

Among the judges of the local court there was a similar vent to expressions of sorrow at the untimely end of the dead man. Judge Phillips voiced the sentiment of his colleagues when he said "That he was able to amass so many millions and still retain his hold upon the hearts of the great masses of people among whom he lived is, in my opinion, the sincerest proof of innate greatness."

One of the noticeable things in connection with the sorrow expressed is that it does not come from a single class or walk of life. Rich and poor alike see in his death the loss of a personal friend. The street car employees who remember the times when he worked with them and was one of them joined with the representatives of gigantic capital in giving voice to their estimate of the man, and they agree.

One point of common regret is that he was not allowed to complete the projects which he had planned. Common opinion gives him a unique place in the world of progress and all looked upon him as the explication of reforms in the world of traffic and transportation. A leader in certain lines of activity and of reductions of charges, he commanded the attention of all interested in street car traffic. No one seems to be able to fill the place made vacant.

SHALL WE ALL WORK HARDER?

A letter published in the Cincinnati Commercial Tribune of June 13, from Daniel Klefer.

Rev. Charles F. Goss, in his "Snap Shots at Daily Life," tells your readers Monday morning, in substance, that if they will all be industrious and virtuous they will all succeed in life. Like Sir Joseph Porter, in "Pinafore," he tells them the story of somebody's success, and winds up with practically the same advice: "Just stick to your desks, and never go to sea, and you all may be rulers of the queen's navy." Such talk is well enough in a comic opera, where it is only intended to furnish amusement, but, when it is delivered in all seriousness, it is anything but complimentary to the intelligence of the person to whom it is addressed.

In last Monday's issue he tells the story of an errand boy, who, by taking, or pretending to take, a great interest in his employer's success received an increase in salary at once, and, it is to be presumed, finally got to own the business. The moral he points out is that, if all errand boys and all others who occupy subordi-

nate positions will attend to their employer's business, and not their own, then every mother's son of them will get to be a boss, and no one need be an underling.

"This is not the doctrine you will hear on the street corners," he says. "It is not the philosophy of the agitator." Let us hope it is not. There ought to be some people somewhere who do not dish out such nonsensical stuff to their listeners, and if such people cannot be found in the pulpits of our fashionable churches, let us be thankful that at least the agitators on the street corners have sufficient respect for the intelligence of the multitude to spare them that infliction.

Let us imagine such a thing as that every man in somebody's employ should actually take Rev. Mr. Goss seriously and follow his advice. What would be the result? As all would be working equally well in the interest of their employers and entirely disregarding their own, then no reason would exist, due to the efforts of any one of these employes, for advancing any one of the number above the rest. The only effect would be to raise the standard of efficiency; to make everyone work harder, without in any way bettering their future prospects thereby.

It is only because the great mass of employes are sufficiently human to prefer their own interests to that of their employers, and sufficiently honest not to try to conceal that fact, that it is possible for an occasional one—who may give his employer's interests the preference, or, what is more probable, may successfully pretend to do so—to raise himself above the multitude. If all would do as he has done no one would secure any advantage and no one would be any better off.

If one employe in an establishment should voluntarily put in an extra hour every day without extra pay, he might thereby secure his employer's favor and succeed in raising himself above his fellows, but if all the employes did this, then none of them would have any claim to preference, and all they would succeed in doing would be to increase their hours of labor, without increasing their reward. So far from bettering themselves, they would only hurt themselves by such a course.

It does not seem to have occurred to Mr. Goss to question the justice or wisdom of a social system wherein, in order that men may obtain something more than the bare necessities

of life, or even to get the chance to earn that, it is necessary for them to secure the favor of other men. Yet, ministers of the Gospel ought to be the first ones to recognize this very fact. They ought to see that the existence of such a system cannot possibly be in accordance with the will of a just and wise God; that, consequently, it must exist contrary to his will, and that all who profess to worship him must be recreant to their duty if they neglect to do what is in their power to change the system. In spite of all this, the ministers who fearlessly do their duty in pointing out these facts are exceedingly rare. It is doubtful if there are more than three of them in this city. The rest are well described by Mr. Goss himself in the individual who has the church or does not help it "just in proportion as it is profitable to himself." It is not very profitable to the man in the pulpit just now to tell the facts about existing social conditions. It is more profitable to lay the blame for existing evils on individuals than it is on the system which compels most men to do wrong. Some beneficiaries of legalized robbery may cease donating to the church if the truth be told regarding the source of their income, consequently the pulpit generally keeps silent on this matter. "No wonder," to quote Rev. Mr. Goss once more, "the church has lost so much of its power."

"IDEALS IN POLITICS."

Extracts from the oration of Hon. Wayne MacVeagh before the Phi Beta Kappa society at Harvard university, June 27, as reported in City and State, of Philadelphia, for July 4.

My purpose is to point out, without the slightest bitterness, to the members of the contented class, the commercial value of ethical ideas as the safest source of the political aspirations of the majority of our people, and the most conservative influence in our national life, and also to point out to them the grave dangers from a business standpoint, in these days of possible conflict between capital and labor, of continuing to substitute money for morals as the permanent and controlling force in American politics.

