

posed to all other monopolies and privileges, why is it not a good platform?

Are we answered that it advocates free silver at 16 to 1? But isn't that issue dead? Is it, or is it not? If it is not dead, let us reason about it and not fall victims to prejudice. If it is dead, then how does it hurt a platform the principles of which are otherwise sound?

The free silver question really cuts no figure with the plutocratic leaders of the "reorganizers." What they object to in the Kansas City platform is not any obsolete declaration for free silver, but its living declarations against monopoly of all kinds. Mayor Johnson hit them squarely between the eyes when in his Sandusky speech he said: "It was not free silver that frightened the plutocratic leaders. What they feared was free men."

#### PULPIT ECONOMISTS.

A prominent clergyman in one of the large cities and on a recent Sunday:

Never has the bread and butter problem been so great to the poor man of this country as at present; never so many scantily fed people as now, with all the work they can do. It is bad enough to do nothing and go hungry; it is worse to work day in and day out and still be hungry, with the employer growing richer day by day. The situation cannot be otherwise with the cost of living increased 40 or 50 per cent. and wages of the hardest worker advanced ten per cent., and not even that much in many instances.

Those clergymen who are really pastors in their parishes know better than any other class of men the home conditions among the poorer members of the community, and many are doing good service in telling the facts of their observation. One can hardly pick up a Monday paper without seeing some such testimony as that quoted above.

We say they are doing good service, because the well-to-do need to know that the glitter of their prosperity is making contrasts of shadows all the blacker. History has shown more than once how a time of prosperity might be a time of intensest privation. We should not be permitted ever to forget the sharp lesson of the reign of Louis XVI., when, on the very eve of the French revolution,

the orthodox journals were talking of France's prosperity. There were doubtless many in France—such as got their cue of thought from reading only on one side, as most of us do—who had no idea how the other side lived. They saw the world through their own spectacles, just as we are apt to do to-day.

"How prosperous everything is," said a dear old lady, showing a letter just received; "I am offered 145 for this bank stock and it never brought more than 120 before." I told her I had had a talk with a carpenter that morning who told me that he was finding it harder to make ends meet than ever in his life, and that the thirty-odd carpenters in the town were thinking for the first time of trying to form a union to raise wages. "Dear me," she said, "I thought everybody was prosperous nowadays."

And so we repeat that the clergymen who are brave enough to tell prosperous congregations that prosperity is not as widespread as most of them perhaps think, are useful prophets in refusing to prophesy smooth things.

But when these clergymen speak further than to tell the facts, when they proceed to discuss the method of alleviation and remedy, there is hardly one in a hundred but adopts a tone that is distasteful to any self-respecting workingman. In the same sermon from which we quoted above the preacher said:

The master is to recognize the servant's humanity. The employer has the authority to command, and it is the servant's duty to obey authority, but the humanity of those in servitude appeals to and cries for mercy at the hand of the master, and it is his bounden duty to obey. . . . The master is to provide comforts and nourishment for the body of the servant according to needs. A man cannot do satisfactory work on an insufficient support or starvation wages.

Now, though clergymen have not, workingmen have, got beyond the time when the relationship expressed in such words is recognized as the true one between the laborer and the man who buys his labor. Labor is now, at least theoretically, free labor. There is no more reason for saying that the plowman, or the factoryman, or the miner is in servitude than for saying the lawyer, or the physician, or the bookkeeper is in servitude. There is no more reason for talking about the

master providing nourishment to the man who sells him labor than to the man who sells him a horse.

If clergymen will change their point of view as to the relationship between the workingman and the employer, will think of his relationship as one involving simply justice and equal rights rather than mercy and charity, and will honestly inquire whether the conditions of labor are based on justice and a law free from all privilege, then they will soon find that there will be more sympathy between the church and the masses and more workingmen in their congregations.

J. H. DILLARD.

## NEWS

The old political saw, "As goes Maine so goes the Union," always excites national interest in the local elections of that State. For this reason the returns from the Maine election of the 9th are of special news importance. But full reports are not yet in, and no inference as to the general significance of the election can be drawn. Both parties are claiming a victory. As this depends, however, not upon the result (Maine being at all times a Republican State by an overwhelming majority), no such claims on either side can be considered without full returns admitting of comparisons with the votes of previous years.

The Republican candidate for governor appears to have received a plurality of about 26,000, which is nearly the same as that of 1898 and 8,000 less than that of 1900. It is also about the same percentage of the aggregate as in 1898, the last previous "off year." The Republican candidates for congress are reported to have been elected by "safe majorities," but the majorities are not given. The two houses of the State legislature will probably be divided between the parties about as before. The Democrats of the Portland county, Cumberland, have elected their candidate for sheriff, but evidently from purely local reasons. Altogether, so far as can be judged by the very indefinite election returns, neither party can claim an advantage. Maine appears to have undergone no notable change in general political sentiment.

At a session of the Wisconsin Democratic convention subsequent to that