

both spades and cloth would be manufactured in England and exported to the United States, and the production of these articles here cease. But nothing would be less likely.

This is what would naturally happen: The United States manufactures and exports spades to England, which manufactures and exports cloth to the United States. Because, in exchanging, say, an even 100 spades for 100 yards of cloth England would receive spades costing her \$100 for cloth costing her only \$80, while the United States would receive cloth costing her \$130 for spades costing her only \$120. This exchange is consequently to the advantage of both countries. There might be trade, of course, not only at the figures quoted, but within the range of advantage of either country, which trade would depend upon the strength of the supply and demand in both countries.

President Taft, with his old, moldy, fallacious cost-of-production theory, appears to have been mostly an onlooker at the building of the tariff wall. Perhaps we are expected to be glad and contented that canary seed was put on the free list, but in the light of actual facts the people are plundered in all directions for the benefit of special interests.

The trouble appears to be the persistent obfuscation of the ever-living, fundamental, economic truth, proclaimed by Adam Smith, that consumption is the sole end and purpose of all production and that the interest of the producer ought to be attended to only so far as it may be necessary for promoting that of the consumer.

With men like Aldrich and Cannon domineering our law factories, the interest of the consumer is almost constantly sacrificed to that of the producer; and they seem to consider production and not consumption as the ultimate end and object of all industry and commerce.

The tariff has passed, but discussion will not down. It augments, because the fraud of the few and the folly of the many have been recognized. The people have been humbugged for a long time without knowing, but now at last they do know.

* * *

THE SACRED RAGE OF THE PEOPLE.

From the London Nation of October 23.

The blaze of indignation that has swept from one end of the civilized world to the other, from Paris to Montevideo, on hearing the tidings of the execution of Senor Ferrer is significant in various ways. In the first place, it is a vindication of what we may term the inherent virtue of the people. Historians and sociologists have been too prone to dwell upon a certain susceptibility to sheer brutality, and to baser suggestions of blind ferocity which they attribute as dominant motives

to the collective mind. A crowd, they argue, is a lower organ of humanity than its individual constituents, its emotions and its conduct are more irrational and more unjust, unfounded fears and suspicions operate as more potent irritants, it rushes into violent action and always repents too late. Even when for the visible chance crowd we substitute popular opinion, the same faults are found by those who from conviction, interests, or temper are enemies of democracy. For in this analysis of the general mind it is nothing else than the whole cause of democracy that is at stake. If the people in its aggregate capacity is irredeemably ferocious, credulous, and incapable of self-control, it is difficult to maintain that the ultimate control of government is better left in their hands than in those of some oligarchy of superior persons trained to act upon their individual judgment, and perhaps possessed of enough good will to keep in check their selfish proclivities.

It is because it affords a practical refutation of this partial judgment of the popular mind that we are glad to witness this powerful display of the popular sense of justice. There is in every people a wisdom, an instinctive intelligence and a passion for right, a veritable voice of God. It is often beclouded, poisoned, and perverted to mean ends. But in the suggestion which works so powerfully upon the popular mind there is almost always a nucleus of sound passion; the mob of lynchers is goaded to a not wholly ignoble fury of sympathy with the victim of some cruel deed; "Mafficking" itself, with its degrading orgies, has its kernel of perverted patriotism.

The people is better as well as worse than its individuals, a crowd is capable of nobler judgments and greater heroism than its average member. Superior persons who sneer at or denounce the voluble indignation of ignorant folk who hardly know the place of Spain upon the map, and never heard the name of Ferrer until last week, only convict themselves of the ignorance which belongs to their superiority. It is true that this popular judgment is not based on a cool consideration of detailed evidence; it is largely instinctive. But the instinct is not so blind, so ill-informed, as is represented. The plain lessons of the secular struggle for toleration and for liberty are branded by just, though formless, traditions upon the minds of millions who have never heard of Lord Acton or buried themselves in the archives of national history. The unholy alliance of Church and State for the suppression of free thought, free speech, free press and free action, is perhaps the greatest, the most potent, and the most oppressive iniquity that history discloses through the ages, and even in the most liberal countries today the forces of reaction are constantly working towards re-establishing in some new shape this famous confederacy of spiritual authority and physical power. It needs no min-

