

what authority is there for disregarding the sacred character of Saturday and setting up Sunday as the sacred day? What religious sanction is there, for instance, for approving baseball on Saturday because that day, once sacred, is so no longer, and condemning baseball on Sunday because that day, once secular, is sacred now?

Much ado is made in some quarters over the fact that Prof Andrews has abandoned the "silver heresy," which got him into trouble as president of Brown university during the first Bryan campaign. But it is very difficult to discover any "gold bug" capital in Prof. Andrews's recantation. He does not repudiate the quantitative theory of money, which is the crux of the silver question. All he does is to say that the unexpected supply of gold has furnished the additional quantity of money for which the coinage of silver was needed. So far from repudiating Bryanism with reference to the money question, Prof. Andrews confirms Bryan's position.

The density of the average mind whose possessors pride themselves upon standing for "sound money"—"sound money, sir, and respectability;" also the main chance—is one of the wonders of creation. To these minds the question of monetary soundness seems to have nothing whatever to do with the question of quantity. Whether or not the quantity of money makes any difference in the great problem of wealth distribution makes no difference to them. They are fetish worshipers all, to whom gold is a god and silver a devil. Now it is quite easy to understand why a man should oppose bimetallism if he does not believe in the quantitative theory of money. If he believes that the value of money is not increased by a small supply, provided it is large enough for the few transactions that are made in actual money, his opposition to bimetallism is comprehensible. Upon that theory, the

most general single standard may well be regarded as the best standard. The gold monometallist, therefore, who rejects the quantitative hypothesis is at any rate an intelligible opponent of abundant money. But the position of the quantitative theorist, when he opposes money abundance, is explicable only upon the suspicion that he is a creditor and expects to profit at the expense of the debtor, by a decline in commodity values. It certainly cannot be explained by any other logical process.

At a recent session of county auditors in Cleveland, assembled for the purpose of assessing railroads for taxation (p. 99), an attorney for one of the railroads, opposed to increasing its tax an objection which is really meritorious. Said he:

In all the 20 years of its existence this road never earned a cent, but lost thousands of dollars a year, until it was bought up by the B. & O. in 1895. Since then, by the hard work, industry and genius of those in charge of it, it has managed to come out a little ahead each year. Are you going to tax that genius, that industry? The road is worth no more than it ever was, practically, except that its earnings have increased.

If only the State of Ohio would agree to the righteous principle of taxation suggested by that railroad lawyer, how quickly Mayor Johnson's campaign for just taxation would come to an end. It is entirely true that industry, genius, earnings, ought not to be taxed. Only monopoly ought to be taxed. But there's the rub! However true it may be that the value of the particular railroad here in question is due to earnings, the fact is that a much smaller proportion of the value of most railroads is due to earnings than to monopoly. It is the right of way and terminal rights that usually count more than industry or genius (except the genius that conspires and the industry that grabs) in the value of railroad properties. And railroad monopolists are extremely solicitous to evade taxes on that kind of value. Those are the kind of taxes Mayor

Johnson is trying to increase upon them, and right well they know it.

There is a significance in the centenary celebration of Ralph Waldo Emerson which ought not to pass unnoticed. It has been said of him that in a materialistic age he recognized the pervasiveness and dominance of spirit. But our own time is more consciously and aggressively materialistic than his; and the sympathetic celebrations of his hundredth anniversary are by that much more significant of resistance to materialism than were his life and his work. This indirect acknowledgment of the supremacy of the ideal and the spiritual is only one of many gratifying evidences of the declining tendency of that materialistic philosophy which came to us out of the prattle of modern science in its infancy and has done so much toward making greed respectable and commercialism sordid.

One of the bequests of Emerson to mankind is very generally overlooked by those who sing his praises. It is not remarkable, perhaps, for he had many sides without much correlation. An admirer of Emerson may, therefore, very easily overlook gifts of his, which, had he been a man of brilliancy less divergent, could not possibly escape attention. The particular bequest here alluded to was finely described by William M. Salter in a paper read by him at the Emerson centennial of the Chicago Literary club on the 25th. Mr. Salter's subject was "Emerson as a Social Reformer." Anything like full quotations from Emerson on social questions would be too voluminous for our space, but a few brief ones may be given to indicate the direction of his mind on these matters, so much more momentous now than in his day.

