

THE GOSPEL OF JESUS
AND THE
PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRACY

VEDDER

THE GOSPEL OF JESUS
AND THE PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRACY

THE GOSPEL OF JESUS
AND THE PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRACY



THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO
DALLAS · ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

THE GOSPEL OF JESUS

AND

The Problems of Democracy

BY

HENRY C. VEDDER

PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
AND AUTHOR OF "SOCIALISM AND THE ETHICS OF JESUS,"
"THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY," ETC.

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1914

COPYRIGHT, 1914

By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Set up and electrotyped. Published September, 1914

TO
THE MILLIONS WHO TOIL
WITHOUT HOPE
THAT THE THOUSANDS MAY ENJOY
WITHOUT THOUGHT

COPYRIGHT, 1914
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Set up and electrotyped. Published September, 1914

TO
THE MILLIONS WHO TOIL
WITHOUT HOPE
THAT THE THOUSANDS MAY ENJOY
WITHOUT THOUGHT

PREFACE

THE man who to-day proclaims the Gospel of Jesus in the spirit of his Master must expect misunderstanding, abuse and perhaps persecution. Why not? Shall the disciple be above his Master?

Still in heaven's name the deeds of hell are done :
Still on the high-road, 'neath the noonday sun
The fires of hate are lit for them who dare
Follow their Lord along the untrodden way.

I am not suprised or disquieted, therefore, that I am accused of being a dangerous heretic. And it is with no expectation of getting rid of that reputation that I here protest that I have no quarrel with orthodoxy. The kernel of it I believe to be truth, as firmly as the most orthodox. I find nothing false in it, save that kind of falsity which results from a laying of the emphasis in the wrong place. The change of emphasis that I urge, from the metaphysics of Paul to the ethics of Jesus, involves such a difference of perspective, such a readjustment of magnitudes and values, as appears like heresy to the more conservative. But after a time they will learn to make the adjustment, and will perceive that nothing valued by the old orthodoxy has been lost, though its form may have been not a little altered.

We need a reconstructed theology. The theology of all Churches has been dominated by monarchical ideas: it needs to be recast in the mould of democracy. It has been permeated with ideas of special privilege, such as were unavoidable when aristocracy ruled the world; it needs to be restated in terms of equal rights. As my critics kindly remind me, I am no theologian; nevertheless I have endeavored to make a modest contribution to such restatement.

Some readers will detect an inconsistency. They will say, at least to themselves: "Here is a man who advocates one thing and does another. He condemns the wage system, yet works for a salary. He is strong against monopolies, yet copyrights his book. He declares all dividends and interest immoral, yet is supported from the income of endowments invested in stocks, bonds and mortgages." All of which is a true bill. And therefore here is a good place to emphasize a thing that should never be overlooked in our discussion of social evils: the individual is powerless in the grip of the social system. He has to live his life under social conditions as they are, not as he thinks they should be, not as he hopes they will be. This is just as true of the millionaire as of the wage earner. The individual is powerless, *except* (and note the exception, for it is a large one) that he is morally bound, while reluctantly accepting facts as they are, to protest against them with all his power, and strive as best he may to amend them. Inconsistency will become a serious charge when the individual has the power to be consistent. In present social conditions, only that

man is to be esteemed ethically culpable who acquiesces in a social system that he knows to be iniquitous and eagerly uses its iniquities to advance his own interests.

Some readers of my "Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus," while commending certain features of it, remarked that it was too much given to glittering generalities, and afforded too little help to those who honestly wish to do something toward the betterment of the social order, but do not know where or how to begin. Something more "practical," it was intimated, was a desideratum. In this book I have tried to be practical.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE GOSPEL AND THE AWAKENING CHURCH	I
II. THE PROBLEM OF SOCIAL JUSTICE	48
III. THE WOMAN PROBLEM	85
IV. THE PROBLEM OF THE CHILD	108
V. THE PROBLEM OF THE SLUM	148
VI. THE PROBLEM OF VICE	182
VII. THE PROBLEM OF CRIME	216
VIII. THE PROBLEM OF DISEASE	250
IX. THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY	282
X. THE PROBLEM OF LAWLESSNESS	332
APPENDIX: A. BIBLIOGRAPHY; B. PROGRAMS FOR SOCIAL REFORM	377

THE GOSPEL OF JESUS
AND THE PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRACY

THE GOSPEL OF JESUS

CHAPTER I

THE GOSPEL AND THE AWAKENING CHURCH

“IN the fulness of the times, God sent forth his Son,” said Paul. However wide scope may be given to these words by an interpreter, they cannot be taken to mean less than a process of social and religious development among the Hebrew people, of which the Gospel was the culmination. It follows that the Gospel cannot be adequately understood, if studied apart from the conditions out of which it sprang.

I

Before their entrance into Canaan the Hebrews had been a collection of tribes or clans, twelve in number, according to their unbroken and uncontradicted tradition. They believed themselves to be descendants of a common ancestor, and hence bound together by those ties of kinship that have always been so powerful among primitive peoples. They had been nomads, but in their new home a part became cultivators of the

soil, while another part dwelt in towns and were for the first time made acquainted with civilization, the art of living together in cities, with all that such life implies, whether of virtue or of vice. Private property in land now developed among them, as it usually does when a nomadic people becomes agricultural. A careful study of the book of Judges discloses these social changes among the Hebrews of that period.

Then came the period of the kings. The Hebrew kingdom, like all Oriental monarchies, was a military despotism, maintained by a standing army, the nucleus of which was a small body of foreign mercenaries.¹ The throne also relied on a landed aristocracy, which owed its special privileges to royal favor and in turn gave its support to its benefactor. Samuel had warned the people that such would be their experience:

“And he [the king] will take your fields and your vineyards and your olive-yards, the best of them, and give them to his servants; and he will take the tenth of your seed and of your vineyards, and give to his officers and to his servants; and your male and female slaves and your goodliest young men and your asses, he will take and put to his work; he will take the tenth of your sheep; and ye shall be his servants.” (1 Sam. 8:15-17.)

¹ The Gittites and their leader Ittai (2 Sam. 15:18-22) seem to have been such a band. Benaiah is later mentioned as commander of similar forces (2 Sam. 20:23). The “mighty men” of David (2 Sam. 23:8) were probably officers of such troops. It was Benaiah who secured Solomon his throne (1 K. 1:8-11, 32-34, 44-46). These *gibborim*, as the main instruments of the kings in maintaining their supremacy and doing injustice, were hated by the prophets (Hos. 10:13, 14; Am. 2:14-16; Is. 3:1-3).

By such means David and Solomon came to the throne; by such means they were kept in power—no wonder there was a revolution after the latter's death. But the revolution did not improve matters much. The history of the Hebrews down to the captivity is a story of the growth of royal and aristocratic power at the expense of the people. The great landed estates increased rapidly, and the peasant-farmers were reduced to poverty, the status of "hired servants," or slavery (2 K. 4:1).¹

This gave occasion for a social struggle the traces of which are clearly marked in the writings of the prophets. Ahab's seizing of Naboth's vineyard may be regarded as no unusual outrage, unless that it was unusually conspicuous (1 K. 21). The prophets bitterly denounced this oppression:

Woe to those who devise mischief
 And work out evil on their beds! . . .
 And they covet fields and seize them;
 And houses and take them away:
 And they oppress a man and his house,
 Even a man and his heritage (Mi. 3:1, 2).

¹The tenth commandment is an unimpeachable witness to the antiquity of slavery among the Hebrews. The words "man servant" and "maid servant" in our English version translate the Hebrew words for male and female slaves. They could be "coveted" only because they were property. The same is true of the wife. The form of the commandment is only possible in a patriarchal society, where the wife was a man's property equally with his chattels and slaves.

Jehovah enters into judgment with the elders of his people

And with the princes thereof:

“It is ye that have devoured the vineyard;

The plunder of the poor is in your houses” (Is. 3:14).

Woe unto those who join house to house,

Who add field to field until there is no room,

And ye are made to dwell alone in the midst of the land
(Is. 5:8).

Ezekiel rebukes the ruling class for their greed: “And the prince shall not take of the people’s inheritance by oppression to eject them from their possession; he shall give an inheritance to his sons out of his own possession; that my people be not scattered every man from his possession” (46:18). Even kinship did not prevent exploitation (Mi. 7:2; Is. 9:19; Jer. 9:4). An interesting incident in the struggle is the protest against private property in land made by the Rechabites, the significance of whose prolonged separate existence has been curiously missed by Christian students of the Bible. It is a pity to spoil the thousands of temperance sermons that have been preached from Jer. 35:6-10, but the story has nothing whatever to do with temperance, and everything to do with this agrarian struggle among the Jews. Jondab, the son of Rechab, gave this command to his children:

Ye shall not drink wine, neither ye nor your sons forever; neither shall ye build house, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyards, nor shall ye possess any; but all your days

shall ye dwell in tents; that ye may live many days in the land where ye sojourn.

The injunction to drink no wine, as is clear from the accompanying injunction, was based solely on the idea that the drinking of wine was a recognition of the right to plant vineyards, which again was inseparable from owning land. For the same reason the Rechabites might not sow seed or build house, since these equally implied recognition of property in land. They were to revert to the nomad life of their forefathers, and renounce ownership of the soil, even right of occupation and use.

We better appreciate the intensity of feeling shown by the prophets when we realize that they came from the exploited class. Elijah came from the hill country of Gilead, Elisha from a village of Ephraim, Amos from Tekoa in Judah, and Micah and Jeremiah from villages of the same region. They represented the peasantry, the tillers of the soil, the keepers of the sheep, the class that was suffering most from the exactions of the rich and powerful land-owning nobles. It is this "class-consciousness," as it is the fashion now to call it, which puts the caloric into these words of Isaiah:

Ye shall no longer trample my courts to bring oblations;
Vain is incense, it is an abomination to me. . . .

Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul
hates. . . .

Wash you, make you clean;

Put away the evil of your doings from mine eyes;

Cease to do evil.
Learn to do good,
Seek out justice,
Set right the oppressor.
Judge the orphan,
Plead for the widow (1:11-17).

And these like words from Amos:

I hate, I despise your feasts,
And I take no delight in your festivals. . . .
Take away from me the noise of thy songs,
For I will not hear the melody of thy harps.
But let justice roll down like waters,
And righteousness like an unfailing stream (5:21, 23,
24).

And Micah is "very bold" when he says:

With what shall I come before Jehovah,
And bow myself before God on high?
Shall I come before him with burnt offerings,
With calves of a year old?
Will Jehovah be pleased with thousands of rams,
Or with ten thousands of rivers of oil?
Shall I give my first-born for my transgression,
The fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?
He has told thee, O man, what is good;
And what does Jehovah require of thee,
But to do justice, and to love mercy,
And to walk humbly with thy God? (6:6-8).

The two great words of the prophetic literature of the Hebrews are "justice" and "righteousness," and

the prophets insist with endless iteration that formal piety is no substitute for these in the eyes of Jehovah. Both are social words; both have to do with social relations; together they inculcate on the son of Israel such conduct as is due from him to his blood brother, son of a common father, according to the old ethics of the clan.

Along with this social struggle went the religious: the contest between the exclusive worship of Jehovah, and the coördinate worship of the Baalim, or gods of the region before the Hebrew invasion. The royal house and the aristocracy were inclined to a "liberal" policy; they made frequent alliances, political and matrimonial, with the heathen, the result of which was to admit the worship of Baalim as subordinate gods—to establish, in fact, a Hebrew pantheon in which Jehovah should hold some such position as Zeus and Jupiter held in the Greek and Roman systems. The wronged peasant-farmer class was, as a whole, faithful to Jehovah and his exclusive worship. Hence the prophets mingle, in almost equal proportions, denunciations of the idolatry of the ruling class and of their social injustice. In both they are sinning against Jehovah. In the prophetic literature, the identification of the social and the religious struggle is nearly complete, if not quite.

The positive side of the prophetic teaching was the announcement of a twofold message: first, Jehovah would punish this double iniquity of the rich and powerful. The monarchy would disappear, and Jerusalem would be destroyed, unless the rulers returned

to Jehovah and caused justice to prevail. The captivity fulfilled this prediction and brought the fierce social and religious struggle to an end. The second element in the prophetic message was that a Deliverer would arise, a Prince who would reign according to the will of Jehovah; and glowing pictures were drawn of the glory, righteousness, peace and prosperity that all should experience in this new kingdom. From this point we trace the development of that Messianic hope, that idea of Redemption, which is the unique feature of Judaism, differentiating it unmistakably from all other ancient religious systems. The Bible is the history of Redemption and the Gospel is the culmination of the story—Saviour is the distinctive Christian word, and salvation the distinctive Christian idea.

The prophetic idea of Redemption is two-sided: the individual is to be redeemed from sin to righteousness, and society is to be redeemed from injustice and oppression to social righteousness. But of these two ideas, no reader of the prophets can deny that the latter is made incomparably the more vivid and emphatic. Yet when the Jews came back from captivity to rebuild Jerusalem, the prophets and their teachings no longer swayed their minds. They came back convinced monotheists, indeed, loyal to Jehovah as the only God, but they came aristocrats also. The prophets were thenceforth relegated to second place among their religious writings, the first place of authority being given to the Torah, or law, which established the privileges and prerogatives of the priesthood on a secure foundation. Thenceforth a priestly caste ruled

the nation. An intellectual basis for their growing encroachments was furnished by the rise of the Rabbis, the teachers and interpreters of the law; and was further completed by the synagogue, designed primarily for the teaching of the law in every Jewish community.

The farmer-peasants had probably never been deported in large numbers, especially from Galilee; and there was now a recrudescence of the social struggle. There is a moving picture of the social distress of the people in Nehemiah V, and of the effort at reform made by him, which probably had only a temporary effect. We lack full materials for the study of this struggle, but the clear-eyed can discern plain evidence of its continuance in the Jewish apocryphal books, especially Maccabees and the Wisdom of Sirach. The growing doctrine of Messianism among the Jews during this period is testimony, both to the bitterness of the struggle and to the encouragement given to the oppressed by this hope. In Galilee, among the peasantry, the Messianic idea seems to have taken the form mainly of hope of social deliverance. In Jerusalem, among the aristocracy, especially after the loss of independence and subjection to Rome, the Messianic hope assumed a political form and was intensely anti-Roman.

The limitations of these ideas that we have been tracing, as they prevailed among the Jews in the time of Jesus, must also be understood if we would get a full comprehension of the Gospel. Jehovah was the Father of Israel, but only the creator of other men.

The Jews were a chosen people, having a relation to Jehovah that no other people could possibly sustain. Redemption, whether of the individual or of society, was for Jews alone. Messiah would sway his scepter over all the nations, but to break them in pieces and make them subject to the Jew.¹ Social justice was justice owed from Jew to Jew, because all Jews were brothers by descent from Abraham. It is the old clan idea of justice, essentially unmodified, that we find throughout the Old Testament. This explains what would otherwise be incomprehensible ethics. The Jew might not take interest from his "neighbor," that is, another Jew, but might lend at interest to a foreigner (Deut. 23: 19, 20; Ex. 22: 25-27). Jews must not eat anything that died of itself, but might give it to a stranger in the gates or sell it to a foreigner (Deut. 14: 21). Jews must not hold each other in slavery, at most after six years a Jewish slave must be freed (Ex. 21: 2), but they might buy of foreigners and hold them slaves forever (Lev. 25: 44-46). Jeremiah stresses this principle heavily, and clearly implies that violation of such brotherly rights was one of the crying sins of his times (34: 8, 9).

No ideas of God sustaining equal relations to all men, of a Redemption for the whole world, of human rights apart from clan rights, can be found in the Judaism in which Jesus was bred.

¹ Ps. 2: 8, 9; Dan. 2: 44; Ps. 47: 2-4. There are occasional glimpses of wider outlook in the prophets (Is. 19: 19-25; Zech. 8: 22, 23), but they never became popular, never were embodied in the system that we know as Judaism.

II

Into such a nation as this, himself bred under the influence of such ideas, came Jesus proclaiming the Good News of a deliverance for all men. Of the various ideas contained in his Gospel, the fundamental thing was the ideal of God that he made known. God is the one Being who is good, the fountain of all goodness. And "good" means the same when Jesus predicates it of God, as when we ascribe goodness to man—that is, it is the same in quality; God's goodness differs from man's only in degree, in extent. When we have formed our highest ideal of goodness, God corresponds to that ideal, yet exceeds it. He has every excellence that we can conceive, without any alloy of evil, in the highest possible energy.

All accounts of Jesus make it plain that he was conscious of perfect moral integrity; he challenged his opponents to point out any defect in character or conduct. That on one occasion he refused to be called "good" (Mark 10:18), may argue that he was conscious of being temptable, and therefore of needing prayer and communion with God such as would keep him ever in accord with his Father's will, but is in no way incompatible with an unclouded consciousness that his loyal allegiance was in fact unbroken. Jesus makes the sweeping claim that he, he alone, has complete knowledge of the Father (Luke 10:21-24), that he alone is capable of imparting such knowledge to those willing to receive it. This is his claim to su-

premacny as religious teacher, and the ground of the demand that he makes for trust in him, or faith. To confess him or to deny him is a matter of transcendent importance, because it determines a man's moral standing (Luke 12:8). This is also why a loyal follower of Jesus can admit no other to be his equal in spiritual authority, can place the words of no other teacher on a level with his.

Jesus proclaimed God a Being whose nature can be best expressed in the one phrase, "holy love," and can be made clearest to us under the figure of Fatherhood. Greek philosophy made men acquainted with a metaphysical Deity; Jesus introduced men to a Heavenly Father. He first taught us to call God "Our Father who art in Heaven." This Father in Heaven he did not hesitate to explain by representing an earthly father at his best, as in the parable of the Prodigal Son. There is no room in that parable for the idea of a God who is angry with the wicked and hates them, or a forgiveness of sins that depends on the propitiation of a stern Judge by a vicarious bearing of the punishment due. These things may be conceived of a metaphysical Deity, not of a Father-God.

Jesus taught his disciples to pray to this Father in Heaven, "Thy will be done, as in heaven so on earth." But what is God's will? Fantastic answers have been given to that question by speculative theologians, but in the light of the teaching of Jesus about his Father the one possible reply is: the will of a Being whose nature is holy love can be nothing else than to make and keep all his creatures like himself. It is the will

of God that his goodness shall prevail in earth as in Heaven. Hence the salvation that Jesus came to give men must consist, not in deliverance from a penalty, not in appeasing a Judge, but in helping men to become good, to become like their Father in Heaven. It is not attainment of formal "justification," but impartation of new character, the power of an endless life. This is the heart of the Good News that Jesus proclaimed and that he sent his disciples out into the world to teach in his name.

But as Jesus revealed God under the figure of Fatherhood, so he described his own mission under a figure: he said to men, "The kingdom of God is at hand." He declared that he was the anointed (Messiah) of God for the purpose of establishing this kingdom. And in discourses and parables, by word and deed, he made clear to his disciples what he meant by this kingdom, what sort of men were to be its subjects, and what it was fitted to accomplish in the world. If we would know what the Gospel of Jesus really means, therefore, we must study his teachings regarding the kingdom.

Jesus taught that his kingdom is both spiritual and material, both visible and invisible; it comes first in the hearts of men, but it becomes manifest in their lives. It is so different from the kingdoms of this world, so contrary to the ordinary desires and instincts of men, as to demand entire reconstruction of character, complete reversal of thought and purpose. And this Jesus again describes under a figure: such a change is tantamount to new birth. This must come

from above; man cannot effect so great an alteration in himself; a Power not himself that makes for righteousness must establish in him this love of righteousness. Hence Jesus adds, only the meek, the teachable, the childlike in spirit can enter the kingdom; the proud, the wise in their own conceit, the self-centered are not excluded from the kingdom—they exclude themselves. This new life, this new character, is the beginning of God-likeness; it is the first step in the process of growing into the Father's goodness; and this possibility of goodness, this approach to the character of the one perfectly good Being, constitutes salvation. It is the only way in which man can be delivered from the power of evil.

“Thy kingdom come, thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth.” When we utter these words we pray for the coming of a society of all those who seek the doing of God's will, a society all of whose institutions shall be ordered according to the will of God. Fundamental in that will is the doing of justice between man and man. The distinction between sins against our brother and sins against God is possible only in thought, and perhaps should be considered impossible even there; in fact, a sin against our brother is a sin against God. That basic truth invalidates most of our current ethics, and quite as much of our current theology. It entirely discredits the evangelism of the past, and calls for a new evangel. Men used to be converted to God alone, and think it quite sufficient; now they must be converted to God and their fellows, or we can no longer recognize them as converted.

And half of those who call themselves Christians—and this is speaking very moderately—have never been converted to their fellows. This is righteous judgment, because the same who said, “Judge not, that ye be not judged,” said also, “Therefore by their fruits ye shall know them.”

In his teaching regarding the kingdom Jesus therefore proclaimed a social revolution, but not by violence. The acceptance of his precepts would now as then lead to a complete overturning and reconstruction of social institutions, but peacefully and in the spirit of mutual good will. This teaching of revolution and rejection of force explains why Jesus was popular in Galilee and hated in Judea—the Messianic ideas of these two regions greatly differed. The wisdom of his program was vindicated by the later history of the Jews: it was a violent attempt at revolution that caused the destruction of Jerusalem and the scattering of the Jewish nation. His teaching has also been vindicated by the uncounted attempts of his misguided disciples to set up by violence the kingdom whose essence is righteousness and peace and inward joy. In all such cases men have found that they who take the sword will perish by the sword.

Neither his own age nor any of the ages that followed could comprehend such a Gospel as Jesus taught. Even the faith of the prophet who first saw in Jesus the Hope of Israel seems to have wavered, for he sent messengers to ask, “Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?” The reply of Jesus has been criticized as an evasion of John’s question

(Luke 7: 19-23), and such it may seem to the careless reader. In view of all the circumstances it was equivalent to saying: "I am not the political Messiah whom many expect, but my works show that I am the Servant of Jehovah whom his most spiritual prophet described. Happy the man who can see me for what I am, and is not disturbed because I do not correspond to his preconceived ideal." What answer could have been more to the point, or more comforting to the imprisoned Baptist? We must recollect that the Oriental habit is to reply to a query indirectly, not in the blunt, direct Western fashion.

The spirit of the Gospel was never set forth more clearly, even by Jesus himself, than in his address in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke 4: 18, 19). The lesson of the day was from Isaiah, 61:1, 2:

The Spirit of Jehovah is upon me,
 Because he anointed me to preach good news to the poor;
 He has sent me to proclaim deliverance to captives,
 And recovering of sight to blind men,
 To send crushed ones away free,
 To proclaim an acceptable year of Jehovah.

"To-day," said Jesus, "has this Scripture been fulfilled in your ears." The Gospel means liberty, it is glad tidings to the poor, it is deliverance of all who are in bondage. A Christianity that does not mean this has become divorced from the teaching of its Founder, and no longer is worthy of his name. Jesus refused to have his Glad Tidings, his joyous, hopeful message of deliverance, wrapped in the swaddling-

clothes of rabbinic ceremonialism. Fasting and sadness were as incompatible with his work and proclamation of new truth as they would be at a bridal feast. There was nothing in common between the old legalistic system and the new ideas of God and life that he taught.

Freedom, equality, brotherhood, are the watchwords of the new faith, yet the disciples of Jesus have ill learned this, while others have not perceived it at all, or have perceived only to reject with scorn. Among the latter is Nietzsche. "Christianity," said he, "is the revolt of all that creeps upon the ground against what is elevated." Precisely: it is the revolt of democracy against aristocracy. Christianity as Jesus taught it, the Gospel as he declared it, is just that, and what the small-souled philosopher thought its disgrace is its glory. But Christianity as practiced to-day is something vastly different; if it has not gone over to the aristocracy, as some charge, it has trimmed between the two, ashamed to desert democracy altogether, while its heart has been in the opposite camp. Or, to change the figure, the Church has been trying to ride two horses, and as democracy and aristocracy get further apart every day, pretty soon something is going to drop.

Brotherhood is on the whole the greatest of the Gospel watchwords. Jesus taught that the members of the kingdom are brothers, because they are all children of one Father. He who cannot see in other men his brothers has no warrant from Jesus to call God his Father. The two things are inseparable. All

men are, actually or potentially, brothers to a disciple of Jesus. That a man is "saved" means that he has begun to see a brother in every other man, that he is beginning to love his fellows as God loves them; and in practice that means that he give to every other man the treatment of a brother. This is the very heart of the Gospel, as Jesus expressed it in his twin precept, "Thou shalt love thy God with all thy heart" and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

And how searching a test of the reality of this love Jesus gives us: "If thou art offering thy gift at the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." That is a simple but decisive method by which any one may decide whether he is possessed by the spirit of love that Jesus taught: Am I more disturbed by the wrong that I do my fellow than by the wrong that I suffer from him? If my brother has aught against me, if I have done him a wrong, I must make myself right with him before I try to get right with God, says Jesus. The process cannot be reversed. How different this is from the spirit of paganism, which regarded it as the highest eulogy of a dead man to say of him that none had done more good to his friends or harm to his foes. "But I say unto you," said Jesus, "love your enemies, do good to them that hate you."

Love requires not only that we right the wrongs we have done, but that we forgive the wrongs done us. Jesus taught his disciples to pray, "Forgive us

our debts, as we have forgiven our debtors." God's forgiveness is not mere remission of penalty, but admission to a new experience of his love; and this is impossible until the spirit of love takes possession of our hearts and rules us. This duty of forgiveness is put in its most striking form in the parable of the two servants—he who will receive forgiveness must bestow forgiveness. And yet, one of the saddest things about moral evil is that we cannot always forgive our brother: the possibility of forgiveness is limited by the receptiveness of others. The heart so calloused by wrong-doing that it has lost its susceptibility, and no longer responds to the voice of love, cannot be forgiven, because it has become incapable of receiving forgiveness. If men will not accept love it cannot be forced upon them, and there is no way in which an offense may be blotted out so long as the offender will not let it go.

III

The Gospel on its practical side is brotherhood. The content of this idea is large, but it cannot be supposed to mean less than these four things: equal rights for all, the supremacy of the common good, mutual dependence and service, and active good will to all.

Equal rights for all. The Gospel of Jesus is pure democracy. Jesus trusted the people as completely as the greater part of those who teach in his name distrust them. Many fancy themselves democrats be-

cause, as they say, they believe in "the rule of the people"; but these are half-hearted democrats who, on cross-examination, avow their belief in the rule of the people, not by the people themselves, but "by a representative part of the people," wiser and better fitted to rule than the whole people. A genuine democrat is one who believes heartily in the whole people and rejoices that he is one of them. If there was a "lower class" in the day of Jesus, he belonged to it; if there were any "common people," he was one of them. The true disciple of Jesus offers the Pharisee's prayer, with the negative omitted: "O God, I thank thee that I am as other men are." He gladly shares the common lot.

One of Abraham Lincoln's truest sayings was: "No man is good enough to govern another man without that man's consent." It is easier, as all human experience shows, to educate a democracy to govern itself, than to train a "better class" to rule the rest of the people. Power is corrupting except when diffused. When everybody has as much power as anybody, tyranny and corruption vanish together. It is no question of a vicious aristocracy—every class is vicious. The working class is no more righteous, no more worthy to bear rule, than any other, and only flatterers and deceivers tell the working class otherwise. The three-cornered struggle now in progress between organizations, each claiming to represent the true interests of the workers, is testimony irrefutable that the workers yield to the temptations of class selfishness as quickly as any other class. The trades unions of

the American Federation of Labor are a labor aristocracy that looks with disdain on the interests of the unskilled labor of the Industrial Workers of the World, while the Socialist Party claims to have at heart the interests of both, but is in imminent danger of failing to gain the confidence of either. There is no way out of the labyrinth but the way of Jesus: the Gospel of brotherhood and equal rights.

"Democracy is a failure," cry some faint-hearted Americans. Pseudo-democracy or semi-democracy has failed, beyond a doubt. When our Federal Constitution was adopted, of a population of three millions about one hundred and twenty thousand were qualified voters. Democracy indeed! Real democracy, real political democracy even, has never yet had existence in America, much less trial, though it is now beginning to prevail; and industrial democracy is still only a dream of the time to be. But pseudo-democracy, failure though it is, has accomplished everything of value, everything that will endure, in the development of America. What may we not expect from a century of real democracy, equal rights for all?

The supremacy of the common good. This negates all selfish striving, all merely personal ambition. It strikes at the root of all modern business enterprise, the end of which is personal profit without regard to the common good. Jesus called the concentrated wealth of his time Mammon, and said plainly to those who would be his disciples, "You cannot serve God and Mammon." But his Church to-day

knows better ; it serves both—God with the lip, Mammon with the heart. It cannot be denied : that bastard, cringing, sycophantic thing that our age calls Christianity is nothing else than the organized worship of Mammon. Mammon is the god of this present world, and all who desire to increase their material possessions rather than their spiritual, all who are actuated by ambition rather than by love, all who would be greatest rather than least, rule rather than serve, are his willing worshipers and slaves. Righteousness, truth and love are foolishness to Mammon ; they are an impractical ideal ; there is no profit in them. But in the sight of Jesus they are the whole of life, all that makes life worth living. Mammon urges men to multiply their possessions ; Jesus urges men to enrich their souls. Mammon is property, and that the world may move forward and upward Mammon must fall. For Mammon is the parent of typhoid and tuberculosis ; Mammon drives our daughters into prostitution and our sons into prison ; Mammon builds the slum and populates it ; Mammon permits some to feast sumptuously and to play, while it compels others to toil and sweat and gnaw crusts ; Mammon creates the conflict of classes and prepares revolutions ; Mammon is the arch-enemy of God and man.

How futile, in view of this teaching of Jesus, is most of what passes for religion. “To such a pass has the Church come that it fights under the banner of Jesus against his Gospel. It wields the sword of the spirit—to quench all that is spiritual. It uses the word of God—in order to falsify the divine. It is

pious, but its piety is godlessness.”¹ The man who piously trusts in the blood of Jesus to save him,² but owns a tenement on which there is no fire escape, will find that the blood of Jesus was shed in vain, so far as he is concerned, if that house burns and destroys the lives of its inmates. For that man is nothing less than a murderer, and a far greater criminal than the man who in passion takes the life of his fellow, for he slays in cold blood and for mere sordidness. That sort of faith without works is the deadest of all things that profess to be spiritual. The Christianity of our day is mainly of that type; it is a Christianity of ostentatious orthodoxy, of large professions, that scorns the real Gospel of Jesus. The hard self-righteousness of the Christian world rules it out of the kingdom of brotherhood. Now, as of old, it is easier to bring the Prodigal home than to soften the proud elder son and make him a true child of his gracious Father.

Mutual dependence and service. Jesus could not grant their mother’s prayer for the sons of Zebedee, and place them on his right hand and his left in the

¹ Kutter, “They Must,” p. 53.

² The late J. Pierpont Morgan inserted in his will the following profession of faith: “I commit my soul into the hands of my Saviour, in full confidence that, having redeemed it and washed it in His most precious blood, He will present it faultless before the throne of my Heavenly Father; and I entreat my children to maintain and defend, at all hazard, and at any cost of personal sacrifice, the blessed doctrine of complete atonement of sin through the blood of Jesus Christ once offered, and through that alone.” This was hailed by the orthodox religious press as “a wonderful testimony.” It was.

kingdom, because these seats were not to be given away as a favor, being reserved as a reward for service. The high places are for those who seek the good of others, not their own—for those who drink their Master's cup of sacrifice, for those who are baptized with the baptism of his vicarious suffering.

This is what Jesus meant by his teaching regarding stewardship. He taught men that they do not own, but owe; that their rights are far less important than their duties. Power, wealth, learning, are not means of ministering to one's selfishness, but opportunities for the service of one's fellows. Those who have most must serve most. The greatest in the kingdom is he that makes fullest and wisest use of his opportunities and rises to eminence as servant of all. Stewardship is the exact opposite of exploitation, the selfish using of one's fellows to advance one's own interest and increase one's own wealth. Stewardship is as exactly opposed also to the selfishness of the idle rich, who devote all their energies to "pleasure"—and secure only their own boredom.

Brotherhood does not imply that all men shall serve in the same way, or that the service of all is equally valuable; but brotherhood does imply that all shall serve. The man who refuses to serve denies his brotherhood and puts himself outside the pale of human society. There is no place for such a man in a rightly ordered world. He is the true outlaw, and by his own act. This is the teaching of Jesus. His disciples must proclaim and exemplify it, and let

Nietzsche rage and Bernard Shaw imagine a vain thing.

Active good-will to all. This is the "altruism," of which Comte and all whom he has influenced have had so much to say. But Paul long anticipated Comte, when he said, "Let every man look not upon his own things, but also upon the things of others." And Jesus was before Paul, declaring, as the highest ideal of men in their social relations, "Whatsoever things ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." The ideal of brotherhood is not merely to abstain from doing evil to men, but actively to do them good. And the Gospel of Jesus inflexibly maintains this as the practical side of religion, without which no piety is of least avail. "For if a man love not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" The principle is as sweeping as it obviously is true. And here is one application of it that every man should heed: If a man does not realize, abominate, repent and forsake his sins against his brother whom he has seen, how can he have any genuine realization of sin against a God whom he has not seen; and how can he repent sin unrealized?

IV

But why call this a new Gospel? Has not this always been understood to be the teaching of Jesus, and has it not always been preached? The words have indeed been declared, but the declaration has

been accompanied by explanations and exceptions that have practically evacuated them of all meaning. There has been formal profession of belief in the teachings of Jesus, while Christians have shown by their conduct that they have never understood his precepts, and so far as they have understood have made but the feeblest attempt to obey them. The new idea of the Gospel is to press home the duty of full obedience.

For Jesus shows plainly in his kingdom teaching that he did not have in mind merely or chiefly the salvation of individuals, but a social ideal. He comprehended, as his followers have not comprehended until lately, that salvation of the individual is all but impossible, so long as he is dealt with merely as an individual; and that a Gospel that deals with men as individuals accomplishes only a partial salvation. The Christianity of Jesus, with its fundamental conception of a Heavenly Father, and all men brothers in his great family, is a social religion. The Christianity that has prevailed for centuries, enthroning a Sovereign in the heavens, who rules according to law, imposes penalties for disobedience and deals with men as individual violators of law, is a religion not only quite different from that of Jesus, but utterly incompatible with his.

And Jesus understood, just as we are coming to understand, that his idea of universal brotherhood, wherever it operates and just so far as it operates, effects the transformation of human relations, and therefore of social institutions. As men progress in

goodness, that is, in likeness to God, the desire to sacrifice self for others will take larger place in their lives, selfishness will be driven out, and those social institutions that rest on selfishness will give place to relations that rest on unselfish love and are inspired by mutual good-will. The Gospel of Jesus declares in no uncertain sound that, until a man begins to show this divine spirit in his daily life, he does not know the meaning of salvation. And to say that the honest acceptance of this Gospel by the professed followers of Jesus would transform society is not speaking lightly or unadvisedly. "It is useless to nurse any illusions," says Pouget; "the day when it would be tried to introduce into social relations, in all their strata, a strict honesty and a scrupulous good will, nothing would remain standing—neither industry nor commerce nor finance—absolutely nothing."¹ The bona fide application of the Golden Rule for a week by everybody would so change the world that it would be simply unrecognizable. But we do not live under the Golden Rule; we live under the rule of gold.

The current Christianity is not consistent even in its individualism. The Gospel of Jesus has much to teach it regarding the worth of the individual man, and thereby takes issue anew with modern industrialism and certain dachshund² economists. "How much then is a man of more value than a sheep," said Jesus.

¹ "Sabotage," p. 87.

² The dachshund has been described as "a dog-and-a-half long and half-a-dog high," which irresistibly suggests those economists whose extent of knowledge about things material so markedly exceeds their moral height.

