

The Public

Dr. H. J. Woodhouse
Nov. 3-00 Box 511

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 7, 1900.

Number 118.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

Always have an open mind, but don't keep it open at both ends.

Some irreverent punster, impressed with the efforts of the Outlook to sanctify imperialism, compares it with Outing, which he says makes religion of sport, while the Outlook makes sport of religion.

A peculiarly ignorant criticism of the American declaration of independence is the one now so often heard in plutocratic quarters, that it falsely asserts that all men are created equal. This is false—so the criticism runs—because men are not created equal in stature, nor in weight, nor in mental or physical ability, nor in health, and so on. The criticism would be beneath notice if it were not so common. But it is common, and the thoughtless are often fooled by it. In considering it, it should be observed at the very outset that the declaration of independence is not a treatise on physiology. Its declaration of equality cannot, therefore, be assumed to relate to physical proportions or strength. Neither is it a treatise on mental philosophy. Consequently the equality assertion cannot be assumed to refer to mental qualities. The document is altogether political; that is, it deals exclusively with rights. It is to be assumed, therefore, that in asserting the equality of men the declaration refers to equality of rights. In other words, that it means that men are created equal politically. Nor does this eminently sane construction rest wholly upon assumption. The assertion of human equality is made not only in

a distinctly political document, but specifically in a paragraph, and even in a sentence, in which "rights" is both the dominant idea and the dominant word. What the declaration means is that men are created with equal rights with reference to each other. If this assertion is false, its falsity must be proved by something more worthy of the human reasoning faculty than trifling references to differences in height, strength, mental qualities, weight, and so on. It must be shown that some men have a title by birth to rule over their fellows. Otherwise the assertion of the declaration of independence holds good.

Some of the magazines are renewing discussions of the theory that according to the religion of Christ in its purity only the poor can be saved. Naturally enough, objections to this theory are abundant. We see too much individual evil among those whom we call the poor, and too much individual good among those we account rich, to like the idea of salvation for the one class and indiscriminate damnation for the other. But does it follow that Christ's condemnation of riches was without religious basis? Must we soften the rigor of his words into allegory, or repudiate them altogether? To us it seems not. There is an explanation which, without doing violence to any really good impulse of the human soul, accords with Christ's merciless condemnation of riches. This explanation requires in the first place that we consider salvation and damnation not as judgments pronounced by some heavenly police court, but as the natural and necessary spiritual results of certain kinds of spiritual life. In the next place it requires a recognition, such as Henry George made in his posthumous book, of a scientific distinction between riches and poverty.

Mr. George distinguished riches as the power a man may have to get more than he earns, which in its last analysis is a power to extort unrequited labor from others. In that view of riches it is not very difficult to believe that the rich cannot be saved. The man whose income is unearned, be it great or small, and who likes that kind of income so well as to demand the perpetuation of the social conditions that make it possible and to use his influence to that end, is a rich man in the Christian sense—in the sense in which riches are condemned. Such a man cannot love his fellow man. Insisting as he does upon social institutions that rob them, he must be regarded not as loving but as hating his brother. How, then, can he possibly enter into the so-called heavenly life, which, if it means anything, means above all things else a life of brotherly love? There is a profound rational truth in the idea that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven.

Chinese news does not yet afford a basis for fair judgment as to either the merits of the difficulties or the duty of foreign governments. That foreigners have been murdered, and that foreign representatives are among the victims, are reasonably well-assured facts; but it is by no means clear that the Chinese government has participated in any outrages, or encouraged them, or been indifferent to them. On the contrary, all the news from the Chinese side which reaches us, and some from the other side, indicate that it has tried to perform its foreign obligations faithfully. There is no evidence thus far of any assault upon foreigners by Chinese soldiers or officials, or of any concert of action between Chinese soldiers and the mob, except in defense