

stuffs, and Americans offer to supply them; but the German government interferes, thereby preventing the Germans from buying what they want. Then America "retaliates." Her people want German foods, and Germans would supply them; but in a spirit of retaliation the American government interferes and prevents Americans from buying what they want. Inasmuch as it is German buyers that are coerced by Germany, and American buyers that are coerced by the United States, how does the German government hurt us, and how do we get even? Can one government retaliate upon another by balking its own people, as our government purposes doing in this case?

Mr. Chamberlain was evidently acting under the influence of this crazy notion when, in his speech in parliament on the free trade question, he spoke of "putting on a duty to protect our staple industry." Now, how could a British duty protect a British industry? Only by forcing British buyers to take its products when they prefer other products. In other words, what Mr. Chamberlain proposes, and what is always involved in this idea of protection, is to tax the home people who want to buy a foreign product, so as to prevent their buying it.

To be sure, it is argued that the tariff tax is paid by the foreigner. That is, each country can get its revenues by taxing another country! Mr. Chamberlain himself has borrowed that argument from the American protectionists, who borrowed it from the British protectionists of Cobden's day. But the only grain of truth there is in it is that a foreign producer who lives near the border may, under certain exceptional circumstances, pay a small duty on the importation of his products into the foreign country when his home market is farther away, and that a foreign monopolist also may pay some duty in order to sell goods in a foreign country. Only monopolists can afford to. But even these excep-

tional cases are so in such slight degree that they count for little beyond furnishing a few minor statistics for juggling purposes. Moreover, if the foreigner does pay the tax in order to sell his product, what becomes of the home industry? He certainly won't pay the tax unless he sells his product, and if he sells his product the home producers can't sell theirs.

What may have been in the mind of so consummate a politician as Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, when he decided to plunge his party and his country into the middle of a protection issue, no one but himself can tell. It is tolerably clear, however, that he could not have expected to alter British sentiment so radically in a few months as to secure at the next elections a new lease of power for the Conservatives. To "the man in the street," therefore, and even to "the man up a tree," it looks very much as if it had been Mr. Chamberlain's design to break up the Conservative party by precipitating a ministerial crisis under circumstances which would bring the Liberal party into power for a brief season, in the expectation that upon its downfall he could carry on a campaign of education to the point that would enable him to lead a party of imperial protectionists on to victory. If that was his design, Mr. Balfour has heaped scriptural coals of fire upon his head. But Mr. Chamberlain's scalp is impervious to the heat of scriptural coals of fire. He needs watching, as Mr. Balfour will find to his own cost should he neglect to cultivate industriously the "wary eye."

FORMS OF MODERN INSINCERITY.

Without questioning the actual fact of human progress, but rather in acknowledgment of our intellectual advance, I think it may be said that our present age is singularly insincere. And the immediate trouble, I venture to assert, lies behind the fact of our insincerity and in the fact that so many of us are unconscious of it. We are insincere, and have not yet

arrived at the point of confession that we are so.

My attention was first directed to one form of modern insincerity by listening to an address by a well-known college president on the Democracy of the University. He represented a university founded on private endowments, in which, as I happened to know, not the first principle of democracy was either taught or practiced; and yet in apparent sincerity he spoke as if the universities of the land were really the very savior of democracy.

My next shock came from the pulpit. It happened that I had just read a statement by Canon Farrar that less than three per cent. of the workingmen of England ever entered a church, and a comment by Dr. Josiah Strong that in America the percentage was even less. And yet my preacher asserted that the church was the great bulwark of liberty and of the rights of the people. Evidently, I said, the people do not feel so, and the preacher, like the college man, was talking the reverse of the truth.

By and by I came to see that this seemed to be just the trick of modern oratory. The cue is to say just the opposite of what is.

Take our President, for example, or our Secretary of War. The worse our officers and soldiers behaved towards the Filipinos, the more gravely did they speak of the honor of the army and of the great moderation and self-restraint shown throughout our war of conquest. We now know positively that these gentlemen knew of the barbarous actions of our troops at the very time when they were talking with eloquent gravity of the good conduct of the army. There is with them some trick of the conscience, just as with the university president who talks democracy, and with the clergyman who talks of the modern church as the champion of equality.

But there is a sadder form of insincerity in our modern life than is displayed in these larger oratorical specimens, which are partly products of personal ambition and vanity. The humbler form of insincerity is due to the miserable conflicts in the hearts

of men between enlightenment and dependence. There are to-day thousands of individuals in all the humble pursuits of life who are by vote and speech supporting men and policies in which they do not in their innermost convictions believe, but in which they have persuaded themselves to believe. This persuasion has arisen from the burden of their necessities and from the force of environment. It is the penalty of their dependence.