But the modern capitalist knows better ; he says, "How much then is a man of less value than a mule," and in his mines he takes good care of his mules, while he is reckless of human lives. The Gospel of universal brotherhood is the only demulcent for such social brutalities.

What does the regeneration of society mean? is one of the most frequent questions from those who lend incredulous ears to the new Gospel. The very putting of the question shows that beneath it lies an utter incomprehension of what society is. Society is not an aggregation of atoms, a heap of human sand, so to speak. When the student of social phenomena has counted all the separate facts and events about men he has not accounted for society ; just as the human body is something more than an assemblage of arms, legs, eyes and other organs, and that something is life. Regeneration of society means therefore a transformation of life, a complete change ; it means that a new spirit must take possession of the social group, so that it will of necessity live a new life. Society implies institutions, and those institutions express an idea. What is the all-prevailing idea of present social institutions? Selfishness. What would be the idea prevailing throughout a truly Christian society? Love, brotherhood, service. This is what is meant by social regeneration. The regeneration of individuals will never produce the regeneration of society, until these regenerated individuals pour their regenerate life into social institutions and transform them. This they have never attempted to do, have

never dreamed of doing, have never considered possible, until very recently. And even now it is an ideal vehemently opposed by the Christianity that lives in the past. Father Vaughn says, "Socialism makes for a Paradise beneath the moon, Christianity leads to a Heaven beyond the stars."¹ But the Gospel of Jesus regards these aims, not as antithetical, but as complementary. The true disciple of Jesus chooses both: with the socialist he strives to make this world a Paradise beneath the moon, while with the Catholic he also hopes for the Heaven beyond the stars.

A new Gospel—yes, but it might quite as truly be called the old Gospel, which, after long eclipse, is again beginning to be proclaimed with power. It is true that what has been called a gospel has always been proclaimed; for ages the great effort of those who called themselves Christians has been to win the rest of the world to their Christianity. And we are still told by many that to continue this effort will prove not only a better but a quicker solution of all social problems and a more effectual redress of all social wrongs than direct effort at social reform. It is one of those cases in which a flank movement is more effective than a frontal attack. But reflection brings doubts. We recall that this method has now been tried for nineteen centuries and our social problems are little affected. The world might be filled with such Christians as we have to-day—speaking of them "by and large" and admitting a notable minority of whom this is not true—with very slight result to

¹ "Socialism from a Christian Standpoint," p. 236.

social evils. For our present-day Christians are little instructed in the social teachings of Jesus and in consequence make no appreciable attempt to apply his teachings to social facts. The multiplication of such Christians to any conceivable extent would only result in adding to the present socially ineffective churches an indefinite mass of useless, amorphous piety.

The Church does not make a successful appeal to many high-minded people to-day, because it has become an object of service, not a means of rendering service. Instead of seeking first the kingdom of God, it has sought first its own extension, wealth and power. Its energies are absorbed in holding meetings and raising money. The Church that spends all its energies in merely keeping alive is already virtually dead. The people who are estranged from the Church have become estranged because they are ethically in advance of the Church. The Gospel of Jesus is mainly believed, preached and lived by those outside of the churches. Within the churches there is a vast quantity of piety, but very little of the religion that Jesus taught. A gospel is believed and proclaimed by the churches, and passably lived, but it is not the Gospel of Jesus.

What has for ages been proclaimed as gospel, and is still heard from the great majority of Christian pulpits, is that salvation consists in man's release from a legal penalty. Man has violated the just law of a holy God, and in consequence the wrath of God rests on him, entailing suffering in this world and endless

misery in the life to come. God sent his Son to pay this penalty, which he did in his death on the cross; and those who believe in him, and those only, are delivered from the penalty that he has borne in their behalf. It is not the preachers alone who thus conceive the gospel; the laymen wish this sort of thing, and only this, to be preached to them. Ministers are more open to new ideas about religion than laymen. The mental spissitude of the average business man makes it almost impossible for him to adjust himself to a new religious idea or a new method. The minds of such men become muscle bound, so to speak; their wits get "charley horse."

Not long ago a distinguished layman, addressing a great denominational gathering, made a plea for the preaching of what he called "the pure and simple gospel." And he defined his meaning in words quoted from an orthodox preacher: "We should constantly hold up Sinai and Calvary to mankind. The vicarious atonement should be emphasized. The sacrifice of Christ should be presented daily. His deity and mediatorial work should be constantly kept before the people. The whole gospel and nothing but the gospel should be preached." Would it be possible in the same space to state anything more widely differing from the Gospel that Jesus proclaimed? It might be daring to say that Jesus knew nothing of such a gospel, but he certainly proclaimed something absolutely foreign to this, if the New Testament reports him truly. It follows then that, if Jesus knew

what his Gospel is, the modern preacher does not know.

V

A new Gospel we must have, and we are beginning to hear it. It is nothing else than proclamation of the message of Jesus, "The Kingdom of God is at hand." This is assertion of the possibility of a transformed society, in which every department of man's activity—politics, science, art, education, business, no less than religion—shall be inspired and controlled by the ethics of Jesus. The Master did not summon his disciples to prepare themselves for another world, but to remake this world. For nineteen centuries those who have borne the name of Christ have, with few exceptions, misread his message and consequently have neglected their duty. The new social awakening that is the most characteristic thing about our generation has led naturally and inevitably to an awakening of the Church, new understanding of the Gospel, and will lead to new alignment of all Christian forces.

This is evident in the new idea that is coming to be entertained of the mission of Christianity and the function of the Church. "Missions" a generation ago meant exclusively the giving of the gospel to the heathen, and the heathen were attractive to most Christians in inverse ratio to their nearness. The Church is more missionary than ever to-day, but it has a larger conception of its mission. Despite all

satire, Boorriboola-Gha is still an object of Christian effort and a subject of Christian hope, but not to the exclusion of the heathen around the corner. And it is becoming clearer every day that the chief obstacle to all Christian propaganda, at home or abroad, is the sinister fact that Christians do not believe and make but feeble attempts to practice the truth that they invite others to embrace. The character of the average "Christian" in Asia, as the least intelligent heathen easily perceives, is little influenced by Christian ideals. And the more intelligent heathen can as easily perceive that even the Christian missionaries, while free from the vices of others, are but half-hearted in their acceptance of the teaching of Jesus.

The Church has been the greatest witness to human brotherhood, but in all the ages what she has testified in word she has almost invariably denied in deed. She denies to-day. But her eyes are opening; she is beginning to see that word and deed must be made to correspond and become one witness, and that the Church which fails to bear this witness is no Church of Jesus Christ. Christian sentiments are not sufficient; conduct, character corresponding to the ethics of Jesus, is what the world needs—conduct and character corresponding to the actual teachings of Jesus, and not to some conventional standard far removed from his teachings. Men are coming to apprehend more clearly the great value of the Gospel of Jesus, in its conformity to reality, in its essential practicality. The defect of our social activities at present is that a host of well-intentioned people are engaged, with

lavish expenditure of time and energy and money, in doing perfectly futile things and even harmful things. There are giants to be fought, dragons to be slain, captives to be released, as in the brave days of old; and the social reformer goes against them with armor of pasteboard and sword of lath. So much misdirected effort is really tragic. It is not enough to mean well in this matter of social amelioration. It is above all necessary to see clearly and to think straight in order to do the right thing.

It is well for the Church that her awakening has come, even if vision is still clouded and effort largely wasted. It is her only hope of salvation. A healthy and vigorous religion can no more result from the conditions of economic restraint and social wrong that are the foundation of our American civilization than grapes can be gathered from thorns or figs from thistles. And what is true of the great institution for spiritual culture is equally true of its twin institution for the culture of mind, the university. The scholar must choose between his cloistered pursuit of pure science and social welfare, or lose his hold upon his age. The University of Wisconsin has shown all schools of higher learning how such institutions must hereafter relate themselves to the everyday affairs of the entire community. Both the Church and the university must realize that their office is not merely educational, or inspirational, but one of practical leadership. They have been too long content with being teachers of the world. It is not denied that they have discharged this function well: they have together fur-

nished the basis of knowledge and experience for every forward movement of the race. The ethics taught by both have saturated literature and law, have determined the policies of nations and have shaped social ideals. But they have been content to let the actual work of social regeneration be accomplished by other agencies.

It is quite true, as has been pointed out to weariness, that the leaders of social reform, with very few exceptions, owe their training to Christian Churches and schools, and that their work could not be successfully carried on save with Christian aid and in Christian atmosphere. But now the Church especially is called to do more than train leaders and create an atmosphere: it must do no less than take the active leadership in social reform. And the university must keep step. A certain type of Church is obsolete: the Church content with orthodoxy and careless about the kingdom, the Church that thinks right but never acts, the Church that in place of a power-house maintains a cold storage plant. Christianity means everything to the world or it means nothing. We must either practice during the week what we pray and sing on Sunday or give over altogether our Sunday singing and praying.

This requires of us, of course, greatly enlarged conception of the field of Christian activities, a break with conventional ideas that is shocking to not a few excellent Christian people. But to be shocked is not infrequently good for people, it is often indispensable stimulus. We need a new religious ter-

minology, and while this is making we must contrive as best we may to put a new content into the old words. To use the religious vocabulary of our grandfathers, from which all real meaning has evaporated, is cant. We must vitalize words again or drop them. In the old days the convert was required to "renounce the devil and all his works." The requirement may remain, but we must get a new conception of the devil's "works." While the Church slept he has captured the world of business, and has fashioned it into a fine specimen of his handicraft. The twentieth-century Christian must not merely "renounce" this work, he must actively combat it. The Church has always required Christians to separate themselves from the "world"—some Churches have been more urgent than others about this, but all have made it at least a nominal requirement—but the twentieth-century Christian must see that the "world" is something more and something more deadly than fine dress, jewels and a few tabooed amusements. Our "world" is organized evil, and Christians are so far from having renounced that, that most of them are busily engaged at this moment in extending and completing this evil organization.

And so we need a new definition of "sin"; we must put into this dead word a new living content that corresponds to present fact. In the past this word has suggested almost exclusively the relations of men to God. It is now imperatively necessary that we think more of our relations to our fellows and the ways in which we are all sinning together.

There is crying need of deeper realization on the part of "good" people of those social sins that are more heinous than any individual transgressions, and more earnest seeking after that social righteousness which is the thing just now most urgently demanded among us. The chief obstacle to immediate social progress is the satisfaction of "good" people with the old individualistic standards of goodness, and their refusal to see that such a type of goodness is now hardly distinguishable from badness. And yet we have the word of Jesus himself for it, that to keep one's own skirts clean and pass by on the other side is highly culpable. We need a new "conviction of sin," not less acute than the older type, and far more practical. It is the sins that men commit in their corporate associations, as citizens and as men of business, and in the innumerable and all-influential social relations, such as were unknown to past ages that are to-day most lethal and that call loudest for repentance. The Church has long had a list of seven deadly sins; we need a new list for our time, and it would run somewhat like this: exploitation, profit special privilege, graft, parasitism, waste, inefficiency. And we have great need to join in the Litany, "From these and all other like sins against our kind, good Lord, deliver us."

With this new idea of sin as socialized transgression will go of necessity a new idea of deliverance from sin, or salvation. It will not be deliverance from penalty, not merely transformation of character but radically different social conduct. This will in

volve a new standard of conversion. A man who professes that he has become a Christian must be expected to do something more than relate an "experience" that indicates his coming into new relations with God. We have assumed, in defiance of our experience, that when a man gets right with God (or thinks he has) he will as a consequence get right with his fellow-men. As matter of fact, we have no means of knowing whether a convert has got right with God, but we do know beyond a peradventure that most converts have never got right with their fellows. The good, pious Christian people who fill our churches every Sunday are, for the most part, utterly indifferent about their relations to their fellows. It is not their fault. They have all their lives been taught that "sin" is sin against God, and that the remedy for sin is to seek pardon of God, and this once obtained the sin is washed away. They have no idea of social sins.

Is it not, then, too evident to require argument that we sorely need conversions that will change men's entire social relations and activities? Homely country people used to say of a stingy church member that "when he was baptized he left his pocketbook at home." The ledger of the modern business man has not yet been baptized. More than any other conversion to-day is demanded conversion of the factory, the counting-room and the bank. Greed for gain, and lack of scruple as to means, have together made of the world of affairs an Inferno surpassing the highest flights of Dante's imagination. Honored

Christian philanthropists get their money for the endowment of universities and charities from the blood and bones of their brothers; lovely and cultured Christian women derive the incomes on which their womanhood is nourished from the tears and groans of their sisters, and from the forced labor of little children. Monstrous! incredible! chorus the "good" Christian people. A writer is most culpable to spread such slanders! And just there is the most hopeless feature of the social situation: the "good" people will not believe the facts, will not listen to them if they can help it, shut eyes and ears and will not be informed about our social problems. Their cry is, "Preach the simple Gospel."

But this is the simple Gospel. This is the Gospel of Jesus. Nobody can seriously study His words and have the least doubt about it. The Christian preacher may still determine, as Paul did at Corinth, not to know anything among men save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. But the social Gospel gives new significance to the cross. The "preaching of the cross" has too often meant the preaching of some mechanical doctrine of the atonement, and such preaching has lost whatever power it may once have had. The cross, as Jesus and Paul proclaimed it, means self-immolation. The cross saves no man until he has himself been nailed to it. Not till we have learned from Jesus the secret of sacrificial love, and have ourselves practiced it, has the cross any meaning or efficacy for us. Vicarious sacrifice is sacrifice of ourselves for others, and only so does Christ's sacri-

fice in our behalf become operative. It has been well said: "It is the uncrucified Christianity that speaks in the modern pulpit and sits in the church pew that is driving the passion for humanity into other channels than the Church."

Our enlarged idea of salvation is leading us to comprehend that no deliverance of men can be permanent that does not include a saved environment. The physician who should cure a man of typhoid and then advise or permit him to adopt a diet of typhoid germs would be regarded as insane, even though one who has had typhoid is presumed to be immune to a second attack. The percentage of those who are not immune is large enough to prohibit such a risk. But we turn our "saved" people back to their old environment and expect the new life to survive. Even those Christians who have been fortunate enough always to have an environment favorable to all the virtues often confess that the maintenance of a Christian character is not too easy a task. But many who are rescued in an environment in which there is only incitement to evil, without being taken out of the environment, after a little time of desperate struggle go under again. We cannot accept as our ideal anything less than a saved soul in a saved body living in a saved community. Short of that we have an incomplete and uncertain deliverance, with no promise of permanence. The old method of hand-picked-fruit evangelism no longer meets modern social conditions and needs. To get a man to profess himself saved, and then turn him loose in the com-

munity with a "God bless you, brother," is not making headway against the powers of evil. It need not be abandoned by those who are wedded to it, but it must be supplemented by those who are more awake to modern conditions and modern needs. To hasten the coming of the kingdom and promote the uplift of mankind is a man's job; it is the biggest game that men of brains and brawn can play. The smallest game in the world is the money game.

This awakening of the Church will bring us a new ethic. We have had ethics made by the rich for the poor, by the strong for the weak; we are on the way toward ethics for all. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" has been hitherto interpreted as a precept to govern individuals in their mutual conduct; we are learning to give it a social interpretation. The result of the old individualism has proved to be that men believe they are keeping Christ's words while they are gigantic sinners in their social deeds. There are men among us not a few, rich beyond the dreams of avarice, who are full of the milk of human kindness toward poor John Doe, and will do almost anything to help the individual sufferer from disease or poverty, who have yet done more than any thousand men of any other generation to make men poor and keep men poor. As theirs is a socialized sin against the neighbor, there must be a socialized love of neighbor before the precept of Jesus can be obeyed. Many a man still unctuously repeats, "The wages of sin is death," thinking meanwhile of his brother's drunkenness or lechery or lying or thiev-

ery, but never for a moment giving thought to his own rapacity and greed, the sins whose wages are paid in the death of those whom he daily crushes into deeper poverty and woe.

The old ethics borrowed its favorite ideas from monarchy and aristocracy. Men were exhorted to be content "in the sphere where God had placed them." But we now understand that "spheres" are man-made, not God-ordained, and they are passing away. These ideas of conduct we are replacing by ethics founded on human brotherhood, which again rests on a common divine sonship. And so, commands like "Thou shalt not kill" are seen to have been inadequately understood. "Thou shalt not steal" applies to those who possess, as well as to those who take, property. The stealing of capitalism must be recognized, repented and renounced. The murder of war and industrialism must be made as repulsive to the conscience as individual homicide. We now send the murderer of one to the gallows, or the electric chair; we enroll the killer of hundreds among our "best citizens"; while the slayer of thousands we exalt to the presidency.

Many deprecate the present interest in social religion; they fear that it is a dangerous tendency. The function of the Church, they remind us, may be compared to an electric dynamo: it is the function of generating moral and spiritual energy. If the Church takes the lead in social reforms, it must choose between political programs, and eventually it will be drawn into that entangling alliance with the State

from which it has only lately been freed after ages of struggle. But the risk must be run, if there really is a risk, for a dynamo is a useless thing until it has been connected up to machinery by which its power may be utilized in doing some of the world's work. The Church has too long been an unconnected dynamo; it has generated vast quantities of power that has never been utilized for the improvement of society; its problem now is to get its power turned on to the social machinery.

This is only to say in other words that the Church has been too blind to see fact and truth, too slow to take up the work to which its divine Founder called it; and the work of social regeneration has been undertaken, and thus far has been carried forward, in independence of the Church, and to an increasing degree by men in scant sympathy with the Church. If this purblind policy continues, if the Church is to be ruled by stupid conservatism, men who desire the progress of humanity, and feel called of God to devote their lives to that purpose, will have to forsake their Church though not their religion. Conservatism, in the present condition of society, says Professor Ross, is "like setting the brake on a loaded wagon being hauled up the bare western slope of a sandy hill on a July afternoon."¹ If we do anything we shall doubtless make some mistakes, but if we do nothing we shall die in our sins. Society is an organism and to reform it is an operation in surgery; diseased tissue must be removed and nature must

¹ "Sin and Society," p. 85.

be encouraged to make healthy tissue in its place. Has the organism vitality enough to survive the operation, or will it die on the operating-table from shock and loss of blood? Only the event can answer, but if the patient may die of the operation he certainly will die without it—the knife is the only hope.

Christianity has been and is the religion of the possessing class. Christian teachers teach capitalistic ethics as an inseparable part of their religion. Capitalism has long used Christianity as a means of controlling the workers, by making them satisfied with their lot. Nobody who knows the facts ought to be surprised at the bitterness of the reaction against Christianity among the workers of the world. The changed, or at least changing, attitude of Christians will in time produce its due effect and make possible a better understanding between the Church and the workers. The real affinity between the Gospel of Jesus and the advanced social propaganda forbids that the two great forces for the amelioration of society should be permanently opposed to each other.

For a generation now the Church has made no appreciable numerical advance, though it has poured out money like water and spent effort more freely than in any previous generation of its history. In 1880 there were twenty members of churches in every hundred of the population; in 1910 there were only twenty-four; and during the decade just past the population and the church membership both increased twenty-one per cent. The Church is just holding its own; it is marking time, not marching to

conquest. Only one conclusion is possible: the Church has ceased to meet the wants of the age. It makes no successful appeal to the people at large. It must change its policy radically or lose even more in the coming decades of the century. The Church that busies itself with the things that former generations thought so important—questions of politics and sacraments and liturgies and creeds—while great movements in reform of social institutions and redressing of social wrongs are calling on it for leadership, the Church that with face toward the past stands discussing ancient questions of theology while weighty ethical and spiritual problems press for an answer, will soon be buried along with that past to which it clings with obstinacy so blind.

The future progress of the Church depends largely, perhaps mainly, on the ability and readiness of the ministry to read these signs of the times and become wise and progressive leaders. Hitherto, the average minister has been too busy teaching others their duty to learn anything about his own. Hence the greater part of the clergy are still blind leaders of the blind. The crying need of the ministry is a larger measure of the spirit of Jesus, the spirit of unselfishness, the willingness to jeopard personal interests for the common good. The charge of insincerity so often made against the clergy is, however, absurd to one who has any wide acquaintance with ministers. It is not merely unjust, it is foolish. Precisely because the clergy are so sincere, the case of so many of them seems hopeless; their desperate sincerity in holding

fast to the old prevents them from learning anything new.

The most distressing element of the situation is the lack of sympathy with the workers that is evident among the clergy. With exceptions few and rare, they may always be counted on to side with the exploiting class. In the strike of the silk workers in Paterson, New Jersey, in the summer of 1913, the ministers of that city were arrayed in solid phalanx on the side of the employers. Not one voice was raised in behalf of the workers. Not even was a protest made against the anarchic lawlessness of police and local courts. And this is typical; it happens whenever and wherever there is a clash between labor and capital. This attitude of the clergy can be explained only on the ground of their economic dependence upon the privileged classes. They are the hirelings of capitalism, and, to do them justice, they earn their wages. As a plain business proposition, the Christian churches of America could not be maintained to-day without the gifts of men who are daily exploiting their brothers. In fact, they are so maintained. Is it necessary to go further for an explanation of the attitude of the clergy, or for the attitude of the workers? Are we astonished that there is a widening gap between the workers and the Church? Surprise does small credit to our intelligence. The workers cannot be rationally expected to love such a Church, to believe in it, to attend its services and make sacrifices for its support. Will the Church continue to be such?

It is evident that much remains to be done before the waking Church becomes the awakened Church. A long process of education will be required before the enlarged conception of the kingdom, the Gospel and Christian ethics is generally accepted. But there is nothing to do save to press the good work of awakening and enlightenment, until all the preachers, are converted to Christianity and all the churches to religion.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

I

AUTHENTIC history goes back about five thousand years. We have had fifty centuries of agriculture, and men are still starving; thousands are to-day shivering with cold, after fifty centuries of manufacturing; for fifty centuries we have been building, and have not yet learned to house all our people. There may have been a time when these things were unavoidable: the combined industry of the race did not produce enough to feed, clothe and house everybody, and somebody had to come short of enough. But within a century the introduction of machinery has changed all that; enough is now produced to support in comfort every member of the race. We have conquered nature, but we have not conquered poverty.

Because it is a comparatively new country, with a sparse population, yet possessing immense resources, America should not yet have felt the social problems of the Old World. The continent of Europe, with an area exceeding that of the United States by less than 200,000 square miles, has a population of 400,000,000, who must be sustained from incomparably smaller resources. Think of China, with its 400,000,000 or more, wresting a living from an area

less than half the size of the United States.¹ For a long time to come we should have been free from the economic pressure that in fact we feel so keenly. No nation faces social distress in more acute form, or is more acutely conscious of its social problems. Why? Our colossal American fortunes, the greatest in the world, are the answer. The vast wealth of America has been "cornered" by a few men, and profits the great majority not a whit. Our poor are as poor as the poorest of Europe.

It was hoped and believed for generations, and was the proud boast of Americans, that our democracy would prevent the inequalities of fortune that aristocracy has produced and established in Europe. Perhaps it would, if we really had a democracy. Our pride in America as the world's leader in democracy has had a sad fall, as we have slowly come to perceive that the hard facts are irreconcilable with our bookish theories. America the leader of the nations in democracy? It is falling far behind those nations that we have so long sneered at as "effete." Our working class is treated with a brutality that finds no parallel in any other great capitalist country.

The reason is not far to seek. For two generations the men of greatest physical vigor and mental power in America have sought a career, not in politics but in business. The unexampled rapidity of our ma-

¹ According to the "Statesman's Year-Book," the area of China proper is 1,532,420 square miles, and the estimated population 407,253,000. The area of the United States (not including territories) is 3,616,484 square miles, population 91,972,267.

terial development, without precedent or parallel in the entire history of the world, has stimulated to a degree hitherto undreamt the passion for gain. The possibility that the poorest boy might die the richest man of his generation, actually realized in Rockefeller and Carnegie, has stimulated to the utmost the normal desire to get on, and turned it into an insane frenzy for wealth. Politics have ceased to be politics, and have become business, usually a very sordid and disgraceful business. Neither justice nor intelligence inspires our legislation, but desire for greater wealth; and all our law-making bodies have fallen under the control of the forces that make for wealth. Administrative and judicial departments of government have followed the same course, and corruption honeycombs every part of the conduct of public affairs. Hitherto, as Professor Zueblin well says, "The American public has betrayed its price, as unmistakably as a cheap grafting politician; the price is prosperity, which, unaccompanied by justice, makes a nation of grafters."¹ Our workingmen have for many years been exhorted to vote, not for a principle or for rights, but for "a full dinner pail," and the greater number of them have justified the estimate of their character held by the cheap politicians who devised the slogan.

"Triumphant democracy" is no longer the synonym of the United States. The oppressed peoples of the Old World once looked to us for ideals, instruction and inspiring example. And so, in our complacency,

¹"Democracy and the Overman," p. 70.

we went to sleep, and the world has run by us. The old fable of the hare and the tortoise has a new illustration at our expense. "Free and enlightened" America is the slowest country in the world to respond to the reform sentiment, the slowest country to do justice to the workers. England repealed her conspiracy laws against workingmen in 1825, but in 1836 the Supreme Court of New York declared trades unions illegal; and it was not until 1884 that Maryland repealed her conspiracy laws—the last State in the Union to do so. The secret of our discomfiture lies in the fact that we have understood democracy to be concerned with political institutions only, and to imply merely that all men should have the equal power expressed by a vote. We have been the slowest of civilized peoples to learn that real democracy means the equal sharing of all men in the gifts of nature, the product of labor and the opportunities of development. Democracy means adequate life for all.

On the whole, there has been steady progress in all quarters of the globe, through several generations, not to say through all the centuries, toward political democracy. A survey of the field of history shows despotism yielding to oligarchy, oligarchy giving place to aristocracy, aristocracy gradually transformed into democracy. But while this has been true of institutions, in life there has been no such progress. As truly as five thousand years ago, everywhere on earth the millions toil that the thousands may enjoy. One who, in these conditions, permits himself to wax elo-

quent over "democracy," "equal rights," "justice," "freedom" and the like is become as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. This may shock those who are still living in the paleolithic age, it may even cause them acute pain, but that cannot be helped. The easy, safe, normal way is to repeat what others say, especially what the majority say. Some men get quite a reputation for wisdom by just doing that all their lives. One cannot contradict the majority and expect to be enrolled among the Seven Sages of America.

In spite of the industrious efforts of our rulers to create a contrary impression, hard and disagreeable fact compels the conclusion that we have under the forms of democracy a country ruled by an aristocracy, based on industrial wealth. The old aristocracy, founded on the possession of land, acknowledged duties to the land and did much to help elevate their tenantry. The new aristocracy of wealth acknowledges duties to nobody. "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" is its motto. It is the most tyrannous, the most cruel and the most ignorant aristocracy the world ever saw.¹ This aristocracy of wealth can be displaced only by a democracy of mind. The few will always win while the many are ignorant, and he who would see the triumph of democracy must do his utmost to promote knowledge. None are fit to

¹ "I never could believe that Providence had sent a few men into the world, ready booted and spurred to ride, and millions ready saddled and bridled to be ridden."—Richard Rumbold, 1685. No wonder they hanged him!

govern but the wise and good, and a democracy of the foolish and evil of all possible governments would be the worst. The hope of democracy lies in the capacity of all men to grow in goodness and wisdom. He who does not believe in such capacity has faith neither in God nor in man.

Jesus is the loftiest prophet of true democracy. A democracy that is no more than an enlightened animalism is not a worthy goal of effort, even if it be a possible achievement. Jesus saw this, and therefore he said, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and its righteousness." If the sayings of Jesus about the kingdom are not profoundest wisdom, they are most arrant nonsense. Only an ethical democracy can be a triumphant democracy. That is why "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" sums up the whole duty of man to man. The decisive reason why one should love his neighbor and seek his good is that no man can hate his neighbor and do him injury without also injuring himself. Selfishness is a boomerang. Service of our fellows is the only way to benefit ourselves. This is a plain, hard, business proposition, founded on experience of life. It happens also to be morals and religion.

This prevailing condition among us of real aristocracy with nominal democracy, of practical monopoly with theoretical freedom of competition, of hopeless slavery for the many while we hypocritically pretend that there is hope of advancement for all, is the deadly foe of human liberty and indicts our civilization as a failure. Every court, every crime, every prison is a

proof of failure; every saloon, every prostitute upon our streets, every asylum and hospital helps to roll up the vast total of evidence against the present order of things; every debt, every defalcation, every bankruptcy, every law-suit accumulates testimony to the failure of our civilization. For the end of civilization is the peace, harmony, happiness and moral uplift of humanity.)

The great underlying evil of society as now organized, stated in terms of politics or government, is that it vests public functions in private hands—in hands irresponsible. The power of taxation is fundamental in government, and taxation is justifiable only on the ground of the public good. Every dollar taken from a citizen that is not used for the public good is robbery. Individual monopoly puts into irresponsible hands power to tax for private gain, which is nothing less than stealing under form of law. The price the monopolist can charge is limited only by “what the traffic will bear.” At a certain point, which can be determined only by experiment, increase of price will mean diminution of profit; and for his own sake the monopolist will stop there, or return to that point if he has inadvertently exceeded it. When he compares what he has actually done with what he has power to do, no doubt the monopolist is often astonished at his own moderation.)

The history of governments and peoples discloses many instances of the operation of a general law of social development. There is first necessary a centralization of power, to bring order out of chaos, and

provide the protection and coöperation that are the basic conditions of social progress. For a time this centralized power is beneficent in the main, then it becomes intolerable, and a struggle begins for decentralization and distribution of power. With the political applications of this law all educated people are familiar; the text-books of our school days began our enlightenment, and subsequent reading and observation have completed it. We are now coming to comprehend that this law applies to economics as well as to politics, to the world of industry and commerce equally with the domain of government. For a century or two a process of centralization of industrial wealth and social power has been going on, and the last generation has seen it rapidly accelerated. We see its fruits, we experience its intolerable evils, as our ancestors experienced the evils of political despotism. It has become plain to us that the time has come for decentralization and distribution of industrial power among the whole people, if democracy is to be realized and further progress in civilization is to be possible. America may be still corrupt, but she is no longer corrupt and contented.

II

Our ship of State is about to sail uncharted seas. We modern Jasons have begun a quest for something more precious, as well as more difficult of attainment, than the Golden Fleece: we are in search of social

justice. There must be something wrong in our social arrangements; no rational man can doubt it. Why have we these extremes of wealth and poverty that we cannot lift our eyes without seeing? Evidently because the best minds of the centuries have not been given to the solution of social problems. Men have been too intent on producing wealth, securing power and promoting knowledge, to take much thought about securing social justice. It has been taken for granted that, with progress of civilization, social justice would come about of itself. But now the best minds are awakening to the actual condition of society. A civilization so defective in social justice as ours is seen to be a thing of which we should be ashamed, not proud. Henceforth these problems are to receive the serious attention of Americans who are leaders of thought and enterprise. We feel that we must do something to make the conditions of life better for those who come after us. For, in spite of the Irish orator's famous protest, posterity has done much for us, in giving us the greatest of all gifts, an opportunity.

The demand for social justice is not only insistent but general. From one end of our land to the other, and in every class, there is a growing conviction that something is wrong. As a consequence there is also a growing resolution that something must and shall be done about it. We are an aroused, a determined, almost an angry people, as yet doubting just what to do. This period of doubt will not long endure. Now is the psychological moment to make changes in our

system with least trouble, radical enough to avert revolution, before revolutionary methods are demanded and adopted.

Analysis of this discontent will convince any inquirer that its source is violation by our social order of two fundamental principles of human life. The first of these is, that the soil, the sole source of the means of life and the physical basis of liberty and happiness, is the common property of the race. This fundamental human right society denies. The earth is the Lord's, say the Scriptures; the earth is the landlord's, say our laws. God gave the earth to man for use, to all men equally, again say the Scriptures; but a few men have stolen the earth from their fellows and claim it as their private possession. This is the first great injustice, and the second is like unto it: the sole means by which wealth may be obtained from the soil is labor, which is the common lot of the race. This fundamental human duty society denies; it permits and even encourages spoliation of the hard-working many by the idle few. Our laws say that some must work while others may live luxuriously from their product. For no man can live without work; if he does not work for himself, somebody else must work for him. But an honest man cannot live on the fruits of another's toil, unless he is also doing something of use to society; he must either be a direct producer of wealth, or else a helper of the workers and so an indirect producer. If he neither directly nor indirectly produces, he has no right to existence—he is a mere parasite on society. These are the two funda-

mental principles of life; they stand every economic, ethical and practical test. Their truth cannot be controverted or evaded. Their denial in practice is the source of all our social evils.

The other day a young man in New York became the absolute owner of property said to be worth \$70,000,000, which he had done nothing to earn but to be the son of his father. His father before him, and so on to the fourth generation, had done no more. All that this family has had to do is to sit tight and let their fellow residents of Manhattan pile up millions for them. One scion of the family has shaken the dust of America from his feet, and become a British subject. Americans are not fit for him to live with; they are only fit to pay him an annual tribute of many millions, which they continue meekly to do. Meanwhile, every week scores of children are born in Manhattan with no heritage but poverty and misery.

This is an extreme case, but so long as the world holds one starving child and one millionaire, the millionaire is bound to justify his existence. Christians cannot believe that their Father in Heaven ever intended his children to fare so unequally. Atheists and agnostics cannot believe that members of the same race can equitably be so different in fortune. So long as men believed that God sent the plague and cholera, and all the other ills that flesh is heir to, they submitted with what resignation they could to the divine will. But when they learned the nature and causes of disease, they ceased to talk about "mysterious dispensations of Providence" and began a vigorous fight

against microbes and mosquitoes. And while men believed that God pleased to set some men in high station and some in low, that he had given to this man wealth and to that poverty, some tried to be content in the station to which divine wisdom had assigned them, while those who strove against their lot were stigmatized as rebels against God. Now we all know that our fellows, not God, have made and maintain human inequality; content has disappeared, and a smoldering anger has taken its place, which will burst into a flame of revolution if something is not done speedily to redress our great social wrongs.

Even if the continuance of present conditions were possible, they would be deadly to the race. Some men are so busy in accumulating surplus means of living that they forget to live. Others are so occupied with attempts to gain the absolutely necessary means of living that they have no chance to live. Only a few live: most men merely exist. It is imperative that this be changed. We must have the possibility of life, liberty, happiness, for all. We want the earth, the whole earth, for all men—not to own, but to possess, to use, to enjoy. We need not wonder at the resentment of those who have learned how they have been robbed of their heritage. Machiavelli said that men in general will forgive the murder of their parents more easily than the spoliation of their property. The cynical remark was founded on a wide observation of human nature; and it helps us to measure the retribution that will one day be exacted from the robbers by the robbed, if voluntary restitution is not made.

Recognition of social wrongs and demand for social justice, while general, are by no means universal. A very considerable part of society, including some of its most influential members, elects the ostrich policy: hides its head and refuses to see either present evils or the coming storm. Many will recognize nothing but an unreasonable dissatisfaction on the part of those whose failure to get on is due to their own idleness, dissipation and general thriftlessness. Industry and thrift would solve all social problems; every man might gain a competence if he would. Thrift! Have those who so confidently commend this remedy for social ills ever troubled themselves to think the matter through and discover what thrift signifies socially? Thrift means that if you and I slave and save all our lives, our children may be idle with impunity. It means that one generation shall be workers and the next loafers. Why does not society let one generation transmit to the next the right to murder with impunity? It would be equally logical and quite as ethical.

