the plutocrats who aim to silence him.

For more than a year plutocratic

efforts have been made to oust Herron from his chair in Iowa college. The ostensible reason is that his theories of Christianity as applied to modern life prevent graduates of the college from getting employment as teachers and preachers, and consequently deprive the college of student material. This, however, is evidently only a pretext. The real reason comes now and then to the surface like a whale to blow. Prof. Herron's teaching in the college discourages plutocratic rich men from making endowments. It is lack of endowments and not of students that gives offense. The fact that Iowa college is the only western college of wide repute which is under no obligations to mammon, is felt as a blemish. It is in truth a glorious distinction.

Some idea of what it is in Prof. Herron's teachings that so disturbs the placidity of plutocrats and staves off coveted endowments, may be derived from a Chicago episode of the past week.

Herron had been invited to supply the place temporarily of Rev. Dr. Thomas before the congregation of the People's church, which meets Sunday mornings in McVicker's theater. Dr. Thomas is a man of liberal ideas, a democrat in the fundamental as distinguished from the party sense, and a religious as distinguished from a pietistic preacher; while his congregation has regarded itself and been regarded as devoted to the truths of Christianity rather than the pretenses of churchianity.

Meetings of this congregation, filling the large theater, sat under all the sermons that Herron preached. The congregation was not only satisfied; it became enthusiastic, as all audiences do that surrender to the persuasiveness of Herron's arguments and the charm of his oratory.

But on the last Sunday but one that Herron was to supply Dr. Thomas's place, he made some of his offensive applications of Christian principles; and upon the demand of one aggressively plutocratic trustee, seconded by others of the subservient type, he was forbidden to complete his engagement with Dr. Thomas.

Strangely enough the trustees themselves invited the reporters into their confidence, and the whole story came out. Prof. Herron gave it connected form in the following interview:

I had made up my mind to say nothing about this, and insisted that the committee of the Christian Citizens' league say nothing, but as the trustees have given you the matter for publication, I can say all there is to say.

There is no trouble between the People's church and myself, and I have no relation to the People's church to sever. I am lecturing Sunday evenings and Monday noons in Central Music hall, under the auspices of the Christian Citizenship league. While here, I preach in different churches Sunday mornings. Dr. Thomas needed rest, and left the city, asking me to preach for him till his return, one week from next Sunday. I have been doing so, and had one more Sunday to preach. Last Tuesday two of the trustees waited on me and said they did not wish me to preach the remaining Sunday, as certain things I had said drove away some men of wealth whose money they needed to run the church.

I replied that we would have no trouble on that score, as I did not care to preach to men who could not bear to hear opinions contrary to their own opinions or financial interests. It seemed bewildering to me that a few men of wealth should assume it to be their right to direct what sort of message 2,000 or 3,000 people should hear preached to them on Sundays. I wonder how the people like it. But such is the way the present day church is governed. I took it all as a matter of course, and I have only the kindest feelings to these trustees. They do not represent the church or Dr. Thomas. They represent the money which rules.

Fortunately for a clear understanding of the objections to Herron's ideas of applied Christianity, the trustees in this case made specifications. Now, specifications are dangerous; and heretofore Herron's plutocratic critics have shrewdly generalized. Even when professing to specify they have been vague. But in the present case no fault can be found upon that score. The specifications are specific. There are two general charges, and no more; political preaching, and preaching socialism; and these charges are supported each by a single specific quotation from his sermon.

In support of the charge of political preaching it is stated that Prof. Herron used the following language:

This is a perjured nation. It has been

untrue to its promises to the natives of the islands of the sea.

In support of the charge of preaching socialism, the following utterance is specified:

It is complained by givers of charity that the poor are ungrateful. This is not to be wondered at, and is a mark of latent manhood. The poor want justice.

One might ask, If these things, so gravely charged to Herron as pulpit crimes, are unworthy of utterance from a Christian pulpit, what is a Christian pulpit for?

No candid man who remembers 12 months of American history denies the facts from which Prof. Herron concludes that ours is a perjured nation. Did we not declare that Cuba is and of right ought to be independent? and go to war with Spain to make her independence secure? Did we not disclaim any intention of sovereignty? Did we not proclaim that forcible annexation is criminal? And did we not make these declarations on the basis of principle?