ute research into the methods of judicial inquiry prevalent in Spain to recognize in the legal assassination of Ferrer a modern instance of a once familiar procedure. Those who lecture the peoples for their want of self-control say they ought to accept the informed judgment of the tribunal which must be presumed to have before it facts and evidence of criminal intent not publicly disclosed as yet. But it is this procedure, the secrecy, the preference of a military for a civil court, the selection of witnesses, the hurrying of the execution, that furnish the substance of our indignation.

It is not, as some foolish persons suggest, a sign of growing anarchism that leads our great cities to organized protest against this action of the government of Spain. On the contrary, this protest is the most powerful testimony that could be given to the growing recognition of the modern state as a standard and security of justice. In earlier times, nay, in times not remote, such acts of a state were so common as to awaken less indignation and no surprise. The most Christian monarchs employed false charges, cooked evidence, and hurried executions, as usual methods of dealing with the propagators of dangerous doctrine; the church used the secular arm freely and openly to rid her of her enemies. We cannot affect surprise that the church and the compliant government of Spain should have failed to recognize that the age has gone when these things can be done with ease and impunity. For the force of the indignation of the civilized world against the judicial outrage in a little known country has surprised those who are in sympathy with the movement. It is, in the first place, a new testimony to the solidarity of labor. For though the shock of the outrage was felt among all classes of the nations, it is significant that the working class organizations have everywhere and alone exerted themselves to give immediate and vigorous expression to their sentiments. Others have followed their lead. In some ways it is to be regretted that the public manifestation of an almost universal feeling should have been left so exclusively to the spokesmen of the extreme left. But any such consideration is outweighed by the revelation that the parties of urgent discontent in every land join in demanding plain public justice as the first and most urgent duty of the state. This sense for justice is the basis of democracy, and it is only natural that it should find earliest and most vehement expression among the workers, who in every country are still most exposed to the dangers of an officialism wielded by class or creed, and who see in liberty of speech and education the best security against such abuses of power. This internationalism of moral sympathy is not the mere vapid sentiment which some represent it to be. The official answers of foreign ministers still belong to the era of separatism

which ever asks "Am I my brother's keeper?" International relations on their formal side still remain so inchoate that no open expostulation with a foreign government is possible, unless it be covered by the assertion of some special interest upon the part of the intervening nation, or unless the erring state be very feeble or very backward. But the international character of this ferment of feeling must be itself a factor of growing import in the relations of states and governments. Perhaps the time may even be approaching when it will be recognized, not merely as the right, but even as the duty, of the responsible statesmen in the foremost civilized nations to denounce as disturbers of the international peace governments which commit or permit atrocities that shock the conscience of humanity and stir dangerous emotions of riot and distrust throughout the civilized world.

It is profoundly to be desired that the keen general sense of justice widespread among the peoples should grow so strong and find such vigorous expression as to compel their governments to seek modes of realizing in peaceable forms of representation this reality of the moral and emotional solidarity of nations. The enlistment of the labor movement in the different nations in this cause of humanity is an admirable rejoinder to those who charge it with materialism, class-hatred, and anarchic tendencies. For the agitation has evinced in the workers the most passionate conviction that the state stands first for justice, that the education of the people is their truest and safest method of advance, and that a martyr for education is even more sacred than the soldier who suffers or is slain in the narrower political and economic struggle. . . .

+ + +

A LAY SERMON.

An Address on "The Promise of Divine Protection,"
Delivered Before the New Church Convention
at Brockton, Mass., June 12, 1909,
by Alice Thacher Post.

+

Thus saith the Lord that created thee, O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel, Fear not; for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine. When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee; when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee.—Isaiah xliii. 1, 2.

+

Wherever throughout the wide world the universal Word has gone this message of love and protection has carried comfort. Our brethren of the ancient time, and our brethren in the far corners of the earth, share equally with you and