The ostrich plan includes not merely the ignoring but the denial of patent social facts. "I object to the word 'class'; there are no classes in America," said a talented and cultivated woman lately in a public inquiry. Could anything be said that would show greater blindness to existing facts? We have classes as well marked as those of any European country, but the distinctions with us depend less on birth, family, gentility. Our classes are purely economic classes: the line of demarcation is one of wealth, or rather of income. The late Ward McAllister once expressed

the opinion that about four hundred families constituted the "society" of New York. He may have been inaccurate in his figures—the exact number is of no moment—but he was quite right in principle; in every city and town, down to the smallest village, there are certain families, a number larger or smaller according to the size and wealth of the place, who constitute "society," and their decisions fix the social status of every newcomer, whether he shall be in "society" or not. Fifty years ago we aped the aristocracies of Europe and affected to make birth the chief qualification. The would-be entrant to "society" was asked, Who was your grandfather? Of late we have had the courage to set up a standard of our own, or, rather, to recognize frankly what has always been our real standard, and the question now is, What is your income? Not that the question is asked in quite this bald, blunt fashion, but that this is the accepted test of social fitness. And below the Four Hundred, in which few can maintain themselves who do not possess millions, are other groups united on the same principle of possessing approximately the same incomes and therefore being able to do the same social "stunts." There is, too, a degree of fitness in the standard, for self-respecting persons cannot long remain with comfort in a social circle where the financial pace is too hot for them—they cannot entertain in the style of richer people, and their pride forbids them to be continually accepting favors that they cannot return. And there we reach the ultimate fact: The amount of income finally decides the social question, to

what class a man belongs. It is no use to blink the fact, and pretend that we have no classes.

III

The world's workers, who produce the world's wealth, are now demanding access to the soil and their rightful share of the product of their industry, so long withheld from them. If we do not give, it will not be long before they take. Theirs is the power to take. They have only to realize their strength and act together, and all present institutions of the world would disappear in a day in one common ruin. It is time that the owners of vast wealth realized that they hold their property only on the sufferance of those who are so cruelly wronged by present social arrangements, and that sufferance will not last indefinitely.

It has been estimated, on the basis of the best data obtainable, that nine-tenths of the wealth of America is owned by one-tenth of the people. What 80,000,000 possess would not make spending-money for the other 10,000,000. The estimate is no doubt crude, because the data on which it is based are crude. The art of collecting and collating social statistics has only begun to be practiced; but the error is negligible for our purpose. That the estimate is roughly just is proved by other available facts. For example: the average annual product of the individual worker is calculated from the census returns to be \$2,400; while the average annual wage of the producer is \$780. Of

each worker's product, therefore, \$1,600, or more than two-thirds, goes to those who have produced nothing. The monstrous injustice of this admits of no denial or palliation. Still, there are persons who seem to reason (let us call it that) that, inasmuch as the capitalistic class is satisfied with what it steals from workers, the workers are or should be satisfied with what is not stolen from them. If employers are happy in their palaces, laborers should be contented in their slums. Strangely, the worker no longer approves that sort of logic.

When the laborer goes to the market place to sell his labor, he finds that sellers are many and buyers few. When he goes to buy food and clothing and shelter, he finds that buyers are many and sellers few. Hence he gets low wages and pays high prices. Reader, how do you appraise the system? Just? humane? promotive of human welfare? encouraging to civilization? The employer sells his goods, the employee sells his life; we have given every protection to the former and denied all protection to the latter, thus proclaiming to the world our conviction that life is of less worth than steel rails or woolen cloth. Are we really less brutal and material than our laws? Have we done ourselves injustice? How can we pretend so, while we tolerate a social system in which the proletarian swings like a pendulum between a condition of dependence when times are good and vagabondage when times are bad? Work, the opportunity to gain a livelihood, is not recognized as his right,

but a favor granted by a boss, like a bone thrown to a dog. Often there is no bone. Ought not the great majority of working men be called rather working animals, that they submit one day longer to such a system? So long as they get fodder and a stall, they manifest a bovine content with their life. Add thereto a mate, and it is a difficult thing to awaken their intelligence and rouse them to make an effort to better themselves. Deprive them of fodder and stall, and they seem unable to do more than bellow and paw the ground.

At least, this has been their history up to now. Hitherto the capitalist has been able, if not to satisfy, at least to quiet the laborer by paying him a pittance and adding a draft on the bank of Heaven. Is it strange that the worker has become dissatisfied? He does not discover any unseemly eagerness on the part of his employer to take his profits in that currency. Wall Street quotes no rates on that kind of paper. The magnates of High Finance when off duty, so to speak, may address Sunday schools and advise their hearers to lay up their treasures in Heaven, but in business hours what they understand is cent per cent. here below. Hope of the life to come is indeed a precious possession for the laborer, but it does not clothe and feed his family or pay his rent. The worker is just human enough to wish for a larger proportion of his pay now, and in material things, without denying the value of the spiritual. For though he has an immortal soul which clamors for its

rights, he is just now an immortal soul housed in a mortal body, that cries out against hunger and cold and nakedness. And the body often cries so insistently that the cry of the soul is unheard. It was not for nothing that the ancients held the bowels to be the seat of the affections and will. The hungry man will hear the call of his stomach, when the still small voice of conscience falls on deaf ears.

The preachers who insist that man's chief duty is to consider the welfare of his soul to the last man look wonderfully well after their bodies. Not one of them omits his three meals a day for fear of hurting his soul. It is ever the well-fed man who piously insists that "Man cannot live by bread alone"; the ill-fed man is acutely conscious that without bread man cannot live at all. In spite of Mr. Lincoln, it is very easy to fool people; it is still easier to fool oneself. The preacher has no need to worry about bread, because some other man is working to feed him. He can keep his hands soft and white, because some other man wears callouses and grime for his sake. The preacher may deserve his immunity, but the least he can do in return for it is to recognize the situation and stop talking nonsense to the man whose labor supplies his bread.

It is often objected to current proposals for social reform that they would really promote greater social injustice than they seek to remedy. It is charged that social reform practically amounts to taking from one man that which is his and giving it to another who

has not earned it.¹ It would not be possible to misunderstand and misstate the case more completely. What is proposed is to take from one man who has not earned it property that he merely calls "his" but to which he has no moral title, and give it to the men who really earned it. The horror that conservative people feel—or affect—at such proposals might be not a little lessened if they would consider the historic origin of present "vested rights." Communal property preceded private; the latter is a comparatively recent growth and has progressed chiefly by the usurpations of the strong and aggressive few and the passive surrender of the great majority. The ethical right of the majority to reverse the process, whenever it can and as far as it pleases, will be questioned by few who judge human institutions in the light of their origin and growth. Thus far the majority propose only a slight modification of the system of private

¹ "How are the inequalities in society to be wiped out? How is government to insure happiness to the individual? Is it by an equal distribution of property? Is it by taking from one man that which is his and giving it to another who has not earned it? I submit that this is the ultimate result of a thorough analysis of all the theories advanced by the Progressive party. It is easily seen that under the progressive program the whole machinery that has been so carefully built up by the older statesmen of this country and of England to save to the individual and the minority, freedom, equality before the law, the right of property and the right to pursue happiness, is to be taken apart and thrown into a junk heap." Speech of William Howard Taft in New York, January 4, 1913. Of this farrago of nonsense, the last five words only betray some comprehension of fact. The junk heap is where most of the "machinery" belongs.

property: the claim of the State to the "unearned increment," the value added to land, not by anything that the private owner does, but by the growth of the community, is by many conceded to be just.

Society has a clear ethical right to take for the common good value which society alone confers. Every form of wealth save land value is produced by labor. Every other form of wealth is consumed or deteriorates and must be replaced by new labor. Land values grow with the growth of population, without labor, and continue as long as the population remains, and no longer. We speak of "land values," because that is the accepted phrase, but land values are not properly values: they are merely the landowners' power to levy tribute (called rent) upon other forms of wealth. The landowner is a parasite: he produces no more wealth than any other thief. There was a time when the whole of Manhattan Island sold for \$25; now much of it is worth \$500 a foot front, some of it even more. The difference between the two values is due solely to the fact that the inhabitants have increased from a few Indians to nearly two and a half millions of people. Nobody who owns a foot of soil on Manhattan Island has done anything by his own labor or skill to add one dollar of value to his possession; the community has done all; the community may take what it has given.

Testamentary rights are of still more recent origin, of little ethical weight and of more than doubtful social value. The right of a man "to do what he will with his own," even during his lifetime, has been con-

siderably limited by law and should be limited much more strictly. When he dies his property no longer belongs to him, but to those that come after him. All of a man's possible ethical rights of property end with his own life; he has no moral claim to bind the future generations. Each generation in turn has a right to the earth and the fulness thereof. The power to dispose of property by will is ethically indefensible, and ought to be abrogated. Every estate should be settled by law, in accordance with acknowledged principles of equity, as is now done in cases of intestacy. Social justice can be satisfied with no less.

IV

What has the Gospel of Jesus to do with all this? Some say, Nothing. The view of the Gospel that many hold to be the only orthodoxy is, that if we can save a man's soul from a future hell of which we know nothing, not even that it exists, we may without compunction leave his body in a present hell of which we know only too much. Our age needs a very different view of the Gospel from that, and is rapidly getting it. We must have a Gospel that is concerned with men's bodies as well as with their souls, because it is a Gospel for this life as well as for the life to come. It is a Gospel that sets itself the task of transforming this world into the kingdom of God.

Such a Gospel demands of its votaries first of all that they see clearly and think straight. Men and women of sensitive social conscience are vainly trying

to-day to make the Gospel practical by applying charity to the consequences of social evil, instead of applying justice to the causes of social evil. By so doing they perhaps succeed in solacing an uneasy conscience, but they accomplish nothing of social value. What is called Christian charity, or simply philanthropy, concerns itself only with effects, and in consequence it so directs its well-intended efforts as to increase social evils rather than remedy them. To individuals it has done much good, but society as a whole has been more injured by charity than benefited. None will deny that it has failed to diminish appreciably the vast total of social suffering. We may expect something worth while to be done only when Christian men and women come to see that the Gospel does not permit a man to live at the expense of his fellows—when all forms of profit, and especially rent, dividends and interest, will be recognized as profoundly immoral, since all alike violate the law, "Thou shalt not steal."

The Gospel of Jesus cannot tolerate two sorts of ethics: one for the working class, another for the capitalistic. For example: the workers are severely criticized for sabotage, even of the milder sort, by the very capitalists who constantly form "gentlemen's agreements" or other combinations to limit output and maintain prices—criticized by the very commission merchants who destroy food products rather than permit prices to be lowered. The Steel Trust, fixing the output of each concern included in the organization, and the price at which every pound of product shall be sold, cuts a sorry figure when it denounces workers

for a policy of "ca' canny." The Gospel of Jesus cannot tolerate one standard of ethics for individuals and another for corporations. "Corporations have no souls," said Blackstone, and the saying has proved to be true in a far different sense from that he intended. There is a certain hardness and ruthlessness in corporate management that is not found in business enterprises conducted by an individual or a firm. A man may be haughty, insolent or vindictive in business, but he cannot practice the passionless cruelty, the impersonal brutality, of a corporation. A man may have many motives in conducting his business; a corporation has one sole motive: dividends.

Those who believe the Gospel of Jesus will try to understand the ethics of the workers before pronouncing condemnation. The right to life and liberty is meaningless, unless it means a right to employment. "You do take away my life, when you take away the means by which I live," said Shylock, and it remains true even if he did say it. The workers in a great industrial enterprise have an equity in the business that thinking employers are beginning to recognize. Hence, in the vocabulary of the worker, "Thou shalt not steal" translates into "Thou shalt not scab." Likewise, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house," under modern conditions means, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's job." People outside of the working class find it difficult to comprehend this simple ethical principle, and wonder why the worker feels so bitter toward the "scab." Can people of the North who lived through the civil

war remember how they once felt toward a "copperhead"? Are we patriots enough to comprehend our fathers' execration of Benedict Arnold? Are we Christian enough to understand what our New Testament says about Judas? To the worker, a "scab" is Benedict Arnold in industry; he is Judas reincarnated; he is both thief and traitor.

It must be confessed that the attempt to apply the Gospel of Jesus to the solution of social problems is less successful than we have a right to expect. This is because the attempt is but half-hearted, in the first place, and because it is opposed by the very persons who ought heartily to forward it. A large part of the clergy are openly indifferent or secretly hostile. Many publicly declare that social service and social justice are but "fads," notions of a day, and unworthy of serious consideration. Of the Christian laymen of intelligence and high ideals, but a small proportion are sufficiently enlightened to perceive that social injustice harms not only the class that suffers from it but even more the class that profits by it. The men who have succeeded, the men who are comfortable, the men for whom life is relatively easy, cannot be aroused to take interest in the abolition of privilege and the redress of social grievances. It is their selfish satisfaction with their own lot, their indolent refusal to think seriously of social problems, that is mainly responsible for the slowness of social progress.

It is not a little discouraging to know that, after half a century of energetic wrestling by a few with the problem of crime, there is more crime than ever

among us: that millions have been spent in the fight against disease, and tuberculosis and typhoid slay more victims every year; that society has been contending vigorously against vice for generations, and that the saloon and the brothel were never so flourishing; that peace societies have been propagating their principles for generations, arbitration treaties have been concluded and The Hague tribunal established, yet every year all nations are increasing their armaments and one of the bloodiest wars of history has been raging within a twelve-month in the Balkans. Evidently one of two things must be true: either the forces aiming at social reform are all too weak, or the efforts made are misdirected and futile. Possibly we may see reason to conclude that both are true, but the error of method is the really serious thing.

Napoleon's ideal, *La carrière ouverte aux talents*, has been highly praised by some who have imagined that social justice lies that way. But this is only to substitute an aristocracy of intellect for an aristocracy of birth or wealth. What of the poor without talents? No talents, no rights, is the only corollary from the Napoleonic formula. But we must have social justice for all, not opportunity for a few to exploit the less gifted of their generation. The United States has for a century offered a large career for talent, and we are by no means satisfied with the social results. The despised Middle Ages were, in many respects, marked by a social justice superior to our own. Society then tried to prevent unfair competition, to give every man a chance in his own rank.

Rising capitalism was from the beginning impatient of all such restraints, and insisted that they should be removed, so that competition might be made free and every man might find his level. It proved strong enough to carry its point; restraints were removed; competition was without limit. What followed? We have but to look about us and see.

Men get in this world about what they deserve, some complacent social philosophers tell us. It is a specious saying, but untrue, and also irrelevant. Nothing is more idle than to consider the character of rich and poor as individuals. Beautiful souls are found in the slum and in the mansion, and ugly souls are found in both; and the relative proportions it is as unprofitable to discuss as difficult to ascertain. What the poor "deserve" is not the question; the question is, What are we bound to give them? The goodness of this or that rich man is not the question; the question is, What effect is unearned wealth likely to have on character? Nothing can be a clearer proposition than that unearned wealth in the hands of one man can only mean that earned wealth has been wrested from the hands of another.

Our problem, looked at in a practical way, is to translate the laws of industrial production into terms of human happiness and virtue. The solution of the problem may be expected when as much time, study, intelligence and religion have been expended in securing the due reward of labor as have been expended on the making of profit; when the welfare of the laborer is deemed as worthy of consideration

as equipment, efficiency and selling; when the man behind the machine is held to be of greater importance than the machine. In a word, when the good of humanity is the impelling social motive.

Scientific efficiency, of which we hear a great deal in these days, means among many other things—and this is really its most important meaning, though few recognize it—that men and women are not to be permitted to work beyond their powers. It is not socially profitable to allow overstrain, fatigue beyond the point that the daily and weekly rest will suffice fully to overcome. To tax the future by exacting too heavy tasks now may fill an employer's purse, but it will bankrupt society. The struggle for an eight-hour working day, and for one day's rest in seven, is an attempt to secure recognition of the worker's right to leisure. Leisure is good for man; much leisure is indispensable to the best humanity; but complete leisure is the worst thing man can have. A leisure class is always an idle class, a vicious class, an anti-social class. The curse of unearned wealth is the power that it gives to some men to be idle while others must work to keep them in their idleness. It is as unjust and unethical a system for the idler as for the worker—it corrupts both. The worker's leisure is now mainly involuntary, and takes the form of unemployment. Some is voluntary and takes the form of vagrancy. Not less than higher wages the worker needs more leisure, regular leisure, that he may have opportunity to develop a higher manhood. Some of them will misuse their leisure? Quite likely,

until they learn how to use it better. But "there is no cure for the evils of liberty but more liberty."

Max Nordau tells us that the natural or zoölogical morality affirms rest to be the supreme merit, and does not define labor as pleasant and glorious except as it is indispensable to material existence. Pouget, following Nordau, denounces the usual ideas of the duty of labor and the dignity of labor as bourgeois morality. The premise of such reasoning is faulty and so the conclusion is invalid. Nordau does not correctly state the zoölogical morality. Man must work and incur fatigue in order to rest, just as he must be hungry in order to eat. Merely to masticate and swallow food is not eating; it is only the mechanical process that accompanies eating. Eating is the enjoyment of food, and for that hunger is indispensable. Doing nothing is not resting; no man can rest until he is tired. Labor is zoölogical morality, as a precedent to rest.

Nordau's error probably arises from the fact that "labor" connotes two different ideas, for which we require and fortunately possess two different words. "Labor" may be accurately defined as the pleasurable exercise of our faculties, physical or mental, in the accomplishment of a useful task. For the other idea commonly associated with "labor," we may take the word "toil," and define it as the irksome use of our faculties, mainly physical, in the accomplishment of a necessary or imposed task. The difference is the difference between voluntary exertion and compulsory, between the pleasurable and the irksome. Toil, en-

forced labor, is slavery. Whether the laborer is driven by the whip of a master or the whip of necessity matters little to him. The chattel slavery of the field has given place to the new wage slavery of the factory, with a great theoretic increase of liberty, but with little substantial betterment of the worker. Many object to "wage slavery" and "wage slave" as exaggerated terms. Judge Pitney, now of the United States Supreme Court, in a decision while judge in New Jersey, held that picketing was robbery, on the ground that, "The relation of master and servant being established, then the services of the employee became a property right." A picket, striving to persuade a worker to stop giving his labor as "servant" to his "master," is trying to rob the latter of a property right! What is the difference between this and chattel slavery?

V

One of our chief national characteristics is that we are a wasteful people. We have burned up more of our forests than we have used. The deer and bison, the fur-bearing animals, the fish and wild fowl, once so plentiful, we have nearly or quite exterminated. We build houses and factories of flimsy materials, let them burn and rebuild them of the same over and over, at a cost many times greater than to build well once for all. It is estimated that \$1,500,000,000 is spent by the business world every year in advertising, of which every cent is economic waste, though un-

avoidable under our present system, and the people pay for it in the advanced cost of living.

One of our magazines recently called attention to the weak spot in our present business methods: all effort is concentrated on cheapening the cost of production, and practically no attention is given to the excessive waste in selling. This is probably because it is easy to pass on the cost of selling to the buyer. The result is that it costs from two to five times as much to sell as it does to manufacture. As an illustration of how the buyer is made to pay, it is related that the United States government lately bought 12,000 typewriters in one lot (of a grade that usually sells for \$100) for \$14 each; and, at that, there was a profit for the maker of a dollar on each machine.¹ What does it cost to make a \$3,000 automobile? Nobody but the maker knows, and he will not tell; but probably not over \$500. A generation ago, as everybody knows, a high-grade sewing-machine could not be bought for less than \$60; now department stores are selling better built machines of the same makes for \$20 or less. While the bicycle craze lasted, the better class of wheels were kept at \$150; and perhaps some readers have not yet forgotten how it transpired in a law suit that it cost less than \$20 to make them. It may not be as bad as this in all forms of manufacture, but it is only a question of degree; every-

¹ The manufacturers have recently explained that there was additional profit derived from the resale of old machines taken in exchange; and that this accounts for the low price. It accounts only for a small part of the margin (\$86) between the usual price and the price to the government.

where the cost of selling is excessive, and the buyer pays not only for his goods, but whatever is expended in inducing him to buy.

The defenders of the capitalistic system have long been accustomed to claim that, with all its defects, some of which they admit, it transacts the world's business with great efficiency. When the system is analyzed, however, it proves guilty of such prodigal and reckless waste that one wonders how it can keep on going. A conservative estimate, supported at every point by the best statistical data obtainable, makes this waste amount to the stupendous sum of a hundred billion dollars a year—a sum that, if saved under a scientifically managed social and industrial system, would give each family of the United States an income of \$6,000, or ten times the average wage-earner's income to-day. We have not even the consolation, such as it would be, of knowing that this loss of the producer is the capitalist's gain—it is absolute, irrecoverable loss.¹

We are not only wasteful of our wealth, but of human life. We waste life by disease, by accident, by overwork, all preventable. A half million people die every year quite unnecessarily, and subtract just so much from our potential wealth. We are slowly learning that men are more valuable than property, and

¹ A. M. Simons, "Wasting Human Life," Girard, Kansas, 1912. Similar figures are given in Koester's "The Price of Inefficiency." Koester is a civil engineer, educated in Germany; his thoroughness of investigation and his aloof impartiality give his conclusions great weight.

that the greatest of all our extravagances is this reckless sacrifice of human life. A revolution would not cost more in blood and lives than the present industrial system is costing; 45,000 workers are killed every year by criminal negligence; one miner of every hundred dies, because his employer cares less for the lives of his men than he does for his mules. Nor have we completed our indictment, when we have counted those killed out-and-out by the system; those who die by inches, years before their natural time, are also to be charged to its account. In England employees work on the average 55.2 hours a week, but one-half of our steel workers are compelled to work 72 hours a week, about a third work more than 72 hours, while a fourth work twelve hours a day for seven days of the week, with an occasional 24-hour work-day. Such labor cannot but result in early death, and in the degeneration of the race, physically, intellectually and morally. No demand for social justice is more insistent, or appeals more strongly to the conscience, than the demand that this needless sacrifice of human life shall cease.

The great advance made within a few generations in productiveness of labor, through multiplication of machinery, has been of slight benefit to the laborer, though of vast profit to the capitalist. The old tools were merely aids to the hands and all labor was manual; the new tools, machines, have almost eliminated the hand. The machine now produces results of power, dexterity, complexity and even delicacy that no hand ever equaled. But "labor-saving" machines

belie their name; they have saved the employer cost of labor, but they have not made the worker's toil lighter nor added appreciably to his wage. And the employer has, for the most part, been able to see nothing but the benefit to himself; the just claim of the worker to a share in this increased production has been either denied or ignored. He has not been intelligent enough, in most cases, to see what his own highest interests demanded—that the greatest ultimate profit is not to be made by forcing wages down to the lowest level of subsistence for the workers. Mr. Redfield, the Secretary of Commerce in Mr. Wilson's cabinet, sums up his experience as a manufacturer and his conclusions as a student of economics in these words: "Given the scientific spirit in management, constant and careful study of operations and details of cost, modern buildings and equipment, proper arrangement of plant and proper material, ample power, space and light, a high wage rate means inevitably a low labor cost per unit of product and the minimum of labor cost."¹ Swinish selfishness invariably defeats its own purpose. Only social justice can produce social prosperity.

One difficulty in the attainment of social justice is that many among us hold so obstinately to a political philosophy that experience has shown to be without foundation in reality. This is a theory of the limited functions of the State, out of which grew the

¹"The New Industrial Day," p. 121. Mr. Redfield considers this summary of a long argument so important that he prints it in italics.

practical maxim, *laissez faire*, let things alone, interfere as little as possible with the "natural laws" of society. Those who entertain this theory believe that the State has done its full duty when it has applied the Marquis of Queensbury rules to industry and commerce, and insured victory to the man who has the strongest "punch." This appears to be still the ideal of most economists, that the victory belongs to the strong. "The big company has a right to beat the little one in an honest race for cheapness in making and selling goods; but it has no right to foul and disable its competitor."¹ What right has the big company to beat except the right of bigness? That quotation helps us to comprehend the cause of the popular prejudice against the great capitalistic concerns. The mere size of corporations is not a bad thing, but it is a dangerous thing. For size means great resources, and that means great power, and power is dangerous. Power is nearly always used for selfish purposes, without regard to the good of society. The people are right, therefore, in regarding great corporations as a menace; the burden of proof is upon the corporation to show conclusively that it is promoting the public interest, not preying on the public. The presumption is invariably against it.

The protection of the weak is, or should be, quite as much a function of the State as giving opportunity to the strong. The strong need no aid; they can

¹ J. B. Clark, "Control of Trusts," New York, 1912, revised ed., p. 28.

always look out for themselves and their own interests; if government fails to protect the weak it has little social justification for existence. And the Gospel of Jesus certainly enjoins protection of the weak as the first duty of the strong. The Gospel, therefore, can never be adjusted to either competition or monopoly—twin forms of industrial piracy, both of which fly the black flag and cut every rival's throat. Plato taught that the end of the State is to make men virtuous; the modern view is that the end of the State is to make men comfortable; but why may not men be made both virtuous and comfortable? Is the highest virtue attainable without a certain measure of comfort? Surely the two ends are not incompatible, much less antithetic. The ideal of the State should be to secure such organization of society as will give to every person opportunity to live the largest life. This is also the idea of the Gospel of Jesus, for that is what the kingdom of God means.

When we are told, then, by Herbert Spencer and others that the best government is that which governs least, our reply is, Yes, if it is despotism, oligarchy, aristocracy, using the machinery of government to plunder and oppress the people. It was under such experience that the maxim was developed. But if the State is a democracy, a people governing themselves for the common good, all the government that will promote the common good is desirable, and that will be matter for experimentation, not for *a priori* decision. Men decry the demand for more legislation, as

merely the attempt to cure evils of law by more laws. But law is only the orderly means by which men act together in society and enforce a common will and purpose. More and more legislation is inseparable from democracy. May it also be increasingly wise legislation! The alternatives are despotism or the mob.

Another obstacle to progress toward social justice is belief that men cannot be made righteous by environment. But is it not quite as true to insist that men cannot become righteous without suitable environment? If we interrogate our own personal experience, most of us will find cause to acknowledge how potent environment has been in our case. We can easily conceive a world in which it would be as easy for men to do right as it now is hard, because we have been fortunate enough to live in such a world. That is to say, our environment has always made it easy for us to do right and hard to do wrong. We have lived in surroundings and companionship full of incitement to virtue and almost free from incitements to evil. Our chief temptations have been temptations to be good and to do good. To do wrong has always meant for us that we must overcome all sorts of restraints and obstacles placed in our way by our conditions of life. Goodness, service of our fellows and brotherly love have been normal results of our surroundings; and so far as we have failed to realize such ideals, we have been opposed to our environment, not in harmony with it. It ought to be easy, it is easy, for us to

imagine a society in which not merely little groups shall furnish their members such environment, but the whole should be like this. Nothing less is demanded by social justice. Nothing else is contemplated by the Gospel of Jesus.

CHAPTER III

THE WOMAN PROBLEM

FAR be it from the writer even to seem to imply that woman's nature is so incomposite, her relations to society so uncomplicated, as to present but one problem for solution. The definite article in the title of this chapter is emphatic. It is intended to signify no more than that a single woman's problem, the economic, is what immediately concerns our discussion. Some would perhaps prefer to call this a group of problems, rather than one problem; yet it will be found, on careful examination, that the problems constituting the group all grow out of the economic inequality of woman, and that to secure her economic equality is to solve all of them at once.

I

“Woman's rights” has too long been synonymous with the ballot. A marked change in public sentiment has taken place within a decade regarding equal suffrage. The conviction has been rapidly growing that there is one conclusive argument for woman suffrage: women want it. There are no arguments against it,—

only prejudices. The adoption of woman suffrage as a plank in the Progressive party's platform in 1912 no doubt means that this question has been practically settled—that it is only a question of time, and no long time at that, when the ballot will be given to women in all the States, as it has already been given in many of the newer States of the West. Some hard fighting will, no doubt, yet be necessary before the end is reached, for prejudice everywhere dies hard, but the goal is in sight.

But equal suffrage is only one of the demands of that remarkable modern movement for which the name Feminism¹ has been devised; in some respects it is the least important demand. Feminism demands for woman not merely equality at the polls, but equality everywhere—equality, be it observed, not identity. Feminism demands that whatever woman does shall be judged as work, not as the work of woman; and it demands that she be free to do any work that she cares to undertake. In other words, that the sex question shall be eliminated from practical affairs as far as is humanly possible. Wifehood and motherhood will always be, as they are now, the highest calling of woman, but not every woman is called to be wife and mother, any more than every man is called

¹ An anonymous writer in the *Century*, for April, 1914, thus defines Feminism: "To meet life untainted: to labor, to succeed or fail, as human individuals only; to feel handicapped by nature only, not by men; to seek their own success in self-chosen appropriate paths unhampered by laws or conventions from which men are exempt." The "square deal" for their sex, in short.

to be preacher or poet. Feminism merely demands that all other callings shall be open to woman on equal terms, and that the only question of her entering them shall be the question of her fitness. That can be determined, as in man's case, only by experiment.

So long as woman's "wrongs" were conceived to be chiefly or wholly her exclusion from political affairs, so long as the "rights" demanded for her consisted of the right to vote and hold office, the agitation in behalf of women made not the slightest dent in the armor of conceit worn by the average male of the species. When orators declaimed about "down-trodden woman," men merely grinned. They knew that in the majority of homes woman rules despotically. They knew that the laws—laws made and administered by men—are on the whole more favorable to women than to men. Even the average policeman will not club a woman as quickly or as brutally as a man—he remembers mother and sister and wife. The policeman who clubs a woman while in uniform is probably a wife-beater out of uniform. A jury in any State will acquit a woman on evidence that would convict a man.¹ It is well-nigh impossible to get a verdict of guilty on a capital charge against a woman; and when she is condemned, almost always some expedient is

¹In three years, thirteen women charged with murder were acquitted in Chicago (Cook County), and only one convicted, who died in jail. The State's Attorney said: "The blame is on jurors, who seem ready to bring a verdict of acquittal whenever a woman is fairly goodlooking, or is able to turn on the floodgates of her tears, or exhibits a capacity for fainting." Associated Press dispatch, March 16, 1914.

found to save her life. Whatever the statutes may say, the men who administer them have practically abolished capital punishment for women. In one State, a woman convicted of murder on the clearest evidence remained unexecuted for thirteen years, because one governor after another refused to set a day for her execution; and she was finally pardoned. The property laws of most States favor women at the expense of men—so far favor them as at times to be unjust. A husband is legally bound to support his wife, according to his ability and station, and if he fails she may herself buy whatever is necessary and he is liable for the debt. This obligation holds, even if she has money of her own, while he cannot touch a dollar of her property but by her free gift, nor is she liable for his debts.

What has wrought the great change in men's attitude toward the agitation for woman's rights has been the enlarged conception of those rights on the part of women themselves. The social disabilities of women, rather than their political and legal grievances, have roused men to a new way of thinking. This is no doubt part of the general awakening regarding social conditions that is characteristic of society as a whole. Women have come to see also that they are contending, not merely against artificial discriminations because of their sex, but against wrongs rooted in economic conditions with which sex is only remotely related, if related at all. This has given to twentieth century Feminism both a breadth and a depth that were absent from the Woman's Rights movement of

the nineteenth century. Men who were indifferent or hostile to the political aspirations of women are accessible to ideas regarding the economic wrongs of women. Men engaged in commerce or industry have practical knowledge of these wrongs, and already have latent ethical ideas regarding them that need only to be stimulated in order to rise to the region of conscious thought and action. Such men, for the most part, acknowledge the obligations of Christian ethics, so far as they understand what these obligations require.

It is the office of the Gospel of Jesus to arouse these latent ideas and to clarify them, so that their ethical bearings will be definitely apprehended. It has long been the boast of apologists that Christianity has been the chief agent in the uplifting of woman. This claim has been sharply challenged of late, and some have even maintained that Christianity has actually retarded the emancipation of woman. A Feminist writer not long ago urged it as a reproach against the Christian attitude to her sex that women are classed with chattels and domestic animals in the tenth commandment. It might, of course, be pointed out that the tenth commandment is of Jewish origin, not Christian; but, apart from that, the objection would lose force if those who urge it would reflect a moment on the difference between an enumeration and a classification.

II

We have already seen that one of the greatest blessings of civilization, and a prime condition of social

progress, is leisure; a reasonable proportion of time to be used in rest, recreation, and culture. No one at present profits less by leisure and money than those who have most of both. They have come into their kingdom recently, for the most part, and have as yet not the least idea how to rule it. "Painting the town red," scattering money lavishly up and down the Great White Way, is the one means they can devise, in their poverty of intellect and imagination, to get rid of their surplus. It is quite as true of American women as of American men that they fall into two classes: those who have no leisure and those who have too much. It is even truer of women than of men, for the wives and daughters of a large proportion of men who work belong to the leisure class. What will they do with it? is one of the most important of present-day questions. Will these favored women choose the life of idleness, of luxury, of self-indulgence, or the life of social service? Much of our future welfare depends on that decision. As Ferrero has pointed out in his "Women of the Cæsars," the decay of the Roman empire was in no small degree due to the fact that the women of Rome's upper classes chose the self-indulgent life.

On the other hand, the working-woman has little or no leisure, and this is consequently one of her greatest needs. She needs sorely not the leisure of idleness, but the leisure of congenial occupation. This is the more necessary the more mechanical and dull her work. And, as machinery takes an ever larger place in industry, all labor will tend to become mechanical and

deadening. The greater need then of leisure, of pursuits that will be a genuine re-creation, of systematic culture of body and mind. Women need such leisure more than men, for their more acute sensibilities suffer greater harm from monotony and mechanism.

The whole spirit of modern industrialism is opposed to such sentiments, and the capitalistic system is incompatible with progress in this direction. The spirit of industrialism is to extract from the worker the last ounce of effort of which he is capable; and the capitalistic system takes from the worker the fruits of his labor, beyond the barest subsistence, and gives them to the fortunate few. No class feels so keenly the effects of this social injustice as women who must work for a living. No class has profited less by the great industrial and commercial development of the past century. It was a long step forward for society as a whole when steam was harnessed, new machinery was invented, and the factory resulted. One worker could then produce as much as ten, fifty, a hundred, had produced before. So great an increase in wealth should have meant a general increase in social well being. But who got the increased product? There was another great social advance when the railway and the steamboat supplemented the factory, and stimulated production by simplifying distribution. But, again, who got the increased product? Still another tremendous impulse has been given during our own day to all forms of industry, as the manifold applications of electricity came to be discovered. But who got the increased product? It was divided as an old salt said prize money is di-

vided in the navy: they sift it through a ladder, said he, and what sticks goes to the enlisted men, the rest goes to the officers. About the same proportion of the increased product of industry fell to the share of the producers; the non-producers got nearly all. And of all workers the women got least.

In 1900 there were 5,319,397 women engaged in gainful occupations out of a population of 28,246,384 over ten years of age. Nearly one woman in five is a wage earner. And of these wage earners, 1,312,668 were in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits. This is the largest proportion of women workers to population in the world, and makes our problems more acute than those of any other land. We have done less toward the regulation of this form of labor, less for the protection of our women workers, than any other country. Even Russia has more humane laws for the protection of women than some of our American States. Pennsylvania, second among our commonwealths in population, wealth, and industries, ranks twenty-sixth in her labor legislation for women and children. Ponder it well, men of America: we are the most backward country on earth, that pretends to the possession of a Christian civilization, in the protection of womanhood. And, when you have thought well of it, be proud, if you can, that you are an American citizen! And a Christian!