The first ethical idea which it seems to me it would be wise for us, even from the point of view of the stock exchange, to guard most zealously just now is the ideal condition of society with which President McKinley closed his congratulations upon the opening of the exposition at Buffalo

—that of peace on earth and good will to men. I observe with especial sorrow that many Protestant clergymen mistakenly suppose that they can safely substitute at this day and in our country the teaching of Mohammed for the teaching of Christ. We all know the temptations to which such clergymen are exposed. It is so much more comfortable to "swim with the tide," and it is so much more certain that the incomes on which themselves and their families are dependent for the comforts and luxuries of life will share in the commercial prosperity of the country, if the doctrines preached by them and advocated in their religious journals recognize that the making of money is the first duty of man in the new century, and that keeping one's self unspotted from the world, so far from being, as was formerly supposed, true religion and undefiled, is a foolish and sentimental expression, incapable of application in the rough world in which we live, where each man's duty is to take care of himself. But, after making all allowance the most abundant charity can suggest, it will still remain a grave and menacing peril to American respect for the moral law if clergymen are permitted without rebuke to preach the righteousness of unnecessary or aggressive warfare, the killing of weaker peoples in order to reduce them to subjection, and the robbing them of their possessions.

It is quite possible there may also be great commercial value for us at the present time in the ethical ideal that all men are born equal and equally entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I fully recognize the present unpopularity of this ideal. I know that to declare one's belief in it is to expose one's self to the dreadful charge of disloyalty; but as in matters of religion American democracy rested at its birth upon the message of the herald angels, so in politics it rested at its birth upon the doctrine of the equality of men.

Great popularity no doubt just now attaches to money and great unpopularity to morals, on the ground that money is modern and practical, while morals are antiquated and impracticable; and they tell us that the race of to-day is a race for new markets won by war, for the exploiting of weaker peoples, for larger armies, for ever-increasing navies, for expanding trade and for greater wealth. I confess I would have thought the growth of our own be-

loved country in material wealth and prosperity in the last 30 years of unbroken peace and of amity with all mankind had more than satisfied any avarice which could have found a place even in the dreams of civilized men. Those 30 years demonstrated that in order to be a world power we need not be a robber nation.

There is still another ethical ideal which may soon prove to be of very great commercial value in American politics—the ideal of the citizen, whether in or out of office, exhibiting moral courage in dealing with important public questions. The truth is that physical courage has always been the most commonplace of virtues, and could always be bought at a very cheap price, so that it has become an unfailling proof of decadence for any people to become hysterical over exhibitions of animal courage without regard to the moral quality of the service in which it was displayed or of the comparative weakness of the adversary. Just the contrary is true of moral courage. It is among the rarest of virtues, and its services are of far greater value in this democratic age than ever before.

Indeed, the days may not be distant when the existence of law and order in America may depend upon it, for it may be found that it, and it alone, can protect us from the dangers which Mr. Webster believed would follow our present condition, a "rapid accumulation of property in few hands." For that reason the commercial value of such courage in a government by the majority can hardly be overestimated; and surely, if we are to find it a bulwark of defense in our day of need, we ought to be now commending it by our example, showing how really brave men face grave problems of government, and set themselves as brave men should, to finding the best possible solution of them.

There is another very grave problem which we are also refusing to consider, and by which refusal the ethical ideal of law is also being destroyed. It is the problem presented by our negro population, now approaching 10,000,000 souls. We gave them the suffrage and we have allowed some of them to be killed for possessing it. We appointed some of them to office, and have stood meekly by when they were shot for having our commission in their hands. They are being burnt before our eyes without even a pretense of trial. We are allowing state after state, openly, even contemptuously, to nullify a

solemn amendment of the constitution enacted for their protection, to secure which we poured out our treasure without limit and shed the blood of our sons like water. All of us, whether in public office or in private station, now concur in trying to ignore the existence of any such problem at our doors while, laughing like the Roman augurs in each other's faces, we indulge in self-congratulations about the blessings we are carrying to another 10,000,000 of dark-skinned races in far-distant lands.

It certainly would tend to make private property far more secure in America if the less fortunate majority of our population saw us of the more fortunate minority giving courage and time and thought to efforts to solve these problems and others like them, and thereby to lessen some of the evils which in many cases bear so heavily and so unjustly upon the poor. Indeed, the influence of ethical ideals upon American democracy ought to be considered of value if only because the cultivation of such ideals will inevitably tend to make more really patriotic all classes of our countrymen, for such ideals lift us all above the unsatisfied standards of public duty with which we are vainly trying to connect ourselves. They bring us into the air of a higher and purer love of country, and they set us face to face with the early American spirit in its best estate. In such communion a sordid and selfish public opinion, with low methods to mean ends, tends to disappear, and a cowardly and corrupt public life becomes less possible.

TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

An address issued by the American Anti-Imperialist leagues on July 4, 1901.

The Anti-Imperialist Leagues of the United States have been silent since the Presidential election, but not because they have less faith in their cause or believe the battle lost. They had hoped that those who voted for Mr. McKinley, while disapproving his policy in the West Indies and the Philippines, would see that their votes were misinterpreted, and would make their disapproval known and felt. They had hoped that congress would claim its place in our government, and would insist that the principles of freedom must be recognized and applied wherever our country holds sway. They had hoped that the supreme court would with no uncertain voice declare that no human be-