

ing rates of interest tend to prove that the times are harder than ever. It would be as sensible to point to falling wages as to falling interest as evidence of returning prosperity. Just as wages fall because the demand for labor is slack, so interest falls because the demand for capital is slack.

In the bill for the territorial government of Hawaii, we have further evidence of a definite plutocratic tendency. By setting up money qualifications for seats in the legislature, and such a qualification also for the right to vote for members of one house, the Hawaiian commissioners make money instead of manhood the test of intelligence and public spirit. But possession of money is no test of either. Some of the richest men are neither intelligent nor public spirited, while many poor men are both. Indeed, poverty may be evidence of public virtue; it may be the result of resisting corrupting temptations. In a period when wealth is acquired by monopoly, and poverty goes hand in hand with virtuous industry, the imposition of money qualification upon the right of suffrage or office holding is a reflection upon the intelligence and public spirit of those who impose it.

In the Christian Advocate of the 1st, G. A. Coe exhibits some disturbance of mind over indications he has observed that popular knowledge of the contents of the Bible is declining. He had made some systematic inquiries among college students, and found that on the whole they had rather hazy notions. His questions called for information as to what is the Pentateuch, what is higher criticism, and whether the book of Jude belongs to the old or the new testament, and had asked for the name of an old testament patriarch, the name of an old testament judge, the names of three kings of Israel, the names of three prophets, and for a quotation from the beatitudes, and one from the letter to the Romans. Only eight persons in 100 answered

all nine questions correctly. This reflects rather severely upon the educational institutions which the students in question attend; but what seems especially to disturb Mr. Coe is his notion that it indicates a low order of Christian life. Mr. Coe is here entirely wrong. Christian life in our colleges may be of a low order, but the answers to Mr. Coe's questions do not prove it. Every one of those questions might be correctly answered by the most satanic college student to be found anywhere, while a truly Christian man might slip up on nearly all of them. Had Mr. Coe wished to ascertain the grade of Christian life in our colleges, he should have asked the students for their understanding of the eighth commandment, the two great commandments, and the golden rule. There is a vast difference between Christianity and fetish worship; and Bible scholarship is only fetish worship when made a religious test.

Prof. Geo. D. Herron closed a series of lectures at Chicago last Monday, which have been of absorbing interest and supreme importance. They were given under the auspices of the National Christian Citizenship League, to audiences which packed the large hall for eight successive Mondays at noon. On several occasions people were turned away because there was not even standing room for them, so great was the attendance.

Whoever has heard Prof. Herron will not be surprised to learn that the large audience remained throughout every lecture, attentive, interested, deeply moved, both by the manner and by the matter of the lecturer. Though he makes only the simplest pretensions to literary skill, and none at all to oratory, Prof. Herron unconsciously exhibits qualities of the highest order in both. His style both in composition and delivery is indescribably charming. But back of his style is something that makes his style for him, something without which the best style would be empty

pretense—his simple devotion to the message he bears.

Judged by his lectures, Prof. Herron's mission is to revive a comatose Christianity. He teaches that Christ announced a new law to the world, the law of love; and that through the operation of this law society is to be redeemed from the state of organized selfishness which we call civilization. He is, however, no idealist of the jelly-fish order. It is not by talking about love that he expects love to gain the mastery in economic affairs. Nor is he a non-resistant. He realizes that social unrighteousness must be eradicated by forced changes in the social structure; and in so far as municipal laws and institutions interfere with the free play of the law of love, he urges that they be altered or abolished. The ballot is one of the weapons which he would have the people wield for the regeneration of society.

But in Prof. Herron's view, forcible social reform is not for the purpose of making an ideal civilization; it is for the purpose of making the ideal civilization possible. That ideal civilization he would look for from the free development of the law of love; and, if we understand him, he would expect it to be, when fully developed, a universal state of mutual self-sacrifice or self-giving.

Though we should feel impelled to criticize some parts of Prof. Herron's lectures, we should heartily endorse much the greater part of them. This work of criticism and endorsement, however, we shall reserve until the lectures appear in book form. But the ideal set forth we may briefly consider now.

While believing fully in the efficacy of the law of love, we regard love in this connection not as synonymous with self-sacrifice or self-giving, but as synonymous with justice or righteousness. Now justice is a moral equilibrium—not an equilibrium of rights, nor an equilibrium of duties,

either of which is impossible, but equilibrium of rights and duties as correlatives. And that kind of equilibrium is antagonistic to self-sacrifice.