A people who are careless of their women and children offend against a fundamental social instinct, for women and children are the future of the race. Whatever harms them attacks society at its most vulnerable

point. To bear and rear healthy children is the most important of race functions, and society cannot afford to permit women who are or should be engaged in the work of maternity at the same time to do exhausting work, in factories or anywhere else. Every industry must be judged by this test. The New York clothing trade has made a few millionaires and thousands of consumptives. But what do the millionaires care about that? It is "one of the incidents of the trade." The employer may look on a woman as merely a means of producing wealth, but the community ought to take a different view of the matter, and assign her a higher grade in the scale of being. It is the function of the Gospel of Jesus to inspire this higher ethical note in industry, but what is the gospel actually proclaimed accomplishing? The clothing workers have been striking repeatedly in recent years to better their conditions, among other things to abolish tenement-house work; the employers have been fighting hard to retain all the old abuses, especially work in tenements. Now, it is notorious that this particular form of industry is exceedingly hard on women and children. But in their contests how many expressions of sympathy have the strikers received from Christian sources? How many discussions of the issues, indicating even an intelligent grasp of their side of the question, did we read in religious newspapers or hear from Christian pulpits?

The conditions of women workers are perhaps worst in the textile industries. Attention has been directed to these conditions within a year or so by the strikes at Lawrence, Massachusetts; at Little Falls, New York,

and at Paterson, New Jersey. A shocking state of affairs, dimly suspected perhaps before, but not definitely known, has been forced on the attention of the entire nation. Nobody can hereafter plead ignorance. The fact has been disclosed that girls have been earning from \$2.50 to \$5.00 a week, few of them attaining the higher figure. Women have been working sixty-five hours a week for \$3.00 (and part of this "overtime" work, so as to increase the pittance a little); some have worked as many as eighty-four hours a week for a maximum wage of \$7.00, but more often \$5.00. Such labor is continuous; the workers do not leave their machines even for luncheon, eating what they can snatch as they work, so as to lose no time. And often such labor is performed in extremely unsanitary conditions, while, of course, the workers must live in crowded rooms, amid all sorts of disease-breeding surroundings.

While these are cases of extreme hardship, perhaps, the condition of women workers generally is little better. Sanitary surroundings may sometimes be better, but the economic return for labor is much the same in all forms of industry, and in all localities. The Social Service Commission of the Inter-Church Federation of Philadelphia issued a public warning in 1912 to girls of rural Pennsylvania not to come to that city for work unless they have prospect of a situation that will pay them at least \$8.00 a week, that being the minimum on which a girl can support herself there respectably. At the same time they stated that in nine of eleven textile industries of the city the maximum wage falls

below this minimum requirement. According to statistics furnished by the Federal government, the average earnings of women and girls in factories is \$4.62 for the first year and \$5.34 for the second. After ten years they attain the magnificent wage of \$8.48; but of the total number employed the average pay of 40 per cent. is under \$6.00.

Nor is the case any better when we turn to women employed in stores. In the three great cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago there are nearly 36,000 women employed in the department stores that are so great a feature of our American social and business life. Their average weekly wage is \$6.13. The average girl must work eight years before she can receive \$8.00, the least sum that will support her respectably in Philadelphia, and inadequate in either New York or Chicago. Other cities are no better. Miss Butler's careful investigation in Baltimore¹ brought her to the conclusion that there are twice as many earning less than \$5.00 as there are earning more than \$6.00. The minimum cost of living in Baltimore is estimated by Miss Butler as \$6.70, which certainly does not err by excess; yet of the employees of stores in that city 54 per cent. are paid less than the cost of board and clothes.

In the spring of 1913 an investigation was undertaken by a committee of the Illinois State Senate that disclosed results briefly summarized above; and, while this investigation was in progress, and Chicago employers were contending that \$8.00 a week was a gen-

¹ "Saleswomen in Mercantile Stores," New York, 1912.

erous salary for a working girl and quite enough for her to live on, the guardian of a fifteen-year-old girl came into a New York court and declared that his ward found it impossible to get along on an allowance of \$12,000 a year. As her estate produces an income of \$50,000 a year, the surrogate obligingly increased her scanty allowance to \$20,000. Is any comment necessary?

Some may be inclined to think that the conditions in the smaller towns are better than in these large cities. The only difference appears to be a quantitative one: there are fewer industries and fewer workers in the small city than in the large. An investigation of the smaller cities of Pennsylvania resulted in the conclusion that no working woman could be properly maintained in these towns for less than a weekly wage of \$6.80; and this included nothing for amusement, only the absolute necessities were taken into account. In these cities the average pay of girls is rather below than above \$5.00.¹

What possibility of leisure, what possibility of culture, what possibility of physical well-being, what probability of continuance in virtue, can the student of the woman problem find in such facts? Has anybody the hardihood to say that such facts accord with the

¹ The case is little different in England. In Birmingham there are said to be 116,000 working women, and 14 shillings is estimated to be the lowest wage that will keep a woman worker respectable and healthy. The average wages for unskilled labor for women over seventeen are barely 10 shillings.

Gospel of Jesus, the gospel of equality, of brotherhood, of deliverance?

III

What are the causes of this economic deficiency of women, and are they removable? The causes are, in part, general, as is shown by the fact that the deficiency is general, not confined to any one branch of industry or commerce. Careful investigation shows that one great cause is the relative inefficiency of women's labor. It is not a fact, as many women have charged and still believe, that women are generally paid lower wages than men for the same work. There is sometimes sex discrimination, but not generally. The real fact is that women and men are generally employed in different kinds of labor, and women are paid lower wages for less efficient service. There is little sentiment in business; employers, as a rule, no more discriminate against women than they discriminate in their favor. Male and female employees are alike machines for production, and it is purely a question of the best machine. It will be impossible to persuade many women that such is the case, but investigators of their own sex have come to this conclusion.¹ That women's wages are not determined by sex considerations is proved, among other ways, by the fact that their wages have at times increased in higher percentage than those of men.

¹ For example, Edith Abbot in "Women in Industry," pp. 313-315.

Assuming as a fact this relative inefficiency of women's work, can a good reason or good reasons be assigned for it? It has been suggested that girls show a greater tendency than boys to drift into employment by the route of least resistance, rather than prepare for a well-chosen line of work. There are fewer trades and skilled occupations for them, and they take the first work that offers, through ignorance and inertia. Woman's expectation of marriage makes her less efficient; she takes her work less seriously; likewise hers is a shorter working life.

One of the chief factors in the problem, therefore, is to increase the efficiency of women workers. We must begin back of the time when they seek employment—in the schools—and secure for them a better training. This will be discussed more thoroughly in the chapter on "The Problem of the Child," but just here one aspect of the question demands attention: In all the discussions and experiments regarding manual training and vocational schools attention has been paid chiefly, if not entirely, to the needs of boys. The training of girls for industrial life has been comparatively neglected, in spite of the fact that their need is really greatest. We shall never see the efficiency of women workers greatly increased until this defect in our educational scheme is remedied. So long as men enter on their callings on the whole better prepared for efficient service than women, nothing can give her economic equality. No determination of society, no fairness of employers, no legislation can give validity to the equation $2=3$.

But all competent investigators are agreed that inefficiency is not the only cause of low wages for women. It is not even the chief cause. The chief cause is the modern revolution in industry, the effect of which has been felt in the home as everywhere else. The introduction of factory-made clothing, food, and furnishings has set a host of women free from the tasks of their grandmothers, and they have turned to other work. Girls go into factories and stores and offices, in many cases, because the combined earnings of the family are none too large for the family's support. In other cases they seek work rather than sit idly at home and be supported by the labor of father and brothers. In either case, it is much to their credit that they have responded to the call of duty, or have chosen the useful life in preference to the ornamental. But the inevitable result has been such an increase in the body of women workers as to cause keen competition for work, and the consequent forcing of wages to the lowest sum that the most needy or most eager workers are willing to accept. Inasmuch as a large part of women workers live at home, and only partially support themselves, their competition for employment has forced wages below the subsistence point for those who lack this advantage. Many department stores will employ only girls who sign a statement that they live at home; and justify the low wages paid by this fact, and its implication that their employees do not depend entirely on their wages for a living.

Another serious factor in producing low wages for

women is that the employer is able to deal with them as units; there is great lack of organization and cooperation among them, as compared with men. It is not true that women lack the faculty of organization. Every church has long known how efficiently women can organize and conduct enterprises, and that they often show superior business skill in such work. It is true that their efforts have been mainly confined to things that are in themselves trivial and not worth their while: bazaars, fairs, and festivals. But, in larger and more important enterprises, such as women's missionary societies, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the various suffrage organizations, they have been uniformly successful. Women's clubs and leagues in great variety have sprung up in the past two decades, and hardly one of them has been a practical failure. There are now even trades unions of women. Still, it remains true that this spirit of cooperation is a very recent thing, and that in all forms of industry women are still far behind men in effective organization. The centuries-long subjection of women has repressed initiative and made coöperation difficult for them. But they are learning the trick, and already they are beginning to teach men lessons in what we have fondly persuaded ourselves was our exclusive game. The greater subserviency of women to custom has made them slow to adopt the principle of coöperation. But they are fast learning that only the weak fear and obey customs; the strong make customs. And women are coming to realize their strength.

A favorite explanation of women's low wages, and one that has been much insisted on by the wealthier classes, is the distaste for domestic service among American-born white girls. Of the 1,124,383 domestic servants returned in the census of 1900, less than thirteen per cent. were native born of native parents, while nearly seventy per cent. were foreign born or negroes. Domestic service was once the chief resort of the untrained woman; now scores of factories and stores offer her employment—at starvation wages, to be sure, but on terms so much more satisfactory to her than the position and work of “servant” that she will no longer accept the latter at any price. In industry or commerce a woman's hours may be long, but they are fixed, and her evenings, Sundays, and holidays are hers to spend as she wills. This greatly enlarged leisure, and the fact that she is not a “servant,” but may regard herself as a “lady,” give her such a sense of freedom and dignity that domestic service in comparison seems to her a status of slavery. No wages or comfort will be regarded by women bred in a democracy as sufficient compensation for the confinement and humiliation of domestic service. Servility, in name or spirit, is incompatible with democracy. The servant problem is already acute, and will become increasingly so, as long as the aristocratic spirit that demands “servants” lingers. If people living in a democracy insist on maintaining aristocratic institutions, they can do it for a time by importing their “servants” from foreign nations where real aristocracy exists.

IV

The ultimate solution of the problem of women's wages must be postponed until we consider the general problem of poverty. For a complete solution must be something radical, something that goes to the very bottom of our social evils and deals with primary causes. But there are two important measures proposed for immediate adoption that profess nothing more than relief at the points of greatest pressure: a minimum wage for women and an eight-hour working day. The ignorance of our public men about such measures is both discouraging and disgraceful. Whenever statutes of this sort are proposed and discussed, the articles in our newspapers, the speeches in our legislatures, and other forms of public debate invariably proceed on the tacit assumption that these are the crude proposals of theorists, experiments in legislation now to be made for the first time, propositions that we undertake a pioneer work in social reform. Whereas the fact is, as every public man who pretends to intelligence should know, that every measure of social justice proposed in the United States in recent years has a counterpart in European countries that has been in successful operation for years, sometimes for a generation.

A minimum wage bill, for example, was passed in England in 1906, and not for women only. England had been shown the way by one of her Australian colonies. Victoria adopted the minimum wage for work-

ers of both sexes in 1896. At first it applied only to five "sweated" trades: the making of shoes, bread, clothing, underwear, and furniture. Its operation was so successful, and so won the approval of both employers and employed, that, by 1910, virtually all the industries had been included in its scope. Experience confirmed economic theory, and both showed that a minimum wage tends to increase production, by increasing the efficiency of both workers and establishments. The latter is accomplished by the elimination of those concerns that can be maintained only by levying a tax on the community to make good their own defects. Those concerns that are most favorably situated, best equipped, and managed with most ability get the business, and society profits by the elimination of costly production of goods by the unfit and incapable.

The proposition to ensure to women workers such compensation as will maintain them in comfort and decency is nothing else than the principle of economy translated into the terms of modern business and social life. "Conservation" is one of the watchwords of our time. Conservation is too often narrowly interpreted to mean only material things: our forests, mines, water-power, and the like. This narrow commercial interpretation is inadequate; the most needed conservation is the conservation of human beings. The law of the sea must become the law of the land: *women and children first*.

Employers oppose a minimum wage law on the plea that, if they were compelled to pay the wage indicated,

they could no longer conduct their enterprises, **and** must either become bankrupt or go out of business. The sufficient reply to this plea is: Any business that cannot be maintained, save by paying women a wage below a fair living standard, is a business that ought not to continue. There are probably fewer such than many suppose, far fewer than interested employers assert, but there ought to be none. This is not a harsh judgment founded on vague, impractical sentiment, but what it is now the fashion to call "a cold business proposition." For such a business, instead of contributing to the wealth of the community, is a tax on the community's resources. Society has to make good the deficiency of wages; in some form and in the long run the deficient income must be supplied. If the underpaid worker lives at home, her family must contribute to her support, and that contribution is their tax paid to keep going an unprofitable business. If she does not live at home, soon or late the deficiency must be made good by some form of "charity." The employee becomes ill and must be treated free of charge in some hospital or dispensary; or she becomes a pauper and must be wholly supported at public expense; or she contracts tuberculosis and must be sent to a State sanatorium; or she goes on the street. In any case, the community ultimately pays the tax. People must live, people do live, and, if their wage will not maintain them, the burden of their maintenance in the end falls on the public. It is as certain as mathematics.

Society has thus far elected to maintain at great

cost public and private charitable institutions to care for the workers who have been insufficiently paid, rather than compel employers to do justice. If it wishes, it can continue that practice, but, to say the least of it, it is hardly economical. Millions are expended to-day in charities that ought to go into the pay envelopes of the workers; and, if they did go there, small need would be felt of the charities. It is thus, on one side, merely a problem of economics, while, on the other, it is a problem of humanity, of justice, of the practical application of the Gospel of Jesus.

We must not, however, blink the fact that the minimum wage and the eight-hour working day are merely palliatives. It is even a question if they would long palliate. The serious economic criticism is made of the minimum wage that its effect would be only temporary. It would immediately produce non-employment of those women whose labor cannot be made profitable at the minimum fixed by law; and they would either become a tax on society in some form, or would seek employment in other industries only to lower wages in them. Or, even supposing that this difficulty could be surmounted, and that all women workers can be given employment and paid as the law directs, cost of production will be increased, prices must be raised, the cost of living rises, the minimum wage becomes inadequate, and the last state of the woman worker is at least no better than the first. Under the wage system and industrial competition there must ever be the same

vicious circle: higher cost of living leads to a demand for higher wages, and, this gained, there follows greater cost of production, higher prices, and increased cost of living again. There is no end to the process, and no real relief for the workers in it anywhere. Nevertheless, as temporary palliatives, the minimum wage and the shortened working day are worth trying. The wisest economists, though they may guess, cannot know how they will work until they are tried.

It is the same problem that must be faced in some form by all organizations and reformers that are experimenting with palliatives, because they lack either insight or courage to attempt a radical remedy. The trades unions are meeting the same difficulty. What has the workingman accomplished through his unions in the way of social betterment? In some cases, not in all, he has won an increase of wages. But if he must pay the amount of this increase and more in higher cost of living, wherein is he helped? And the undeniable fact is that cost of living has increased much faster than wages for two decades, and the process seems likely to go on indefinitely.

Next to the ignorance of men who lead public opinion, and of the legislators who enact public opinion into law, the greatest obstacle to progress in dealing with this economic problem is our courts. We call them courts of justice, but they have too often proved courts of injustice. For our sins we are afflicted with a lot of Bourbon judges, who have neither learned anything nor forgotten anything in a lifetime of legal practice, who have stood stock still intellectually and

ethically while the world has run by them. In their devotion to precedents that have come down to them from a different social order, they cannot see the demands of the present. Our courts are standing to-day as a serious obstacle, and often as an impassable barrier to social reform. They have decided, for example, that a statute prescribing shorter hours of labor for women is unconstitutional, because it abridged women's freedom of contract! How well such a decision accords with the favorite maxim of lawyers, that the law is the perfection of reason!

Worst obstacle of all to progress is, no doubt, the indifference of well-to-do people in general, who are in no way personally affected by the wrongs and sufferings of working women. If society at large does not advocate the present iniquities, it at least tacitly acquiesces in them; to a large degree it profits by them; and it has hitherto refused to face the problem, but has taken refuge in cowardly silence. At critical moments it fails to speak the decisive word in favor of justice and progress. We call ourselves a Christian nation; we profess some respect for the teachings of Jesus, for the Golden Rule, for the Beatitudes. Actions speak louder than words, and by our actions we give the lie direct to every such profession. By our fruits we are known, and all our conduct gives emphatic approval, not to the social ethics of Jesus, but to such beatitudes as this: Blessed are the exploiters, the sweaters, the oppressors of women, for theirs is the Kingdom of Profit.

CHAPTER IV

THE PROBLEM OF THE CHILD

To inspire men to perform their social duties is a prime object of the Gospel of Jesus. That is the way of salvation for the individual and for society—a way by which the one is delivered from sin and the other from misery. Of all the social duties, none can take precedence of duty to the child. A Bill of Rights for childhood, that has been widely adopted as a basis for social work, declares that every child has an inalienable right: To be born right; To be loved; To have his individuality respected; To be trained wisely in body, mind, and spirit; To be protected from evil persons and influences; To have a fair chance in life. These rights of the child impose corresponding duties of parenthood. But duties of parents are duties of society also, which is bound, for its own present welfare and future happiness, to supplement the performance of parents wherever that is deficient.

These inalienable rights of the child are violated at almost every turn, and by every class of society. Naturally, each class has its own pet methods of violation. Among the well-to-do the tendency is toward the hurtful indulgence of children. The American spoiled

child is the marvel and the disgust of intelligent foreign observers. Among the poor the tendency is toward inhuman abuse of children, partly in the way of actual physical violence, partly in loading them with tasks too heavy for their years. The ethical results, though quite different, are about equally injurious to social welfare, but the economic results are worst in the case of the poor child. According to Ellen Key, this is the century of the child. As one looks about him one can hardly escape the conviction that this is expression of a hope rather than statement of fact. May achievement speedily make good this prophetic title!

What is the century thus far doing for the child? It is still permitting him to be exploited by a system of child labor that is but a euphemism for child slavery and child murder—a system compact of woeful waste and brutal savagery. Of the male children reported by the census of 1900 between the ages of ten and fourteen (4,083,041) there were 875,640 wage-earners; and of the 3,997,193 female children 321,982 were workers. In all, 1,197,324 of the nation's children were earning their bread and helping to support their families. Not a single one of them should have been at work. Thousands of children of still tenderer years are engaged in daily labor. Little tots that ought to be in kindergarten are working for thirty cents a day. Children all over our land are hopelessly toiling in the treadmill of industry who ought to be going with shining morning faces to school and filling the

playgrounds with their joyous laughter. Many of our "good" people cannot believe that such statements are anything but a hideous slander. It seems like treason to one's country to believe that a system so full of cruelty and iniquity can exist among us. It is the ignorance, the incredulity, the supineness of the "good" that keep such a system in existence. It would be so disagreeable to believe that these things are true, for then we should be compelled to do something about it; our consciences would not let us rest; so it is much more comfortable to disbelieve.

What kind of a people must we be to permit such things and feign a convenient ignorance of them? For, of course, no one is really ignorant. No one can possibly shut eyes and ears tight enough to keep himself from knowing. For several years the newspapers have been full of evidence, that not even the careful editing of the slaves of capitalism could evacuate of all their significance. Did Christian men and women see and ponder the testimony printed in the summer and fall of 1912 concerning child labor in the canning factories of the great Empire State? It was shown that 1,259 children under sixteen were employed in the canneries investigated; 141 less than ten years and 14 less than six. Mere babes were kept at work shelling pease and stringing beans until their fingers cracked open and had to be done up in rags. Surely an aroused and militant conscience will do something to end such abuses, or we shall soon have to take lessons in humanity from Turkey and China.

I

Of all forms of social waste, child labor is the least excusable, because it is so patently foolish. The child is the embodied future. We can never have good citizenship without protected childhood. Premature work means premature decay of physical energy and moral fiber. A long and well-trained youth means full development of human powers and a long, productive life. A short youth means imperfect development of body and mind, and, as a necessary consequence, a short and comparatively unproductive life. Child labor is a process of squandering future wealth to satisfy a present need—that is to say, it would be that, were there any present need, as to which something will be said later. Child labor denies the child proper education, demands of immature bodies and minds what only maturity can safely attempt to give. It places the child at the most plastic period of life under conditions that not only fail to develop him into a normal human being, but stunt his body and stupefy his mind and give a wrong twist to his moral nature. An experienced manufacturer has said: "You can protect a machine, you can guard the buzz-saw, but no law that you can enact can in a large industry protect the heart and soul of a child."

Books like "The Bobbin Boy," in which boys of a former generation were told about the early life of Nathaniel P. Banks, and similar tales of the rise of poor boys to distinction or wealth, while they may

have done something to stimulate the ambition of the young, have accomplished untold harm by encouraging the impression that going to work at a tender age is, on the whole, favorable to achievement. Physiological science is absolutely and irrevocably opposed to such a conclusion. It maintains that child labor is a costly method of discounting the future, which inevitably curtails the total contribution of the individual to the wealth of the world and makes society just that much poorer. Men are not so foolish in the treatment of domestic animals as they show themselves in the treatment of the young of their own species. What farmer would work a young colt? And, when the farmer does begin to work his colt, does he set him to plowing from sunrise to sunset? Any farmer who did that would be promptly suspected of insanity by all his neighbors. But a child, even at fourteen, is still a "colt." Is a two-legged colt worth less than the four-legged? That he is seems to be the judgment of thousands who possess both, if we may infer their mental processes from their actions.

The right of the child to his childhood, and the duty of society to protect childhood, are ethical principles that do not require to be argued or proved. Merely to be stated is sufficient to secure assent to them from any normal man or woman. But the man engaged in business, especially in manufacturing, is not a normal man. He has become so wonted to some abuses that he does not see them; he cannot even see them when they are pointed out to him. We must appeal from him, therefore, to the larger public. Society at large

suffers more than the child himself from neglect to give him adequate protection. For the child is our most valuable national asset; and to waste this source of wealth, or even to fail to make the most of it, is criminal folly.

Socially speaking, the worst use to which we can put a child is to put him to work. Play should be the only work of a child. To be sure, this is flat contradiction of the theory by which most of us were bred; for in our childhood we were taught that "work is good for us," and various more or less disagreeable tasks were exacted of us by our parents, on the principle that the more disagreeable the task the more valuable as discipline. But modern psychology has proved conclusively that such a theory of child training is altogether wrong. Play, in the sense of the agreeable exercise of our faculties, is the way by which they develop most rapidly and normally. Play is not only the best means of developing body and mind, but has equal ethical possibilities, and is the most effective of all preventives of juvenile delinquency. The child who is not taught to play as well as permitted to play is not only deprived of his birthright but is subjected to a direct course of preparation for the penitentiary.

Not enough attention has been as yet directed to the fact that play is a great school of ethics. The first requirement of all childhood games is to "play fair," and to learn that rule thoroughly is the foundation of subsequent character. Possibly some of us can recollect among our schoolmates boys who never learned fairness on the playground. If we have watched them

in their later career we have also noticed that they have never played fair in business or profession; the habit of taking an unfair advantage that they acquired as children has stayed by them all their lives. If the history of men who have built up great industries and fortunes by secret rebates and other unfair advantages could be investigated, the chances are ten to one that it would be found that as schoolboys they were "cheats" and "snitches." The boy who defrauds his playmates at "one-old-cat" and "duck-on-the-rock" is the future trust magnate. For the children's rule of fair play in games is just the Golden Rule applied to the affairs of the playground; and all our social ills are merely failure to apply that same rule in the great game of life.

The freshness and spontaneity that are so valuable gifts in every serious pursuit—and so rare—are developed in the child by play. It is no small part of the tragedy of life that these qualities are gradually crushed out of the man. Even the infrequent cases in which they survive would probably not exist but for a joyous childhood. Society's problem, one of the gravest of problems, is to make these cases less rare, to increase freshness and spontaneity everywhere and make life better worth living for all. This can be done only by wise training during the tender and formative years, and for this reason the child's right to his childhood must be asserted and protected. Such protection will increase the productive power of labor indefinitely. Everybody knows that a man does his best work when he is interested in his task, and that there cannot be a

better recipe for poor work than to set a man at a task in which he takes no interest. When men bring to industry more of the child's freshness their work will become play, a pleasurable exercise of their faculties. From the viewpoint of ultimate efficiency, therefore, child labor becomes an obstacle to progress that society cannot afford.

II

Child labor is socially unnecessary. The social surplus of wealth is already very great and is increasing rapidly from year to year. Individuals may need the labor of the child, society does not. Arguments in favor of child labor on economic grounds that are often put forth by interested manufacturers are found on analysis to be unfounded. No legitimate business will suffer from giving adequate protection to children. But even if the contrary were true, and it were demonstrated that certain industries would suffer by shortening the hours of child labor and raising the age limit, the answer of society must be: let them suffer. Society cannot afford to maintain industries by such a tax on its resources as child labor involves. If an industry cannot stand on its own feet, without this form of subsidy from society, let it perish. Such an industry is not a necessity, but a luxury far too costly.

As matter of fact, wherever additional protection has been given to children, not only has industry not suffered, but the output has been increased and employment has been given to a larger number of per-

sons. Experience has convinced manufacturers, who, before experience, were opposed to the legislation, that protection of children is a benefit to industry. It could not be otherwise. Economic theory, founded on observation, maintains that child labor is unprofitable for two reasons. The first is that, while it seems cheap, it is the dearest labor in the long run—dearest because least efficient. It is a short-sighted industrial finance that looks only at the pay-rolls instead of scanning the quantity and quality of the output. Employing inefficient labor, even at low cost, entails a loss on any manufacturing business. The man who cannot see that is not fit to be in business, and probably will not be long, if he has shrewd competitors. Child labor is not only future waste but present loss. A second economic objection to child labor is that it lowers the standard of wages and of working and living conditions, and so lessens the efficiency of all labor. The child is a competitor of adult laborers, even of his own parents, whom he and they fancy that he is helping. Child labor tends to lower sanitary standards, for the child will submit to conditions against which adults would revolt. Thus industries that make large use of child labor become parasites on society, for they must be supported by what is in effect a tax on other more economically conducted enterprises.

The laws that have thus far been enacted, and many of those now proposed for enactment, fail to promise any considerable betterment, partly because of feeble enforcement, partly because the advocates of reform have been and are too timid to ask for laws with teeth

in them. Child labor must not only be regulated in all industries, but should be prohibited in some: in all those that tend to destroy health and retard growth. It is bad enough that adults must be employed in such institutions; it is intolerable that children should be admitted to them. The age of employment is too low; fourteen years is the highest we have had courage yet to demand; it should be sixteen, or even higher. But the whole principle of an exclusive age limit is wrong; fitness, not age, should be the test of individual employment. Aside from a convincing certificate of the required age—and thousands of certificates now issued are fraudulent—two other qualifications should be required: First, the child offering himself for employment should be required to present a certificate of graduation from a grammar school, an honorable completion of the entire eight grades. Second, there should be a physical test; the child should be examined by a proper medical officer, appointed and paid by the State for the purpose, and should be required to present to the employer this officer's certificate of physical fitness for labor. No child ought to be employed until it is certain that he will not suffer irreparable injury from his labor. A New York statute that took effect October 1, 1912, requires such a physical examination by the medical officer of the Board of Health before "working papers" are issued. It cannot be doubted that every State will soon have such a law; it is the very minimum of rational regulation of child labor.

The first and greatest cause of the increase of child labor is the industrial revolution that has resulted in

the socialization of labor in the modern factory system. The machine and the factory first made child labor profitable on a large scale—immediately profitable, not economically and, in the long run, profitable. The opportunity has stimulated greed to the utmost. The greed of parents leads them to sacrifice the ultimate interests of their children for immediate gain; and this is true of any parents who are not compelled by actual want to put their children to work, yet do it. But more effective as a cause is the greed of capitalists, who, to make a profit for themselves, are willing to exploit children simply because their wages are lowest. There is also the greed of the children themselves, anxious to begin to make money, and not intelligent enough to perceive ultimate consequences. And perhaps most reprehensible of all is the greed of society at large, ever clamoring for cheap goods and caring nothing at what cost cheapness is attained.

Next to this cause, and often barely distinguishable from it, is the poverty of the working class. The high cost of living of late years has made the problem of subsistence an acute one for all workers, but especially for the unskilled or little skilled, whose wages are lowest of all, but whose need of food, clothing, and shelter is as great as anyone's. Many parents are employed at wages that enable them to make "just too much to die and not enough to live." The average workingman would no doubt prefer to see his children growing up under the best conditions for producing health, intelligence, and character, instead of competing with him in industry and lowering his wages be-

low a decent standard of living. But the immediate questions for him are: What shall we eat? and, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? These questions cannot be postponed; their immediate solution is urgently demanded; and to the workingman the only possible solution seems to be that his children shall begin at the earliest time the law will permit (and often considerably earlier) to contribute their earnings to the family fund. When the question of present hunger and cold is pressing, what use of urging on men that their future interests will be injured by the only conduct that promises to keep them alive?

It is, however, not merely the ultimate, but the immediate, interests of the workers that are threatened by child labor. Of this they are conscious; at least, they recognize effects, if they do not clearly perceive causes. The effect of child labor is destructive to family life. One of the most frequently urged objections to socialism is that it would break up the home. Those who raise that objection should look more carefully at what the existing system has already done and is daily doing to destroy the home. Child labor is especially disintegrating, in that it results in the independence of the child before he is fitted for it. He is earning his own living and knows it, and that makes him impatient of parental discipline and control. He has been compelled to play a man's part before he became a man, and he demands, in turn, a man's privileges. In many cases the children are the chief support of the home; the father is dead or worse, and the mother dare not restrain her children for fear of los-

ing their earnings. This is particularly harmful in the case of young girls. To give a child independence before he is mature enough to use it properly is as rational as to give a baby a loaded revolver for a plaything. Moreover, children thus deprived of oversight and training, even if they do not go wrong, receive no preparation for life. When they marry and attempt to establish homes of their own, the factory-bred boy lacks sense of responsibility and too often deserts his family in a crisis of its fortunes, while the factory-bred girl knows nothing of homekeeping and the inevitable result is matrimonial unhappiness and domestic shipwreck. In every way the home is sufferer, and must be sufferer so long as the present system continues, and particularly so long as child labor is permitted.

III

The problem of the child is not solely an industrial problem; it is even more an educational problem. To prohibit the child from working is therefore only the first step toward solution; quite as much as to be saved from premature labor, he needs to be prepared for intelligent and efficient labor when he reaches the proper age. No one, probably, would maintain that such is now the case. Among our social reforms, reform of education is one of the most pressing.

No educational reforms are worthy of serious consideration that are not based on study of real conditions. More than twenty million children are attending

primary schools of the United States, the vast majority of them in public schools. We spend \$450,000,000 on these schools, nearly as much as for automobiles, a little more than a third of our tobacco bill, and not much more than one-fifth of what is worse than wasted in drink. Even so, we have not schoolhouses adequate to contain this great school population. In New York City alone, over 100,000 pupils are attending school but half the time because of lack of room. If the truant laws and labor laws were adequately enforced hardly a city in the Union would find its schoolroom adequate. Our parsimony is disgraceful. Until lately much of the ancient patriarchal idea survived in our laws and customs: the child was the property of his father. The father, therefore, could give the child such an education as it pleased him to give, take him out of school and put him to work at as early an age as he chose and keep the child's wages until his majority. The latter is still his legal right, but the other privileges we have taken from him by laws of compulsory education and truancy. Having assumed the obligation to educate the child, it is our plain duty to fulfil it.

For this ridiculously inadequate expenditure of ours we are getting more than we deserve, but far less than we need, in the way of education. We were long accustomed to consider ourselves the most intelligent and progressive nation in the world; our Fourth of July orators told us so every year, and we believed them. But in 1880 the official report of the Commissioner of Education rudely awakened us. Our percentage of il-

literacy in that year was 22.15, while that of England and Wales was 10.55, Scotland 6.46, and Prussia 4.21. We have improved considerably since then, so that our percentage has been reduced to 7.7, but we are still far behind Germany, considerably behind Scotland, and probably not in advance of England.¹ In Germany, where the whole male population of full age is obliged to do military service, only three men in a thousand are found to be illiterate when they join the colors.

The whole blame of illiteracy is obviously not to be placed on the schools. Almost any American would say instantly that foreign immigration is chiefly responsible for our large percentage, and next to that the element of negroes and Indians in the census. But we must not be too complacent in thus laying the blame on the foreigner. The immigrants who come to us, if themselves illiterate, are more eager to have their children educated than the older American stocks. The census figures, when analyzed, show a greater percentage of illiteracy among native whites of native parentage than among native whites of foreign parentage. The proportion of children from five to fourteen years attending school is greater among those of foreign

¹ There is a difficulty in making accurate comparisons because the methods of gathering the facts are diverse. The test of illiteracy in Great Britain is inability to sign the marriage registers. In most of the Continental countries, where compulsory military service obtains, the test is the ability of army recruits to read and write. Only France and Italy, like the United States, make an educational census of the whole population over ten years of age.

parentage and foreign birth than among native Americans of two or more generations.¹

Fact is worth more than theory in education, but we must have a theory. That something must be wrong about the American theory seems to be indicated by these facts. It would perhaps be more strictly accurate to say that we have had and still have two theories of education. One is, that education should be chiefly cultural, and has as its end the unfolding and perfecting of the human spirit. The other theory is that education should be chiefly practical, and its end the disciplining of human faculties into a perfect tool. The one sort of education would fit the child to make a living; the other, it is said, makes him fit to live. One or other of these theories is held by most teachers with so much of conviction as to imply suspicion of the other and often open hostility to it. Neither theory can be said to have been carried out consistently anywhere.

The reason may be that the inherent good sense of the average American community has felt, if it has not clearly perceived, that the unflinching carrying out of either theory is undesirable. Culture, pursued as an exclusive aim, too often becomes an intellectual drug habit, which unfits its devotee to face life and see things as they are. There may be place in an aristocracy for a man so highly cultivated that he does not know how to earn an honest dollar, but not in a democracy. On the other hand, the "practical" ideal, thor-

¹The illiteracy of native whites, born of native parents, is 5.7; of native whites, born of foreign parents, 1.6.

oughly enforced and measurably realized, would make us a nation of Gradgrinds and altogether eliminate spiritual progress. But if it is undesirable to follow either ideal exclusively, neither is it necessary to arrange some weak and ineffectual compromise between them. They are not so much contradictory theories as complementary. In our discussions we are too prone to forget that the "practical" subjects may be made "cultural," while most of the subjects supposed to be purely "cultural" may be so taught as to be "practical" also. The distinction, when not merely verbal, is one of emphasis and method.

On one thing we can surely all agree, and in the end we shall be found to agree: any subject that is not directly connected with life has no proper place in primary education. The high school and the university exist for the cultural subjects, with less regard to their severe practicality, and primarily considering what will most promote symmetrical development. The common school exists to give the elementary education needed by every citizen, and, while all its aims should be practical, the cultural element should not be, need not be, and, in fact, is not excluded.

If, in the light of what has been said, we look farther into the conduct of our public schools, we shall probably come to the conclusion that their greatest fault has thus far been that they have been organized on an assumption totally divorced from reality. It has been assumed by educators that a single type of education is adequate, that all children can and should have the same training; that a single type of training will fit

them for callings the most diverse. Nothing could well be more at variance with the facts of life. The consequence of this assumption has been that our public schools have been organized for the needs of the well-to-do and the rich. They have provided a fairly adequate training for children a large proportion of whom develop a taste for higher education, and are of an economic grade able to afford it, or have sufficient personal initiative and aggressiveness to secure it against all obstacles. But for such as do not desire the higher education, or cannot obtain it, our schools offer opportunities so vastly inferior that one may almost say they offer no opportunity at all. There is, in other words, no adequate provision for the education of that vast majority of children who must earn their living by the labor of their hands. The public school curriculum is dominated by the high school, and the high school by the university. We have the anomaly of a school system avowedly democratic, but really aristocratic. While the democracy "pays the freight" the freight is too often delivered at the wrong address.

