

the cross; and, in that supreme moment, while all the hosts of heaven listened, and men, exhausted by the frenzy of their hatred, rested for a space, hark!—

Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.

Black was right. Men may prophesy and women may pray, but peace will come to abide here on earth only when the dreams of childhood are the accepted charts to guide the destinies of men. Not till men become as little children will peace come to abide here on earth.

But Black spoke, not as an exponent of this doctrine of the Christ, but as a scoffer of it. Hear him:

The fate of nations is still decided by their wars. You may talk of orderly tribunals and learned referees; you may sing in your schools the gentle praises of the quiet life; you may strike from your books the last note of every martial anthem, and yet, out in the smoke and thunder will always be the tramp of horses and the silent, rigid, up-turned face. . . . If the pressure is great, the material to resist it must be granite and iron.

No doubt, so long as the scoffers of peace, who sound the praises of war, are dominant, the silent, rigid, up-turned face will mark where passed the man of granite and iron; for war is the instrument by which the men of granite and iron decide the fate of nations.

But, you may talk of world powers, and the glories of battle; you may voice from the forum the wanton eulogies of strife; you may blot from your books the last note of every paean of peace and love, and yet, forever upon Calvary will appear the silent, up-turned face of One who died under the iron heel of the men of granite; died, without so much as lifting His almighty arm in His own defense; and in so dying, branded eternal infamy upon the hellish front of war. And over the crests of the centuries, wafted on airs of heaven, we hear the matchless words:

Except ye become as little children ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. . . . Peace on earth, good will to men.

And when (God hasten the day!) the will of the common people—the multiplying hosts of Christian democracy—shall have wrenched the helm of human destiny from the crimson hands of self-seeking demagogues, then war shall end, and peace shall usher in the blessed reign of human fellowship and love, beautiful as the dreams of childhood.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

The slave that is content is twice a slave, for not his body alone is in bondage, but his soul also.—C. V. Burke.

THE GREED OF A FEW A PERIL TO THE LIBERTIES OF THE MANY.

From the editorial columns of the Detroit Times of May 5, 1904.

We see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves us and causes us to tremble for the safety of our country.

As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned, and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money-power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all the wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the republic is destroyed.

We feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of our country than ever before, even in the midst of war. God grant that our forebodings may be groundless.

Monarchy itself is sometimes hinted at as a refuge from the power of the people. In our present position, we could scarcely be justified were we to omit to raise a warning against the approach of returning despotism.

It is not needed or fitting here that a general argument should be made in favor of popular institutions; but there is one point with its connections, not so hackneyed as most others, to which we ask brief attention.

It is assumed that labor is available only in connection with capital; that nobody labors unless somebody else owning capital, somehow, by the use of it, induces him to labor.

Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor and could not have existed if labor had not first existed.

Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration.

We bid the laboring people to beware of surrendering the power which they possess, and which, if surrendered, will surely be used to shut the door of advancement for such as they, and fix new disabilities and burdens upon them until all of liberty shall be lost.

In the early days of our race, the Almighty said to the first of mankind, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," and since then, if we except the light and air of heaven, no good has been or can be enjoyed by us, without first having cost labor.

And inasmuch as most good things have been produced by labor, it follows that all such things belong of right to those whose labor has produced them.

But it has so happened, in all the ages of the world that some have la-

bored and others have, without labor, enjoyed a large portion of the fruits. This is wrong and should not continue.

To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any government.

It seems strange that any man should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing bread from the sweat of other men's faces.

This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it.

P. S. There is no doubt that this editorial is pretty fierce. Doubtless there are those among the solid, conservative "sane" element who will declare that it is actually "socialistic," since labor is declared to be the "superior of capital," and entitled to all of its product. The suggestion that the Republic is in danger of destruction if the concentration of wealth be permitted to go on a little longer, will also doubtless be regarded as the product of an overwrought imagination. In fact, this editorial contains so much "dangerous" doctrine and so many extravagant statements that we should not now print it were it not for the fact that it was written by Abraham Lincoln 40 years ago, forming part of his Message to Congress in 1864. In reprinting it we have changed the Lincoln "I's" and "my's" to "we's" and "our's," but otherwise it is word for word as Lincoln wrote it.

We trust this explanation will be considered sufficient justification for printing so incendiary an article.

POLITICAL ECONOMY.

By Louis F. Post. Written for and published in the first number of the magazine "Successward," of San Antonio, Tex., and reproduced here by permission of the editor-in-chief, E. G. Le Sturgeon.

"Economy" is a term which refers to the management of resources. It names the process of adapting appropriate means to desired ends.

We know something, for instance, of the "economy" of birds, of the "economy" of squirrels, of the "economy" of beavers. They adapt the means or resources at their command to the ends they desire—the satisfaction of their respective wants.

So with man. He adapts the means or resources at his command to the ends that he desires—the satisfaction of his wants.

In the case of a Robinson Crusoe, this process of adapting means to ends is wholly individual. It is in no sense

political, for the term "political" implies human intercourse.

But when we transfer our thoughts from a lonely Robinson Crusoe to mankind in general, the fact of human intercourse is disclosed and trading phenomena begin to appear. Trade is one of the phases of human economy in the social sphere. It is a natural method of co-operation, whereby men mutually adapt their available resources or means to the end of satisfying their respective individual wants.

The best name for this co-operative economy would be "social economy." But governmental organization has become so intimately identified with social concerns as to affect our economic thought with political impressions and to color our language with political terms. We are consequently accustomed, when we mean social economy, to say "political economy." Strictly, political economy is merely government economy—the economy of public finance. But as most commonly understood, the term is synonymous with the social economy of mankind. It refers to the co-operative processes whereby the means available to man are by man adapted to the end of satisfying human wants.