Yet have we not ignored Cuba's independence? Have we not forcibly annexed Porto Rico? Are we not rushing our soldiers to their death in an effort to forcibly annex the Philippines?

If this be not national perjury what could be?

And is not perjury like that a fit subject for pulpit condemnation? Or is the Christian pulpit reserved for the bloodthirsty invectives which from many a one in these United States have been levelled at natives of the islands of the sea for fighting against awful odds for their God-given liberty? Is it Christian patriotism in the pulpit to preach death to Filipino patriots, and offensive politics in the pulpit to preach against American bad faith and invasion? Does Christ indeed keep step to the deadly music that Otis makes? or is he as Lowell described him, still "agin war and pillage"?

Herron offended a spurious patriotism and a counterfeit Christianity by naming the crime of which this nation is guilty. In righteous wrath he thereby followed the example of his Master. Jesus unreservedly denounced the plutocrats

of his day. Herron has merely used more and milder words than his Master, whose simple expression was: "Hypocrites!"

And if the specification of political preaching so weakly supports the charge, what shall we say of the specification of preaching socialism?

That their ingratitude for charity is, as Herron says, a mark of latent manhood in the poor, few would deny except those degraded souls that seek salvation by grudgingly relieving the necessities of people whose impoverishment they defend as necessary to afford them opportunities to practice charity. But Herron added that "The poor want justice." Was that, then, the sting in his words? And why should that remark sting? Was it because it is true?

Justice is what the poor do want. If the poor had justice there would be no very poor. Neither would there be any very rich. For great poverty in the midst of great wealth, particularly as the poor are the workers as a class and the rich are the idlers as a class, signifies one thing with tremendous emphasis—it signifies that the poor are poor because the rich are rich.

Doubtless that explains the sting in Herron's words. "The poor want justice"—what if they should come to realize their want! What if they should not only want justice in the sense of lacking it, but should come to want it in the sense of consciously desiring it! Should that happen, how would plutocracy fare?

Men who are poor because they lack justice, and come to consciously desire justice, would be a dangerous element—men with votes; they would soon sweep away the cobwebs of privilege in which plutocratic spiders entangle their spoil. There you have the reason, then, for the plutocratic objections to Herron's applications of Christianity. He interprets the poor to themselves. He shows them that their destitution in the midst of abundance is not a mark of divine disfavor, but a result of human injustice. And he implores mankind to remedy the injustice as an act of Christian faith.

Herron's remark about the poor wanting justice, was loaded; and plutocrats who therefore resent it

show that though they be lacking in Christian spirit they have a full share of Yankee wit.

Though the quotations from Prof. Herron which are made above serve well the purpose of indicating the grossly irreligious character of the pious hostility to his theories of applied Christianity, they are only barely suggestive of what he teaches. An elaborate expression is to be found in his new book, published by Crowell, of New York and Boston, under the title "Between Caesar and Jesus." This little book comprises a series of eight lectures, the burden of which is that Jesus' law of love is a veritable law, to which mankind must conform under penalties for disobedience similar to those which attach to the law of gravitation.

In the conflict between existing civilization and an awakening conscience respecting social relations and obligations, Prof. Herron in this book unfolds what he calls "the ethical tragedy of the economic problem." It is impossible, he argues, for any man, under existing social conditions, to live his own life in society without participating in social wrong. He cannot, for example, so much as clothe himself, either in expensive or cheap clothes, without patronizing sweat shops; nor could he refrain from patronizing them without depriving their miserable victims of the boon of work. "If we stay at our posts in order that we may change the system, we are on the backs of our brothers; if we desert our posts, in order that we may get off our brothers' backs, we take bread from their mouths, from the mouths of their children, and add to the army of the workless and hopeless." Thus we are deprived of the highest of all rights—"the right to do right," the right to earn our living "in such a way as to help the living of every other man."