How serious this failure of our schools is probably few of our people really appreciate. We have so long been accustomed to flatter ourselves that we have the best school system in the world that we listen with a certain impatience to anybody who questions the accuracy of this notion, and so the facts filter but slowly into our minds through this layer of conceit. An examination of schools in fifty-two cities, representing with fairness the entire United States, shows that the majority of the children who enter complete only the

fifth grade; only half of those entering are carried to the final elementary grade (eighth), and one in ten to the final year of the high school. Or, to put it in other figures that may be even more impressive: of 1,000 children of school age, only 120 graduate from the grammar school and six from the high school.

Why do so many children begin to get an education and fall by the way? Investigation shows that relatively few children leave school because of failure in studies, at least as the direct cause. The majority leave in order to go to work. Poor health or sickness in the family is assigned as a reason by a large number, some of whom may really have left because of failure. An intensive study of 300 pupils showed that not over twenty per cent. left school at the age of fourteen because of real economic pressure. But, on the other hand, more than two-thirds of the children and three-fourths of the parents did not believe that it was worth while to spend more time in school. Their conviction was that the school was teaching them nothing of real value to them; and the probability is that they were right. But a school system that, by its repressive discipline and its unpractical curriculum, contrives to make children hate school rather than love it, to make children glad of any excuse to leave and go to work, instead of imparting a thirst for further learning, must so far be reckoned a failure, must it not? A system that miserably fails to accomplish its avowed purposes is not an object to which we can point with pride, but something of which we ought to be bitterly ashamed.

No public school system can be called even tolerably

satisfactory so long as it does not carry the majority of entering children through at least the eight elementary grades. With better teaching this might be done even now, for the majority of children spend sufficient time in school to complete the eight grades. The schools are not efficient enough to get the best results possible in the time now available. Consequently the defects of the schools that call for immediate remedy are those known as retardation and repeating: the failure of so large a proportion of pupils to obtain promotion at the end of the year, and their consequent obligation to take the work of a grade a second and even a third time. It is estimated that \$27,000,000 is spent annually in the instruction of "repeaters." Or, in other figures, one-fifth of the school money is devoted to educating one-twentieth of the children—which, to say the least of it, is bad business.

The causes of retardation are complex, including factors so diverse as truancy, ill-health, dulness, and laziness. The chief cause, however, is none of these, but curriculum and instruction adapted, not to the slow child, or even to the average child, but to the unusually bright child; and next to this unquestionably comes irregularity of attendance. When three-fourths of the children are present less than three-fourths of the school year, a school cannot reasonably be expected to produce satisfactory results. Conceding this difficulty to be beyond the scope of school authority, and to be in the sphere of parents and the law, it remains true that the school can and must do much to prevent retardation.

In days to come we shall look back with amazement on the whole present machinery of grades, examinations, marks, and promotions, and wonder how it ever came to be called an educational system. We shall think it the strangest thing that children could ever have been trained according to the absurd ideal of "making marks." We shall wonder why the best pupil was supposed to be he who most nearly approximated the intelligence of a parrot. We shall be unable to understand why schools did not train pupils for power, and make the test of their efficiency not the ability to remember, but the ability to think and to do things worth doing. At present the best we can hope is the abatement of some of the rigors of the system.

Schools have already found advantage in making promotions oftener than once or twice a year; term promotions, at least, should become the rule. The frequent reclassification of pupils encourages the bright and does not discourage the dull, by trying to force a pace too rapid for them. Promotion of qualified individuals, rather than of whole classes, promotion by subjects rather than by grades, would solve a large part of the problem.

Combined with this method many schools have found great advantage in giving more attention to individual instruction, special attention to the dull and slow. This has been found possible without increasing the teaching force, but if it necessitates smaller classes and more teachers, let them be employed. The efficiency of the schools is the first thing to be considered; expense is decidedly a secondary consideration. The

one thing in their public expenditure of which Americans never complain is the amount spent on schools—unless it may be an occasional grumble, for which there is only too good ground, that they get so little for their money.

The true theory and practice of education we owe to Froebel (who, of course, built on the labors of his predecessors, particularly Komenius, Rousseau, and Pestalozzi), and he merely applied the Gospel of Jesus to the school. The whole idea of the Gospel is freedom from the bondage of law and enjoyment of the liberty of grace. A Christian life is the free and spontaneous doing of the will of God, not because God drives us with a whip of obligation whose lash is the fear of hell. The Gospel ideal is nature corrected and directed by grace. Whether Froebel understood this ideal or no, consciously or unconsciously he applied the principle to education. He threw aside the notion that it is good discipline for a child to be forced, or to force himself, to perform distasteful mental tasks—which is nothing less than our old foe, asceticism, under the new face of education. It is a notion wholly pagan, not Christian. Froebel saw that a child's mind and a child's body should be developed through pleasure, not through pain, by being trained to do delightful things, not things repulsive. Hence the kindergarten, with its fundamental principle that all work should be made play.

But as the child develops the reverse is equally true: all his play should become work. That is to say, the pleasurable employment of faculties should no longer

be an end sufficient in itself, but become a means of accomplishing useful things. Yet the distinction between play and work should never become entirely clear to a normal man or woman. Mark Twain hit the fundamental philosophy of social activity, when in "Tom Sawyer" he defined play as work you don't have to do. The difference between play and work is not the amount of physical exertion respectively involved—men play themselves to an exhaustion as utter as is ever produced by work—but the sense of obligation to do. Take away that burdensome sense, somehow make all work inviting, and it becomes play. The greatest of all social problems lies just there: how to annihilate work. The school can do this now; society may do it by-and-by.

Dr. Montessori has made the first real advance in education since Froebel. Since all our knowledge is obtained through the senses, it would appear obvious that education ought to begin with the training of the senses and proceed to the training of the mind. But, instead of doing this obvious thing, education has for several thousand years been devoted to training the mind, leaving the senses to be trained by the experiences of life in any chance way. And, even as to training the mind, attention has been directed mainly to cultivating the one faculty of memory, with little or no attention to apperception, reasoning, imagination. Educators have inexplicably ignored the fact that nobody has ever seen a mind apart from a body. The fundamental fact of pedagogy is that the mind can be reached and developed only through the body.

The value of the Montessori method is that it begins with the training of the senses, teaching the hands of the child and through these the mind. She is applying to normal children the methods devised and found effective in the case of the abnormal and defective. She is availing herself of the newer psychological knowledge to modernize the methods of Froebel. With him she recognizes the principle of free development; no constraint is put on the child to learn what the teacher thinks it best for him to know, but his own faculties are given free course. The play instinct is seized upon and utilized as much as possible, and education is made a process of pleasurable exercise of his faculties by the child according to his own impulses. No wonder the progress made under this method astonishes all beholders by its rapidity and solidity. No wonder that even "weak-minded" children respond readily to it, for these have senses as capable of training as the strong-minded. It is the first rational, scientific and really practical system of education ever devised, and it is all these because it follows the method of nature.

Yet even Dr. Montessori has not given us the last word. Educators have learned, albeit slowly and unwillingly, that whatever the child is taught must be made to interest the child; but they still shy at the converse principle that whatever interests the child must be taught. But the two principles must go together if we are to have a wholly rational system of education, and even Montessori has only arrived at the first—re-

discovered what Froebel and others had taught before her, and that Froebel at least had embodied in a workable system.

It is easy, much too easy, to over-stress the objection to our schools that they are not "practical." They must not be made too practical. Industry has as its aim production, and insistently demands an education that will make school graduates better producers. Education must aim at the unfolding of human powers, not for production solely, but for life, with due regard to the fact that people must earn a living, but not forgetful that "the life is more than the meat." One kind of training is in the sphere of the useful, the other of the ideal. But, again let it be said, this does not imply incompatibility, still less hostility, between them. Useful activities may be modified if not directed by the ideal, and the ideal may keep in view the practical as at least one of its ends.

IV

The years devoted to the training of the child are all too short, as well as ineffective. The compulsory school age should be raised to sixteen and all labor should be forbidden before that age. The primary schools should be so improved that the average child will graduate from them at twelve. For the intervening four years a new system of training should be devised, or a great expansion and improvement of one

already in partial operation, and made so attractive and helpful that, instead of one in a hundred graduating from our secondary schools, as now, 75 per cent. or more should be graduates. This is not too high an aim and is by no means an impossible result.

As a preparation for this secondary instruction, manual training should be introduced and made effective in all primary schools and continued through all the grades. It should be genuine manual training, a continuation of the Montessori principle through the later years of instruction, adjusted to the growing intelligence and information of the child. Genuine manual training, one says emphatically, something not synonymous with industrial training, indeed quite different. Real manual training is part of education; industrial training is a device of business. The value of manual training in the primary school is not practical but cultural. The use of the hands is an indispensable part of development of the mind, as the new psychology has taught us. It enlarges the child's material for thinking and trains him in its use; that is, in more accurate thinking. Education without manual training imparts words and ideas, great things, priceless things indeed, but of no use until brought to the test of reality. Until his world of thought is made to conform to the world of fact a child wanders in a maze of dreams. One of the worst features of our education at present is that the child is taught in school a theory of life that all his experience of home and street contradicts, and presently, when he enters shop or store, it is

shattered to bits, and there is no Omar to teach him to remold it nearer to the heart's desire.¹

Because of its cultural value manual training should be given to every child, without regard to social standing or probable calling. A boy should learn to use ordinary tools, not because he is to be a carpenter or a plumber, but because he will very likely be a lawyer, and a better lawyer for such training. No man is educated until he can do as well as know. Girls should be taught as well as boys, but perhaps in a different way. A chief value of manual training is its effect in vitalizing all the other school work; it puts new meaning into arithmetic, for example, for a child to discover its use in measuring and calculating his work. A psychologist would predict this; the experience of the classroom proves it. Manual training interests children who are not interested in routine school work, and causes the teacher to revise hasty judgments of the intelligence and capacity of pupils that have been founded on bookwork only.

That this is the right way in education has been discovered by the negro race before the white. As teachers we should all take off our hats to Booker Washington. There was not a white man in America who had the sense to establish Tuskegee Institute. When,

¹ This is recognized by some of our foremost educators. Dr. James Russell, head of the Teachers' College at Columbia University, is reported in a public address to have said: "The greatest peril of our education to-day is that it promises an open door to every boy and girl up to the age of fourteen, and then turns them ruthlessly into the world to find most doors not only closed but locked against them."

after the civil war, the white race wished to do something for the uplift of the negroes, we established colleges in which they were instructed in Latin, Greek, and higher mathematics; and theological schools in which they were given courses in Hebrew, Greek exegesis, Church history, and systematic theology. That was the measure of our sense: a determination that the negro should have just as good instruction, just as lofty educational ideals, as the white. But Mr. Washington saw that his race must be taught to make a living, as the indispensable foundation for making a life—that economic independence was the way of salvation for the negro. And so he established Tuskegee, where negro boys and girls are given a plain English education without frills, and are at the same time taught how to earn an honest and comfortable livelihood. In the process they are given all the culture that as individuals they are capable of absorbing, all that in the present economic conditions of their race is of value.

In secondary schools, attention may be properly given to the probable future of pupils. The present high school is well adapted to the needs of the class that attend it. But alongside of the present high schools, which are too literary and exclusively cultural for the needs of the majority, should be established schools of equal grade of the industrial and technical kind, frankly devoted to the preparation of children for various forms of manual labor, and others to prepare for "business," the various clerical and semi-professional callings. Excellent private schools make part

of this provision now, and graduate annually thousands of students; but all forms of secondary instruction should be a public charge, not one kind merely. Every argument that can be advanced for the high school applies with equal force to the other classes of secondary schools. And besides there is this further argument, surely not lacking in force: they are more needed.

For the present, until public opinion will not merely support but compel the raising of the school age to sixteen and the provision of such secondary schools as have been indicated, much might be done for those compelled to go to work at fourteen by the establishment of continuation schools, where they may acquire the theory of what they learn in practice in the shop, so as not to be all their lives at the mercy of rule o' thumb. Employees should be taught how much it is to their interest to gain such education, because it will promote their efficiency and add to their earnings. Employers should be taught how much it is to their interest to have their workmen made more intelligent and efficient, so that the coöperation of the employing class may be secured for these schools. A few schools of this class have already been established, and employers have sent their apprentices with continued pay for half a day or a day a week. The results have been so excellent that, while at first employers merely permitted attendance on the part of their apprentices, they now require attendance. But for those who can remain in school until sixteen or after, industrial and technical high schools, of grade fully equal to the pres-

ent high schools, ought to be provided without delay. As a temporary provision, courses might be established in the present high schools in mathematics, physics, chemistry, and drawing, as they apply to trades and industries of our day.

All this may seem visionary to those who encounter these ideas for the first time. Such incredulous persons will perhaps be astonished to hear that Germany has had this method in practical operation for a generation. There are eleven fully equipped technical high schools, with a teaching staff of nearly eight hundred, and 16,570 students, of whom 2,000 are women. There are four agricultural high schools, besides agricultural institutes at eight universities, and 67 other agricultural schools of lower grade, not to mention 195 similar schools that are maintained only in the winter. Other technical schools are: 15 schools of mining; 15 of architecture and building; 5 academies of forestry; 27 schools of art and art industry; 429 commercial schools; 100 schools of textile manufactures; 12 for special metal industries; 12 for wood working; four for ceramics; 11 for naval architecture and engineering; 19 for navigation; and 11 music schools.¹

The success of the system goes far to explain the great strides forward that have placed Germany at the head of the industrial nations of the world. The boy or girl in the primary schools is assisted by the teacher to make choice of occupations for which they are best

¹ These facts are given on the authority of the "Statesman's Year-Book."

fitted, and psychology is invoked to give aid in this matter. All this is in marked contrast to the American boy's headlong fashion of going to work, taking the first job he can get, and trying one thing after another until, if he has sufficient good luck, he finally discovers something for which he is not too unfitted to get along after a sort. The German teacher then makes it his business to see that the pupils get the supplementary training that will best fit them for the work chosen. Employers are compelled by law to excuse their child workers for instruction without loss of pay, and also to pay the tuition fees. These, however, are said to be merely nominal, the chief expense of the schools being borne by the municipality and the State. The result of a generation's working of the system is that practically all the manual laborers of Germany, excluding agriculture, are skilled workmen, and the rough work to which unskilled labor is adequate is now done almost wholly by foreigners.

V

After all, is not the greatest defect of our school system that it still makes no adequate provision, in most cases no provision whatever, for the physical culture of the child? Obviously, this is quite as important as his mental culture, but educational theory has hitherto been that care of the child's health and physical development belongs to the parent and the home, not to the school. And perhaps an ideal division of

responsibility and work would be that. But the school must face facts, the school must get results; and its methods must be adapted to existing fact and desired result. It is incontrovertible fact that the parent and the home do not care adequately for the physical development and health of the child. It is equally incontrovertible that a child in poor health, or with a body imperfectly developed, cannot do his school work properly. Systematic medical inspection and systematic physical training are, therefore, an indispensable part of a school system. For a few children of the well-to-do these may be superfluous things, but for the great majority of school children, even from the well-to-do classes, it is the condition of normal proficiency in study.

A modern school might as rationally be left without desks, text-books, and blackboards as without gymnastic apparatus and a playground. And a playground is not a mere vacant lot to run about in, but should have the fittings of an athletic field. Games and exercises should be taught as carefully as the other school subjects, and proficiency here should count for as much as proficiency in class. The calisthenics introduced into the schools a generation ago were an excellent thing of their kind, a welcome relief to muscles and nerves tired by ordinary school tasks, but they are quite useless for physical culture. Manual training would, of course, do something for the bodily development of pupils, but the chief reliance must be on the gymnasium and the playground, where regular work is done under a competent instructor. Such work

would be directed to the removal of physical defects and the securing of a symmetrical physical growth. The remarkable results obtained in many colleges by compulsory physical exercise under competent direction both shows the practicability of the proposal as applied to the public schools and warrants the hope of great improvement in national physique and national health. Let the advocates of the new and much talked of eugenics direct their efforts to this point and they will be able to free their movement from some of its present absurdities. If for a generation we should bestow on the bodies of our children half the attention that we now give to their minds, we should become the admiration of the world.

Investigation of our schools shows that no small part of the failure of the pupils to do their work properly is due to the fact that they are not sufficiently nourished. It is impossible for a growing child to study well on little breakfast and less luncheon. It is true that the children of European immigrants are generally accustomed to a light breakfast; but that should be followed by a hearty luncheon, and this is seldom the case. Their parents are often at work, and, in lieu of a home meal, five cents or less is given them to buy luncheon, which as often as not is spent for candy instead of more nourishing food. To provide a good midday meal for the children, that will enable them to do their work without physical exhaustion, has already been found essential in certain quarters of some cities, and will ere long be regarded as much a

matter of course as any other kind of school equipment.¹

These ideas about physical culture in the schools will appear to many people mere fads, so far removed from the sphere of the practical as to be worthy of no serious consideration. Let such ponder a few plain facts. A few years ago forty children in a Cleveland school were organized into a special class to try the effects of mouth-hygiene. They were first submitted to various mental tests; then their teeth were put in order by a dentist, and each was provided with a toothbrush and pledged to use it regularly. Twenty-seven of them had persistence enough to maintain the experiment for a year, at the end of which time the mental tests were repeated, and showed a gain of 99.8 per cent. When we consider that 75 per cent. of our school children have physical defects at least as serious as bad teeth, and what might be accomplished by systematic medical inspection and physical culture in overcoming these defects, how can anybody question the importance of this matter?

As regards the matter of practicability, an experiment in four of the public schools of Philadelphia is decisive. Mr. Charles Keen Taylor, a former instructor in psychology in the University of Pennsylvania, organized a club for boys by the simple process of showing schoolboys photographs of boys of their own age who were well developed. All were naturally

¹ England passed a statute known as a Provision of Meals Act, in 1906, and a Medical Inspection Act in 1907. "Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1912," vol. I, p. 495.

eager to attain a like development. Each boy was given a physical examination; if his physique was first-class and his class standing good he was given a first-class button; fairly good physique and standing entitled him to a second-class button; while any boy who joined the club was entitled to a third-class button. Some special privileges were given to all members of the league, but every boy wanted to get into the first class as quickly as possible. They were given advice as to the exercises to take to remedy their defects, and, as promotion depended on their success, they did as they were told. A regular diet was advised as requisite to the best physical progress, and an early bedtime, and they were warned that smoking was especially detrimental.

Tests at the end of a year showed surprising progress. Over 80 per cent. of the boys who had smoked before entering the club had stopped, and the physical progress of all was highly gratifying. Inasmuch as the experiment has been conducted at practically no cost, without apparatus or playgrounds, the fact that the weaklings of this club were started in a single year on the road to strength, while the more fit developed a high degree of muscular power and endurance, makes this one of the most effective object lessons of the value and practicability of physical culture for school children.

V

But it will be of no avail to improve the schools unless the children are free to take advantage of what

they offer. The ignorance and greed of parents, and the intelligence and greed of employers, must not be permitted to continue the exploitation of the child. The root of the chief evils that constitute the problem of the child is Profit. The moment it ceases to be profitable to exploit the child he will be given a fair chance to enjoy his childhood. There is a very simple expedient, that has already been tried in a small way, which will dispose of the worst of these evils at a blow and with an ease all but ridiculous. A Federal statute forbidding the shipping into any other State of any goods manufactured by the labor of children under fourteen or sixteen years would be immediately effective. Few factories find profit in manufacturing goods to be sold within the State where they are made—that is too small a market in these days. The United States Supreme Court has passed several times on the constitutionality of this principle in legislation, declaring that Congress has the sole right to regulate interstate commerce, and any regulations it makes are within its discretion and not a matter for judicial interference.

But child exploitation in factories is not the only way in which the welfare of the child is menaced and his rights abridged. In domestic, agricultural, and street labor there are abuses quite as great as in factories, and thus far there has been little done to regulate them. The need of regulation is shown by the census statistics, which make it clear that 75 per cent. of child workers fall into these classes, while only 16 per cent. are in factories. Children of three and four

years work by the side of their mothers in hundreds of tenements; and children of school age are kept from school and employed in tasks beyond their strength on thousands of farms. The "bound" boy or girl, taken from some charitable institution or from the poorhouse, and often treated with less consideration than the dumb animals, is a feature of many a farm. These evils are more delicate to deal with and more difficult to cure than the factory, where massing of workers together, if it creates some special difficulties, at least makes the problem of control simpler. No suggestion that seems sufficiently practicable has yet been made for effectually dealing with domestic and agricultural child labor.

Child labor in the streets is in many respects a worse evil than labor in factories. It is hardly less detrimental to health, and far more detrimental to morals. It is the more difficult to deal with, because many of the workers are not employees, but work directly for themselves or their families. This is the case with newsboys and, until lately, was the case with bootblacks.¹ Street labor trains these children in all forms of mendicancy, dishonesty, and vice. Many of them are not so much impelled by need as allured by the liberty and opportunity for self-indulgence made possible through their gains. The economical and ethical de-

¹ Bootblacking is ceasing to be a street industry, but is becoming something even worse through the infamous *padrone* system. Boys (mostly Greeks) are imported for this work, and others (mostly Italians) are obtained from the slum districts and exploited by these *padrones*. In all our large cities this is now one of the worst forms of child labor.

fects of this form of child labor are almost innumerable, and of the most serious nature. Street labor breeds distaste for any regular work, because all street occupations are casual and occasional, most of them therefore uncertain and all without oversight or discipline. No training could be worse for children at their most susceptible and plastic age. Street occupations lead nowhither. The boy grows into the man and finds no opening into a man's career; he has, in fact, ceased to be a boy without becoming a man.

Owing to its occasional character, street labor involves excessive fatigue at times, while it offers excessive leisure at others; these are conditions favorable to dissipation and immorality of many kinds. It compels exposure to bad weather and so favors resort to stimulants. It compels familiarity with vice of every kind at an age when ignorance is both bliss and safety. A natural result is that a large proportion of street workers become vicious and are afflicted with venereal diseases, thus becoming centers of infection to the whole community. Many become recruits of the habitual criminal class, and in later years fill our jails and prisons, not to say our asylums and hospitals.¹ If there were no ethical objections to child labor in the streets the economic cost is too high.

It is objected that the work done by children in the streets if done by adults would prove too costly—that child labor is an economic necessity. Experience

¹As to what is now attempted for the cure of juvenile delinquency, there is no better source of information than the group of reports in the number of the "Survey" for February 5, 1910.

shows, however, that newspapers can be profitably distributed by adults, especially by utilizing the services of old men and cripples. To do this on a larger scale would be to "kill two birds with one stone," not only eliminating the objectionable child labor, but furnishing profitable employment for a needy class. Experience has also shown that men can be profitably employed as messengers, instead of boys, and that they are more prompt and efficient. The economic argument for child labor is but a pretext, and a very weak one at that.

Few States have as yet made any attempt to regulate this form of child labor. New York has a statute, but Pennsylvania has none; Massachusetts and New Hampshire alone among the New England States have acted; and Wisconsin is the only one among the older Western communities to attack this problem; no Southern State has done anything. The newer States, where the need is least, have done most: Oklahoma, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada have the best laws. The older commonwealths and the richer should blush to find themselves surpassed by Utah and Nevada in anything that relates to human welfare. Utah and Wisconsin alone make the age for street labor as high as twelve years; other States content themselves with prohibiting boys under ten from engaging in street occupations. Practically all make the age limit for girls sixteen years, which is more praiseworthy. Still, it is apparent that much remains to be done, even in States that have done something, before regulation of

this form of child labor can be said to be at all satisfactory.

It is charged by some that what has already been done in the way of legislation has made the lot of the child rather worse than better—that our zeal is so little according to knowledge as to make reformers more dangerous as friends than employers are as enemies. It may be so. It almost certainly will be so, if reforms are suffered to go singly. Other measures of social justice, like a minimum wage for the head of the family, compulsory insurance from accident and unemployment, and old age pensions, must go hand in hand with abolition of child labor, as well as the better provisions for education already outlined, or we shall take the child out of the streets and factories only to thrust him into the jails and almshouses. We must guard lest we attempt to be kind only to be cruel. There is grave danger, and we shall do well to recognize it, that society, in a blind attempt at reform, may come to practice a brutality greater than it now reprehends in the capitalist.

CHAPTER V

THE PROBLEM OF THE SLUM

THE slum is the problem of great cities, but it is not the problem of all great cities. New York and Chicago, Boston and Philadelphia, have slums; London has slums; but the cities of continental Europe for the most part have no slums. European cities have a housing problem to solve, but not a slum problem. The slum is a social disease that may be named Americanitis.

This is an acute problem in American cities for many reasons. We have felt to the full the universal modern tendency toward urban concentration of population. Immigration has also produced a congestion of foreign population in all our large cities, especially those on or near the Atlantic seaboard. There has been no efficient planning of our cities; their extension into the original suburbs has been the haphazard process of profitable speculation, complicated by all sorts of municipal "graft." Until recently, all our cities have permitted their people to erect any sort of buildings anywhere, of all kinds of materials, and to maintain for occupation buildings that long since ought to have been condemned and torn down. Only our larger cities now place any effective restrictions on building, and these restrictions are nowhere such as

they should be. It is our lack of thought and foresight that are chiefly responsible for the existence of the slum. Our municipalities live from hand to mouth and to educate them to any other method is a slow and painful process.

New York is, of course, the city in which Americanitis is most severe. Of the 3,437,202 people in Greater New York in 1900, more than two-thirds of the whole, or 2,372,079 lived in tenement houses. The figures for 1910 when available will certainly show larger numbers, and may show a larger proportion, of tenement-dwellers. In 1900 there were 82,652 tenements in Manhattan and 33,771 in Brooklyn. Of course, a large proportion of these, perhaps half, were more or less pretentious "apartments" outside of the slums, occupied by the rich and well-to-do. Though many of these are far from ideal from the sanitary point of view, they are occupied by a class who are able to look out for themselves, and may be trusted to insist on a certain standard of cleanliness and healthfulness, even if that standard be not always the highest. It is the other half, whose poverty compels them to take what they can get in the way of habitations, who must be housed in the slums or not at all, whose plight calls for our sympathy and help. What is thus true of New York is true in varying degrees of all our large cities, and may become true of the small.

I

After all, the slum problem, though exceedingly grave, is comparatively simple. The slum as it exists

is a complicated affair it is true, and its existence complicates or intensifies almost every other social problem of the great cities, but it has a single cause and may be the most easily and quickly cured of all our great social ills. For the slum is purely and simply the result of bad housing, and the slum may be forever eradicated by good housing. On the theoretic side it is a problem in engineering and architecture; on the practical side it is a problem in finance. There is nothing mysterious, nothing even difficult, in the terms of our problem; we understand it perfectly; further investigation or study will increase our knowledge in detail, but are not needed for action; we have come to the point where the only requisite is to do something, and to do it quickly and well. It is a problem of the practical type with which the American genius is peculiarly fitted to cope. It is, in a word, a business man's problem, and the everlasting wonder is that Christian business men do not tackle it and get it out of the way. If Christianity meant anything to them in their business life they surely would.

The slum has become a moral condition, but it has a purely physical cause. Hence we are wasting our present efforts to combat it with moral remedies. The effective remedy must be, like the cause, physical. When we analyze the facts of the slum we come to this at the bottom of all: The evils of the slum are all traceable to the attempt to house a large population in dwellings intended to house a small population. If the number of dwellers were limited to the number for which the building was planned, there might be un-

sanitary quarters and unwholesome houses, but not the slum. It is the combination of bad housing and overcrowding that constitutes the evil, which is thus physical in its base, moral in its results. "Five into one you can't" we used to be told in the arithmetic class, but the modern landlord is superior to mathematics. "Five into one I can" he says, and he does it—puts five families into a building constructed for but one family. When this is done through a large section of a city, the inevitable result is a slum. Dirt, degradation, vice, crime find a congenial residence and a safe shelter in the slum. Poverty lives there because it has no choice; disease flourishes there because it finds ample material to work on and conditions just made for it; vice and crime run to cover there because it is an ideal hiding place for those who love darkness because their deeds are evil.

Let us, however, be just to the landlord; not all the evils of the slum, not even all its overcrowding, are justly chargeable to him. His reckless and inhuman greed is responsible for only part of the overcrowding of the slums; the people of the slums ably second his efforts. The greed of the landlord is paralleled by the greed of his tenants, who sublet their rooms or small apartments to lodgers. This is especially true of some of our foreign populations, who thus receive from lodgers almost or quite enough to pay their own rent. Inspectors have found incredible numbers of people, of both sexes and all ages, occupying a single room. In one home reported, not only was all the floor space occupied, but three men slept on the piano!

In another three girls, earning an average of \$10 a week, slept on the floor of a dark closet. The result always to the health, and often to the morals, of those herded together in this indecent and unsanitary manner hardly needs to be enlarged upon. That such practices should be made not only unlawful but impossible cannot be regarded as a question for argument.

When one says that the slum may be easily destroyed by providing good housing, one should not be understood to say that all the things found in the present slums will immediately disappear. Poverty, for instance, has a much deeper cause than overcrowding, and will be far more difficult to cure. The destruction of the slum will greatly decrease vice and crime, but they will still remain problems to be dealt with. Disease would probably be lessened fifty per cent. by the removal of the slums, but disease will still present a knotty social problem when the slum is gone. As the slum is not the sole social evil, or the sole cause of social evils, we are to expect progress, not victory, as the result of its elimination. It is important that we have a clear understanding of what it is fair to expect as the result of a successful campaign against the slum, or inevitable disappointment awaits us.

This matter of good housing must be regarded as fundamental among our social reforms. Children growing up in dark, ill-ventilated, filthy houses cannot be expected to reach normal physical development. Healthy bodies are possible only amid healthy surroundings. The school problems that we have already had occasion to note are greatly aggravated, if not

wholly caused, by the slum. Pupils cannot do their school work properly if their vitality is sapped by their environment; and they are graduated from the school to begin the serious business of life with the double handicap of weak body and undeveloped mind. The slum is, therefore, an economic blunder of the first magnitude. If no ethical considerations were involved, simply as a matter of dollars and cents, solely as a question of industrial efficiency, society cannot afford so expensive a luxury. The slum diminishes the productive capacity of its inhabitants by fully fifty per cent. Even America, loudly as we boast of our national wealth, is not rich enough to dismiss as trifling such a drain on her resources as this.

There is great danger that anything like adequate statements regarding the slum will be looked upon as exaggeration by those who have given no attention to the matter. And one difficulty in dealing with the subject is lack of those precise figures that are so convincing to minds of a certain type. The physical effects of overcrowding have not been scientifically investigated in America, but a careful study has been made in some foreign cities, notably in Berlin. It was found there that there was a death rate of 163.5 per 1,000 families occupying a single room, 22.5 for families occupying two rooms, 7.5 for those who had three rooms, and 5.4 for those having four or more. That rapidly descending scale tells its own story. And yet not all of this tremendous difference in death rates can be justly ascribed to the one cause of overcrowding. No small part must, of course, be assigned to the general eco-

conomic differences between the families investigated. A family able to occupy three rooms and pay the rent for them would also be able to afford more nourishing and more abundant food, more and better clothing, and probably better nursing and medical care of its sick members than a family so poor as to be compelled to live in one room. Nevertheless, that overcrowding vastly increases the death rate, in an inverse geometrical ratio to the rooms occupied, is a conclusion that such figures absolutely compel.

We should begin the work of housing reform with a conviction that housing evils are not necessary. The slum is not rooted in the nature of things, inseparable from dwelling together in cities. Our present evil plight is due to a combination of ignorance, neglect, and greed. Even fifty years ago nobody could have foreseen the growth of our American cities. Most people have heard the story of the city hall in New York, and how the wise city fathers voted to have the rear walls built of brick, while the rest was of white marble, on the ground that the city would never extend above that point and so the material of the rear wall did not matter. Nobody, therefore, thought of the housing problem as a problem; the simple thing was to build houses as fast as they were wanted, and, as that had always been done, everybody thought that always would be done, if he took the trouble to think anything about it. And when the matter began to be a problem people were too busy and had too little civic conscience to do anything about it until the evils became great and crying. Then, the horse having been

stolen, we carefully locked the stable door, after our usual habit.

The slum problem would be much easier of solution but for a false civic pride that devotes its energies, not to learning facts and applying remedies, but to concealing facts and discouraging investigation, on the ground that publicity will hurt the town. Things cannot be harmful if they are kept hidden, is the concealed premise of those who thus reason and act. But any sound reasoning and policy must be based on an exactly contrary premise: that nothing evil can be made less evil by concealment, and that publicity is the first step toward a remedy.¹ Next to this false civic sentiment the most serious obstacle to better housing conditions is the apathy of the well-to-do, who, because they are comfortable, cannot be roused to the helping of others.

The encouraging feature of the present situation is that ignorance is passing away; that apathy and neglect are giving place to intelligent interest; and that greed, if it cannot be shamed into decency, is about to be restrained by law.

II

In theory, at least, the problem of good housing is not complicated. We are sufficiently familiar with bad

¹Housing surveys and reports now accessible to the public have been made in Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Kansas City (Missouri), Louisville, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco.

housing: those ill-ventilated, ill-lighted, damp buildings miscalled houses, with foul courts and fouler cellars, with little plumbing and that bad, insufficiently supplied with water, with toilet conveniences wholly inadequate and often dangerous to the public health, reeking with filth and infested with vermin and disease germs, which constitute the tenements of our large cities. Such buildings are directly or indirectly responsible for the major part of industrial inefficiency, inebriety, disease, vice, crime, juvenile delinquency, debased citizenship, and race degeneration that afflict American society to-day. Why do we tolerate such moral pest-houses? Why do we not make it possible for even the poorest family to have something worthy to be called a home: an apartment suitable to its means and size in a well-constructed, well-lighted, well-ventilated building, clean and sanitary, securing to them reasonable comfort and privacy, with courts in the rear in which there shall be grass and flower-beds and playgrounds for the children?

Some will doubtless reply that one might as well expect to see the New Jerusalem come down to earth, that those who demand such things are amusing themselves with Utopias that can never have objective existence. But the above is a literal, exact description of what Berlin to-day offers working people. Large numbers of model tenements have been erected in that city within the last generation, some by municipal enterprise, some by private, containing no fewer than 10,000 apartments. The enterprise has given so high satisfaction that it is growing in importance every

year. Many of the privately built tenements are co-operative, and the tenants own their apartments for life and for the lives of their children. These new houses are built with sound-proof floors and double windows, and each group of apartments is provided with café, library, assembly-room, and kindergarten. Only half of a lot may be occupied by a building, which ensures a large central court, with grass-plots, trees, sand piles for children, bars, swings and so on. Apartments are of various sizes, adapted to large families or small, and the number of persons that may occupy each is strictly limited by law. There is poverty in these tenements to be sure, but it is a well-darned, well-brushed, well-scrubbed poverty very different from that of the slum. And there is very little of vice or crime, while disease is reduced to a minimum. Shall we go on saying that what is actual in European cities is chimerical when proposed for our own?

It is a condition of good housing in our cities that nobody should be permitted to build in the central space of its squares; every house should front on a street and have assurance of plentiful light and air. The back-yard house, or rear tenement, is one of the great menaces to public health and morals. Investigation of the children brought into the juvenile courts of Philadelphia has shown that ninety per cent. of the children came from houses of this kind.¹ In the summer the temperature is 16 degrees higher in such courts

¹ This statement is made on the authority of Mr. Bernard J. Newman, Secretary of the Philadelphia Housing Commission, who has specially investigated the question.

than on the streets. The effect of these conditions on the health of the inmates does not need to be described. The unfortunate tenants pay the price in sickness and death for these defects in housing. The community does not realize what a tax the community as a whole is paying in order that a few property owners may have the privilege of maintaining such conditions.

