

persist in their insistence, the men will not delay in according it to them. It is natural that the men should not give it to them until they have to, or until they see that it is wise to. They do not want their political plans interfered with. But when they see that the time has come they will not wait for the fortress to be stormed; they will do as they have always done—they will make the best of it, and surrender as gracefully as possible.

"I believe that the wisdom of woman is of that direct and simple kind that, were she enfranchised, she would drive us a long way, and speedily, upon the road of civil service reform. Because there is one thing in which I have noticed that all women are relentless—they pardon anything but incompetency, and in the selection of their servants they are guided, far more independently than men, not by any consideration of sympathy or personal liking, but with an eye mainly to the results.

"And in the same way, I believe that the enfranchisement of woman would be the beginning of economies now undreamed of. If there is one thing woman knows how to do, it is to get value for her money."

TREASON TOWARD IDEALS.

A letter written to a professional friend, a conservative, after hearing a lecture by Prof. Edward A. Steiner, of Iowa College.

My Dear Doctor: The inspiring and prophetic address to which we listened last evening at the Congregational Club, must have touched a responsive chord in the heart and mind of every person present. That such was the fact I have not the slightest doubt, and that fact goes far to show that the sympathies of every decent citizen are enlistable on the side of truth and justice whenever that side is fairly presented.

Most of those present probably said a hearty "amen" to President Strong when he thanked God that we live in a land of freedom, and most of them would have been in hearty accord with yourself in calling me a "pessimist" when I said that the address seemed to me as much an arraignment of the ruling classes in the United States as of those of Russia. You spoke of the high ideals which rule the people of this country, and I ventured to say that we had turned our backs on the ideals which had been the glory of America in the past. You denied this, and probably most of the friends whom we had just left would have supported your contention.

I wonder how many of you have

kept intelligently informed of the history of our country during the past five years.

You doubtless remember that in the early days of the republic the Whig party secured the passage of a so-called "Alien and Sedition Act," and was promptly driven out of power by an aroused and indignant people. No similar insult to the American people has been consummated till recent years. After the death of President McKinley the Republican Congress enacted a statute which was approved by President Roosevelt, which gives the executive officer of the new Department of Commerce the power of deporting an immigrant, however worthy his character and harmless his life, on the mere suspicion that he entertains "anarchistic opinions," and that too without legal appeal or redress. John Turner a labor unionist from England, was so deported; Count Tolstoy might be so deported should he attempt to visit this country; and should you or any other reputable citizen be detected in the heinous act of inviting the latter to come here or harboring such a man here, you would be liable to heavy penalties. As yet no wave of indignant repudiation has swept from power the sponsors of this thoroughly despotic, un-American and contemptible legislation. Only the despised anti-imperialists, with an occasional religious weekly, have protested against this infamy, and for the credit of the masses of the Republican voters of the country it is to be hoped that they have never heard of it.

Look at the indignities and outrages perpetrated upon the Chinese by this same Department of Commerce, and that too in utter disregard of the treaty rights of the Chinese; look at the senseless and barbarous and wholly unnecessary cruelties inflicted upon the poor and ignorant and helpless who seek our shores as the promised land of freedom and a refuge from oppression, as detailed in a late number of *The American Missionary*; look at the hatred which this country has engendered in the Philippines and Porto Rico and in most of the South and Central American countries; look at the dominant political party in this country, divided into contending factions—grafters and their satellites on the one side and more or less unsuccessful grafters on the other. Look at Canada, closely related to us by blood, and a country with which we ought to be on the closest terms of commercial and social friendship; and

what do we see? Not merely commercial rivalry in a friendly way, but bitter antagonisms and hatred have been engendered which will probably for an indefinite period stand in the way of that commercial and organic union which have long been hoped for by the best men of both countries.

A Christian business man, successful and wealthy, said to me the other day that he could see no sense in picking out Mr. Rockefeller for special condemnation for doing more successfully the same things that all other business men are trying to do.

In a discussion on "tainted money" in *The Commons* for September, Professor Graham Taylor says:

If it is the ultimate aim of the protest to rid the earth or at least the church of tainted money, then more effective than to reject every such cent, would it be to line up the forces of righteousness against the conditions which make the acquisition of such wealth possible. But the belief in special privileges and the advantages taken of them, in such ways as the acceptance of rebates and the remission of taxes, are too generally accepted as morally legitimate not only in commercial, but in ecclesiastical systems, to make any such line up for a radical remedy probable.

There is pessimism for you with a vengeance, and just such pessimism as is to be found on every hand among the clergy and other pious advocates of so-called conservatism, who can generally be counted upon to support Republican policies, and to condemn as pessimists and anarchists the men who make an honest effort to "line up the forces of righteousness" against unjust and oppressive conditions.

The good people of our city are making great efforts with reference to the coming revival meetings, and we all hope for the best possible results; but if these same zealous ministers and Sabbath school teachers would spend half the effort in getting into their own minds and the minds of their people an intelligent comprehension of the ethics of Jesus Christ as related both to the simple every day life and the more complex social and industrial life, they would soon have a condition of things so manifestly the work of the Spirit of God that the crowds would rush into the church as on the Day of Pentecost. When men are convinced that the churches are as much interested in the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth as they appear to be in the salvation of sinners, main-strength revivals will become unnecessary.

The McCalls and McCurdys are only extreme developments of the prevalent spirit of getting something for

nothing, and any man who is willing to get a greater value or advantage than he gives in return, is on the same moral plane with other grafters of high or low degree. The practical denial of this truism is one of the chief elements of the dry rot which pervades the modern Christian church and constitutes the most dangerous atheism of the present day.