In this dilemma, which forces upon us the alternative of remaining upon our brothers' backs so as to change the system, or getting off their backs and leaving the system to itself, Prof. Herron urges that we choose the former. We must remain at our posts in society though that involve a social sacrifice of conscience. For

"a social problem can have only a social solution for each individual member of society." "An individual," for illustration,

cannot practice national ownership of land, except the land be owned by the nation; if his zeal be at bottom a spiritual self-deceit and cowardice, he will spend his time discussing ways whereby he may individually escape the curse of private ownership; if his zeal be social and Christian, born out of love for his brethren, he will spend his life in bearing away the curse from his nation and from the world.

There can be no individual extrication from responsibility for a wrong social system. "They who stay in the existing order of things because they do not believe in it, are the ones who will make way for the better order." It is by this sacrifice of the individual right to do right, in order to give our lives to procuring a common righteousness for all, that the new social movement is to be promoted.

Nor does the argument ignore individual responsibility for wrong. What determines the individual's spiritual status in sacrificing his conscience for the common well being is his purpose. "The soul that consents to existing social or political or economic arrangements, whereby some of the sons of God are given privileges and opportunities above other sons of God, is a lost soul." It is acquiescence, not participation merely, in the social wrong that makes it an individual crime.

The one final answer, then, "to the question of the relation of the disciple of Jesus to the laws of Caesar," is that the disciple "must conquer Caesar's realm, and transfer the law-making function to Jesus." And to do that he must participate in the reign of Caesar. To this social sacrifice of conscience even Jesus is no exception. He is indeed a concrete example, for he identified himself with the common lot. It is, therefore, the mission of the Christian reformer "to preach what he cannot yet practice."

Prof. Herron now advances his theme from a consideration of the necessity, in existing social conditions, of sacrificing the right to do right, to the question of how to obtain the right to do right. He finds this right to be dependent upon liberty, and lib-

erty to be fundamentally inconsistent with private ownership of public resources. Whoever "sells his labor power under the compulsion of necessity, for the mere means of existence, is in no sense a really free man;" whence it follows that "the common ownership of the earth is the only ground upon which true property and liberty can be built, the only soil in which individuality may take root."

Having reached that conclusion, Prof. Herron makes an extended examination of church authorities to show that genuine Christian experience always manifested itself in the early days in a reaching after economic brotherhood, the practicability of which, he insists, depends upon whether Christianity itself is practical.

That it is not practical to base Christianity upon existing civilization, he not only concedes; he asserts it. It was because Christ was in conflict with civilization, he argues, that they crucified him. Christ's claim to the Messiahship did not concern the political and ecclesiastical powers; they were disturbed not by that, but because his teaching threatened the existing order of things, because "he was aiming at the wrong at the heart of the nation," and the different parties therefore instinctively "knew him at once as the enemy of their order." And so has it been since. "The history of Christianity is the book of an unrelenting conflict between Christ and civilization."

Nor between Christ and civilization alone, but between Christ and Christianity also. "It was as a teacher of elemental life and law that Jesus came," and the era that finally changed his revelation "from a social ideal to an official religion, from a mode of life to a theological system, was one of moral and religious anarchy, insanely wicked and licentious." Then Christianity's "springtime of moral glory had gone, while the summer was soon ended and the long winter of the faith of Jesus began." Before he can again "have his day and social way, there will have to be done for Christianity what Jesus did for Judaism."

Herron adopts no sectarian label,

religious or economic. In economics he objects to socialism not because it is too radical, but because it is not radical; because he "can see in it at best but a transition method and period, a new wilderness journey and discipline, on the way to liberty." He rejects Christian anarchism as exemplified by Tolstoi, "the lofty Russian prophet," not because its program is extreme in the direction of the future, but because it seems to him to be very reactionary. He keeps out of the single tax camp—

Not because that camp is too far in the social advance, but because it occupies no more than the place of a surveying or engineering corps; when the land is once free, and the depraved system of force, fraud and perjury which we call taxation is removed, with the parasitical governmental functions which the system entails, we have then merely cleared the ground for the social problem; the question of human relations and destiny remains to be answered, and to this Mr. George would agree.

Herron stands "simply as an interpreter of Jesus, as an advocate of his ideal of human relations." This is an attainable Christian brotherhood, he holds, a brotherhood ruled by the law of love, the firm foundations of which can be fixed, and if we become really Christian will be fixed, in natural economic law.