True, one of our chief housing experts, Mr. Lawrence Veiller, pronounces the general opinion that rear tenements are in themselves bad "an interesting fallacy," and declares that "there is nothing in the fact that the building is located in the rear away from the street which makes the house bad in itself." But even the opinion of an expert cannot set aside hard facts like those quoted above. Mr. Veiller is doubtless right in saying that some of the existing rear tenements are better habitations than some of those fronting on the street. But this does not affect the reason why all such buildings should be abolished as soon as possible and no more should be built: that it is impossible to erect buildings within the squares of our American cities and secure to them sufficient light and air to make them sanitary. It is true that in many European cities it is common to erect buildings in central courts, and that many of these are excellent in sanitary character. But the squares or "blocks" of these cities are larger than ours, and consequently European cities can permit what we must forbid.

About forty years ago, though there was no general awakening on the subject, a few people began to perceive the importance of housing reform, and conceived

the idea that private enterprise was quite adequate to secure the necessary changes. Their fundamental idea was sounder than their method. The old notion had been: Make men good and they will better their surroundings. The new idea was: Better the surroundings and it will be easier to make men good. Both ideas are true, and neither is the whole truth. We approximate the whole truth, not when we regard ourselves as compelled to choose between the two as hostile alternatives, but when we conceive them as complementary. Yet here again experience has taught us not to expect too much. Model buildings will not of themselves make tenants clean in body and mind, though model buildings decidedly encourage cleanliness. The unclean and immoral tenant will still be an object of instruction in better ways, and of legal discipline if he refuses to reform.

It was soon discovered that private enterprise was not adequate. Not a few of the experiments in model buildings were failures from every point of view. Some were badly planned, some were extravagantly built, some were unwisely managed. On the other hand, some were from the first successful, like the block of model tenements built by Mr. Alfred T. White in Brooklyn, in 1877. In 1896 the City and Suburban Homes Company built tenements in New York that were entirely successful and paid five per cent. on the investment from the beginning. It turned out, however, that these object lessons of what might be done had little or no influence on the building enterprises of New York and Brooklyn. The ordinary

commercial builder continued to ask himself, not if model tenements were feasible, but if they were as profitable as other less costly buildings. Object lessons count for little with those whose end is profit, unless it be an object lesson in making money. And to the rich men of New York, even those of benevolent impulses, "philanthropy and five per cent." did not prove an attractive bait.

In forty years of private enterprise slight progress was made toward solution of the housing problem in New York. In that time 89 houses were built on the "model tenement" plan, with accommodations for 17,940 persons, while during the same time commercial builders erected 27,100 tenements, which house 1,267,550 people. It would require a long time, proceeding at that rate, to solve the housing problem by private enterprise. But in 1901 the legislature passed the first statute enacted in the State of New York that exacted of builders a fair standard of tenement construction. For the first time a sufficiency of light and air was prescribed, adequate sanitary arrangements, and suitable precautions against fire, including fireproof staircases and halls, as well as fire-escapes. In essential particulars the houses erected under this act are "model" tenements; and since its enactment ordinary building enterprise has provided 21,761 houses, with room for 1,266,275 people. The experience of New York seems to point out to other cities the way in which best results may be expected under present conditions: a statute that will virtually say to builders: "You shall not build a house in which people ought not

to live." Should there be in years to come a marked change in the terms on which land is held and improved, the case might be altered.

III

We have learned then what we need to do and how not to do it. Our chief reliance for housing reform must be on wise legislation. Two things must be aimed at: abolition of existing buildings unfit for habitation, and prevention of inadequate building for the future. The latter is incomparably the easier task. Any city will find it comparatively a simple matter to establish building regulations such as will ensure the erection of "model" houses for the time to come; and exceedingly difficult to undo the mistakes of the past. The sooner, therefore, the future is taken in hand and made reasonably secure the better for all concerned. As a rule, our cities have not sufficient authority to enact proper measures for themselves, but must have recourse to the legislatures of their States. Here, then, is the first objective of effort at reform.

In several States efforts have been repeatedly made to secure a good building law, and their successes and failures are instructive for others. The tenement problem first pressed in New York, and in 1877 that city secured from the State legislature a bill which was believed to be a solution of the problem. But, owing to the inexperience of those who drafted the statute, this law opened the way to some of the worst abuses

and errors of housing that have ever been known. The notorious "dumb-bell" tenements were planned by builders so as to comply with the provisions of the law but to be more promotive of disease, vice, and crime than any of the older "rookeries" that they displaced. In round numbers 10,000 of these tenements were built in New York, containing over 100,000 dark rooms, including rooms opening into so-called "air-shafts" which admit little air and less light. These rooms, into which sunlight can never enter and where fresh air is almost unknown, are surcharged with disease, and are the abodes of the vicious and the criminal as well as of the virtuous and unfortunate poor. They send a stream of sick to our hospitals and of criminals to our jails and prisons. The respectable and self-respecting workers must live side by side with the vicious and the diseased. We have here most effective demonstration of what has been previously said, that good intentions are not sufficient equipment for the would-be reformer, that expert knowledge of actual conditions and effective remedies is indispensable. Legislatures do not possess this; many "reformers" do not possess it. Statutes will be worse than useless, they are likely to be positively harmful, unless they are drawn with help of the best expert aid.

For the most part, existing statutes are far too lax, and, such as they are, they are inadequately enforced. In particular, almost nothing is attempted toward the demolition of the older and more unsuitable buildings. That this is a task beset with many difficulties has already been recognized, but that a thing is difficult is

no reason for utter failure to attempt it. As in the matter of erecting new buildings, the demolition of the old has been left to private enterprise. The obstacle that prevents progress by this method is the same that we encounter when we analyze any of our social ills—Profit. The old building is the most lucrative form of real estate investment, returning often an income of fifteen to twenty per cent., while a building up to modern requirements would be so comparatively costly that the net income would certainly be less than ten per cent. and perhaps not over five. The average owner cannot be expected to improve his property under such circumstances; it would not be “good business.” The moral sentiment of the community, expressed in statute, must compel him to act. Such statute should not be too drastic. It should prescribe a reasonable limit of time within which the improvement must be made. Recognizing that it has hitherto acquiesced in the wrong and so has become a partner in the guilt, the city should, in some cases, bear a part of the expense or grant a temporary relief from taxation that would counterbalance the expense thrown on the owner.

A single type of statute will not serve for all cities, because the terms of the housing problem are different in the small city from those of the large, and are by no means the same even in the large cities. New York is unique; it stands in a class by itself. Its physical conditions doom it to the tenement house forever, because it can house its immense population in no other way. But other American cities not only have a small-

er population to house, but have practically unlimited opportunity to spread in all directions. Given good transit facilities, they can distribute their population over a wide territory. Hence, in most cities realization of ideal housing is a possibility, and that ideal is a separate house for every family. The detached, or semi-detached house, in which the greater part of the working people of Philadelphia live, for example, is duplicated in a large number of American cities and should be characteristic of all. There is no difficulty in building such houses, in ample numbers to supply the demand, by private enterprise; and, for the most part, there is little fault to be found with their sanitary condition. Their rents also, though probably higher than they should be, are not exorbitant. Through the aid of building and loan coöperative societies many thousands of workers have been able to buy their houses and be their own landlords.

It is, therefore, a clear municipal duty to provide rapid transit to suburbs, or at least to see that it is provided. Without such provision the ideal solution of the housing problem cannot be regarded as within the bounds of possibility. The worker must live near his work; we must accept that as one absolute datum of our problem. But nearness has come to be a matter of time rather than of space. For the rich man with his automobile, the suburb is to-day nearer his office than his city house used to be; and the result is that, more and more, the rich are living in the suburbs and deserting the cities. Rapid transit puts the poor man on a level with the rich in this access to his work,

and so the poor man can also live in a suburb. Whatever may be the policy of society in the future toward all means of transportation, its present attitude toward city and suburban railways should no longer be doubtful. Whatever private enterprise is unable or unwilling to undertake, our municipalities must supply. This is no more than organized society owes to the units that compose it. And if our present municipal machinery lacks either courage or intelligence to attack this problem and deal with it successfully it must be swept out of existence and something more effective must be devised and put in its place. For this slum problem is literally a question of life or death; the cities must conquer the slums or the slums will conquer the cities.

In cities where tenement houses, few or many, must be built, a few general principles should control their erection. The health and safety of the dwellers should be the first consideration. It would be injudicious to accept the suggestion of some and require all such buildings to be of fireproof construction. If building is made too costly it will cease altogether and, as a result, the housing problem will become more acute than ever. Slow-burning construction would suffice, all halls and staircases to be of iron and stone or brick, with adequate fire escapes as an additional security against fire. A minimum size of rooms should be prescribed; every room should have a window opening either on the street or on an open court of prescribed size. The plumbing should be of the best, the water supply abundant, and toilet facilities adequate for

cleanliness and decency. Experience shows that not all desirable details need be prescribed. Though the New York tenement law of 1901 prescribed only a private toilet for each apartment, 85 per cent. of the houses built under that act provide a bathroom also. Overcrowding should be prevented by a limitation of the number that may occupy each room and apartment. The cost and labor of inspection, in order to enforce all these details, may, in large part, be reduced by throwing responsibility on the landlords. They and their agents know better than anybody else whether the legal requirements are observed in their houses, and a suitable penalty for violation would stimulate them to considerable vigilance.

Inasmuch as the back yard has practically disappeared from our large cities, the question of housing reform is directly connected with another important municipal question: the providing of suitable and adequate parks and playgrounds. Both children and adults need such provision, but the children most of all. Chicago has lately spent \$13,000,000 on playgrounds, and that city never made a better investment in its history. More than 18,000 of the youth of the town are organized in athletic clubs, and the results to the health of the city and the productive power of the people are out of all proportion to the amount of the investment.

IV

We must by no means pass by suggestions and plans for the relief of congested population in our cities,

which would, of course, greatly simplify the slum problem. Our newer Western communities, where the problem is less urgent, might well go to school to Australia and learn how to do it. Several years ago a world-wide competition for designs of a proposed new capital city was instituted, and in 1912 the first award was given to a Chicago architect and landscape gardener. This is of itself guarantee that we have brains and skill available to solve all our problems. The new Australian capital is to be located in a federal tract of 900 square miles, much like our District of Columbia. The plan adopted was evidently suggested by Major L'Enfant's design for the city of Washington, but modified to suit the conditions. The city will be built around two lakes, connected by an ornamental waterway, the whole forming an irregular body of water some eight miles long and from a quarter of a mile to two miles wide. Four distinct quarters or districts are set off: for a government center, a residential section, a manufacturing section, and a suburban or semi-agricultural district. Each of these has its own center—a park and public buildings—with avenues radiating thence like spokes from a hub, and streets of parallelogram arrangement. Nothing could make a stronger appeal at once to the eye and to the imagination. In such a city congestion and overcrowding will forever be impossible. In the matter of the slum, an ounce of prevention is worth a ton of cure.

As to the older cities, the Honorable James T. Bryce—it does not seem right to call him viscount—

former ambassador from England, one of the most profound students of things American, in an address delivered not long before his departure from our shores, made a suggestion of much value. He declared the true municipal ideal to be cities of 150,000 people. He said the country would be more prosperous and happy if the manufacturer with a plant to erect would take it away from the great centers and place it in the heart of the country, where a garden city would form around it, and where workers and all classes of individuals could lead a normal and healthful life.

Mr. Bryce probably meant that much more should be done than has been done along this line; for he could not be ignorant of the fact that some experiments have been made, though not with the most encouraging results. The town of Pullman, on the outskirts of Chicago, was established on precisely Mr. Bryce's principle by the corporation of that name. It was and is a model town, a veritable garden city, with broad streets, beautiful parks, perfectly built and appointed houses—a place, in short,

Where every prospect pleases
And only man is vile.

In fact, man was very vile there. The exorbitant rents charged by the corporation for houses, the equally exorbitant prices exacted by the corporation stores, and the generally tyrannical management of the property, first provoked one of the greatest strikes of

our history and later led to the incorporation of the town into the city of Chicago. Its people preferred the disadvantages of one of the most corrupt city governments in the world to longer endurance of the paternal kindness of the Pullman corporation.¹

The Krupps have established a similar town in connection with their great works at Essen, the Pittsburgh of Germany. The streets are wide and clean, parks and trees abound, and this firm has had enough enlightened selfishness to build a sufficient number of one-family houses to provide for the workers, and to charge them a lower rent than private landlords at Essen formerly demanded. A garden colony, named Altenhoff, has also been established, in which the retired and infirm workers live free of rent. There are, in addition, hospitals, sanatoriums, and other helpful institutions.

But possibly Mr. Bryce's suggestion was prompted less by what he may have seen or read in the United States or Germany than by the experience of his own country. Lever Brothers, makers of soap, have established a garden city as a suburb of Liverpool. Port Sunlight occupies an area of 230 acres and was planned by an expert, who made skilful use of the natural features of the location. Roads, parks, and public buildings are the best of their kind. The cottages for workers, instead of the usual monotony, dis-

¹The United Steel Corporation is in process of establishing a model town at Gary, Ind., but, though several pictorial and laudatory accounts of its progress have been published, there is a singular lack of any vital information. It is impossible, at present, to form any intelligent opinion regarding what has been accomplished for the well-being of the workers.

play considerable diversity of style. Ample playgrounds and athletic facilities are as prominent features of the city as church, library, or art gallery. The rents charged are merely sufficient to keep the property in good repair and maintain the community institutions, the company making no profit from an investment of \$2,500,000, finding its sufficient returns in the increased welfare and efficiency of its workers. They recognize that "business cannot be carried on by physically deficient employees any more than war can be successfully waged by physically deficient soldiers." This is one of the most enlightened enterprises of its kind anywhere in the world.

But this is so wholly exceptional a garden city, because of the exceptional social intelligence of its founders, as to weaken very slightly the conclusion that private enterprise cannot be expected to make a contribution of much value to the housing problem. Port Sunlight is almost solitary among proprietary cities in being what it pretends to be. Most towns of the kind, under pretense of philanthropy, have been a mere means of skinning the workers. Not content with exploiting them in the factory, corporations have made their towns an additional means of exploitation, in rent, food and everything they could control. With an ingenuity almost more than human, that may without prejudice be called diabolical, they have made these fair-seeming enterprises the means of stealing from helpless workers the last possible percentage of their product, all the while with unctuous hypocrisy making loud pretenses of benevolence and goodwill. Long

before capitalists as a class could be raised to the plane of mental and ethical eminence of Lever Brothers, capitalism will have ceased to be.

The most hopeful results, up to the present, both in England and in Germany, have been reached where the garden city has not been a humanitarian enterprise, but has been established on ordinary business principles. Of several such towns a good representative is Letchworth, near London. It is a coöperative affair, the profits being limited to five per cent. It occupies a tract of nearly 4,000 acres, and has grown in a few years to a population of 7,000. It is laid out on the plan of an English country village; streets and houses are of great variety; generous provision has been made for athletic sports and numerous community buildings are provided.

Little has been done as yet in England by direct municipal action toward the establishment of garden cities, but much has been done in Germany, within a very short time. The first city of the kind was Hellerau, begun in 1909 as a private enterprise, and now coöperative under municipal oversight. It occupies a tract of 345 acres near Dresden, and its growth from the beginning has been remarkable. The city is carefully laid out with regard to artistic effect, and the carrying out of the idea is secured by having a commission pass on all architects' plans. The success of Hellerau has stimulated other cities to undertake like suburbs, among them Nürnberg and Munich. The German ideal of a garden city is a suburban town systematically planned, either now or ultimately to be

owned by the municipality. This discourages speculation in land and ensures that the increment of value shall accrue to the community.

The garden city naturally commends itself to those who look for quick results, because it is indisputably an easier project than remaking an old city. But, while the new suburban town may thus be made to do something of value in providing for the housing of thousands, other thousands must still remain in the great cities. The garden city is a palliative, very useful, quite hopeful, but at best only palliative; it is no cure for the slum. The larger cities will continue to exist; in all probability they will grow even larger, and we must learn how to live under these conditions. The city must be rebuilt; the slum must go.

V

It is just here that another experience of Germany becomes of great value for us.¹ We have not entirely outgrown that arrogance of spirit which led an American Senator of a past generation to ask: "What have we to do with 'abroad'?" We no longer flatly deny that Europe can teach us, but we are not yet very eager to learn lessons from that quarter. Nevertheless, it will be well for us to realize that some European countries have anticipated us in dealing with social

¹ For many of the facts in IV and V of this chapter I am indebted to Howe's "European Cities at Work," but personal observation confirms the facts related under V.

problems, and in particular have so treated the slum that it is rapidly vanishing.

Up to 1870 there was no country more backward than Germany in treatment of the slum problem. Nothing had been done since the Middle Ages to improve German cities. They had certain advantages over us, however, for dealing with the housing of their people. The very age of their towns guaranteed the existence of a civic pride that we have not had time to develop. Their governments and citizens were more accustomed to a paternal policy than ours. Accordingly, the leading citizens and men of business took the matter in hand and have continued to manage it. What would have happened had any American city been turned over to its bankers and merchants and manufacturers to do with it as they chose? They would have grabbed every franchise in sight, stolen everything not nailed down, and generally exploited their fellow-citizens to the utmost, to swell their own private fortunes. That is precisely what they have done, so far as they were able, so far as they could control city governments. But the business men of German cities did differently; under their management a policy of municipal socialism has been pushed far. They have reversed the American method, which is for the community to keep and operate all enterprises that are unprofitable and onerous, and turn over to private parties for exploitation everything that is profitable. The German cities keep the profitable enterprises for the community, if they concern the community.

The housing question was regarded as an insepa-

rable part of the development of a German city. And so it was not left, as among us, to private enterprise and haphazard municipal ordinances. In every case they have done what only a single American city has even contemplated—of course, only Washington can be meant—and planned the town for generations to come. It will be an easy task in future years to project these plans to any desired extent and preserve the unity of design as the town grows. Washington is the one really beautiful city in America, but Germany abounds in beautiful towns. Usually a public competition has preceded the adoption of a plan, to which the best engineers and architects have contributed their ideas. Once a choice has been made it has been adhered to, with only such modifications as experience has suggested.

As already intimated, a generation ago German cities were no more ready than other towns to house the people who began to pour into them. But they awoke to the situation; American cities continued to sleep. German cities, with hardly an exception, were still contained within the old mediæval walls; the streets were narrow, the houses small and unsanitary. The walls were razed, save here and there portions preserved for historic association or picturesque effect; the moats were filled; and these spaces were turned into boulevards, parks, and walks. In the old city many buildings have been torn down and rebuilt, scrupulous care being taken to preserve the ancient architectural forms; some streets have been widened, and the whole much improved. But, of course, the greatest effect

has been obtained in the extension of the city beyond the old walls on the new plans adopted.

While private enterprise has been permitted and encouraged to undertake as much as it chose, there has been no hesitation to make the city itself the leader in this movement. Ulm, a city of 56,000 people in Württemberg, has bought up land so extensively that it now owns 80 per cent. of the area of the town and suburbs, amounting to nearly 5,000 acres. Out of this a large woodland has been reserved for recreation. Industries are confined to certain districts—something that no American city has even attempted to do. The city itself has built 175 houses, and leases ground for others to build for seventy years, agreeing to buy back the houses at the expiration of the lease for 80 per cent. of their cost. As municipal ordinances strictly control the type of house to be erected, this is a safe offer to make. Nor is Ulm alone in such enterprise; Munich owns 23.7 per cent. of the property within its limits, Leipzig 23.3 per cent., Strassburg 33.2, Hannover, 37.7. Outside the city limits most towns own much more land than within; Berlin, for example, owns in the suburbs more than twice the whole city area, and Strassburg almost three times.

Frankfurt-am-Main is one of the most progressive cities of Germany, and by consequence one of the most beautiful. The municipality owns one-half of the area within its limits, and 3,800 acres outside, making a total of 16,600 acres. Its broad streets, scrupulously clean, its numerous well-kept parks, make it an exceedingly attractive town. The city owns and oper-

ates its street railways, electric light and water works, leaving the gas supply to private enterprise. It was the first German city to tax the unearned increment, but most other cities followed its example and in 1911 the principle was adopted in imperial taxation. The problem of municipal finance hardly exists for Frankfurt, or any of the German cities. What is not produced by regular revenue for improvements they have had no difficulty in borrowing on bonds at a low interest rate. Like all other German towns situated on rivers or seaports, Frankfurt owns its docks and harbor facilities, managed in harmony with the imperial government, which controls the means of transportation.

Düsseldorf may be taken as an example of the smaller cities of Germany, not so much visited by tourists, and of no great industrial or commercial importance. This town operates practically all municipal enterprises: gas, electric light, street railways, water. Lighting, either by gas or electricity, costs less than in most German towns, yet a handsome revenue is derived from this source for public purposes. The street railways charge a fare just half that of American lines, and are profitable at that. Cars are provided that resemble a pullman coach, or a magnate's private car, more than the miserable contraptions that we Americans submit to be carried in. The city has undertaken large operations in land, in order to check private speculation and keep down prices. It not only erects houses for workingmen, but has established a municipal bank and pawnshop for their benefit, and

maintains a system of insurance against sickness, accident, and old age. Many of these things have no immediate relation to the matter we are considering, the housing problem. They are interesting, however, as showing that, in the experience of Düsseldorf, the attempt to accomplish one kind of social betterment is very likely to lead to another. The housing problem and the beautifying of the city mark the beginning, not the end, of the modern municipal activity of Düsseldorf. It has done somewhat less than some others in constructing garden cities in the suburbs, because the whole town has been transformed into what well deserves to be given that name. There is not another more beautiful city in Europe to-day.

With straighter streets, wider streets, streets less crowded and better policed, German cities have better transit facilities than American. The cars make less frequent stops and run much faster with more safety to the people than with us. The parcel post also gives great aid to the solution of the housing problem, and quite as much to reduce the high cost of living. The middleman is largely eliminated: direct from producer to consumer is more and more the rule, especially with food products. The public market does the rest. The butcher shop and the grocery store fill a small place in the life of a German town; one may travel miles, especially in the suburbs, and never see either. Germany has entirely solved neither the housing problem nor the living problem, but she has attacked both with a vigor and intelligence that contrast painfully with our sleepy stupidity, and she is in

a fair way to reach passable solutions before we get waked up enough to make any real effort.

One item in Germany's procedure is instructive, as a lesson in regard to the way in which social questions are interlocked; so that to do anything of value has more than one good effect. A generation ago Bismarck devised a system of workingmen's insurances and pensions, as he openly avowed, to "dish" the Socialists. He effectually dished, not the Socialists, but himself, for the Socialist vote increased thereafter more rapidly than before. But the system was not half bad; it was, of course, a palliative, and slight at that, but it was better than nothing, and so far as it went the Socialists could not and did not object to it on principle. But, after thirty years or so, the funds accumulated for that purpose became an embarrassment; it was necessary to find some safe and moderately profitable investment for them. There is no safer investment than real estate, and so these funds have been freely used to solve the housing problem. Model tenements have been erected by their aid and pay a fair interest on the capital invested in them, which can be used to pay the insurances and pensions that fall due. It is said that one of our insurance corporations, the Metropolitan Life, has adopted a similar method of investment, advancing money for erecting tenements, controlling the type of building and regulating its occupation, thus supplying excellent homes at moderate cost. If more of the funds of life insurance companies were invested in similar manner, instead of loaned for gambling on the stock exchange,

there would be less complaint of the companies and marked advance toward solution of the housing problem.

VI

It has already been pointed out that the slum question is at bottom a question of finance, and a hint has also been given of the method by which the problem may easily be solved. German cities have shown us; some of the newer Canadian communities have shown us. So long as the chief burden of taxation falls on improvements, building will be delayed and land speculation will be encouraged. An owner of an unimproved city lot can now hold it, while the city builds walks and sewers and paves streets, for which he usually pays only a relatively small tax, until the rise in value of his property satisfies his greed and he is willing to sell to some one who will erect a building upon it. When the building is erected, a relatively heavy tax is levied on it, and the better the building the heavier the tax. We thus offer a high inducement to owners and builders to build in the cheapest and flimsiest manner possible, and to maintain an old building as long as it will stand, rather than pull it down and erect a better. When we become socially intelligent enough to remove our taxes from buildings and levy them on land values, we shall no longer be guilty of selecting out the most enterprising and thrifty of the people and fining them for every contribution they make to our progress and general welfare.

Taxing the unearned increment, besides being ethically just, is, therefore, socially wise.¹ As this increment is more and more taken for public use, other forms of taxation will be found unnecessary. Land speculation will be first lessened, then destroyed, as the motive for holding unimproved land becomes inoperative. The builder being no longer penalized for his enterprise, more beautiful and durable construction can be afforded and the quality of buildings, both public and private, may be expected to rise rapidly. It will probably be advisable to prescribe a minimum standard of construction, but builders in general will often, if not always, find it profitable to exceed this.

The slum is generally regarded as a problem of large cities only; and for convenience it has been so treated in this discussion; but the discussion should not close without at least an intimation that this assumption does not altogether correspond with fact. Cities of the second and third classes already have this problem to deal with, and their future growth is likely to make it pressing. Even towns of 25,000 population and under are not so free from the slum problem as they may complacently think themselves to be. Not a few of the smaller towns have had a painful awaken-

¹ The objection that it would be impossible to value land with sufficient accuracy to afford a basis for equitable taxation is shown by experience to be, like so many objections to socially progressive measures, quite unfounded. So far from difficult to estimate accurately, land values are the easiest of all values to ascertain with accuracy. The census of 1900 separately valued farm lands and improvements. New York, Boston and other cities have made valuations of the land within their limits.

ing of late to realization that there are shameful housing conditions within their limits. They are awakening to the fact that unless they face these conditions and at once provide better housing they will soon have to contend with all the evils of the great cities, on a smaller scale to be sure, but the same in quality. Wise action in New York in 1830, or even in 1850, would have prevented that city's difficulties. To-day is the day of salvation for the smaller towns.

There is no social problem in which Christian people ought to be more deeply interested than the slum problem. There is no problem to which the Gospel of Jesus is more vitally related. For the home is the foundation of society, and in the slum we see what capitalism has done to the home. The progress of the Gospel is inseparably bound up with the maintenance of the home. A Christian society is under strictest obligation, for its own preservation and progress, to see that the homes of all its members, poor as well as rich, so long as there must be poor and rich, are made habitable. To neglect this is social suicide.

CHAPTER VI

THE PROBLEM OF VICE

I

“THE oldest profession in the world” is no longer a profession but a business. It has always been pursued for gain, of course, but the gains were once small and accrued to the scarlet woman herself. Now vice has felt the influence of the age and has become commercialized; and, finally, it has succumbed to the irresistible tendency and has become a trust. We call this form of vice the “social evil” and we do well, for it is the sin of society, not of the individual alone. “The wages of prostitution,” says George Bernard Shaw to the people of England, “are stitched into your buttonholes and into your blouse, pasted into your matchboxes and your boxes of pins, stuffed into your mattress, mixed with the paint on your walls, and stuck between the joints of your water pipes. The very glaze on your basin and teacup has in it the lead poison that you offer to the decent woman as the reward of honest labor, while the procuress is offering chicken and champagne.”

We call these poor creatures that walk our streets offering themselves for sale “fallen women,” but the

truth is that the whole community has fallen with them. We who sit smug and self-satisfied at our virtuous firesides are partners in this traffic; we are enjoying the rewards of a system of which they are an inseparable part. They have been ground into the dirt in order that our womenfolk may be kept spotless. It is for us, therefore, as well as for them, to weep and repent our fault, and go and sin no more.

There are people who will deeply resent these words as they read them, and the depth of their resentment measures the necessity for speaking such words, and even harsher. For the criminal hypocrisy of the moral part of the community is responsible for the great extent of this frightful evil. Among the good and religious people of this world there is a vast quantity of what Dickens named Podsnappery. Mr. Podsnap, it will be remembered, had a way of disposing of disagreeable facts by a flourish of his arm, sweeping them behind him, with: "I don't want to know about it; I don't choose to discuss it; I don't admit it." The "good" men and women, and even the bad men and women who would be thought good, have insisted that this matter should never be mentioned above a whisper. Not a word must be openly spoken or written about it—veiled allusions and decorous phrases were the utmost admissible. It is only recently that it has been discovered to be possible to discuss the problem of vice with all necessary plainness, yet without coarseness.

This policy of finger-on-lip and sh-h-h-h! has been tried long and has proved a complete failure. The no-

tion that women and young people must be kept in a state of blessed innocence (by which we really mean a state of ignorance that is often far from blessed) and permit only men, and "men of the world" at that, to know the facts, is so at variance with reality as to be absurd beyond words. When our women and our young people cannot go upon our streets, cannot read a daily newspaper, without having the facts in their grossest form thrust upon them, why keep up this vain pretense of "innocence"? Our conduct is mere prudishness, and has become one of the chief obstacles in the way of solution of our problem. It is also one of the things upon which the people of the underworld chiefly rely, and not in vain. This very ignorance, mis-called innocence, is one cause of the fall of thousands of young women every year. If they knew the pitfalls that surround them they would be on guard. Turn on the light, then; only vice itself has anything to fear from it.

But it is not merely the hypocrisy of prudishness, it is the hypocrisy of fear, that strives to put the taboo on discussion. Nearly every social ill from which we suffer is discovered to have its roots in capitalism. If investigation and discussion should make it clear that vice is nothing else than a part of the price that the great multitudes of toilers are paying to maintain in luxury an exploiting class, a tremendous impulse will be given to the demand that capitalism shall cease. Realizing this, the capitalistic class and all its adherents strive to hide from view the sores of society for which it is responsible, and so far as possible to deny

their very existence. And often a red herring is drawn across the trail by fussy "investigations" by "commissions" that do not investigate, and elaborate "reports" that carefully avoid telling anything but surface facts. One of the richest of our younger multi-millionaires has financed a pretentious "scientific" investigation; and every now and then the laboring mountains bring forth a ridiculous mouse.

If the inevitable penalties of vice fell only upon the guilty we might possibly continue to look on with selfish equanimity and see the guilty suffer. But society has awakened to the truth of the Gospel that no man liveth to himself, that if one member suffers all the members suffer with him. Science confirms Scripture that the sins of the guilty are often visited on the innocent. Not only the women who voluntarily choose vice instead of virtue are dragged down to hell, but the daughters of our sheltered homes become the victims of those foul beasts of prey, the recruiting officers of the underworld. Nobody can longer be sure that his own family is immune from this frightful curse. Not only do men who love impurity more than purity pay the cost of their indulgence in venereal disease, but they become sources of infection to innocent women and children. Not only is the underworld putrid with these diseases, but it is rapidly passing on the infection to the upper world. Careful examinations and estimates by the best qualified men of science warrant the belief that twelve per cent. of the entire population of London and Berlin are afflicted with syphilis, and fifteen per cent. of the population of

Paris. Our great cities are probably no better and possibly worse. In sheer self-defense, if it would avoid universal contamination of blood, society is now forced to deal with this problem more effectively than it has ever yet dreamed of doing.

Our governments, Federal and State, expend millions every year in exterminating insect pests that threaten the farmer's crop, and other millions in the prevention and cure of diseases that attack the farmer's stock. Research stations and agricultural colleges are studying these problems and are rapidly finding solutions for them. This is part of our campaign of conservation, and is mentioned by way of praise, not of criticism. Criticism should be directed to another point: for this problem of vice that vitally concerns the interests of society, that attacks the very root of social institutions, the family, that threatens the life and happiness of millions of our people—for this governments have no thought, spend no money. What has been accomplished thus far has been due to private enterprise; and, naturally, it has only skimmed the surface of things. Investigations financed by the very class that maintains the evil cannot be expected to bring forth truth, at least not the whole truth. Yet, superficial as the investigations have been, and feebly palliative as are the remedies proposed, we have learned much—all that we really need to know for immediate effective action.

We have learned, to begin with, that the condition society has to face is this: Vice of all kinds, and especially sexual vice, the most formidable of all, is

a great commercial system, in which large capital is invested, and from which immense revenues are derived. It is not only vice but greed that we have to fight. Mr. Samuel H. London, a government vice investigator, estimates that there are 63,000 white slaves, whose "earnings" are \$188,000,000 annually. The Rockefeller Bureau of Social Hygiene, in its first report of its work during 1912, gives, as a conservative estimate of the number of prostitutes in the borough of Manhattan, 15,000; and says that a large number of resorts are operated as a trust or "combine," controlled by a group of about fifteen men. The same facts, on a smaller scale, would be discovered by similar investigation of any of our large cities, and to a considerable degree they exist in our smaller towns. We need no exact, scientific statistics to convince us of the extent and enormity of the evil.

We have also learned that in every American city of any considerable size, and in most of the smaller towns as well, there is a secret league between the municipal authorities and those who conduct this vile business. Vice is under the ban of the law, and it is the duty of the police to suppress it. Instead of making any effort to do so they give the business their protection, in return for a regular tax levied by them and as regularly paid. From this "graft" police officials heap up fortunes, while a considerable part goes to maintain the corrupt political machines of our great cities. Gambling, another form of vice, is commercialized in a similar way and receives like protection. The saloon owes its ability to violate with impunity all

license laws to the same source. All these forces of evil are so interlocked and so entrenched within our present municipal systems and laws as to be impregnable for the present. Society is powerless to deal with them until it can effect fundamental reforms in government. Every little while there is an "exposure" with great display of "scare heads" in the newspapers; but it exposes nothing that every intelligent person did not know before, and it leads to nothing. Once in a decade or so there is some notorious crime, like the Rosenthal murder, which brings the underworld into the lime light for a few weeks, and may lead to a brief moral spasm in the community, and may even result in the conviction of a criminal or two. But none of these things affects vice in any appreciable degree. It does not make a dent in the system. Men may come and men may go, but the system goes on forever.

And it will go on forever, unless society—which means all of us—ceases its fooling with the symptoms of this social disease and goes to the root of the matter, seeks out the cause and removes it. This is a perfectly simple thing to do, though very difficult. For there is practical unanimity among investigators of our social conditions, so far as they have courage to speak out, that poverty is the great cause of sexual vice, as it exists among us to-day. Young girls are not inherently vicious, and very few of them choose this life of shame because they love it. They are literally driven to it, or tempted beyond their power of resistance, or decoyed and forced into it. The greed of those who have commercialized the business and

the need of those who enter it are the two grand factors of our problem, beside which any others are negligible.

II

Possibly it is too cavalier a disposal of the question of the cause of vice to attribute it so exclusively to poverty. There is no intent to deny that other causes contribute to swell an evil of which poverty is the fundamental cause. Ignorance ranks high among these contributory causes, and its ill effects are not limited to the encouragement that it gives to all forms of harmful indulgence. The price that society is paying for ignorance is even greater than the price paid for vice. On the theory that it is not "nice" or "proper" for young people to know the fundamental facts of sex, the origin of life, the dangers of vice, they have been kept in as much ignorance as possible. It has not been possible to keep them in total ignorance, but much of the knowledge that they manage surreptitiously to acquire is warped and misleading. In our anxiety that they should not be given right information we have brought it about that they have obtained much misinformation. We ought to be proud of our achievement!

On the contrary, we are becoming somewhat ashamed of it, and are beginning to recognize the necessity of sex education and sex hygiene. As a consequence of this awakening it has been seriously proposed that elementary instruction should be given

in our public schools, and a few tentative experiments have been made in that direction. The ideal thing would, of course, be instruction by parents; but since so many parents are restrained by a false sense of shame from performing this duty, and since so many others are incompetent to perform it, and since in any case so many children will certainly fail to receive any parental instruction, some provision will eventually have to be made in public education. The difficulty at present is that few teachers have knowledge and training that fit them to give such instruction. And in country districts, where teachers are mainly girls only just out of school themselves, it can hardly be considered desirable that they should undertake such work. It cannot be said that any satisfactory solution of this part of our problem is yet in sight, but we shall doubtless find one if we search with determination to find.

