

operator, nor necessarily to his value as an adviser. It is to his autocratic assumptions with reference to the general policies involved in the utilization of the facts he discovers, or the desirability of the special skill he possesses. This food-devitalization fad, with its collapse, affords a good illustration. The time will probably come when the vaccination fad will suffer a similar disaster. And so with that other and kindred and more irrational and horrible fad that has recently made its way in the field of medical expertism—human sterilization as a check to the propagation of criminal propensities.

* * *

SEEDS OF BAD GOVERNMENT.

The men "higher up" in politics sow seeds of bad government, of which men "higher up" in business reap the sordid fruits.

An illustration was given at Albany last winter by Elihu Root, United States Senator from New York, when he argued against the referendum. Appealing to the legislators not to be allured into allowing the people, their principal, articulate expression in public affairs, he said: "Whenever you take away [legislative] powers, you weaken [legislative] responsibility." So Senator Root would weaken the responsibility of the people by taking away *their* power. He would have the people delegate governing authority to agents, and be outside of and consequently indifferent to the government themselves. He would make them apathetic subjects, not intelligent citizens wide awake in affairs of state and by initiative and referendum compelling their agents to respond to their corporate will.

It was the same Mr. Root, then Secretary of State of the United States, who made the suggestion, imputing dishonesty to the United States Supreme Court, that "constructions of the Constitution would be found," etc. This did more to undermine the respect of the people for that august tribunal than patriotic and courageous attacks on its reactionary decisions.

Richard Olney has afforded another illustration like that by Senator Root. Mr. Olney was President Cleveland's cabinet officer, and as a member of the Democratic party is supposed to differ from Mr. Root's party in principle. But only recently in addressing the Massachusetts legislature he said: "For the legislature of the Commonwealth to leave the question of Boston's future charter government to the arbitrament of a fraction of the voters of the State would be an abdication of its functions and a practical refusal to perform one of the most important trusts committed to it."

Shades of Sam Adams and the New England Town Meeting! The city of Boston can't enact a charter. The legislature alone has that power. It acts for the State, and from the viewpoint of State policy. The city of Boston cannot deprive it of its functions or its responsibility. All the citizens of Boston could do would be to approve or reject the act of the legislature in imposing a charter upon it. But it should be at liberty to do this according as the city, by vote of its citizens, regards the charter as fit or unfit for its needs as a city. This would not supplant the legislature; it would co-operate with it. What Mr. Olney was proposing was that the city of Boston should be deprived of the essential democratic right of independence, of self-rule, of the right to pass on its own fundamental law, of the right to disapprove of a charter if it did not find it satisfactory.

How much better for Boston to educate its electorate up to a good charter, or for its electorate to educate the State legislators up to the will of Boston, than to be obliged to live under a charter for which it is not responsible. How much better for the citizens of Boston—the some time cradle of liberty—to feel that they have a voice in the making of the fundamental law of their city, than to allow themselves to become obedient subjects.

Let us recognize that the cause of bad government must be reached if we would have good government. Let us realize that the cause of bad government comes from a false attitude of the people toward government. Let us understand that the men who sow these seeds of bad government, are treacherous to American principles, even if they are the men higher up—even if they are the men highest up.

LEWIS STOCKTON.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

THE CHURCH AND SOCIETY.

Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mr. Duncan (p. 441) has answered an article which I contributed to your valuable paper last March (p. 269). I regret that he has misunderstood my position. He represents me as excusing the Church from taking any part in social reforms. My plea is quite the other way. Had Mr. Duncan read my article more carefully he would not have fallen foul of me. He has quoted one or two sentences, taken them apart from their context, and given them a different meaning from that which was intended. We ought to guard against this kind of thing in all our reading.