When Emerson wrote of "property," it is evident that his thought turned, like that of the farmer or the real estate dealer, to "real property," and that his imagination, like theirs,

comprehended only the land and not its improvements. "I find," he writes in "The Conservative"—"I find this vast network which you call property, extending over the whole planet. I cannot occupy the bleakest crag of the White Hills or the Allegheny Range, but some man or corporation slips up to me to show me that it is his." In the same essay he makes the conservative say: "Touch any wood, or field, or house lot on your peril; but you may come and work in ours for us, and we will give you a piece of bread." In his "Man the Reformer," Emerson brings this thought to the logical and moral climax, for there he says: "Of course, while another man has no land, my title to mine, your title to yours, is at once vitiated." And in his essay "On the Times," he prophetically wrote of the spirit of progress as looking into the legal network of landed property and accusing "men of driving a trade in the great, boundless providence which has given the air, the water and the land to men to use and not to fence in and monopolize." In this connection four lines of Emerson's "Boston Hymn" must be forever memorable. They address themselves to that species of conscience before which hoary wrongs masquerade as "vested rights," that disordered conscience which protests in the name of justice against governments ceasing to do evil until the beneficiaries of the evil are compensated for the pecuniary loss they may suffer. Emerson wrote of chattel slavery, but his sentiment applies as well to the question of compensation for abolishing any other communal wrong:

Pay ransom to the owner  
And fill the bag to the brim.  
Who is the owner? The slave is  
owner,  
And ever was. Pay him.

"You think the manager is inconsistent, do you?"

"Why, yes! He tells the public he has the greatest clown on earth, and he tells me I'm not worth my salt."—Puck.

### IMPERIALISM AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

There seem to be many who have failed to recognize any practical connection between imperialism and the internal social problems of a country. We are apt to think of imperialism as affecting only the foreign policy of the nation, and thus we fail to see its relation to home affairs, except, of course, as it increases government expenditures.

If we seek to get below the surface of vanity and hurrah, and try seriously to discover the real philosophy of the imperialistic movement, what, let us ask, is the impelling motive? Think of what England has added to her territory since 1870: an area of 4,754,000 square miles and an estimated population of 88 millions! Why this immense expansion? What strong forces are back of it? Manifest destiny and Anglo-Saxon push are words: what is the thing? Mr. Hobson, an English writer, in his book, "Imperialism: A Study," has given the answer.

"It is not too much to say," he writes, "that the modern foreign policy of Great Britain is primarily a struggle for profitable markets of investment. To a larger extent every year Great Britain is becoming a nation living upon tribute from abroad, and the classes who enjoy this tribute have an ever increasing incentive to employ the public policy, the public purse, and the public force to extend the field of their private investments, and to safeguard and improve their existing investments."

In other words it is in the growth of concentrated capital and the consequent desire for profitable foreign trade and investment that we find the explanation of colonial expansion. It is for foreign markets and the exploitation of weaker peoples that battleships are multiplied, taxes increased, expenditures quadrupled, lives sacrificed, and principles trampled under foot. It is for extending trade influence at the behest of financial rulers that the natural spread of civilization and self-government is disregarded and a domineering tyranny established over unwilling subjects.

All this has become as true of

America as of England. We have not an equal necessity of looking abroad, because of our larger home market; but we are looking ahead. It may be that the home market of America still takes 96 per cent. of all manufactured articles, only 4 per cent. going to foreign markets; but already we find that the extension of foreign trade and the competition in foreign markets are begetting and fostering our imperialism. And at the same time, as has been the case in England, they are beginning to be used as an argument for resisting the demands of laborers for better pay and shorter hours. This argument is being dinned into the ears of British workingmen, and in due time it will be dinned more and more into the ears of American workingmen. Furthermore, the same argument is used to excuse the monopolistic methods of trusts. In an article, for example, in one of the current reviews, a writer concludes a lengthy discussion of the Standard Oil Company by telling how this company sells about 60 per cent of the oil exported, how its power at home enables it to compete in foreign fields, and how it sells abroad at a lower price than at home only where it comes into competition with Russia in the eastern market.

But in a still more intimate way the purpose and methods of imperialism connect themselves with social problems at home. Readers of *The Public* may, perhaps, remember a book on Poverty reviewed some time since in these columns. It was a minute study of the English city of York, in which place the author found that over 40 per cent. of the population were virtually paupers. Now suppose England, instead of overwhelming the Boers, had given her thought and effort to enabling these people to become purchasers of her goods! Well does Mr. Hobson speak of the "absurdity of spending half our financial resources in fighting to secure foreign markets at a time when hungry mouths, ill-clad backs, ill-furnished houses, indicate countless unsatisfied material wants among our own population." Imperialism turns its back on these conditions in the home market. It does not seek to increase this market by