To close his plea for this Christian renaissance Prof. Herron discourses on "the victory of failure." Measured by conventional standards the life of Jesus was a failure from beginning to end. It was without a single complete example of success. Yet, had his life been otherwise he could not have been the savior of men. So has it always been. "It is through the sacrifice and failure of the individual idealist that human emancipation has proceeded from the beginning." And now, "the supreme need of the social crisis is that of strong men willing to fail, that they may prove the justice of love and the wisdom of love's sacrifice. Above all else, society needs deliverance from the impracticability of the practical man, from the failure of his successes."

To read Herron's book is to understand why he is feared. It is not

because he advocates violence; in fact he condemns that. It is not because he advocates expropriation of just property; he does not. Neither is it because he holds up an ideal of social life in which equality holds sway; privileged orders never fear ideals if they be preached merely as ideals. It is because he recognizes and advocates as the first and fundamental thing to be done to realize the ideal which Jesus proclaimed, a perfectly practicable economic reform whereby the privilege of private ownership in land would be abolished. He is an idealist with a practical method, an idealist with the sword of justice in his hand and his feet upon the ground. For that reason he is a menace to plutocracy, and for that reason plutocracy fears him and seeks to silence him.

NEWS

Fighting in the Philippines has been shifted from the region of the Pasig river and the lake, to the north in the direction of Malolos, the Filipino capital. The river and the western shores of the lake being in control of the American forces, the Filipino army, as will be remembered, was cut in two. This was the first step in the American plan for conquering it piecemeal. At our last report, that had been accomplished; and after the 19th fighting in the Pasig river region stopped, except for desultory firing upon the Americans by Filipinos. After two or three days of comparative quiet, the next movement in the American plan began. This contemplated a campaign against the northern wing of the Filipino army, with Malolos for the objective, it being understood that with the fall of that city the Filipino army would disintegrate and the war be ended.

While apparently inactive for several days after the 19th, the American force was being reorganized for the Malolos campaign, and on the 25th the first advance was made. At day-break 11,000 American troops moved upon Malabon, a town about six miles north of Manila, which the Americans were reported to have captured more than six weeks ago (see No. 46, page 8), but where the Filipinos were now so securely entrenched that a hot battle was necessary to dislodge them. The news reports describe the result

of this battle as "a sweeping victory." Three lines of Filipino trenches were taken and the Filipinos retreated northward along the railroad toward Polo. As the main body of the Filipino army had been moved down from Malolos to Malibon, it was part of the American plan to surround it there; but the Filipinos succeeded in keeping open their line of retreat, and this part of the American plan wholly failed.

Though the Filipinos retreated, they did so slowly, fighting every inch of the ground from successive lines of trenches. On the 26th the Americans closed in on Polo, and the Filipinos resumed their retreat, firing as they went. They would fire a few volleys from their cover, and then hurry back to other cover. These tactics they repeated, so that the day's work for the Americans consisted in storming successive trenches. Before vacating Polo, the Filipinos set it on fire, and when the Americans came up they found it deserted and burned almost to ashes. The Americans pushed on beyond Polo, after the Filipino rear guard; and on the 27th they captured Meicauayan, a place about two miles beyond Polo, but not without a fight, and advanced to Marilao. All along the way, the Filipinos fought desperately, and the country between Marilao and Manila is described as presenting a picture of desolation. "Smoke curls from hundreds of ash heaps, and the remains of trees and fences torn by shrapnel are to be seen everywhere. The general appearance of the country is as if it had been swept by a cyclone. The roads are strewn with furniture and clothing dropped in flight by the Filipinos. The only persons remaining behind are a few aged persons, too infirm to escape. They camp beside the ruins of the former homes and beg passers-by for any kind of assistance. The majority of them are living on the generosity of our soldiers; who give them portions of their rations. The dogs of the Filipinos cower in the bushes, still terrified and barking, while hundreds of pigs are to be seen searching for food." Upon abandoning Marilao, the Filipinos set it on fire and continued their retreat.

It had by that time been found impossible to pen in the Filipinos between two advancing lines, as had been designed, and the decisive battle which the Americans had been trying to force was considered as like-