I have written you at this length because you are a trained physician as well as a Christian man, and so have no excuse for the unscientific and illogical thinking which characterizes the average citizen, whether clerical or lay. No more is it true that "the undevout astronomer is mad," than that the Christian physician who permits himself to rest content with the conventional ethical ideas which seem to satisfy the average clergyman and citizen, is guilty of treason to everything that is worthy of respect.

Engage nine out of ten supposedly intelligent church members in conversation regarding any sociological question, unionism and strikes for instance, and you will find all their sympathies on the side of capital.

I was invited some months ago to join the Minneapolis Citizens' Alliance; but when I had made it clear to the president, an excellent Christian man, that I would be very glad to be a member, provided the Alliance was to be used to secure justice, a square deal for labor as well as capital, the invitation was not pressed.

You and I owe it to ourselves to do some straight thinking, to call things by their right names, and to speak and act with uncompromising loyalty to truth and justice.

Very sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. BROWN.

Minneapolis, Minn.

THE APPEAL FROM TYRANNY.

Portions of a sermon preached by Jenkin Lloyd Jones at All Souls' Church, in the Abraham Lincoln Center, Chicago, Oct. 15, 1906, as published in *Unity* of Oct. 19.

"Strafford," like the other dramas of Browning, is a thought drama. . . . The actors in the drama, some 17 in number, fall easily into two groups: King Charles and his retinue of cavaliers, with the earl of Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, lieutenant general of Ireland, as the leading spirit on the one hand, and the group of Presbyterians, those early Roundheads, who, in the interest of freedom and democracy, sent Charles and Wentworth, the "poor, gray, little old" Bishop Laud, as he is called in the

drama, and many others to the block. At the head of these Puritans are the stalwarts, Pym, Hampden, Harry Vane, Fiennes and the others. . . . With the character studies we cannot at present concern ourselves. The main issue, the central purpose of the drama, is clear. It is a struggle between private preferences and public duty. Shall a man stand by his friends through thick and thin, or shall he if need be sacrifice friend and family in the interest of country?

Thomas Wentworth, who, in due course of time was made Earl of Strafford by the weak King Charles, was born with a silver spoon in his mouth, if indeed it was not a golden spoon. In his veins ran the proud blood of the Conquerors; his family tree was laden with earls, barons, dukes and duchesses, kings and queens innumerable; he inherited a princely fortune and an active brain; he was precocious in the university and early led a noble lady, the choice of his heart, to the altar. He loved the weak King Charles, and in the ardor of his youth swore fealty to him. To this oath he was true to the end of his life, although he found long before the end that the king was unworthy of such fealty and incompetent to reciprocate. Over and over again he found him balking and interfering with and frustrating his plans, and in the end consenting to his execution, although he had privately given his pledge that no harm should come to his person or his property.

As lord lieutenant of Ireland, Wentworth ruled with a strong and relentless hand, holding that a subjected country had no rights which a king and his representatives might not overrule. When affairs at home became unmanageable and the weak hand of the king could not control the uprising of the people under such splendid leadership as Pym, Hampden, young Harry Vane and their Presbyterian colleagues, Wentworth was sent for. He received his earldom and tried to direct affairs in the interest of his friend, the king. According to the evidence brought out by the great trial, he advised transporting his Irish army to intimidate the free spirit in England and proceeded to plot to make "King Charles as absolute as any prince of the whole world," to use Strafford's own words. He was a sick man, but thought it was worth while to live and to have foes, "just for the bliss of crushing them." This towering ambition, this loyalty to his friends, this devotion to politics for

the sake of what was in it to himself and to his friends, made him indifferent to, if not insensible of, the self-sacrificing love of Lady Carlisle, whom he persisted in calling a child.

Over against this man who "sold his soul for a title," was set first and foremost his old friend, Pym, who loved him to the end; who never loved but one man, "nor did Jonathan love David more." Remembering the happy days of their childhood, for awhile Pym hoped that England and the right would win back this ambitious nobleman, but never for a moment did he allow his personal friendship to cloud his judgment or to interfere with his loyalty to England and to the right. So Pym and Hampden and Harry Vane and others forced the issue, compelled the weak king to call his Parliament, and they dragged this courtier friend, this splendid soldier, this brilliant thinker and magnetic orator to trial. It was one of the great trials of the world, graphic glimpses of which we catch in and between the lines of Browning's drama. Strafford was impeached for having "procured power subversive of law;" for having declared that "the king's little finger was heavier than the loins of the law;" for having boasted that "the Irish was a conquered nation and that the king might do with them as he pleased;" for appropriating public funds to private uses, securing and maintaining a profitable monopoly of tobacco; for, to use a modern phrase, "cornering certain manufacturing interests in flax." He was accused of proposing the coining of base money and trying to revise the iniquitous levy of ship money; of advising the hanging of good citizens by their heels, and much more to that effect. . . .

Strafford went to his doom unfree from the toils of the expedient, from the paralysis of the luxurious, from the logic of the successful, saying: "O God, I shall die first! I shall die first!"

Pym was true to country and sacrificed his friends; Strafford tried to be true to his friends and sacrificed his country. Which is better? Let history answer. . . .

The sermon which Browning preached in this drama of "Strafford" is imminent, imperative; it is in the present tense. The United States, Illinois and Chicago are to-day cursed with large-headed, efficient, subtle, attractive and lovable Straffords. The floors of the United States Senate ring today with the feet of men who are there by intrigue, who have bought their places with money or with favor; who