In old times, when there was less spread of education and enlightenment, we can imagine that courtiers, retainers, dependents, serfs, and slaves had, as a rule, never a thought but that the rule of their lords was as the will of God. Their subserviency was at least sincere. In modern days it has become necessary to be insincere in subserviency. The trouble is that freedom of actual social conditions has not yet caught up with the spread of freedom of thought upon these conditions. The trouble is not so much intellectual, but lies rather in the will and character. The inherited forces of inequality, the vested rights of classes, the taint of dependent inertia, all tend to hold in abeyance the full and final freedom of will and character. Hence the lack of right action, and the false persuasion to a support of existing conditions, which is at bottom insincere.

These two forms of insincerity, of the orator and of the people, different as they may have seemed in this presentation, may be seen to meet together in the utterance and thought of the great modern dictum, "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." The senator, fresh from securing a franchise for some monopoly, rolls it from his tongue with solemn vehemence. The people, who might and do know better, uphold the very measures and policies that belie the theory of equal rights which they applauded in the platform of the party and in the speeches of the politicians. One is the insincerity of charlatanism; the other is the insincerity of impotence and slavishness. The orator hires himself to secure some monopoly for a corporation; the corporation clerk upholds the monopoly as a part of his own living. Each will profess

to believe in the general principle of "special privilege to none;" neither will apply it to the special case. The orator talks one way and acts another; the servant thinks one way, or would if he could, and persuades himself that the other way is right.

The fact seems to be that the tendency of modern conditions, coupled with modern intellectual progress, is to sear conscience and beget insincerity. Without offense to Shakespeare, it may be said that in modern life and in present social conditions it is not conscience, but the lack of conscience, that doth make cowards of us all.

J. H. DELLARD.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Freiburg, Baden, Germany, May 25.—Revolution is spreading in Russia. The organization of the movement is being perfected. But what is more important, the broad masses of the people are in a state of eager excitement. Hunger and misery have played their part and the indistinct glimmer of the intellectual and political development of western Europe, contrasted with the unspeakable wretchedness of their own condition, is moving that vast unleavened mass, the Russian folk, with a might, almost irresistible, that is akin to rage. To convert this force into action is the desire of the people and into this work they throw themselves with the courage of those who have nothing to lose. The revolutionary agitation to them is welcome. They go out to meet it. In many quarters a repetition of the peasant revolt of last year is expected and this in spite of the knowledge of the terrible punishments meted out to those simple farmers who had only taken from the landlords that which they considered their own. The government sees this and their question is how to break the gathering storm.

The salvation of the government is at stake. What must they do? With the revolutionists they have fought for years with all weapons conceivable and inconceivable: Siberia, exile and death—but all in vain. The simplest method at hand seems to be to turn the attention of the people into a channel harmless to the powers that exist at St. Petersburg. It is not hard to deceive and lead a people that have been kept in such thorough ignorance as the Russian peasantry and the scape goat is always at hand—the

Jew. This idea is especially pleasing to the government because, of all the socialistic organizations at present in existence that of the Jews is the oldest and most important. With it there has been many a bitter fight. To weaken this society and at the same time to bring it into disfavor with the Russians is particularly desirable. Every use is made of the natural distrust that an undeveloped folk always feels for strangers with different and unusual customs. This is blown by the bitter propaganda of the anti-Semitic press, the Conservative party, and especially the Orthodox church into a national hate. As was the general case in the middle ages the Jews in Russia are subject to special legislative restrictions. This opens them to contempt from even the lowest of the low. Despised as well as hated, the ground is prepared for such tragedies as have just taken place in Kishineff.

Kishineff is a town of about a hundred and fifty thousand inhabitants, situated not far from the boundary of Roumania. It has large iron industries and machine works principally engaged in the manufacture of farming implements. The people are not true Slavs, but a mixture, the eastern element predominating. Formerly there was no open ill-feeling between the numerous Jewish population and the Russians and Mahomedans. Five years ago an anti-Semitic newspaper was founded—Bessarabetz. It was the only one in the entire district. Any attempt to found a rival was met by the refusal of the authorities. The sheet was sold at a very cheap rate, which enabled it to be read by large masses of the people.

A short time ago in the neighborhood a boy was murdered. The "Bessarabetz" brought forward the old medieval slander that at Easter the Jews are bound by their ritual to offer a sacrifice of Christian blood. The story is as old as the days of Hugh of Lincoln and is found repeated in many curious forms all through the early history of England and France. There was an investigation, and in spite of the fact that an official report was given out that the child had been killed by his own relatives in order to obtain his share of an inheritance, the Bessarabetz continued to publish the same stories as formerly.

For months before Easter it was an open secret in Kishineff that on the feast of the Resurrection the Jews would be punished. All knew the story and many of the police spoke about it openly. Deputations of the promi-