There can be no state of mutual self-sacrifice. It is unthinkable. For if there be equivalents for the sacrifice, it is not sacrifice; and if there be not equivalents, there can be no equilibrium of rights and duties—no justice. Is the term "self-sacrifice" objected to and "self-giving" urged as a preferable term? Then we must take note that except in the sense of self-sacrifice there can be no self-giving without self-receiving, which makes the term "self-giving" meaningless as the statement of a principle of just human society.

Sacrifice is often called for when the equilibrium of rights and duties is disturbed. Men may go to the cross, to the stake, to the gallows, to battle, or may endure starvation and dishonor, for the purpose of restoring the equilibrium,—for the purpose, that is, of securing a condition in which rights and duties shall be more nearly reciprocal. Such sacrifices are glorious, but they are abnormal. They are duties growing out of abnormal social conditions. In normal conditions there can be no duties without corresponding rights, nor any rights without corresponding duties—no giving without receiving, no receiving without giving. For that reason it seems to us that the conception of an economic state which emphasizes giving and ignores receiving is, not Eutopian as some of Prof. Herron's critics would call it, but disorderly. If such a state were ever by any possibility established, its inevitable development would be away from justice, because the conception of moral equilibrium, equality of giving and receiving, would be absent.

But whatever we may say of Prof. Herron's social ideal, his work in social and religious reform admits only of praise. In the name of the founder

of Christianity he is calling upon professed Christians, in a voice that will not be silenced, to obey the law of Christ. Upon his lips, Christian precepts cease to be pious platitudes, and Christian doctrine comes to be upon the whole a law of healthy human life. Before men can know how to save society from the curse of poverty in the midst of plenty, they must be inspired with a consuming desire that it shall be saved; and that desire Prof. Herron is awakening where it slumbers and quickening where it has awakened.

Our opinion, expressed in connection with the election massacre of negroes at Wilmington, N. C., that the race question there is at bottom a labor question, receives further confirmation from an agitation now in progress in the same state relative to the school fund. Under the present constitution that fund must be apportioned per capita among all the children of the state, black as well as white. But it is proposed, through the agitation to which we refer, to amend this provision so as to allow only a small part of the school fund to be devoted to negro education. The pretense for this is that each race should receive school funds in proportion to the taxes it pays. That pretense is transparent. When indirect taxes are considered, it is altogether probable that the blacks of North Carolina pay vastly more taxes than the whites. But the argument which gives vitality to the agitation relates to the effect of education upon the negroes as field hands. Because negroes, like their white brothers and sisters, seek more polite employment, when they are educated, than that which the field and the kitchen afford, education for the negro is regarded by the whites as something to be prevented. It is the old spirit of slavery days, which made it a crime to teach negroes to read, because educated negroes made bad slaves. Educated negroes now make bad field hands; and for that reason they must be deprived of education if possible. The so-called race question at the south is

not a race question. It is a labor question.

Some St. Louis contractor, Quigley by name, tearfully complains that "labor is the scarcest thing in America to-day." There never has been a time, he says, since 1887, when workmen were so hard to get. He doesn't mean skilled labor, either. No, no. He means "men who can do ordinary labor, such as is required by contractors." Yarns like this are out of all harmony with bushels of facts that are familiar to everyone who knows anything about the lives of the people who do hard work for a living. Almost at the same time when Quigley complained in a St. Louis paper of scarcity of labor, a Chicago paper told of the death of a returned soldier who committed suicide because he had hunted in vain for work and saw no chance ahead. Nor was that a solitary case. Those good people who are trying to find places for soldiers who lost their jobs when they enlisted, are finding that work, not workers, is the article of greater scarcity. Let any responsible person advertise for common laborers at \$6 a week, and he will have more applicants than he can provide for. Let him offer \$12, and he will have an army to deal with. An offer of \$100 a month would give him the pick of the land. What sense is there in saying that work is abundant when everybody knows that these things are true?

Yet we would not accuse Contractor Quigley of lying. He has doubtless found workers really scarce. But that is because he wants men to go long distances from home for wages that would give them no security of return except by counting their road ties, hobo fashion. As to the wages he offers he is significantly silent; but he does give an idea of the kind of work he has to offer. One lot of men he wants to send into Mississippi, another he is sending to Alabama, and so on. This pretense of scarcity of labor is like that of which we hear every summer from the agri-

cultural districts of the northwest. Large numbers are wanted, on quick call, at some far-away place, for a short time, at the lowest rate of wages; and because the employer can't get them instantly, he bewails the scarcity of laborers. That wouldn't make much difference were it not for the comfortable fools who insult hungry and workless men by quoting his wails to them to prove that in spite of their own doleful experience, work is abundant and only laborers scarce.

