

who knows social right from social wrong; but it is a great pity that the distinguished gentleman, while detecting an infraction of that sacred principle in the coercive measures of certain labor organizations, fails utterly to perceive any violation thereof in law-created privilege.

Organized labor, Mr. Parry believes, is becoming reformed, as the result of adverse experience. "Current events appear, in fact, to be forcing its reformation," he says. "Sooner or later," he continues, "it must see that it cannot make headway against the individualistic character of our institutions." A very safe assertion—"sooner or later."

Unhappily, it will probably be "later," if Mr. Parry is correct in his opinion as to the political tendency of organized labor. Organized labor is yet to march a weary distance backward before the advent of that happy day when it will be able to see that it cannot make any permanent and persistent headway against the individualistic character of our institutions; for organized labor gives strong evidence of a disposition to stampede into the quagmire of socialism.

If Mr. Parry's own vision were clearer, he would perceive that the element of monopoly which pervades the existing economic system, destroys freedom of individual initiative, robs the competing business-man and wage-man alike of much of the fruits of their labor and enterprise, and coerces them into mutually destructive conflict in blind and futile attempts at an equitable distribution of the rapidly diminishing proportion of their joint product which remains for competitive division.

The pitiful and utterly hopeless struggle on the part of organized labor to compel business men operating in the competitive field to yield up a larger proportion of what the monopolist leaves for the employer and his workmen to scramble for, is not a whit more disheartening than the blindness of Mr. Parry to the obvious fact that such a scramble is the inevitable result of monopolistic infractions of the principle of individual rights.

Mr. Parry's argument in favor of unimpeded operation of natural law in the whole field of human industry is unassailable. But his application of the principle lacks amplitude in its details.

For instance, how can natural law operate freely in the monopolized anthracite coal fields? How can natural law operate freely in the monopolized iron mines? In the monopolized coke industry of Pennsylvania? In the railroad monopoly, where there exists "an agreement between gentlemen" to charge all that the traffic will bear—and the power to carry out the agreement, too?

Mr. Parry's speech is admirable in its scientific aspects, from the theoretical standpoint that he occupies, but it is fatally inadequate to the actual situation that confronts him. If the premises were what he tacitly assumes them to be—that freedom of competition exists under existing laws and institutions—his argument, in so far as it deals with economic law, would be unanswerable. But as millions of American citizens deny his premises, it is incumbent on him to prove them before demanding acceptance of his conclusions.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

A PARADOX OF THE MODERN GOOD.

In a Baptist church of a country neighborhood there was a pious old deacon who always raised the tunes. Memory brings him back with his solemn, yet cunning, countenance. As he stood to lead the congregation of which he was the acknowledged chief, the tune rose with his body. It was he who led in worship, he who maintained the rigid moral laws of the community. It was he, who on one occasion, though there seemed to be extenuating circumstances, carried the day for the expulsion of a young man and woman from the church for having attended a dance. It was proved that they did not dance, merely looked on; but even this slight concession to the ways of the Evil One could not be condoned in the eyes of the sturdy deacon. He stood unflinchingly for the truth as he saw it, and thus to all the youth of the neighborhood he shone as the paragon of righteousness. They did not know that he had made

money by charging two per cent a month to needy neighbors, and it would not have meant much to them had they known. A mere matter of business seemed to them to have nothing to do with morality and religion.

A Presbyterian elder in a large city was known as one of the most liberal men. He gave a thousand dollars to begin the educational work of the local Y. M. C. A. Indeed, without his aid the night school could not have been established. He was a man of strictest piety. He would have marked any man for hell whom he saw enter a bar-room. He never failed to be present in church twice on Sunday, and at the Wednesday night prayer meeting. He was also president of a bank. As such he closed out a woman who thus lost her all; but this was business. This transaction and the donation to the Y. M. C. A. happened to take place in the same week. Why not? Business is business, and religion seemed to have nothing to do with the strict duties of a bank officer.

The chancellor of an Episcopal diocese, a lawyer of wealth and great prominence, served on many boards of charity in his native city. At a meeting of the board of an asylum for orphan boys, his great influence and dignity carried the point of concealing from the assessor certain securities which were not legally exempt from taxation. But it was entirely in the interest of orphans, and after all it was only the iniquitous public treasury that was outwitted. And the board were all honorable men. What had a mere matter of taxation to do with honor and religion?

The Rev. John Hutchins, of Litchfield, Conn., has written to the New York Tribune a letter telling of the beauty of Mr. Rockefeller's private life. Mr. Hutchins happened once to be thrown quite intimately into the Rockefeller family circle. He tells of the family prayers and other fine, homely customs. He had many confidential talks with the great man and in some of these talks he boldly ventured on a delicate question. He raised the point "How to reconcile private Christian character with the larger

public dealings in the world of finance." Mr. Hutchins says: "I put the question to him in more than one of our conversations, and could give his answer if that were my object. They were not satisfactory to me. They were to him."

It is a pity that Mr. Rockefeller's answer is not given. He is a Baptist, like the deacon mentioned above, and the cases are as much alike as great world dealings can be like the dealings of a petty neighborhood. To the wicked it seems that all such instances show what Dean Williams calls a "disintegrated conscience." Some statement of reconciliation is manifestly needed. There are many in the world outside of the churches who think they see a paradox.

