

"The earth hath he given to the children of men" (Ps. cxv. 16). As the milk supply comes with the calf and baby, so come the land values with the community, and in proportion to the demand of the people is the supply of land values. If communities, instead of individuals, received these values, social conditions would be incomparably different. If the people of India could hoard the wealth of India, would they not have and to spare? Prof. Herron says, in "Between Caesar and Jesus:"

In the early part of 1897, when meetings for the relief of the famine in India were being held in English and American cities, when contributions were received from newsboys and washerwomen, scores of ships laden with wheat and carrying millions of money, arrived in English ports as rents from the people in India for the privilege of living on the lands the English had taken from them.

Dr. McGavran told us, at the jubilee convention, that it was not because there was not food in India that the people died by thousands of starvation, but because they were too poor to buy the food. Would they be as poor if labor had its just reward? Says Henry George:

If men lack bread, it is not that God has not done his part in providing it. If men willing to labor are cursed with poverty, it is not that the storehouse God owes men has failed, that the daily supply he has promised for the daily wants of his children is not here in abundance. Our trouble lies in that we have given into the exclusive ownership of the few the provision that a bountiful father has made for all.

May there not be deep lessons for us, in famine-free lands, in this daily death of thousands in India? Jesus never promised to care for the lilies and birds when separated from the land.

Is there not too little attention paid by Christians, ministers and missionaries to these matters of gospel economics? — Laura DeLany Garst, in Christian Standard, of Cincinnati.

#### WHAT IS ENGLISH?

Extract from an article with the above title, published in the London Speaker of April 21.

"English" means nothing, unless it has some reference to the traditions and the individuality of England. If an Englishman is proud of the aggression of his country, he is proud of something which is not peculiar to England. If he rejoices, as a good many of our London journalists are entitled to rejoice, that he did his part in inciting his countrymen to extinguish two independent communities of white men, he finds satisfaction in a policy which England

shares with Russia, Prussia, Turkey and the Saracens. If he has helped to extend the power of marauding financiers, he has certainly done something to draw England away from the beaten track and the traditional lines of her historical policy. Above all, if he has condoned the raid, made heroes of the chief actors, deprecated the payment of an indemnity to the Transvaal, and represented the whole transaction as a piece of romantic chivalry, he has taught his countrymen to admire qualities, such as forgery, lying, cowardice, bad faith, and financial greed, which nobody but the most ignorant and unscrupulous of Anglophobes has ever associated with the name of England.

The liberals who oppose the government, and who hate the spirit which during the last few years has been driving their countrymen into courses which they regard as dangerous and dishonoring, have no reason to fear the results of an appeal to the standards and the traditions of England. Let us take one aspect of the English history. For some generations our nation stood in the eyes of Europe for nationalism. The names of Canning, Byron, Palmerston, Lord John Russell—chief of all, that of Mr. Gladstone—were associated with that idealist movement which rescued the smaller states from despotism and gave a certain sacredness to the idea, the claims and the life of nationality. Nationalism has suffered a good deal at the hands of the jealousies, the ambitions, the new enthusiasms, which have given to the closing years of the century so dark and ominous a complexion for humanity. And if liberals wished to see in our policy in the near east something of the spirit which they were proud to identify with the actions of their greatest statesmen in the past, they might be open to rebuke on the grounds of a rash and inconsiderate judgment, but to say that their standpoint was not English would have been the silliest of slanders. Last year enough of that old tradition survived to make professors, politicians, men of letters and of science, in England as elsewhere, sad and indignant over the extinction of the autonomy of Finland. Is there anything anti-English or un-English in the feelings of liberals who are horrified and revolted by a course of action which has made their country no longer merely a helpless spectator in the eclipse of a national movement (as she was in the Greco-Turkish

war), no longer a sympathetic mourner over the destruction of a guaranteed autonomy (as she was last year), but the agent herself of the destruction of the principle for which, in other days, she had made so stout a stand in Europe? This may be cant, as it may be cant to believe in freedom of speech, but it is the kind of cant which made a great part of English history, and a part which we fancy a great many Englishmen have no wish to forget. . . .

There are not many Englishmen who remember with pride that we withdrew our ships from Port Arthur at the peremptory dictation of Russia; an indignity which was in no way redeemed after our retreat by our petulant assertions that our ships had the best of rights to be there. Let us recall that incident, the tone of the German dispatches a few months ago, the impotence of our fleet to act on the coast of Crete three years ago, except as the instrument of the German emperor's selfish ambition, and then recollect the exuberant enthusiasm with which some of our newspapers invited us to make war on two small republics with a united population that was comparable to that of a respectable English borough, and with a militia which, these newspapers assure us, would never take the field. An England which picks its quarrels with the weak and makes all its concessions to fear may be the England of Mr. Rudyard Kipling and of the Times, but it is not the England of history, and we don't think it will be the England of to-morrow.

#### THE PROFITS WILL GO TO THE FEW.

There is a point in regard to our national imperialism and expansionism that seems to be in danger of being overlooked by both sides in this controversy, and that is the point of who will receive the profits, if there shall be any, and who will pay the bills. Our new expansion is not to be an expansion of the race or nation in any such sense as our expansion on this continent has been. As Prof. Bernard Moses, one of the members of the new Philippine commission, has well said—and note his words, for it is a confession by an official engaged in the work, of the real inwardness of the whole scheme: "If our race moves forward upon these regions it will not be the race as a whole, but the race represented by its organizing and dominating classes. The migration beyond this shore will, therefore, be the movement of a class."