Another contributing cause of the extensive prevalence of vice is the double standard of morals. Dr. Homer Clark Bennett has put this very cleverly in some verses, which, if not great poetry, are great sense:

If the prodigal boy had been a girl,
How would the story have run?
Would the fatted calf have been killed as quick
For the daughter as for the son?
Would the welcome back have been the same;
Would the ring and shoes and all,
With the robe, been given a daughter
Had she been the one to fall?

The Prodigal Son is not only a parable with a deep religious teaching, but it is a story true to life in every detail. Not even Jesus could have told such a story of a Prodigal Daughter, for there never was an age in which it would have been true to life. But this is not to say that Jesus would not have approved the same treatment for the daughter as for the son; and in giving different treatment to the sexes we set at naught the spirit, if not the letter, of all his ethical teaching. But it is not so much the abstract ethical character of our double standard with which we are just now concerned as with its social consequences. Our double standard, with its stern penalties for women and its easy condoning of the sins of men, does little to restrain women, but much to encourage men to vice. A tremendous obstacle to any real progress in social purity is the eagerness of "good" mothers to secure as husbands for their daughters young men who are known to be vicious, and the willingness of fathers to stand by and see such sacrifice without protest. The social ostracism of the vicious of both sexes would be a deadly weapon against the powers of the underworld. We need a social ethic that will no more tolerate "sowing of wild oats" by a young man than by a young woman. It is not a double standard of morality that now proclaims the contrary, but a double standard of immorality.

But, after recognizing all these contributory causes, we still come back to poverty as the prime cause of vice. "Poverty" is, to be sure, a term of indefinite connotations. If it is limited to actual suffering—to

real, acute hunger and cold and nakedness—it could not be said to be the chief cause of anything. Comparatively few are led or driven into a vicious or criminal life by the pressure of bitter want. “Poverty” may be defined in social terms as a return for one’s utmost service as a worker that is insufficient for a decent and comfortable living. So long as those who organize the business of prostitution pay high wages, while those who organize ordinary “respectable” business pay low wages, there will exist a social condition making prostitution inevitable. What is true in the large is equally true of individual cases. The poor young girl, working hard for a pittance, longing for the leisure, the finery, the pleasure of her more fortunate sisters, and the rich young man ready to give her all these things in exchange for herself, are a combination fatal to womanly virtue and social well-being. Every form of vice and most forms of crime depend on the presentation to a weak individual of a strong temptation, to him practically irresistible, by some one who profits personally or financially through the maintenance of that temptation. Vice could not exist without constantly new recruits; the saloon could not be maintained but by the continual creation of new appetite for drink. We have been attempting to solve the problem by dealing with the weak individual who falls, by trying to reform magdalens and drunkards. We must resolutely attack the man or the organization that maintains the temptation if we expect any valuable social results.

The relation of wages to living is therefore funda-

mental in this problem. Recent investigations have done much to establish the facts beyond reasonable question. According to the Consumers' League of New York, a girl who must support herself in that city cannot do so decently on a wage less than \$9 a week.¹ The Philadelphia League names \$8 as the standard for that city. The great majority of workers in factories and department stores in these two cities receive a maximum wage less than this minimum sum: 77 per cent. of workers in department stores receive less than \$8 a week; and the average pay of women in factories is \$4.62 for the first year and \$5.34 the second, while 40 per cent. receive less than \$6. It takes eight years for the average store employee to reach a living wage, and ten years for a factory employee. These figures have been published far and wide and never challenged; so their correctness may be taken as established. It follows, therefore, that, unless they live at home and only partly support themselves, the wages of women workers are below a decent living standard. The majority receive little more than half a living wage, and are consequently in a condition of constant poverty.

Nothing has done more, probably, to open the eyes of the American people to the real condition of women workers than the investigation into the Chicago department stores conducted by the committee of the

¹Mrs. Frederick Nathan, of the New York Consumers' League, is authority for the statement that 60 per cent. of the saleswomen over sixteen years of age in New York stores receive less than \$6.50 a week.

Illinois Senate in the spring in 1913. These stores are among the largest and best managed in our country. They are owned and conducted by men who have considerable repute as "philanthropists"—they are liberal contributors to local charities, to investigations of the "white slave" traffic, and the like. That they and their business methods had any relation to social problems seems never to have occurred to them. The Committee did not probe far without discovering that these department and mail order stores were making enormous profits, yet paid many of their girl employees less than a living wage. The head of one of the largest establishments admitted that the profits of his business amounted to \$12,000,000 the preceding year, and also admitted that he employed 119 girls at \$5 a week, but added that 1,465 received not less than \$8 a week. Of course he could see no relation between low wages and prostitution.

Another store owner, who refused to state his profits but virtually admitted that they ran into millions, scouted the suggestion that low wages could have any relation to vice. He maintained that \$8 a week was ample to support a girl in comfort in Chicago, but on being given pencil and paper and asked to make out a budget this was the best that he could produce: Outer clothing, \$1; shoes, hats, underwear, \$1; laundry, 25 cents; room and board, \$4; car fare, 60 cents; luncheon, 70 cents; physician and dentist, 60 cents; church, 10 cents—total \$8.25. A little thought will show anybody how absurd is the idea that a girl who has this liberal wage could be tempted by the induce-

ments offered by a vicious life, its specious promise of ease and luxury. Think of the palatial apartment and sumptuous meals she can enjoy for \$4 a week, and the luxurious luncheons she can have for 70 cents a week, not to mention the magnificent clothes and glittering jewels that she can buy for \$1! How ridiculous that she should think of surrendering all this, together with the privilege of standing every day behind a counter, where she is scolded by impatient buyers and lordly floor-walkers, and ogled by silly dudes and fined by the head of her department for the slightest offense, until her nominal pay of \$8 becomes \$6.42 in her pay envelope. Why should she listen to the siren voice? Why, indeed!

III

That the causes of vice are mainly economic and therefore demand an economic remedy is sufficiently obvious. The one that has been suggested, the only one that may be said to be under immediate consideration, is the minimum wage, the probable effect of which measure on women's economic status has already been discussed. We need only repeat that this is at best a slight palliative, a mere tinkering with surface facts. The *Evening Post* of New York said not long ago with regard to such experimentation with partial remedies: "If the fact of gross inequality of fortune, the fact that the rich might easily part with their superfluity and give it to the poor, were to be

accepted as a reason for compelling such redistribution, the process could not stop with a little thing like a pitiful minimum wage for women. It would necessarily mean a complete reconstruction of the whole economic and social system." This is quite correct. Nothing less than such a reconstruction of our social and economic system as will secure the abolition of poverty can be reasonably expected to cure any of our social evils, and especially the evil of prostitution. Critics of socialism often pronounce it an immoral system, but it should be given the praise of seeking to stop the greatest immorality in existence, the sale of women's bodies, by making women economically independent. It is capitalism that is immoral, in that it makes this cruel and wicked business inevitable.

The fair-minded employer should welcome every step toward economic justice to women, such as the minimum wage law. In the present system, wages are adjusted, not to the earning power of women, but to the least wage upon which life can be supported. The wage-scale in any line of business is practically fixed by the meanest, least scrupulous competitor. What he pays others must pay or be undersold, though they might gladly pay more. The minimum wage makes this extreme exploitation unlawful, and compels the unscrupulous employer to act as if he had some decent scruples. This gives the better employers their chance to treat their workers with a greater measure of justice and yet not incur danger of bankruptcy.

No one can study the conditions in which the girl workers of our cities live and labor without an increas-

ing sense of the fact that the cure of poverty must precede the cure of vice. Here is where the problem of the slum impinges on the problem of vice. Many forms of industry are carried on in tenement houses, besides those that the law has undertaken to prevent. The manufacture of artificial flowers is one of these, and young girls often work far into the night at this occupation. In the crowded tenements it is difficult to observe the decencies of life; and their bare, cheerless life of incessant labor becomes abhorrent to such girls. Their amusements are few, the dance hall and the moving picture show have few rivals. These are the recruiting places of vice, the haunts of cadets and procuresses, and the result can be easily foreseen. Poverty and the life that it compels have weakened the moral fiber of many young girls, and the allurements of a life that is speciously presented to them as one of ease and pleasure prove too great for their powers of resistance. Even so, many of them do resist, and have to be drugged or otherwise forced into a life that they would never voluntarily enter.

The cure of poverty will depend to a great extent on the raising of the standard of efficiency among girl workers. At present 49 per cent. of girls who are compelled to work go into factories, and only one per cent. into skilled trades. Employers who can see beyond the weekly pay roll are now aware that the low wages paid to inexperienced and unskilled are the highest wages of all, measured by the sales cost, which is the only scientific measurement. The cheapest wages are the highest. Employers are looking for a way to elimi-

nate inefficient workers; the surest, as well as the most profitable, way to eliminate the inefficient is to make all workers efficient. We are now revolving in a vicious circle, from which the capitalistic system offers no way of escape: inefficiency produces poverty and poverty in turn produces greater inefficiency.

But would the abolition of poverty be really effective as a remedy for social vice? Does it not, after all, depend for its existence on a human passion and a human weakness quite unconnected with poverty? No doubt poverty is not the sole cause of sexual immorality, for that has existed in all forms of society for ages, and will probably continue in some form for ages to come. The abolition of poverty would not abolish sexual immorality. It would reduce sexual immorality to sporadic cases, individual moral aberrations—such as are found, for example, in a rural community where all the people are substantially on the same economic level; such as are found among the rich, who are likewise economic equals. The difference would be this: women would continue sometimes to give themselves to those whom they loved, without the sanction of legal marriage, but they would not sell themselves promiscuously. Sexual immorality would continue, but prostitution would disappear, especially the commercial forms of prostitution. Vice would be a personal error, it would no longer be a great commercial enterprise.

The sexual impulse is undoubtedly one of the strongest factors of human nature, and any scheme of social reform that ignores it is doomed to failure.

But marriage, whether we regard it as a divine institution or as merely human and social, is the normal provision and the sufficient provision for satisfaction of the sexual impulse, in its highest forms equally with the lowest. Vice is the perverted satisfaction of the lowest. This perversion is powerfully stimulated by anything that prevents normal satisfaction. Poverty, which forbids many thousands of adult men and women to marry, and compels other thousands to postpone marriage until middle age, is a direct stimulus to vice the force of which can hardly be exaggerated. A standing army and navy is a standing invitation to vice. Enlisted men are practically all celibates, and the teaching of history is plain that celibacy on a large scale means sexual vice to an alarming degree. Part of the price we pay for our army and navy is the degradation of American womanhood. A monastery, or any organization that forbids marriage or makes it practically impossible, has always been a hot-bed of vice. A society in which there are many thousands of men and women debarred by poverty from marriage as inevitably produces prostitution as a match produces a blaze. The demand creates a supply, and the supply stimulates the demand, and so the evil grows, even without any commercialization. An economic state that would make early marriage possible is the first condition of eradicating vice; the effort is hopeless otherwise.

But even before the abolition of poverty and the relative abolition of vice we can do a great deal toward reducing this social evil to much smaller dimensions.

It is the system, the commercialization of vice, the Trust, that greatly aggravates the evil. An ethical evil must be opposed by ethical means; an economic condition demands an economic remedy; but a business organization may be destroyed by law. We must adapt our remedies to the things to be reformed or abolished. We cannot break up a vice trust by ethical measures, and economic remedies are too slow-acting. We need, and we have a right to expect, some immediate results.

This is why the remedy hitherto attempted by the "good" element of the community has been so ineffective. Christians have applied the old individual idea of the Gospel to this problem, and, in rescue work, Magdalens' Homes, and missions in the slums have sought to reclaim these fallen women. The work has been successful in this sense, that thousands have been reclaimed; and, if there is joy in heaven among the angels over one sinner that repents, this work must have caused great joy in heaven. But it has produced little result on earth. For every soul rescued, a dozen, a hundred, fresh recruits have been added to the ranks of the fallen. If firemen were playing on a fire with one stream of water while a dozen streams of oil were turned on by others, how long would it take to put out the fire? Does it not become plainer every day that this work of rescuing individuals is to approach the problem of vice from the wrong side and to waste effort in a labor beside which that of Sisyphus was pleasant exercise? The only hope of solution lies, not

in rescuing women after they have fallen, but in preventing their fall.

Not all of the vice that poverty causes goes by that name; much of it is dignified by the title of Christian marriage. When a woman sells herself, not to many men, but to one man, for the sake of a home, of support, of ease and luxury, not the grace of holy altar and the blessing of priest and book can make the transaction anything else than unethical and vicious. Yet this kind of sale, this form of vice, society pronounces perfectly "respectable." Our social arrangements virtually compel the majority of women to trade on their sex, and to make the best bargain for themselves possible. A woman is said to have married well when she gets a good price for herself, in money and what money will bring. But where this is the sole motive, as it so often is, a woman does not become a man's wife—she becomes his mistress, in a way that law and social custom approve.

All our terminology of marriage reflects this vicious and degrading fact. The law says that a man must "support" his wife, and when a woman marries she expects to be "supported." No idea of an equal partnership, to which the woman contributes as much as the man, is recognized either in law or in our verbal usage. The woman is an economic dependent on the man she marries, as she has been on her father before marriage; and in the vast majority of cases the law and the language correspond to the fact. Because of this economic dependence, women have for generations been compelled to develop to the utmost and to make

most skilful use of their sexual attractions, to induce some man to desire some woman enough to undertake her support. That explains the provocativeness of dress and manner found so widely among women of all classes; this is their trade, the only one to which most of them have ever been bred: to catch a husband. It is horrible and vicious and depraved and "virtuous."

I am writing almost coarsely about this thing; I admit it; I deplore it; for I am choosing as decorous words as I can find to describe a thing so essentially coarse that it is a wonder the very ink does not blush. And yet who will venture to deny that the thing described is of daily occurrence, and who will accuse me of incorrectly describing it? So long as her sex continues to be her one commercial asset a woman cannot fairly be blamed for making the most of it. It is society that must shoulder the blame of keeping her in this state of economic dependence. It is society that must undertake to make impossible such unions as are now so common, by assuring women such economic independence as will make it possible for every woman to give herself to the man whom she loves, and unnecessary to sell herself to a man whom she does not love. At present the so-called "good" woman is driven by the same economic necessity as her "fallen" sister to trade on her sex.

III

There are three practical ways of dealing with social vice. The first is indifference, the method of the

Greco-Roman world and of the heathen world to-day. This is practically our method also, since for the most part we simply let things drift, shut our eyes to fact, occasionally making some spasmodic attempt at repression, but refusing to make thorough study of conditions and find a cure. Raids and arrests, and long intervals of doing nothing, will never rid us of vice; it has been tried for three thousand years without the slightest result. This method will not even destroy the commercial system; it only makes it a little more difficult and expensive to do business. We can never cleanse the river at the mouth while allowing sewage to be discharged into it along its hundreds of miles of length. To cure bad results we must get at sources.

A second method is that which has been advocated in this discussion: an intelligent attempt to seek the cause and to apply the cure there, in the only place where it can be effective. When every girl receives a wage sufficient for her comfortable support, when every young man receives a wage sufficient to enable him to marry, we shall see an end to social vice. When women no longer need to sell themselves no man can buy them.

But we must in fairness consider a third method in which many profess confidence, namely, segregation. Sexual vice is illegal, but it is proposed practically to legalize it by setting apart a district in each city in which the law may be violated. We must recognize facts, say those who propose this method; and it is a fact that the evil exists and we are not able to eradicate it; let us therefore restrain it within limits, as the

best that we can do, instead of permitting it to pollute the whole city.

Let us recognize facts by all means, but there are two ways of doing it: to recognize and accept, or to recognize and war against the facts. Segregation proposes to recognize and accept the facts of social vice as inevitable, incurable, inescapable. That is precisely what the moral sentiment of America has thus far sturdily refused to do, and so far it is a healthy moral sentiment. It has thus far lacked sufficient vigor of health to war against the facts intelligently and persistently. That the facts are here we all see; that they are inevitable, in the sense that they are the necessary result of our present economic system, is becoming clearer every day; that they are incurable, that we have not the intelligence and the power to solve this problem, provided we have the will, is precisely what most of us refuse to believe.

Because segregation is a plan, not to cure social evil but to make it permanent, it fails to command ethical support. Outside of the vice system and its patrons and secret friends it has few advocates. Where it has been tried in our communities, as in Chicago, its effect has been to increase the worst evils of the system. It has stimulated the "white slave" traffic, the entrapping and forcible detention of young girls, which is perhaps the most cruel and shameful feature of the whole shameful and cruel business, but necessary for its profitable continuance, since not even poverty will force girls in sufficient numbers to choose the vicious life, and so fraud and force must be employed.

Two years' study of the whole subject in Europe convinced one competent investigator, Dr. Abraham Flexner, that there segregation fails to segregate, regulation does not regulate or control, and medical examination of a fraction of prostitutes is no protection to society against disease. His negative results are valuable; more courage would have made Dr. Flexner's constructive work of equal value. He discovers the economic significance of European prostitution; there is practically but one source of supply for the vice, "the lower working classes and mainly the unmarried women of these classes." The daughters of the poor are, in Europe as here, the victims of the system, with only here and there one from the educated and well-to-do. Surely, the conclusion is so obvious that no man with rudimentary reasoning powers could fail to draw it: the way to fight prostitution and end it, the only way, is to increase the intelligence and economic well-being of the lower classes. Instead, however, of drawing this obvious conclusion, Dr. Flexner slips adroitly aside and indulges in meaningless fine writing: "Civilization has stripped for a life and death wrestle with tuberculosis, alcohol and other plagues. It is on the verge of a similar struggle with the crasser forms of commercialized vice. Sooner or later, it must fling down the gauntlet to the whole horrible thing. That will be a real contest—a contest that will tax the courage, the self-denial, the faith, the resources of humanity to their utmost." This again emphasizes the lesson that one great obstacle to social progress to-day is the cow-

ardice of those men who should be leaders, but are afraid to speak the whole truth.

One argument often heard in favor of segregation is that any attempt to repress vice without segregation will result in scattering the vicious throughout the community; they will invade the good residential districts and annoy the rich and well-to-do. Let them scatter; let them invade. The poor have had to tolerate them long enough. It is the rich whose profits cause the system; it is the rich whose money maintains it; let the rich then reap the full fruits of what they have done and are doing. It might and probably would rouse them to do something effective for the lessening of the evil, if not for its cure.

But the chief objection to segregation is that tolerated vice becomes by imperceptible degrees approved vice. Toleration destroys the sense of right and wrong in a community to an astonishing degree. The houses that are rented for this vile business bring the highest rents; and, tempted by this opportunity for gain, people of the highest respectability and social standing rent their property to the members of the "system." It may be that in some cases they are ignorant of the fact, that agents acting for them are responsible; but it may well be suspected that so long as income is large they take good care to keep themselves ignorant of such details. A faithful preaching of the Gospel of Jesus ought to produce an ethical condition in Christian churches incompatible with such things. At present this left-handed partnership with vice is no bar to church membership. It was at one

time proposed in Chicago to put a placard on each house let for immoral purposes with the name and address of the owner. The very proposal led to a sudden cleaning up of one of the worst districts of the city. The example is to be commended to other cities; there can be no doubt of its effectiveness in stimulating dormant consciences into active life.

In December, 1913, the president of a Realty Company and manager of an apartment house in New York was convicted of renting a flat to be kept as a disorderly house. Justice Collins inflicted the maximum fine of \$500, but remarked that this was inadequate as a penalty and therefore also imposed a sentence of twenty-five days' imprisonment. The Court added that this conviction of a person of prominence and wealth for this offense was the first in a long number of years. But the offense is without doubt frequently committed, and if such convictions were more frequent people of wealth and respectability would derive less income from this filthy source.

It should be recognized that something can be done to reduce the extent of vice and suppress some of its crying abuses, by the general reform and cleaning up of our political system in which we Americans are now engaged. All those changes of method that give the people more direct control of government, including the initiative, referendum and recall, are helps toward solution of this problem. Those experiments in better municipal government, originating in the West and rapidly making their way eastward, will work in the same direction. Whatever changes in our

system make for more real democracy will be effective in dealing with the second great factor in the system of commercialized vice, the greed that actuates it, the profit that makes it possible and keeps it going. Democracy will make a quick end of the alliance with the underworld that the police of our cities have so long maintained. No sober man will deny that the problem is a tremendous and many-sided one, nor will he maintain that striking improvement is to be hoped for in a day. But now that we are getting a better idea of the terms of the problem, what we have to do and how to do it, steady progress may be reasonably hoped for.

It has been a great surprise to Americans of the better class to discover how intimate is the connection between vice and politics, and even yet they are hardly able to believe the facts thrust upon them from all sides. Yet the facts are too well attested to be disbelieved. Men have only begun to suspect the tie that exists between vice and capitalism. As we have seen, one great obstacle to the suppression of vice is found in the fact that the property interests of our "best citizens" lead them to give the system effective if secret support. But this is not the only, or even the chief, connection between men of wealth and vice. The existence of a large class of the vicious and criminal, the pimps and thugs of the underworld, is useful to capitalists—in fact, is indispensable. It furnishes the gangs of "guards" and "strike-breakers" employed against the workers in every great strike. It is the reserve militia of the employing class, and is

promptly called out whenever there are labor troubles, when it does effectively what it is hired to do.

This sort of thing is work very congenial to the people of the underworld. It permits them to go armed and to indulge their liking for violence, while it supplies them with money for the indulgence of their appetites. It offers them facility for committing all sorts of minor crimes with impunity, for the testimony of their victims will not be received against theirs in any court. If the strikers are women, it offers a golden opportunity to do their favorite work as panders; for when working women are out of work, hungry and desperate, is the very time when they can best be persuaded to exchange the factory for the brothel. The police know these things, but it is their interest also to side with the employing class. The capitalists know the facts, but so long as strikes are broken they care for nothing else. So our cities have a large class of gunmen and "crooks," and when there is no other outlet for their activities they occasionally kill a policeman. Then we have a great excitement for a few days, and matters go on as before.

Even when the police are honest and try to break up the commercialized system of vice, they are greatly handicapped by the law and the courts. It is exceedingly difficult to obtain evidence that will convict offenders. Officers in plain clothes are often forbidden to enter illegal resorts to get evidence against them, and to send an officer in uniform is "to hunt ducks with a brass band." The law, as interpreted by the courts, requires corroboration, in case a briber turns

state's evidence, and the transaction being conducted in private there is never any third party available to furnish the corroboration. It actually seems as if the law and its administration were carefully contrived for the protection of the law-breaker, not of society. And so there is little improvement in a state of things that places heavy stress of temptation upon those who are little able to bear it, at the same time furnishing very inadequate protection for the weak. The only ray of hope is a growing sense of social and personal responsibility for such conditions, since this promises for the future a closer brotherhood and a higher morality.

Something may be done by better legislation to lessen vice, even though the value of this remedy is greatly overestimated by hosts of good people. The Mann Act is an excellent specimen of what may at present be accomplished by this method. It is directed specifically against the "white slave" traffic, and provides imprisonment up to five years and a fine up to \$1,000 for inveigling a woman into a house of prostitution or detaining her there against her will. Desperate efforts were made by the interests involved to break this statute, by inducing the Supreme Court of the United States to declare it unconstitutional. The Attorney General did society good service, upholding the statute vigorously, and as it turned out successfully. He argued that since the Supreme Court had upheld the constitutionality of the law against the transportation in interstate commerce of diseased cattle, it ought to be humane enough and wise enough to

regard women as at least of equal importance with cattle. "Will it be said," he argued, "that Congress, if it chooses to act, cannot protect the people of the several States against the wrongful transportation of women and girls—that the law affords greater security to cattle than it does to persons?" The decision handed down in February, 1913, sustained the statute. The law went into effect in July, 1910; and in two years following the Federal courts secured 337 convictions, with sentences totaling 607 years and fines aggregating \$66,605. There were only 35 acquittals of those indicted and tried.

V

What has been said applies in most particulars also to that other great vice and social evil, the drink habit. Men have used alcoholic beverages from prehistoric times, and drunkenness has always been a social evil of most races. But only within the last century has the evil been so commercialized and extended as to become a world menace. The saloon is merely the local manifestation of a great capitalistic enterprise. As with all forms of Big Business, no restraint of law, morality or religion is permitted to stand in the way of Profit. Not only is every effort to limit the sale of liquor fought to the last ditch, but there is a constant and successful effort to stimulate the demand for liquor and so to increase its sale. "Successful," one says, because, notwithstanding the remarkable

growth of "dry" territory in recent years, there has been a large increase in the per capita consumption of alcoholics.

These facts are not so well known as they should be, so it is perhaps pardonable to dwell upon them a little. In the fiscal year of 1913 the people of this country consumed 143,300,000 gallons of distilled liquors, an increase of 7,500,000 gallons over the previous year, and breaking all former records. They poured down their throats during the same year 64,500,000 barrels of beer, exceeding any previous year by more than a million barrels. Incidentally it may be mentioned that they smoked during the same time 7,707,000,000 cigars and over 14,012,000,000 cigarettes. These, as a Kentucky "colonel" might say, are the necessaries of life. What was left out of their incomes the people spent for food, clothing, rent, and other luxuries.

So completely is the business commercialized that the independent saloon hardly exists. There is a Brewers' Trust and a Distillers' Trust, and between them they not only manufacture the great bulk of liquor made, but control the retail trade. Most saloons have an ostensible owner, but the Trust has a chattel mortgage that fully covers the value of furniture and stock, and the "owner" is in reality only the hireling of the Trust. And when legal means of sale fail them, when lawful weapons of resistance to society prove ineffective, the Trusts never hesitate to resort to illegal—assassination and arson have marked the progress of temperance in every State where it has

progressed. The "blind tiger" and the "bootlegger" would, of course, be impossible institutions if distillers and brewers would sell only to reputable persons and through legal agencies. Licit or illicit is all one to them, so the stuff is sold and the great god Profit remains on his throne. In my haste I have done them injustice, and I hasten to admit it: they would prefer, no doubt, to sell under the law, but when they cannot they are determined to sell against the law.

So long as this great business of making a profit from the sale of alcohol in its various forms continues, attempting the reform of individual victims is an absolutely futile method of dealing with it. Not only will the present volume of the traffic continue, but the ingenuity of men and the power of money will be exhausted in attempts to create more appetite and extend the business. And experience shows that the attempts will not be in vain. Prohibition does not prohibit, in any real or effective way. The Church and the various anti-saloon agitations, in spite of their local victories, are making no impression on the traffic as a whole. In spite of all yet accomplished by the forces hitherto arrayed against the saloon, a greater volume of liquor pours forth every year. We must learn to strike at the root of the evil, and not at a small branch here and there. And the roots of the liquor traffic are Profit and Poverty. Anything that improves the economic condition of the whole people will tend powerfully to reduce the consumption of liquor. But the quickest and surest results may be at-

tained by eliminating the element of profit. There is one certain means of doing this, and that is to socialize the business, take it out of the hands of individuals and subject it to State control.

It will be urged that nation-wide prohibition would be equally effective and ethically better. Let us not dispute over a name. What I am calling State control is exactly what is usually called prohibition, which is not prohibition at all. The name is not honest, and that is why I prefer not to use it. In those States where a so-called prohibition law prevails, Maine for example, there is a State dispensary in every town where liquor may be bought, the buyer signing his name in a register and stating the purpose for which it is bought. Manufacture and sale of liquor are prohibited to individuals, but the State sells liquor in the so-called prohibition States. The Maine kind of "prohibition" is what I advocate for all our States, under the more honest term of State control.

This would effectively dispose of one root of the evil, Profit. The business would not be conducted for a profit; it would be minimized as far as possible; and whatever profit there was would be for the benefit of us all, not for the enrichment of a few. In a very short time the sale would be reduced to small proportions, and in a generation might be expected virtually to cease. Especially would this be the case if the progress of society should eliminate the other root, Poverty. Sociologists are more and more coming to the conclusion that the drink habit is less a cause of

poverty than an effect. If we accept their opinion, we come by another way to the conviction that we have here a social evil for which an effective cure can be found only by the abolition of poverty.

CHAPTER VII

THE PROBLEM OF CRIME

I

CRIME is one of the costliest luxuries that society permits itself to enjoy. We worship efficiency, forgetting that the efficiency of the social order is measured by its degree of success in eliminating crime and other unnecessary costs. The more perfectly organized the society, the fewer the criminals. A high ratio of crime is an indictment of a people's civilization. The United States has a high ratio of crime. We have, it is true, elaborate and costly machinery for the detection and punishment of criminals, and thousands are detected and punished every year. There is no reason to question the excellence of the machinery; it is good of its kind. Yet that it is ineffective hardly demands argument or proof. We know perfectly well that we are engaged in the foolishly wasteful process of making criminals by thousands and reforming them by hundreds. Why not try to stop the making?

If there are some who will demand proof of the ineffectiveness of our present system, let us take the prevalence of homicide throughout the United States, and especially in our cities. The average ratio of homicides in England is .9 per 100,000, while in thirty

of our large cities the average ratio in the years 1901-1910 was 6.9 and in 1911 it rose to 8.3. We should probably select Russia as the least civilized of European States, the country of "pogroms" and Nihilists, yet in our large cities as many people are murdered each year as in the whole of Russia.¹ On the other hand, the number of legal executions from 1909 to 1912 was 400. With an average number of 2,439 yearly homicides during the last ten years, there was an average number of yearly executions of about 100. No wonder the Hon. Andrew D. White declares that "we lead the civilized world, with the exception, perhaps, of lower Italy and Sicily, in murders, and especially in unpunished murders." What is the necessity of agitating for abolition of capital punishment? a sarcastic critic of our institutions might ask. It is already virtually abolished. And its substitute, imprisonment for life, is also practically abolished. The average "life" sentence is proved by our prison records to be about six years; and the worst cases are frequently pardoned after a year or two of confinement. Society has at present no protection worth mentioning against the crime of murder.

Our system is as costly as it is ineffective. A rough estimate is that crime costs us as much as education, but the fact is that we have no statistics of crime worthy of being called scientific, and so any conclusions must be tentative. But enough is known to

¹ The exact figures are: homicides in Russia, 1907-1911, 7,716; in American cities, 1905-1909, 12,198. The correspondence of years is not exact, but this is immaterial.

warrant the statement that to protect itself against crime and punish criminals costs society the equivalent of every bale of cotton and every bushel of wheat raised in the United States. Governor Foss told the American Prison Association that Massachusetts in 1912 spent \$7,000,000 for police, courts and prisons, and less than \$25,000 for the restoration of criminals to good citizenship. Massachusetts has always been considered one of our most intelligent and progressive commonwealths, yet it spends \$280 for the punishment of crime for every dollar that is spent for the cure of crime. Naturally, we get for such expenditure more criminals and more crime. Four million dollars a day are worse than wasted because society is not willing to adopt curative measures, but prefers palliatives, and the least effective of palliatives at that. Not only are we constantly manufacturing fresh criminals, but the older stock are degenerated rather than regenerated by our system.

One reason doubtless why our machinery fails to accomplish the desired result is that it violates men's ethical sense at every turn. To begin with, it is so bunglingly devised and so blindly and partially administered. A man steals a railroad, a factory or some other valuable property, in Wall street, by means that we all understand. What do we, what does society, do to him? Most of us admire and envy him; the rest condone his fault, especially if he is a good fellow or benevolent. Another man breaks into the first man's house and steals some property, silverware or jewelry. What does society do to him? If he can be

caught, he is sent to prison for a term of years, usually a long one. In such case, the man robbed has no better ethical title to his property than the man who robs—it is a case of one thief taking from another thief. But there is a vast social difference between the two offenses, identical as they are in ethical quality: the law permits and custom makes respectable one sort of thieving, while both condemn the other. But “Thou shalt not steal,” if it has any validity, applies to both men and to both offenses.

The differences between the crimes of the upper classes and those of the lower correspond very closely in the main to their economic differences—that is to say, their crimes differ more in degree than in kind. The poor man is a little criminal, the rich man a big. One sins at retail, so to speak, the other at wholesale. There is something impressive about the rich man's crime; often its very audacity takes the breath away and makes one almost admire; while the poor man's offense often seems less wrong than mean and sordid. Among the upper classes the devil has learned to encase his cloven hoofs in spats and patent leathers; he hides his tail under a dress suit, and a silk hat of the latest shape covers his horns. Among the poor he stalks in the old form, finding no disguise necessary.¹

In both higher and lower classes crime has an economic cause, the same economic cause in truth. Crime is inseparable from the capitalistic system of industry. Poverty incites the worker, greed impels the employer,

¹ Ross, “Sin and Society,” especially the chapter on New Varieties of Sin.

to those acts that we call criminal. Take a single class of such acts as an example: Fire Commissioner Johnson, of New York, is responsible for the assertion that one fire of every four is of incendiary origin. Men deliberately start fires, and other men even more deliberately hire fires to be started, in order to collect insurance. There was a regular system in New York a few years ago, and may be still, and the like doubtless exists in other cities, whereby a dishonest business man could hire professional "firebugs" to set fire to his premises. The insurance companies, in their greed for premiums, permitted such reckless over-insurance of property as in itself constituted a bribe to every dishonest man to commit this form of crime. If there were no fire insurance, fires would be diminished fully 25 per cent. Thus it comes about that a business designed to protect the community against fire results in increasing the danger of the community from fire. This costly form of crime is one of the elements of the high cost of living; for, of course, the cost of premiums and all loss by fire is ultimately assessed on society, in the form of enhanced prices. Another consequence is that the class ordinarily described as law-abiding and conservative, the "business men" of the community, destroy more property than the class ordinarily described as criminal. This extraordinary state of affairs never before existed in any nation or society; it is the product of our modern industrial system and of unlimited competition in the insurance business.

II

One great difficulty in our dealing with the problem of crime is that we have no consistent system of penology. Our laws are founded on several different, if not contradictory, principles, some of which are no longer tenable. Punishments have been imposed by statute on the principle that certain offenses must be expiated by a certain penalty. But the idea of expiation is philosophically absurd and socially impossible. To "make the punishment fit the crime" seems easy until it is tried. Nobody can tell just what degree of moral turpitude is involved in a wrong act, and nobody can know the degree of suffering involved in a given penalty. Any algebraist will assure us that an equation containing two unknown quantities is insoluble. Expiation could not be accomplished even with the values of both unknown quantities given, for evil cannot be expiated with evil. If, for example, a man has taken life, for society to take his life does not constitute expiation of the crime—it is merely another crime, murder added to murder.

The new idea of God that Jesus has given us assures us that He does nothing to man save in love. We can no longer believe in a hell to which a vengeful Deity condemns men to suffer endlessly, as the fit reward of the evil they have done here. If we believe now in future retribution, it is suffering that men bring on themselves by refusing a Father's forgiveness and scorning a Father's love. That is the only

idea of God and of retribution that Jesus permits a follower of his to entertain. If, as the theologians have for ages been asserting, human law at its best is but a transcript of the divine, then every act of society in dealing with crime, not prompted by the desire to protect itself by bettering the criminal, is itself criminal.