We need no better proof that work is scarce than the fact that workers are cheap. Nothing that people want can be both scarce and cheap at the same time. And in this connection it is a significant fact that interest is falling. The Bowery savings bank of New York has reduced the rate of interest to depositors from 4 per cent. to 3½. This is one of the largest savings institutions in the country, and others are expected to follow its example. Several Cleveland savings banks have already done so, reducing their rates from 4 per cent. to 3. The Milwaukee savings banks had already reduced from 3 to 2½, and Detroit had gone down a year ago from 4 to 3½. In Chicago the rate is still at 3, but many savings bank officials there believe that it must soon be reduced. This general decline in savings bank interest signally confirms Henry George's theory that wages and interest rise and fall together. The concurrent prosperity of monopolies also confirms his other theory, that monopolies rise in value as wages and interest fall, and fall as wages and interest rise.

Plutoeratic politicians and newspapers are deeply disturbed over the democratic plan of collecting funds for the next presidential campaign. This plan contemplates popular subscriptions of \$1 a month from now until the election. It would seem to be a very dignified and legitimate method. There is certainly nothing about it which can be fairly called begging. Yet the plutocrats denounce

it as begging. Of course they never beg for political funds. Their method is ever so much better. When Hanna wants campaign money he promises full value for what he gets; and his successful candidates redeem his promises for him.

In commenting last week upon the mismanagement of the army camp at Mauntauk Point, we referred to the water supply there in such manner as to indicate that it was neither pure nor plentiful. In doing so, we had no intention of implying that there was any lack either in the natural purity or the natural supply of water under Long Island. It is well known that Long Island has an excellent natural water supply. But we did intend to imply that the water furnished at the camp was sadly lacking in both purity and quantity, and that was in accordance with the best information we had been able to obtain. We are now assured, however, through a private letter from W. H. Baldwin, Jr., president of the Long Island railroad, that at all times an abundance of pure water was supplied to the camp. Mr. Baldwin's letter is as follows:

I must give you a true statement of the water supply at Montauk: Three days after notice was given to the public that the United States soldiers would be camped at that point, a newspaper reporter, representing several of the New York papers at that time, sent a dispatch to the effect that there was no water. He boasted of his enterprise and stated in my presence that it was "hot stuff" and that "it made the government officers hustle." The simple fact is that under the whole of Long Island, from fifty to one hundred feet below the surface, is a stream of perfectly pure water which the geologists say passes from the hills in Connecticut under Long Island sound and under Long Island to find its way finally into the sea. This wonderful water-bearing stream is tapped all over Long Island and gives out a water supply which is famous and well known to everyone in this part of the country.

One ten-inch pipe was sunk about fifty feet deep. It passed through several strata of clay and was sunk about twenty-one feet into the water-bearing level. From 700,000 to 1,000,000 gallons of water were pumped daily from this single well. The temperature of the water was quite as cold as ice water, averaging about forty-five degrees in

temperature. Continuous pumping up to the capacity of the pumps, namely, 1,000,000 gallons per day, did not lower the water from its original level over three inches. Various bacteriologists and chemists analyzed this water supply, and the report in each instance has been that the water is as nearly pure as any water that can be found. To satisfy the demands of certain persons, large filters were set up and all the water supply to the camp was forced through these filters. To show the carelessness displayed by certain critics I must tell you of one instance: A most distinguished New York doctor, whose sole interest was sincerely to help the public, reported that the water was milky and that it must contain salts which would be injurious. This report gained credence because of the distinguished authority who passed upon it. The milky color to which he referred was nothing more than the air which was forced into the water when it passed through these enormous filters, and if the water was allowed to stand for a minute all of the air bubbles disappeared and the water was perfectly clear. At the same time the water as pumped from the deep well was always as clear as crystal. That well was the chief water supply of the camp, and after the first two weeks was distributed in a pipe line to all portions of the camp.

I send you this statement because, although there were many things to cause criticism, there were many things misrepresented, and nothing more so than the question of the water supply.

Although the war has cost less than the amount of money Secretary Gage borrowed upon war bonds, Mr. Dingley, chairman of the ways and means committee, announces that there will be no reduction of the war taxes before next winter. This is a bald confession of the inadequacy of the Dingley bill to meet ordinary expenses. It is worse. It is an admission of the deliberate purpose of Mr. Dingley's wing of his party to retain in force as long as possible the unfair war tax law. That law was so drawn as to catch the poorer classes and let the rich escape. As Thomas G. Shearman wrote when it was originally under discussion, its weight falls in the ratio of about 10 per cent. upon the rich, 30 per cent. upon the middle classes, and 60 per cent. upon the poorer classes whose incomes are derived wholly from their current labor. That is the kind of tax measure which