It is not going too far to say that there are many who have a feeling that there is need of a readjustment of sins. They think that some discussion of this is more needed in church councils than some of the subjects that are so strenuously debated. Why, for example, should it not be a sin to be hard on a neighbor in interest? To take quick advantage of a mortgage? To lie about assessments? To beat down a competitor by bribing a legislature? Why are not some of these doings held up to the anathema of the orthodox? Clearly the churches need to think of these matters if they wish to solve the sense of paradox that many think they see in the modern good.

J. H. DILLARD.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

MEXICO.

Tula, Ver., Mexico, May 10.—Miscegenation is a word that is very popular in the South but it is little used elsewhere. The Southern bourbon keeps it on hand just as his Northern prototype treasures the name "anarchy;" he hurls it like a hand grenade at a fire whenever the spirit of democracy threatens to burst the bonds duly made and provided by the said bourbon.

Mexico is peopled largely by mixed races; the majority of the progressive population has both white and Indian blood in its veins, and a considerable share has also something of Negro ancestry. The leaders in industry and politics, particularly in the latter, are most frequently of this mixed origin,

the amalgamation of races being in some cases recent and in others of several hundred years' standing. The aborigines had a comparatively high civilization, while in our Southern States the Indians were exterminated and grossly ignorant Negroes imported in their stead; this would have given the advantage to Mexico but for the fact that the percentage of white men to the total population was much larger in the South. Yet to-day the cultivated Mexican is the peer of the civilized man of any country, and among the masses the higher middle class exhibits the same sterling traits that are so prized in the ranks of American communities.

Regarding the mixture of races the situation is substantially the same in the South and in Mexico, except that miscegenation is nominally under the ban in the former while it has the prestige of the civilization that has been built up in the latter. The traveler in the South, judging from the variety of shades of color in the population, might well doubt if there is in the entire country a single Negro of pure African blood; the minority of really black men may have been caused by "reversion to type" as easily as by unmixed ancestry.

A law against the intermarriage of races is undemocratic, as it denies the right of private judgment in a matter peculiarly personal in its nature. It thus antagonizes the true spirit of modern progress and has been almost universally abandoned. Like most restrictive laws such a statute is injurious in its practical workings. It is obeyed by the better classes, but does not check the dissolute, as they have no desire to marry; on the contrary, it encourages the libertine if the injured woman has fewer rights. Legislation when backed by a strong public sentiment can to a considerable degree restrain illicit sexual relations, but it suppresses entirely the legitimate union. The better class of offspring being inhibited and the worst kind only partly eliminated, the tendency is downward from generation to generation, except as it is relieved by the innate wholesomeness of human nature—because even the dregs tend constantly to throw up shoots to the light or to die out. But the law in the South is not supported by a united public sentiment against irregular sexual relations between the races; on the contrary they are condoned at least as generally as prostitution is in cities the world over. They are even encouraged by not holding the white father accountable for his illegitimate offspring at the bar of public opinion. This attitude of the parent and of the public teaches many unfortunate children to regard themselves as little above the beasts, so it is a matter of surprise that the worst class of Negro crime is not more common in the South. The community prevents the appearance of the best type of Negro except as he is

painfully evolved through generations of inferior ones; meanwhile it fosters the production of the worst kind and complains gravely of the low character of the Southern Negro! In Mexico even the most unpromising child of mixed blood has for "elder brothers" many of the most illustrious names of the Republic, and public opinion is on the whole disposed to try him on his personal merits; these influences, with the loyalty of white parents generally, must often redeem lives that in the South would become public menaces.

In Mexico the old Spanish families have markedly deteriorated in many localities through persistent intermarriage, despite the freedom given by law and by custom to unions with other races. This illustrates the law of affinity which impels the great majority of men to marry in their own race and even in their particular class, whatever legislation may bar or permit. A law against miscegenation is not necessary to preserve the integrity of the great mass of a superior race. With human nature and public opinion as we now know them, such a law offers little discouragement to unworthy alliances and casual relations between the races; but it prevents the limited number of high-class mixed marriages that would naturally occur and which in their offspring would set a higher standard of emulation and self-respect among all people of mixed blood in the community. Where more races than one are to occupy a country jointly, high-type citizens of mixed blood have an important office to perform, if democracy is ever to be more than an empty word when applied to diverse races. And without democracy social organization is lame and impotent. The superior race is first responsible and must take the initiative; if it is democratic in its attitude towards the man of darker hue he in his turn will be so to his still darker brother. In this way the man of mixed blood will act as the intermediary for social solidarity and human brotherhood; he better than anyone else can understand the man who is darker and the man who is lighter.

Much of the prejudice against mixed marriages really centers upon the assumed inferiority of the one race or the other; but this feeling lessens with growing democracy and culture as the character and personality of the man and not his race and ancestry become the criterions. And the racial inferiority of the Negro will diminish with time until some day he will attain the present high estate of the Japanese. Since the present war in the East no doubt any Jap with cash and culture would be permitted even in the South to marry any woman whom he could induce to accept him—at any rate, if he could not do it there he could anywhere else in the world.

HERBERT FOSTER.