The Church that refuses to recognize and condemn existing social evils and call for repentance, is self-condemned. The Church did her duty in the fifties and sixties in not only condemning the principle of

slavery, but in calling for the abolition of the institution of slave ownership and the traffic in Negro slaves. But the Church would have shown a weakness had she demanded that the only way to get rid of slavery was to kill all who had slaves and refused to free them, or advocated any other specific method of abolishing the evil. So to-day the Church neglects her duty unless she not only condemns our modern forms of slavery, but demands the abolition of the evil, monopoly, in all its forms, which is at the root of it. But it is not for the Church to preach the method by which this shall be accomplished. This is agreeable to the example of "Amos, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, John the Baptist, Jesus, Paul," who are referred to by Mr Duncan. I have not read all written by the others whom he mentioned, namely, "Bernard, Augustine, Savonarola, Knox, Wesley, Parker," to be able to quote them too. I think, however, that on a careful perusal of them, it will be found that they all follow the same principle. They were specific in their condemnation of evils and in calling for repentance, but they did not as Mr. Duncan asserts, prescribe "the specific measures by which the reforms of their own times were to be brought about." In this Mr. Duncan is at fault. None of them espoused the cause of any one of the various "isms" of their day. As citizens we are bound to be true to the "specific measures" we believe in, but as preachers we have nothing to do with the methods of rectifying wrong. The question of method is not one of right or wrong, good or evil; but one of good and better. All methods that aim to be constructive have some good in them. Assuredly some are superior to others. Men, however, must be left in freedom to select what seems to them to be best. No church may judiciously take it upon herself to dictate that which is the best. Indeed, the moment any preacher does this he is not speaking for the Church of God, but for himself. But he speaks for the whole true Christian Church when he defines any evil and calls for repentance.

LOUIS G. HOECK.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, May 11, 1909.

The British Budget.

Official reports of Lloyd-George's presentation of the Liberal budget to the British House of Commons on the 29th (p. 443), are now at hand. As Chancellor of the Exchequer, he explained the need for revenues and the sources from which the Ministry proposed obtaining them. After stating the anticipated deficit for 1909-10 to be \$78,810,000 (£15,762,000), and making a

brief explanation, he referred to naval appropriations and old age pensions and the necessity of solving urgent social problems, as chiefly responsible for the deficit.

Of the navy he said:

We all value too highly the immunity which this country has so long enjoyed from the horrors of an invaded land to endanger it for lack of timely provision. That immunity at its very lowest has been for generations, and still is, a great national asset. It has undoubtedly given us the tranquillity and the security which has enabled us to build up our great national wealth. It is an essential part of that wealth. At the highest it means an inviolable guarantee for our national freedom and independence; nay, more, many a time in comparatively recent history it has been the citadel and the sole guarantee which has saved the menaced liberties of Europe from an impending doom. I can assure hon. members, if they still have any suspicion lurking in their minds, that any member of this government, or of this party, proposes in any ill-judged fit of parsimony to risk even for an hour so precious a national treasure they can dismiss those unworthy suspicions entirely from their minds. Such a stupendous act of folly would in the present temper of nations not be Liberalism, but lunacy. We do not intend to put in jeopardy the naval supremacy which is so essential not only to our national existence, but in our judgment, to the vital interests of Western civilization. But, in my judgment, it would also be an act of criminal insanity to throw away £8,000,000 of money, which is so much needed for other purposes, on building gigantic flotillas to encounter mythical Armadas. That is why we propose only to incur this enormous expenditure when the need for it arises. We must ensure the complete security of our shores against all real dangers, but, rich nation as we are, we cannot afford to build navies against nightmares. To throw away millions of money when there is no need for it, purely to appease unreasoning panic, would be to squander resources essential to our safety in time of real danger, and it is the business of a government to follow with calmness as well as courage the medium path between panic and parsimony, which is the only safe road to national security.

Passing then to a consideration of questions of social reform, the Chancellor explained:

What the government have to ask themselves is this: Can the whole subject of further social reform be postponed until the increasing demands made upon the national exchequer by the growth of armaments has ceased? Not merely can it be postponed, but ought it to be postponed? Is there the slightest hope that if we deferred consideration of the matter we are likely within a generation to find any more favorable moment for attending to it? And we have to ask ourselves this further question: If we put off dealing with these social sores, are the evils which arise from them not likely to grow and to fester until finally the loss which the country sustains will be infinitely greater than anything it would have to bear in paying the cost of an immediate remedy? There