

for allies. Her people are unusually independent and liberty-loving, and they wear the galling yoke under protest. The independent papers, chief among which is Verdens Gang, are full of the controversy from day to day. Norway is stirred from North Cape to Lindesnaes, and her men of thought are keenly alive to the affair. She does not possess the American politician type, so that the cause is espoused by Storthing men and authors and business men alike. Such men as Bjornson and Nansen are in the front rank and voice the popular opinion.

The latest development is an appointment of a committee to consider and shape the course of action, and it is sincerely to be hoped that the matter may be concluded peaceably, and that Norway may reach the "ultima thule" of national liberty.

MARY HEATH LEE.

#### THE AMERICAN CLERGY AND PLUTOCRACY.

Written for The Public by Rev. James B. Converse, of Morristown, Tenn., author of "Uncle Sam's Bible."

Can the American clergy be freed from the influence of wealth? from sympathy with the rich? from indifference about economic injustice and political corruption?

If they cannot be freed from these things the chasm between the church and the masses will widen and deepen.

We answer: Yes; all needed to deliver them is self-knowledge and the Holy Spirit. And we give three reasons for our answer.

First, the masses and not the monopolists support the clergy. The children's pennies keep up the Sunday schools; the nickels of the people pay the foreign missionaries, and their quarters support the pastors. Standard Oil may endow a university, but it does not pay the Baptist preachers.

Secondly, the masses also supply the hearers. The plutocrats are few, and their social amusements do not permit their regular attendance at church. The audiences must come from the masses.

Thirdly, there is much knowledge of the Bible, both among the laity and the clergy. Myriads of teachers' Bibles and millions of others are sold. No book competes with it in popularity. Thousands of papers publish expositions of the Sunday school lessons. Hundreds of ministers read the Hebrew Testament, and thousands the Greek Testament. The teachings of the Bible about plutocracy are plain and many. The Founder of our religion was a carpenter. Dur-

ing his public ministry he had no regular salary, but was supported by charity. He had no parsonage, not even a pillow. He preached that it was very hard for a rich man to be saved. His disciples continued his teachings. They went everywhere supported by charity or by their own labor. They taught that covetousness is idolatry, that the love of money is a root of all evil. In the laws which God published through Moses in the wilderness of Sinai, He ordained that all debts should be cancelled at the end of every seven years, and that at the jubilee every one should return to his own possession. Our condition differs widely from that of France at the time of the Revolution and from the condition of Russia at the present time. The French knew the mass and the Russians know their ikons. But we know the Bible, which is the great enemy of plutocracy.

All needed (we repeat) to free the American clergy from its false conservatism is self-knowledge and God's grace. The last our ministers know how to get.

The charge of sympathy with the rich and indifference towards economic injustice and political corruption will be resented. Please hear first, and strike afterwards if you wish.

In other lands the clergy have been and are very conservative. The daily papers give an illustration. The whole world sympathizes with the Russian people in their desire for liberty and admires Father Gapon, their leader. But the Holy Synod, unanimously, so far as appears, denounced him as a renegade priest. The Russian clergy would resent the charge that they are slaves to the autocracy, and would claim to be free. But are they free? Are they not in bondage? Wealth and not office, plutocracy and not autocracy, rules America. Where do our clergy stand?

Another illustration: The French Revolution. The church allied itself to the throne. But the priests did not regard themselves as the tools of tyranny. They thought themselves the defenders of religion, good order, learning and culture. In France the throne, the church and Christianity fell together. So general is our knowledge of Christ and His book that no such result is to be feared here. And yet, even here, clerical indifference to injustice and corruption does great harm to religion.

A third example: England before Wesley and Whitefield. Its laws were bloody and barbarous; but the established clergy did not protest. The populace was poor and brutal, but the clergy did not cure.

These three examples of clerical indifference come from three faiths—Greek, Romish and Protestant. Has human nature been changed by crossing the Atlantic?

The cause of this indifference is plain. Men belong first to their families; secondly, to their class; thirdly, to their nation; and only fourthly to mankind. John Smith is first of all a husband and father; next a merchant; thirdly, an American, and only fourthly, a man. After his family his interests center in his business. He sympathizes with his class more strongly than with his nation or his race. He looks at all matters from the standpoint of his class, and judges all questions by his class prejudices. His daily work controls his reasoning. Our clergymen are educated, and education and wealth have always been associated. They are learned, and learning is a class distinction. They are refined and cultured—other class distinctions. Their habits are sedentary and join them to the class of leisure. Their opinions, sympathies, sentiments, prejudices, very easily agree with those of the class to which so many ties bind them. As the mirror reflects what stands before it, so the clergy reflect college halls, parsonage libraries and ladies' parlors. As a sailor talks and walks and thinks like other sailors, so a clergyman thinks and feels and talks like the members of the class to which he belongs. As the laborer is first of all a workman and after that an American, so the clergyman is first of all a minister and after that a Christian and an American. If any minister will meditate and pray over this question God will make him first of all a man and a Christian.

This indifference to economic injustice and political corruption is shown in many ways. We mention only two:

First, the ministry generally claims to be conservative. There is a good conservatism that conserves what is good and casts out what is bad. There is a still better conservatism that seeks to restore the good which has passed away. But the conservatism the ministry boasts of is preserving things as they are. If taxes, for example, press unduly on the poorest, the conservative justifies unjust taxation. If our laws assist the extortion of trusts and monopolies, the conservative defends the robbery. If our political methods promote grafting, the conservative is a grafter. Clerical conservatism is the Port Arthur of all that is evil in our American civilization.

