

and Christian enough to deal by them in accordance with the Golden Rule of the Nazarene.

\* \*

### Tariff Tenderness for Farmers.

The attention of farmers is called by Alderman George Stewart Brown of Baltimore to another "innocent" in the free list of the Payne tariff bill. It is the item of "sheep dip." Sheep dip, by the way, is a disinfectant much used for the cure of a certain disease of sheep. Of course it may be used for other disinfectant purposes. If not, of what good would it probably be as a disinfectant for sheep? Now this "sheep dip" is in the free list. But it is put there with a proviso excluding "all compounds or preparations that can be used for other purposes"! In other words, "sheep dip" is in the free list provided it be a compound that will not disinfect anything but sheep. For, as Alderman Brown adds, "the Board of General Appraisers have already decided that unless it confines its disinfectant action to a sheep's back, it 'can be used for other [disinfectant] purposes,' and cannot come in free but must pay 20 per cent duty." Farmers should be interested in knowing that it is the name "sheep dip," and not its curative properties, that goes into the free list.

\* \*

### Religio-Economic Lectures.

An experiment in popular lectures on religio-economic subjects was begun at Handel Hall (40 Randolph street), Chicago, last Sunday by the Rev. A. B. Francisco. The experiment is to be continued next Sunday at the same place at 3 o'clock sharp. Mr. Francisco is a rugged, plain spoken clergyman, of commanding presence, who feels strongly, thinks straight, and enlivens his oratory with flashes of spontaneous eloquence. He aims his speech at head and heart alike, and keeps his feet firmly upon the ground. His governing idea is that the social whole, no less than the individual person, is subject to spiritual law. But the spiritual law he preaches is not arbitrary; it is rational. And it is related to natural phenomena in every stage, from the simplest natural laws of physics, up through all the natural laws of industrial activity, including the natural laws of human association. In his Handel Hall lectures, therefore, he keeps himself in close touch with life as we know it here—the picture of a life more real, it may be, but in itself a real life nevertheless. Mr. Francisco's meetings occupy middle ground between religious meetings that leave out economics, and economic meetings that leave out religion.

### ARRAYING POOR AGAINST RICH.

If opportunity were equally open to all in this country and every one had his rights fully safeguarded, there would be no occasion for any protest such as this which recently appeared in Leslie's Weekly, and has been approvingly quoted in great newspapers:

Cruel wrong is done by those who constantly seek to array the poor against the rich and to misrepresent the latter as void of sympathy and all the kindly instincts of humanity. When we stop to think that most of our rich men of to-day were the poor men of a few years ago, we realize the injustice of the accusation. In this great country, where opportunities for advancement are open to all and where every one has his rights fully safeguarded, no class distinction should be permitted to prevail. Demagogues who endeavor to create such distinctions, should be regarded as a menace to the public welfare and be treated accordingly.

No "demagogues" can create class distinctions in any country where opportunities are open to all and rights are safeguarded. It is because opportunity in this great country has been monopolized to an enormous extent by the few, and the rights of the many have been insolently and wickedly ignored, that men of "kindly instincts" protest, in the name of justice, against the class distinctions which have resulted.

Demagogues do not create class distinctions—they merely take advantage of any class distinction that manifestly exists. The ignorant demagogue mistakenly draws the line of class distinction between Rich and Poor, instead of between the promoters and beneficiaries of Special Privilege on one hand, and the victims thereof on the other. And the ignorant press commentator does the same. But the "demagogue" rightly denounces the existing evil, while the ignorant press commentator seeks to defend it by brazenly denying its existence.

There is never any menace to the public welfare from the "demagogue" who tries to create a class distinction; but there is imminent menace to the generating cause of class distinction in the denunciation of special privilege by the prophet and the seer. And always Jerusalem stones the prophets!