Although political economy is a subject of wide and varied application, often subtle in detail and sometimes mysterious, its fundamental principles and great governing facts are extremely simple and easy of apprehension. All its facts, little and great, fall into two categories: (1) man, and (2) man's natural environment; and its processes are but the varying relations of these two things with reference to the adaptation of the latter to the wants of the former. Nothing whatever exists in this world of man and matter, from a clod of earth to a "captain of industry" and the most stupendous and intricate machine he controls, which is not one of those two things or a product drawn by the one from the other. It is man himself; or else it is some part of man's natural environment; or else it is some artificial adaptation of his natural environment by man for the satisfaction of human wants.

In the terms of political economy those three classes of objects—the active producers, the passive resources, and the desired products—have distinctive names. Man's natural environment is called "land;" his economic energies are called "labor;" and the products resulting from the economic application of his energies to his environment are called "wealth." Thus we have the fundamental formula of po-

litical economy, that "Labor from Land produces Wealth."

With a clear understanding of that formula, the subject of political economy is as an open book. All the subdivisions, such as capital, interest, wages, rent, profits, insurance, skilled and unskilled labor, wages of superintendence, exploiter and exploited, competition, etc., are then readily classified according to their true relationships; and all economic problems, such as taxation, public ownership, trusts, tariffs, trade unions, strikes, boycotts, and the like, are thereupon illuminated with a brilliant and steady light.

Equipped with a clear understanding of that primary formula any intelligent person may study political economy in all its ramifications, with pleasure to himself and profit to his community. Instead of a dismal study it will then be to him the most interesting of all possible studies—the study of the phenomena of men at work making a living for mankind.

#### THE RUSSIAN RETORTS.

Said the Russian: "No one ever saw me in a town with such a name as Be-o-wa-wee, Billierica, or Chacaboula, Kokebona, or Wallula, Which are in that wild America. And look! Here's Ocheyedan, Chincoteague and Schaghticoke.

"Isn't it a mighty lucky thing for us We have no names like Agamenticus, Or Guadelupe-Cala, Or Choccolocco-Aia, Cheektowago, Auchincloss, or Alexauken, Cuddebackville, Mehoopany, or Weehawken?

"If we held Anasagunticook in Me, With the Japs at Metabetchouan in Que, I rather think 'twould threaten us With geographical tetanus! Or if we were down in Waxahachie-Tex., And they fell back to Ixcaquixtla-Mex.!

"Wouldn't the correspondents jeer us with a will

If we had a town called Aptakistic-III? A Kishacoquillas-Pa., Or a Kinchefoonee-Ga., A Quinnipack, or plain Shetucket-Ct., A Michlgamme, Mich., or Queechie-Vt.?

"D'ye think I'd live in Wapapello-Mo.? Wapwollopen-Pa., or Wapakoneta-O.? Or Nitta Yuma-Miss., Or Kronenwethers-Wis., Toughkenamon, Onondaga, Squannacook, or Cuyahoga?

"Daguscachonda-Pa. and Quambah-Minn. Rather make a simple-languaged Russian grin.

Yet no doubt they think us dippy At Bogue-Chitto-Mississippi, And conceive our brains as buggy In Alabama down at Chunnenugee!" —Edmund Vance Cooke, in Columbus (O.) Press.

#### SOME NON-PARTISAN POLITICS.

Editorial in August 1st issue of Farm, Stock and Home, of Minneapolis.

The soul of the American citizen must be out of tune or his partisanship fit stuff to armor ships with if he does not have a higher regard for W. J. Bryan now than he had before the late Democratic national convention. This is not said because Mr. Bryan is a Democrat, but because he is an American citizen of whom every other citizen ought to be proud. When in the beginning of his last speech at the convention he modestly, reverently, and with slight paraphrase, quoted Paul's words: "You may dispute whether I have fought a good fight; you may dispute whether I have finished my course, but you cannot deny that I have kept the faith," it is no wonder that 10,000 men rose to their feet and gave the speaker an indorsement that, all things considered, is perhaps without parallel in the history of politics or oratory. And the indorsement came because the words were as true as when Paul spoke them.

And it is well to be proud of an encouragement in well doing a fellow citizen—who is a politician—who will "keep the faith" that is in him, when faithlessness is all round him, and where policy is pushing principle from the platform, and where "what is right" is made subordinate to "how can we win?"

While Mr. Bryan's efforts were defeated by the convention delegates he was triumphantly indorsed by the voteless mass that, constituted an immense majority of convention attendants; and it is now admitted by everybody acquainted with the facts that he came out of the convention with more strength as a leader than he went in with, all of which is more creditable, however, to public sentiment than to Mr. Bryan; it honors itself in being just to that gentleman. Upon this point the following editorial expression of the Chicago Record-Herald, a strong political opponent, is submitted as a sample of many similar expressions that might be quoted:

In the contrast both of cause and of persons the Nebraskan shows to such great advantage that he should receive a tribute of respect even from those who have differed from him most widely in the past upon political principles.

We believe, moreover, that his cleanliness of character, his fine moral qualities, his purity of purpose, his political zeal and his unrivaled gifts as an orator absolutely preclude the idea that he has ceased to be a force in our public life. Whether one approves all his tenets or not, one should recognize the power that is in him, and it may affect millions in the future as it has in the past.

It was ardently hoped and confidently