There can be no doubt as to what "class" is here referred to; the "class" which will go will be the agents of trusts and syndicates. These aggregations of capital expect to obtain control and ownership of franchises, land values, valuable mines and forests, and the profits, whatever they shall be, will go to them, but not to the nation as a whole, but the nation pays the expense.

What is this expense? Tens of thousands of our strongest lives, "the best ye breed," and untold millions of treasure. But statements of round bulks of millions seldom convey any adequate idea, and they need to be illustrated by comparative values. Let us examine a few of the items, on the margins, so to speak, of this bill. To the ordinary person, to whom it is a matter of much self-denial and effort to save \$1,000, it is rather startling to think that we are ordering hundreds of guns for many of which the ammunition alone will cost \$1,000 for each single discharge. The international complications made possible and probable by expansionism have seemed to make it necessary to fortify seacoast towns at an almost fabulous expense. A single mortar battery at Newport is expected to use ammunition costing \$16,000 for each discharge.

About one-half the population of this country are farmers, and they suffer an inordinate expense and labor from being compelled to haul produce and transact business over roads that are bad all the time, and at some portions of the year are almost impassable. They are compelled to this hardship because neither they nor the rest of the public think they can afford the necessary outlay for better highways. Yet to support imperialism we are building a whole naval fleet, when the cost of a single first-class battleship would build a macadam highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The government is now building 61 vessels.

Do you say that this is but a single outlay, and that the vessels once acquired are a permanent thing. The various expenses in connection with the support of an increased navy, such as the renewals of vessels, munitions, supplies, vast numbers of men needed in their handling, etc., are likely to reach a figure beyond belief, when it is compared with our necessary home outlays. The salaries of the naval officers alone are sufficient to build two macadam highways from New England to California every year. These scraps of the expense ac-

count of the navy are startling, and I have not mentioned the equally startling ones in connection with the army.

But what of commerce? Will not the nation benefit by the increased commerce which will flow to our shores? It is sufficient reply to this to say that the commerce of the world can be ours, and could have been at any time in the last 25 years, by simply removing the barriers which we ourselves have erected against it. The party now in power, which is shouting "commerce" so lustily, has for the last quarter of a century denounced commerce as an evil thing, calculated to destroy the prosperity of the nation, and especially of its laborers. If we want commerce we have only to remove the obstructions—not from our harbors, but from our statute books.

I am fully conscious that this viewing of the cold question of profits is not an ideal view, for it takes no account of the eternal verities of right and equity; those mills of the gods that grind so fine, yet when so many are being bewildered by the cry of immense wealth to be obtained—no matter how—it is well perhaps to meet the assertion on its own level and ascertain, if possible, who will obtain the wealth, and who will pay the expense of obtaining it.

It is becoming more and more evident every day that the nation has entered upon the project of looting a country at an enormous expense in blood and treasure, that expense to be the nation's, and the benefit to be for a few private corporations.—Charles E. Benton, of New Bedford, Mass., in Springfield Republican.

#### A PHASE OF THE ANTAGONISM BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

An address delivered by W. J. Strong, Esq., at the annual banquet of the Life Insurance Underwriters' association at the Athletic club in Chicago, April 17.

There is nothing inherent in capital that should make it antagonistic to labor. Neither is there anything in labor that should make it antagonistic to capital. When I speak of capital I use the word distinctively. I do not mean wealth when I say capital, but I mean that part of wealth which is engaged in productive enterprises. There is something in wealth in its broad sense that is antagonistic to labor—the wealth that dissipates itself in riotous living; and my use of the word capital means only that part of wealth which is the brother of labor, that works with labor in the productive enterprises of this country.

We all know that every productive enterprise in this country to-day of any moment is organized into a corporation or a trust; and we, the party of the third part, are interested in knowing why these labor difficulties arise. What is the cause of the differences between that part of wealth called capital, and that part called labor? From my study of this question I am firmly convinced that the difficulty arises wholly from the refusal on the part of capital, which is organized, to recognize labor in its organized capacity.

The mistake the laboring men in this country make is that they do not call their unions associations, that they do not call their walking delegates and their business agents superintendents or general managers. If the labor unions were called associations, and their business agents superintendents or general managers, the public would appreciate the position they occupy. There is something about the word association that suggests velvet carpets, mahogany desks, Havana cigars, silk hats and patent leather shoes. But the word labor-union suggests to the mind greasy overalls, dirty hands, blackened faces, and brogans.

The main antagonism between labor and capital, in my judgment, comes from the failure on the part of capital to recognize the right of labor to act in its organized capacity. They say to the laboring men: "We will treat with you as individuals. If you have any difficulty with us come to us as individuals." Labor might as well say to the corporation: "We refuse to treat with your business agent or superintendent. We wish every stockholder to come here and listen to our complaints. Your business agents are arbitrary and unreasonable, and are working for nothing but to hold their own jobs." The business agents and the walking delegate of the labor union occupy the same position to their organization that the superintendent and general manager do to the corporation and the trust. And until organized capital recognizes labor in its organized capacity these antagonisms never will be settled.

Now the party of the third part, you and I, are interested in this question. We belong to neither element. Every labor union that was ever formed in the history of the world is but an organized protest against the greed of organized capital. The whole civilized world to-day is organized on the cooperative plan. We each of us give up many of our individual rights for the protection of organized society. And for the capitalist to stand back and say, "I