Ignorant speakers and writers have so persistently misapplied the epithet "demagogue" that well-informed readers have come to regard its use as signifying a strong probability of exceptionally high virtue in the person assailed. And this because individuals thus stigmatized are in the great majority of cases found to be men of ster-

ling character and high ideals, fired with a quenchless passion for justice, who refuse to keep silence while powerful and "respectable" thieves ply their vocation of public plunder.

The assumption that in "this great country opportunities for advancement are open to all, and every one has his rights fully safeguarded," is a mossback philosophy, an echo of a long past plausibility, and a plump contradiction of the glaring facts of current economic and political history.

+

A cruel injustice it is indeed to seek to array the poor against the rich; but if the editors of great newspapers and popular magazines lack the capacity to discriminate between the rich, as such, and the promoters and beneficiaries of nefarious schemes for wanton exploitation of the public, then what wonder that the mass of their readers fall into the same ditch with them?

+

And, pray, what does it signify that "the rich man of today was the poor man of a few years ago"? Is not that very circumstance a symptom of the disease complained of? Is the rapid amassing of individual fortunes an indication of universal equality of opportunity, to take advantage of which will make millionaires of us all? He who imagines it, belongs in the kindergarten department of the economics school.

And here is a kindergarten lesson: By how much would it be possible for the employers of the country to advance the wages of their workmen, with safety to the stability of business? Would it be sufficient to enable the most productive laborer or mechanic of today to become thereby the rich man of a few years hence?

Employers engaged in competitive business will aver that no considerable advance can be made in wages without a corresponding increase in the prices of product—the commodities for possession of which the wages must be expended. At that rate will the mechanic of today become, by his mechanical industry, the rich man of a few years hence? Nonsense!

There are two ways, by either of which men may secure great wealth, namely: either by honest, socially beneficial, lawful and exceptionally able enterprise; or, by dishonorable, socially baneful, unlawful and exceptionally shrewd, cruel and masterful exploitation of the public. The former is welcome to his wealth; but, like poor dog Tray, he will doubtless be made to suffer occasionally at the hands of ignorant "demagogues" and eke ignorant newspaper writers, who, neither of them,

have the intelligence, or the sincerity, to distinguish between him and the vicious dogs whose "rich" company he is surprised in.

+

Loose to society the opportunities that those vicious dogs have wrongfully cornered, and not all the demagogues on earth would be able to array one class against another. There would be no "poor," for the reason that the billions now wrung from industry by special privilege and private monopoly, would then be, quite naturally, distributed competitively among the producers thereof. There would still be many rich men; but opportunity being equally open to all—"every one's rights fully safeguarded"—what ground of adverse criticism would remain? None whatever.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN GREAT BRITAIN.

London, April 3, 1909.

Since the last letter on the British political situation (vol. xi, p. 344), there have been several notable movements. At that time the Liberal government had just been partly reconstructed owing to the death of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, and the retirement of a few members of the Cabinet and the consequent appointment of new men to the vacant positions. It is difficult to say what effect this change in the composition of the government has had on its policy. Even after a lapse of twelve months one does not feel justified in saying that the party have withdrawn their support from any of the distinctively Liberal measures which formed the programme of the government when they came into power in 1906. But this period has been remarkable for the restraint which has been placed on the more radical sections of the party and especially on those who regard a strong and clear measure of land reform as the central part of Liberal policy.

The large and increasing number of people who support the taxation of land values have lived and worked in an undefined hope for almost a year. In this matter it will be admitted that their experience would have been different if Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman had lived. The work of governments under a system of party politics is twofold in its nature. First of all they formulate their policy, and then, in seeking to carry out this policy, they expound and recommend it to the electors in order to get their support. This latter part of the government's work, since Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's death, has been less perfectly done. The campaign of the Ministers in the country has been weak and ineffectual.

During last year the House of Lords rejected the licensing bill, and the Scottish land bill for the extension of small holdings in that country, while they fatally amended the Scottish land values bill; and it cannot be said that the Liberal party have proved