The other sign of clerical indiffer-

ence to injustice and corruption which we shall mention is the way the clergy talk about reforming them. Many ministers talk on this subject, either publicly or privately. They chiefly urge two ways of reforming our evils—love and conversion. If all would love one another, they say, the evils would disappear. Love, to be sincere and lasting, must be founded on justice; and to exhort to love without saying anything about justice shows that the exhorter knows nothing or cares nothing about justice. If all were converted, the ministers say again, the evils would cease, forgetting that the evil doers are graduates of our Sunday schools and members of our churches. Such idle talk is the surest sign of indifference.

Mr. Lawson has promised to tell us the remedy for frenzied finance. I will forestall him. The remedy is the economic and political study of the Bible. In this work the clergy should lead.

#### MAYOR DUNNE'S WAY.

Although campaign documents are usually as uninteresting and unimportant after election as campaign posters, two of Mayor Edward F. Dunne's are of permanent interest and importance, owing to their subject matter, coupled with the fact of Mr. Dunne's election and consequent responsibility, and therefore we reproduce them below.

#### ON TRACTION SETTLEMENT FRANCHISES.

Letter from Judge Dunne to George F. Hooker, Secretary of the City Club, first published March 31, 1905.

My Dear Sir: In answer to your letter of the 29th inst., I beg leave to state that, if elected mayor, I would not be a party to, in any possible way, the making of any arrangement whether it be called lease, license, or contract, under which the present companies or any other companies might remain in possession indefinitely of the street car systems, or for five, ten, fifteen, or any number of years, without an arrangement being entered into whereby such lease, license, or contract be submitted to the people for approval by a referendum vote. No final or definite settlement with the traction companies of any character will be made by me, as mayor, without the same being submitted to the people for their approval. I believe that temporary arrangements between the city and a company running for a brief and definite period of time might become necessary for the purpose of giving time to lay before the people a definite proposition under the referendum provisions of the Mueller law. If such necessity arise, I would consider myself free to make arrangements. I will, however,

veto any such temporary arrangements of any name or character if it confer, or if by any contingency it might ripen into, an irrevocable grant beyond such brief definite period. No ordinance of any kind bearing upon the matter of street railroads other than such a temporary arrangement will escape my veto, unless provision is made for the right of the people to approve or disapprove of the same by referendum.

EDWARD F. DUNNE.

#### LAST APPEAL TO VOTERS.

On the eve of election, Judge Dunne mailed this signed letter to the voters of Chicago individually.

My Dear Sir: As citizens of Chicago, interested in its welfare, you and I have discussed for several years the question of municipal ownership.

On Tuesday, by your vote, you will help to settle this question which means so much to the people of Chicago and so much, by way of example, to all the citizens of the United States.

As one interested with you in the city's welfare, I take the liberty of addressing to you a final word before the casting of the ballots.

On Tuesday you will say with your vote, whether Chicago is to have municipal ownership of street car lines, for the benefit of the people, or whether, by means of an insidious franchise ordinance, drawn in the interests of private corporations, municipal ownership shall be postponed indefinitely.

You will decide on Tuesday next whether the streets of this city and the profits of the street car lines shall belong hereafter to Chicago and her citizens, or to J. Pierpont Morgan, of New York, and his Wall street syndicate.

Municipal ownership is not an experiment. It has been tried, and in every case with success.

In hundreds of cities in Europe and Australasia, municipal ownership has reduced taxation, improved the public service, improved wages, hours of employment, treatment of employes, abolished strikes and abolished the most fertile source of political corruption.

In addition, municipal ownership, wherever it has been fairly tried, has reduced the cost to the consumer at the same time that it has reduced taxes.

Permit me to express briefly some of the thoughts that I should like to lay before you personally if it were possible in the limited days of the campaign for me to meet and discuss issues individually with each one of my fellow citizens.

And first let me urge that you point out to your neighbor the importance of voting "no" on the little ballot.

Some of your neighbors, less well-in-

formed than you are, may not realize that the friends of municipal ownership have hitherto voted "yes" in every referendum case. This time, they must vote "no," since their "no" will say that they do not want to give a new franchise to any private corporation.

The citizens of Chicago will be interested not only in increasing their own comfort, lowering taxes, adding to the general prosperity by municipal ownership, but they will be interested also in bettering the condition of those 16,000 hard working men now employed by the traction companies of this city.

Municipal ownership will, of course, guarantee to every worker, regardless of age, his place and his salary. Having proved his ability in open competition, each present employe will be secure under municipal ownership.

New men seeking employment will pass appropriate civil service examinations which shall touch only on their ability to manage a street car, not on their acquaintance with astronomical statistics or ancient history.

The men now upon the payrolls of the traction companies will be transferred to the payrolls of the city, and for the rest of their lives they will be protected by the civil service laws—not subject to dismissal through any man's whim.

And Chicago, generous and just, will see that out of the increased earnings of the municipally owned system, the workmen employed shall be better paid. This can readily be done, since the municipally owned street car system will no longer be compelled to pay dividends on tens of millions of watered stocks and bonds.

You will vote on Tuesday for a principle, not for an individual. Therefore, I confine what I have to say to you to the question of principle—the municipal ownership principle which the city has discussed for so long.

My opponent is committed to the renewal of franchises giving to Mr. Morgan and his syndicate an indefinite lien upon the streets of Chicago.

If I am elected, no more street car franchises shall be given to any private individual or corporation. I shall proceed immediately, as Mayor of Chicago, to establish municipal ownership under the terms of the Mueller law. That law on the statute books of Illinois provides that the lines can be bought, or new lines built, with street car certificates without adding one cent to the indebtedness of the city or one cent to your taxes.

Hereafter, under municipal ownership, the money that has made innumerable millionaires out of Chicago's streets