If the principle of expiation cannot be admitted, as a foundation for criminal law, still less can revenge. Jesus forever ruled that out of the conduct of his disciples. He forbade to his followers the revenge approved by Jewish law, and commanded in its stead the law of love, active good-will toward all: "But I say unto you, Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you." But in spite of these words, the spirit of legislation has been for nineteen centuries, and still is: "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, stripe for stripe" (Ex. 21:24). Still is, one says, for not long ago, in one of our American courts, a judge¹ addressed one whom he was sentencing to imprisonment for life in these words:

"You are to receive a sterner punishment than death. You will die a hundred times. There will be for you only the hopeless painful years from day to day, from month to month, stretching out forever, and in agony. You will be wiped out from human knowledge. You will **not** be permitted to lift a hand or whisper a word. In four or five years the eternal solitude and silence will

¹Judge Marcus Kavanagh, of the Superior Court of Cook County, Illinois, as reported in the Chicago papers.

begin to crush in upon you like an iron weight. You hear that street-car bell ringing now ; you will remember it in after years as the most exquisite music. It will mean hurrying crowds that go where they like and do as they please ; it will mean the greatest of all pleasures—freedom. You can only dream of it by day and by night and your dream will be torture unspeakable. In the summer you will guess there are cool rivers running somewhere under green trees and you will long for the sight of even a green leaf with an aching you never thought you could experience. In a few weeks the holidays with their lights and festivities and happiness will be here, and many a Christmas will roll over you in your iron cage and high stone wall, but you will never hear a child laugh again. The law has taken its full and ample revenge upon you.”

If revenge could be admitted as a valid principle in law, then there are many who would say that a judge who could deliver such an inhuman and malignantly cruel tirade to a prisoner ought himself to be sent to prison for a long term of years. But even a judge capable of such deliberate and cold-blooded ferocity ought not to be punished in a spirit of revenge. He illustrates anew, what history testifies on every page, that bitter personal hate could not have devised more cruel and vindictive punishments than have been administered under sanction of law and in the name of justice.

It is pleaded in behalf of laws framed on this principle that they satisfy a natural sentiment of mankind, which demands retribution and will be content with nothing less. There is no question that the sentiment of revenge is “natural,” in the sense that it exists

and is common; but the question is, Is revenge ethical? Is retribution justifiable? And the answer is that revenge is both irreligious and anti-social. Irreligious we have already seen it to be,—flatly opposed to the teaching of Jesus. It is as clearly anti-social, for all are agreed that only active good-will from all to all is compatible with social happiness and social progress. Revenge is the annihilation of good-will. The present degree of peace and order of society has been attained only by suppression of this “natural” desire for revenge. Individuals are no longer permitted to avenge their own wrongs; society has undertaken to see that each man is protected in his rights. Society must not do what it has forbidden the individual to do. And, besides, a system of retributive punishment will break down of its own absurdities. Some offenses, as treason, cannot be returned in kind to the offender. Let us ponder a remark of Seneca’s,¹ as wise as it is witty—“Would any one think himself to be in his perfect mind if he were to return kicks to a mule or bites to a dog?”

The only ground on which society can make good its right to punish the criminal is the principle of self-protection. Society has the same right as the individual to repel attacks on itself and to use so much force as may be necessary. But society has no more right than the individual to use more force than is necessary for self-protection. This must be regarded as the ethical foundation of penology. Several things follow from this principle. If crime has a social cause

¹ Seneca, *De Ira*, iii, 26.

or social causes, punishment of the individual is an ineffective means of self-protection, because it leaves the cause untouched, to go on producing crime. Real self-protection consists in removal of the social conditions that impel men to crime. It also follows that the real guilt of what we call crime is its anti-social character. The criminal is a man who refuses to accept the ethical standards of society, especially those that relate to property. Some of these standards are artificial and indefensible, but society insists that even these must be respected while they exist and must be modified in an orderly social way. Any other conduct, even if it has behind it a true ethical principle, is selfish and anti-social.

Crimes may be traced to the preponderance in many individuals of the selfish instinct over the social. The great majority of men have been brought by ages of discipline to the point where their social instinct is strong, and they hesitate to perform any act that promises to be injurious to the community of which they are members. No treatment of crime can make any claim to be considered scientific unless its aim is to develop the social instinct in the criminal and so eradicate crime by extinguishing the criminal motive. In other words, the sole adequate protection of society from crime is the reformation of the criminal.

If self-protection is the ethical ground of society's right to restrain the criminal, it follows that whatever is prescribed for him must not be penalty for what he has done, but discipline to influence what he

will henceforth do. This is fatal to the whole idea of "punishment" for crime, even as a deterrent. The saying ascribed to an English judge is often quoted with approval. In the good old days when men were hanged for stealing anything above a shilling's worth, a man was convicted of stealing a sheep, and in sentencing him the judge said: "You are hanged, not because you have stolen a sheep, but in order that sheep may not be stolen." But even conservative England finally became convinced that hanging was no real deterrent of theft, and did not secure its professed end, the protection of society in the enjoyment of property. Sheep-stealing went merrily on in spite of frequent hangings, and it was found better to let the thief live and do what was possible to transform him into an honest man. Now we are finding the principle of equality of sentences to be erroneous. They are indefensible on the theory of expiatory or retributive or deterrent punishment, because they cannot be adjusted to individual guilt. And if penalty is to be corrective, equal sentences are utterly absurd, for the nature and duration of corrective treatment must be adjusted to the character of the criminal and not to the supposed heinousness of his crime.

There has been a great change in the general humaneness of civilized nations in the treatment of crime, but no great advance in principle. In 1837 the death penalty was repealed in England in the case of about two hundred crimes, without any appreciable increase in criminality. Public whippings, brandings, mutilations, once common, are now practically un-

known. Cruel executions, such as breaking on the wheel, drawing asunder with horses, and the penalty for treason, familiar to every reader of English history, of being "hanged, drawn and quartered," are now totally disused. The punishments that were severe to brutality were proved by experience to be no more deterrent than the milder. Indeed, it seems to be fairly well established that petty crimes were proportionally commoner when they were punished by hanging than now when the penalty is brief imprisonment. Men reasoned *a priori* that heavy penalties would deter; but the fact proved to be that the more rigorous the penalty the less the restraint. The way of effectual protection of society from crime is to eliminate the criminal. Since we have decided not to eliminate him by death, the only method left to us is to eliminate him by reform. He must be changed into an honest man.

In other words, everything that we have learned about criminals and crime points to the conclusion that direct attempts to suppress and punish crime are doomed to failure, and that progress is to be made in an altogether different direction from that in which we have been proceeding. We can do much to protect society from crime by a rational treatment of the criminal, concerning which more will presently be said. But effective protection of society must begin back of the crime, in an endeavor to remove its causes. If it is true that crime has a social cause, punishing or reforming the individual is no real remedy. If we permit large numbers of men to be assailed by what are

to them irresistible temptations to commit crimes, and do nothing toward removal of such temptations, we ourselves are the real criminals. When we analyze any collection of statistics of crime, we come immediately to this fact: offenses against property are three times as numerous as offenses against the person. Of course there must be a reason for this, and it is not hard to find. The present distribution of wealth offers a constant inducement to large numbers of men and women to acquire from others with little exertion property that could normally be acquired only by great exertion. Hence those among us whose selfish instincts are stronger than the social—in other words, those who are not restrained by usual ethical principles and social habits—choose this short and easy way. Crime was the original get-rich-quick scheme, and is still the most popular. But crime of that sort is possible only in a society where property is very unequally distributed, so unequally that the moral sense of the propertyless is outraged by the conditions, and respect for property rights correspondingly weakened. If every man had or might have enough for his needs, what inducement would there be to take from his neighbor? The normal man would have little or no motive to steal or defraud, if he were not in need or did not expect to be in need. As all roads lead to Rome, so all investigation of our social problems leads us, by one path or another, to poverty as the underlying cause or aggravation of them all. We may safely conclude that, with poverty, most crimes against property would disappear; and there would remain

only those committed by the abnormal, and crimes of violence and passion, which are relatively few in number.

III

It must of course be recognized that for a long time to come we shall have to face the practical necessity of dealing with crime and criminals. This will be true no matter how rapid progress we make toward social justice and economic equality. What has the Gospel of Jesus to say about our attitude toward the criminal? The whole Christian idea of penology, as we have seen, is summed up in the precept, "Love your enemies." The criminal is the enemy of society; very well, love him, show him active good will, do to him whatsoever things we would have done to us, were the case reversed. We should recognize that the criminal is either born a criminal or made a criminal. He is entitled to our pity as a man diseased or a man deformed: in either case a man needing to be cured, not deserving to be punished. Crime is pathological, and its effective treatment must be a system of ethical therapeutics. We may still call our civil tribunals "courts of justice" if we can persuade ourselves that they deserve the name; but, for our courts that deal with crime, we should invent another title better descriptive of their intent. Possibly "courts of correction" would answer our purpose. Let us, as Mr. Howells has well said, "be very careful how we try to do justice in this world, and mostly

leave retribution of all kinds to God, who really knows about things; and content ourselves as much as possible with mercy, whose mistakes are not so irreparable."

Merely to send a criminal to prison is a pitiful expedient for the protection of society; he should be kept there until there is reason to believe that, if released, he will no longer commit crime. Our present practice operates merely as an interruption of his criminal career, not to mention that his imprisonment has only fixed his character and quite possibly perfected his education as a criminal. To release a criminal unreformed is as irrational as it would be to turn loose a beast of prey after a brief confinement. It is even more irrational, for while the leopard cannot change his spots the mind of a criminal can be changed. In the small percentage of cases in which reform is found to be impossible, after due trial, the only adequate protection of society will be the life-long detention of such. And, since life imprisonment in such cases is socially necessary, it is justifiable.

The indeterminate sentence is therefore the first step in a rational and Christian penology. If the object of society were to punish, on any of the theories of the value of punishment, there might be some justification of fixed sentences. To suit so much punishment to such a grade of crime would in any case be crude justice, but it would not be unjust in principle. If, on the contrary, society has in view the good of the criminal, and believes that the surest protection for itself is lifting him to a better manhood, then there

is no sense whatever in the definite sentence. Men so differ in present character, and in response to reformatory influences, that a term of detention and discipline quite sufficient for one would be altogether inadequate for another. Detention should cease when the object has been attained—namely, hopeful reclamation of the offender—and not before. In leaving discretion to the judge to impose a longer or shorter sentence, the laws of most of our States have virtually adopted the principle of the indeterminate sentence; but the judge is not the person to be invested by law with this discretion, because he can only estimate the gravity of the offense, not the effect of discipline on the offender; and so, with the best intentions in the world, he is more likely than not to make a blunder. The officer to whom the prisoner is given in charge for detention and discipline can best judge the effect and decide when the prisoner is fit to be released. Or, if this is thought too great and too easily abused power to be intrusted to a single officer, his recommendations may be made to a Board which shall have power of final action.

Joined to the indeterminate sentence, of which it should be regarded as a sort of Siamese twin, should be a generous parole system. When a prisoner has given satisfactory evidence under detention and discipline that he is fit to be set at liberty, he should be released on parole. The objection usually made to a reformatory penology is that it promotes hypocrisy rather than reform; that any prisoner will profess penitence, and will behave well for a time, if this

promises to secure his release. The objection is theoretically grave, and no doubt does constitute a practical difficulty, but it is *a priori* reasoning and must be tested by experience. The parole system is already in use in several States, has been tried long enough to give it a fair testing, and has had the happiest results. The released prisoner is of course required for a certain period, varying with offenses and persons, to report himself and his doings to the proper officer at fixed intervals. An unsatisfactory report, or failure to report, is cause for rearrest and recommitment to prison. There are few failures. It is more difficult to follow the cases after final release from surveillance, but those who have had experience with the system believe that fully sixty per cent. do not again commit crime. In time we may hope for much better results than this, but surely even this is making great progress.

Another important change in the treatment of crime is such modification in our penal laws as would permit more lenity to first offenders, especially when the offense is comparatively slight and the accused has previously borne a good character. The shame of arrest, trial and conviction is enough penalty in most cases of this kind to deter from a second offense. It would therefore be socially safe to give the court power to suspend sentence during good behavior for all first offenses, save those of the gravest character. This would result, in a multitude of cases, in the permanent establishment in good character of those who, if sent to prison, may be turned into habitual crim-

inals. The greatest blunder of our criminal laws, and that is saying much, is the sending of first offenders to the common compost-heap of our prisons. France is wiser than we. Its criminal code provides that for first offenses the judge may suspend sentence on parole for three years; if a second offense is committed within that time the penalty is doubled. Our newspapers are full of cases that illustrate the comparative defect of the laws of most of our States, especially in dealing with young offenders. A ten-year-old boy in Georgia stole a bottle of pop, valued at five cents, and for this heinous crime was sentenced to confinement in the reformatory until his majority, or eleven years. A six-year-old criminal in Wisconsin was committed to the State industrial school, also to remain to the age of twenty-one. On the other hand, a boy in Cleveland stole from his employer \$1,400 to go to Oxford and get an education. For several years he had spent all his evenings in study and devoted every cent he could save to the purchase of books. Being sent to deposit this large sum of money in the bank the temptation was overwhelming, and he took the first train for New York and engaged passage on the *Mauretania*. The vice-president of the corporation by which he was employed, when he learned of the circumstances, made the public announcement: "If he wants higher education and has the mental qualifications, I'll see that he gets it." In former times this would have been called encouraging crime, and some may still take that view of the case, but to a fast-

growing number it will seem rather to be encouraging honesty.

Of course, if reform of the criminal is the object of society, capital punishment must go. No one was ever reformed by hanging, or even by electrocution. The death penalty, at least as at present administered, has little deterrent power. Facts already cited—the large percentages of homicides and the low ratio of executions to killings—testify to that unmistakably. We shall soon have to choose between the two horns of a logical dilemma: If capital punishment is to be regarded as just and so to be retained, it involves rejection of the theory of reformation as the sole end of penalty; if reformation is made the sole end of penalty, capital punishment must be abandoned as not only ineffective but indefensible. Society must of course protect itself against homicide, and at present it has no protection worthy of the name. Most homicides are of a nature that warrants expectation of no repetition; society would be safe in releasing such offenders after a period of confinement and discipline—in short, the principle of the indeterminate sentence could safely be applied to the majority of cases of this crime. A small minority of cases would require detention for life, in order to secure adequate protection to society; and a second offense should always be treated in that manner.

IV

The thing that cries loudest for immediate reform in our penal system is the management of our prisons.

With a few honorable exceptions, they are at present criminal universities, in which men are trained to go forth and prey on society. They are officered, in large part, by men who are themselves criminals in spirit, and too often in act, for they violate the law every day in the discharge of their duties. The only difference between them and the men over whom they misuse the authority of society is that they have managed thus far to escape conviction. Not only is the personnel of our prisons almost the worst possible, but the management of most of them is as corrupt and dishonest as it is stupid. It is not extravagant to say that two-thirds of the men in charge of criminals, if they received their deserts under existing laws, would themselves be wearing stripes.

Society at large shares the shame of these facts, because it looks on these abuses with apathy and does not care about them enough to seek a remedy. It is shared by the legislators who made the present system and those who fail to modify it. Bills for the betterment of the system fail at session after session of Congress and our legislatures, because of the indifference of the great majority of lawmakers and the opposition of a few who are interested in maintaining present evil conditions.

Criminals must be sent to prison, as a place of detention, but it ought to be a sanitary building; the health of prisoners should be a first consideration, and humane treatment should be strictly required. How few of our prisons to-day answer these elementary requirements probably few people suspect, but all experts

know too well. Most of the jails, penitentiaries and prisons of America are a disgrace to a civilized people. Many of them are nurseries of tuberculosis and other contagious diseases.

Even if these defects were removed, our penal system would still be fundamentally unjust. A man who commits crime must be detained under discipline for a time, for his own good and for protection of society. This is just and he has no cause of complaint so far. But his family have not been guilty, and why should they suffer for his fault? We treat both the criminal and his family with hideous injustice, and his resentment of our treatment embitters him and makes permanent the enmity that he already feels against society. Let us put the thief in prison, since this must be so, but let him be there employed in some useful and remunerative labor at regular wages, his earnings to be paid to his family. If he is a single man, let his wages accumulate, and at his release on parole he will have a sum that will effectually help him to begin his new life.

This would be rational; this would be humane. But, instead of this, what do we? We hire out our prisoners to contractors (in most States, not in all), and their interest is to get from the workers as much profit as possible; and we employ all the resources of prison discipline to drive these men like cattle, that the contractor's gains may be as large as possible. And the contractor, paying much smaller wages than for free labor, can undersell manufacturers who must depend on free labor, and so floods the market with

cheap goods. The tendency is, and often the result, to reduce the wages of the outside workers to the level of prison prices. Thus a double wrong is done by the system, which has not even the poor excuse of being profitable to the taxpayer, for it usually results in a heavy deficit in the prison accounts, which must be met by taxation. Oh, the offense of this is rank; it smells to heaven! Society is itself a greater criminal than the criminal whom it punishes so cruelly.

There are signs that the public is becoming aroused. In March, 1913, Arkansas abolished the lease system, after a spectacular campaign lasting several years, one incident of which was the pardoning of three hundred and sixty convicts at once by the governor, on the ground that "the penitentiary was not designed for a revengeful hell." Henceforth the convicts are to be worked on a State farm, which is believed to interfere less with free labor than other lines of production, and also prepares men when released to secure employment more easily than in trades.

The contract system was in force in 1913 in the States of Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin and South Dakota. It is in our older commonwealths, the States of the Atlantic seaboard and the middle West, that the abuse still lingers; with a single exception, the newer States of the far West have never adopted the practice or have discarded it.

Even in the States east of the Mississippi in which the State prisons are free from the contract system, it still is found in the county workhouses or penitentiaries and in so-called "reformatories." No interest is promoted by this system but the interest of the contractor. He indeed greatly profits by a system that permits him to treat prisoners as slaves, and to offer goods so manufactured at prices with which free labor cannot compete, save at the penalty of starvation, vice and crime—a system that sends prisoners out at the end of their terms weakened in body and perverted in mind, a permanent addition to the burden of disease and criminality that the community must carry. A fearful price, this, to pay for a system that accomplishes nothing for society but the enrichment of a few men.

The initial mistake in our thinking about a penal system has perhaps been the assumption that criminals must be confined within four high walls, and can be employed only in manufactures. The South taught us the fallacy of this assumption (had we been willing to learn) when it hired out its convicts to contractors to work in the fields and on the roads; but the chain-gang was in no other respect better than the prison shop; the brutality was as great, possibly greater, and while the health of the convicts may have been bettered by an outdoor life, nothing was accomplished for their reformation. The South at length became conscious of this fact and took the next step forward: the establishment of penal farms. The management of these, however, still leaves much to be desired; some of the

worst brutalities in the history of American penology have been disclosed in these penal farms. Certain Northern States adopted the idea and made their farms not merely penal but reformatory. The guards with loaded rifles were dispensed with and the honor system was substituted: each convict admitted to the farm is required to sign a pledge of good conduct. Honor among convicts? Impossible, preposterous! will be the sneering comment of many readers. But at the Ohio penal farm, at Mansfield, during a trial of ten years, out of 2,600 prisoners only 18 ever attempted to escape. The superintendent has no means of tracing all the men after their release, but he believes that fully 65 per cent. live thereafter honest lives. At Cañon City, Colorado, and Great Meadow, New York, similar conditions prevail, with similar results. The prisoners are not required to work all the time; they are encouraged to play baseball and football, and live a normal life in clean surroundings. Treat convicts as beasts and they will become beasts, as the chain-gang and the prison-shop show; treat convicts like men and they will become men. Nearly every State in the Union possesses large tracts of waste land which through the labor of its convicts might be made to blossom as the rose, while the majority of the workers would be reclaimed to lives of honesty and productiveness.

Employment of convicts on road work is equally possible and perhaps even more desirable. It will naturally be argued by many that convicts employed in such labor, unrestrained by guards and loaded rifles,

would promptly make their escape, and would constitute a serious menace to the surrounding community. Experience shows that a few will escape, but that the great majority will be faithful to their pledge of honor. Oregon had, a few years ago, one of the worst prison-contract systems in America. The system was abolished and the convicts were employed in road-building. The new system was efficient in its purpose, and has been equally efficient in men-building. Moreover, it has been profitable: formerly the convicts required from the State treasury \$40,000 a year for their support; to-day they are self-supporting, the prisoners are earning wages for themselves and their families, miles of good roads contribute to the wealth of the State, and a large proportion of the convicts on their release seek and obtain honest employment. It is becoming recognized that one of the most urgent needs of the people of the United States is good roads. Here is a means of obtaining them, not only without expense, but with great incidental profit to the whole community. How long shall we permit the evils of our prison system to continue unabated, when the remedy has been put into our very hands? If men will not hear the call of humanity, will they forever be insensible to the promptings of greed? If they cannot see their fellow man in a convict, can they not see the dollar in his labor—the dollar that they might enjoy, instead of the contractor?

The Washington State Reformatory is another illustration of the fact that the far West is taking the lead in penology. This institution is conducted

less like a prison than a school, and its success has won for it the title of the University of Another Chance. The indeterminate sentence, manual training, corrective discipline, and the parole are its chief features—nothing novel in theory or practice, but still unusual. Firms and corporations throughout the State are said to be willing to give employment to the “graduates” of this school, most of whom continue to give good account of themselves. The connection between crime and ignorance is so close, and has so often been commented on, as itself to suggest that to increase the intelligence of criminals is the best way to weaken the criminal impulse. When the former criminal has been fitted by training of mind and hand to do some honest and productive work for society, more than half the inducement to crime has been taken from him forever.

One is not ignorant of, nor does he ignore, the fact that a prison is not a Sunday school or a kindergarten; that discipline must be maintained (but what sort of discipline?); that prisons should as far as possible be made to pay expenses and not be a burden on the taxpayer; that it is difficult to get men of high mental and moral tone to serve as wardens and officers of a prison; or any other piffling objections that may be made to prison reform. But surely Christian civilization is equal to the task of devising a better system than we now have, and of finding men to work it. One cannot argue with defenders of the present system; they are too ignorant of the Gospel of Jesus, or

believe it too little, to find a common meeting-point with those who believe that Gospel.

If men will endure our brutal and inhuman methods, women will not; and we may confidently expect one of the earliest beneficent effects of woman suffrage to be the amelioration of our methods with criminals. When we think of our filthy jails in which uncondemned and in many cases innocent persons are confined; of our prisons with their crowded unsanitary cells and their slave-pen workshops; of our courts which savagely send a man to prison for thirty years for the theft of a scarf-pin, or a boy for stealing a five-cent soft drink, or a labor leader for leading a street parade; we may well hope with fervency for the day when the American woman may be heard in our legislatures, and even in the holy Congress and possibly on the sacrosanct judicial bench.

V

In the present state of civilization, the crime of crimes is war. There was not a war during the nineteenth century that was not wholly unnecessary and indefensible. This is not equivalent to saying that none of the warring nations had a real grievance, or it may be an unselfish purpose. To say that war is unnecessary is not to say that it is wanton and causeless; it is to say that peaceful solution of the difficulties was possible, and that failure to seek and find peaceful solution in these days is inexcusable. No

difficulties can arise between civilized, not to say Christian, nations that cannot be solved peaceably, any more than difficulties can arise between two civilized men that cannot be peacefully settled. We insist, as a fundamental postulate of civilization, that all difficulties between individuals shall be submitted to the decision of courts, not fought out as in former ages by personal combat. The duel is no more obsolete in civilization than war. War is merely a relic of barbarism.

The ideas commonly connoted by words and phrases like "patriotism," "national dignity," "national rights," are as obsolete, barbaric and criminal as war itself. Their prevalence among the people is one of the chief reasons why war is still possible. Our schools are doing great mischief in still propagating these ideas, under the wrong-headed conviction that this is the way to make good citizens. Much of the cheap sentiment of newspapers and political speeches about "Old Glory" belongs in the same category. There is a real patriotism, and there is a genuine honor for our country's symbol, differing widely from these shams; and they inspire love of peace, hatred of war. Real patriotism wishes our country to be leader among the nations in promoting peace and justice throughout the world, so that the flag will stand for something more than power and will be honored wherever it flies.

Armaments are unnecessary and inexcusable in our state of civilization—as inexcusable as the carrying of arms by private citizens. A man walking the streets

of our cities has exactly the same justification for going armed to the teeth that any nation has for maintaining standing armies and navies. His excuse would be that some other men carry weapons, and that occasionally one of them shoots somebody, and he must therefore be prepared to defend himself. It is quite true that hardly a day passes in which somebody is not shot in New York, but few citizens regard that fact as sufficient reason for carrying a rifle and a brace of revolvers down Broadway. Yet in spite of the patent folly of the thing, the nations of Europe are engaged in a mad race to be first in the matter of preparedness for war, until their enormous armaments threaten them with universal bankruptcy.

And we are urged to join this lunacy. Our magazines and newspapers abound in articles inciting our government to adopt a policy of this kind. Even as it is, our appropriations for war and its results form a larger proportion of our annual national expenditure than can be paralleled in the budget of any European nation, but this does not satisfy the Hobsons. There is probably not a professional soldier or sailor who is not more or less obsessed by this notion of imminent danger to the United States from attack by some foreign power. Now it is Japan, now it is Germany, that is said to be our secret and deadly foe; and horrible are the descriptions of the defeat and suffering that would certainly be ours should such an attack be made upon us in our present well-nigh defenseless state. On us civilians who have retained our sanity, and can estimate this rhodomontade as it de-

serves, these professional advocates of war look with pity not quite unmixed with contempt.

That there is method in this madness we have begun to suspect and even to know. We may acquit the professional soldier of anything worse than a bias resulting from his education and calling, but the civilian advocate of armaments is too often the agent of corruption. It has been made clear in many ways that the creation of a great navy is the inspiration of "graft." The Steel Trust and its allies are those who profit chiefly by the building of these enormously expensive ships of war; just as in Germany it has lately been proved that the great Krupp works have been engaged in the propaganda of warlike sentiment, to stimulate the demand for their immense and costly guns. Ambition and greed—the ambition of rulers and statesmen and generals, and the greed of capitalists—are together responsible for wars and armaments. If these two forces could be eliminated or controlled, there would never be another war.

The workers have lately awakened to these facts. They are expected to furnish food for the powder that the ruling class manufactures—to fight and shed their blood that ruler and statesman and general may be called great and capitalist may become richer. This is the real meaning of modern war, however deftly that meaning may be wrapped up in patriotic phrases. And the working man is very tired of playing "goat," of being the silent and unresisting victim of this abominable system. The workers of Europe have begun to manifest a new spirit and to exercise a decisive influ-

ence in the affairs of nations, by serving formal notice that they will endure this no longer. They have virtually declared a general strike against war. When the conflict broke out in the Balkans, in November, 1912, a general European war was feared. It had long been predicted that, in such an event, the jealousy of the chief European nations regarding the division of the "sick man's" estate would inevitably precipitate a conflict. And for a time it looked as if the prediction were certain of fulfilment. Austria and Germany and Russia began to arm themselves and to send ultimatums, and the clash of arms was expected to come to us on every breeze. Then something happened. On November 17, vast numbers of workmen met in every capital of Europe, save St. Petersburg, and protested against war. Paris, Berlin and London each saw gatherings of nearly a hundred thousand men. A few weeks later came a meeting of the International Socialist Congress at Berne, where the great Cathedral was filled with a shouting multitude listening to speeches and resolutions that proclaimed the gospel of peace and good will to all the world.

There was sudden change in the atmosphere of Europe. The war-clouds dissolved and the sun of peace shone again in the heavens. Statesmen who had been threatening the strong and bullying the weak suddenly began to roar as gently as a sucking dove. The real power of Europe had spoken—the power that usually works and suffers and is silent—the power that produces the world's wealth and is the pillar of kings' thrones and the maker of dukes' coronets, de-

spised and spat upon by the great, but irresistible when it makes its will known. This is the effective war against war. How are battles to be fought and victories to be gained, if the workers will not fight? For reasons that will be obvious to the dullest, the capitalistic press made only the most perfunctory reference to this event, the most significant of the twentieth century thus far, and not one of them had the insight and courage to point out its significance. It would be very bad policy to do anything to develop the consciousness of power among the masses. But what was then done has been thoroughly apprehended by the working classes; and in spite of the silence of the professed leaders and instructors of public opinion the workers are gaining some realization, albeit yet but dim, of their real power and how it may be effectively used.

The ruling ideas of any age or people are the ideas of its ruling class. The classes that have hitherto ruled the world, the aristocracy of birth and the aristocracy of wealth, are giving place to democracy. The world's workers, the producers of wealth, have no interest in wars and armaments; on the contrary, all their interests are on the side of universal peace. The idea that wars are necessary, indeed inevitable, has been carefully fostered and is still industriously propagated by the capitalistic class and its literary hirelings, because in wars and armaments they find immense profits. A great financier over whom the nation lately shed abundant crocodile tears, is said to have got his first start on his career as philanthropist and art con-

noisseur by himself remaining at home during the civil war and selling the government guns that would not shoot. On the whole, capitalists find greater profits in armaments than in wars, but occasional wars are necessary to justify the armaments, as well as useful in providing additional territory for exploitation. The story has been often told, and is generally believed to be substantially true, that an American capitalist, who is also a journalist—or, more accurately, an owner of newspapers—was the real cause of the war with Spain. So confident was he of his ability to provoke a conflict, that, when an employee whom he had sent to Cuba to report the war, telegraphed to his chief, "I can't find any war here; I had better come home," he sent in reply the message, now classic in journalistic circles, "You furnish the news, and I will furnish the war."

How capitalistic greed inspires wars, the recent history of Mexico illustrates. President Diaz was kept in power for many years through the power of capital, which found this course to its interest, as it meant great "concessions" and profits. At length, one dissatisfied clique of capitalists financed a "revolution." Diaz was overthrown and Madero succeeded. Presently, another clique precipitated a second "revolution" and Huerta came into power. Incidentally, Madero lost his life, which was, from the capitalistic point of view, unfortunate, but he took a gambler's chance and lost. Ever since these capital-fomented troubles began in Mexico, the capitalistic cliques have been doing their utmost, through the usual channels

of diplomacy and the press, to induce our government to interfere. After maintaining a policy of "watchful waiting" for months, President Wilson sent a naval and military force to occupy Vera Cruz. The mediation of the South American republics was then offered and accepted, and seems likely to be successful in restoring peace to Mexico, at least for a time. But, as this volume goes to press, the American people are still uncertain whether they are to be forced into a bloody and costly war, merely to serve the purposes of a band of greedy plunderers.

War was once a necessity; it was the only means nations had of settling their differences and righting their wrongs. Generations ago war became a crime. War is now an insanity.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PROBLEM OF DISEASE

I

“Be ye perfect,” said Jesus to his disciples. If it be conceded that ethical perfection only was in his thought (of which none can be certain), it still follows that ethical perfection is for most men impossible without a certain measure of physical well-being. According to the story of Eden, God made man in full bodily vigor and supplied all his wants before he laid upon him any commandment. The Gospel demands of every man that he live a full, rich, noble life, that he become the man God planned him to be. Redemption of the body and the spirit is the goal of a Christian Christianity.

But this implies of necessity the opportunity for every man to live such a life, and our social order denies such opportunity to the great majority. The disciples of Jesus cannot propose to themselves anything less than a perfect human society. That society should be ethically perfect will perhaps be granted without argument to be a fitting ideal, even by those who have no faith that such a society may be attained, or even approximated. We must recognize the teach-

ing of experience, that ethical perfection implies also physical conditions approaching the perfect. To expect high ethical life amid low economic conditions is to expect flowers to bloom on a bare rock.

“Since the second century,” says Ritschl, “nothing has guided the Church less in its efforts for social amelioration than the ideal of the kingdom of God on earth, in the sense in which Christ and his apostles used the term.” A glance the most cursory at our social conditions finds ample justification for this statement as applied to our own age, and a quick flitting through the pages of history brings forth a like result regarding the past. Disease, misery, poverty have always bound men as with chains and fetters, and men will be helpless to rise until these bonds have been stricken from them. These things are here in the world, not by will of God, but by act of man. It is for man to rid himself of them, and to cease praying to God for deliverance from what man brings on himself. The farmer might as wisely sit on the fence and pray for a crop, as for us to beseech God to rid us of pestilence. Yet most Christian people would laugh or pity if they saw such a farmer, while they will regard as irreligious the suggestion that prayer is no remedy for disease. And yet they would probably assent to the abstract proposition that God will not do for us what we are quite capable of doing for ourselves.

The new idea of the Gospel is not hostile to prayer and does not belittle divine help; but it does lay increasing emphasis on self-help, and it does try to put

prayer in its proper place, as a supplement to human effort, not a substitute for it. Above all, it recognizes that to form is better than to reform, that prevention is better than cure; or, to use medical terms, prophylaxis is more important, because more efficacious, than therapeutics. Much disease may easily be prevented; cure is always uncertain. The time is coming when the test of a people's civilization will be freedom from disease. For we have now reached a point where smallpox, malaria, yellow fever and typhoid are no longer diseases—they are crimes. Tuberculosis and syphilis are not diseases—they are penalties. Accordingly, we have now a new ideal of philanthropy: the old nursed the victims of fever and plague; the new exterminates mosquitoes and rats. Father Damien was the typical saint of the old ideal; Captain Lazear is the typical saint of the new.

Economic reasons urge us to attempt the conquest of disease, quite as strongly as philanthropic. Disease is one of the heaviest taxes on production. The estimated economic cost of sickness each year in the United States is \$792,892,000.¹ This is almost certainly an underestimate. Even so, it exceeds the entire cotton crop of 1911, which was valued at \$732,420,000—the largest crop ever grown. The imagina-

¹ The experience of Germany is that 40 per cent. of employees will be sick an average of 8.5 days per annum. Estimating the loss of wages at an average of \$1.50 a day, the cost of medical attendance at \$1.00 a day, and the economic loss at 50 cents a day, the total cost of sickness among the 33,500,000 workers of the United States in 1910 was over \$792,000,000.—Rubinow, "Social Insurance," p. 214.

tion is easily impressed by the proposition to destroy the whole of our greatest crop of cotton. We can figure to ourselves something of the widespread misery and ruin that would result, and also comprehend how every one of us would ultimately feel that loss, in the enhanced cost of cotton goods. We find it more difficult to realize that each year an equivalent tax for sickness is assessed on us, and that we pay in that cost of living about which we grumble. Nothing can be more certain than that eventually it is we who pay for our neighbor's sickness. To play the priest and Levite, and pass by on the other side, is only a temporary evasion of our responsibility; the bill for the sick and wounded stranger will one day be presented to us in such wise that we cannot refuse to pay. It will be cheaper for us, as well as more humane and more Christian, to play the Good Samaritan and take out our two pence at once.

The great scourges of the past are under control, some are disappearing and none are now a great menace to America, though they may for some time continue to afflict other parts of the earth. The Great White Plague, the Great Black Plague, anæmia and alcoholism are the chief scourges of the race to-day. Once we subdue these four great enemies, we may count the victory over disease virtually won. There will remain, not great campaigns to be fought, but a guerrilla warfare to be waged, until, band by band, all the foes will be subdued. That task will be annoying, and perhaps long-drawn-out, but it will be noth-

ing in comparison to our present difficulties and dangers.

II

As yet we are only feeling our way to better methods; old ideas and old methods still hold the great majority in their grip. Our confused thinking, the natural result of this transition, makes us uncertain in both aim and procedure, so we fumble and fail. When we first became aroused to the ravages of tuberculosis and the possibility of curing the great majority of cases in the initial stage of the disease, we had a national spasm of zeal for the establishment of sanatoriums and camps for the open-air cure. Enormous sums, each year growing in actual and proportional amount, are expended in this hopeless and futile effort. In the year 1912 nearly \$19,000,000 (so it is estimated by the national society for the cure of tuberculosis) was spent in the United States in this way. There are no figures available for the sum spent in prevention, but it was doubtless trifling in comparison. And probably nobody, certainly nobody of authority, would maintain that any impression worth mentioning was made on the Great White Plague by this immense expenditure. There were unquestionably more new cases than cures during the year.

Even with our imperfect methods of registration, it is known that 180,000 persons died of this disease in 1912, and the real number was probably in excess of 200,000. In some classes the mortality is excep-

tionally high: 90 per cent. of the deaths of employees in the textile industries are from tuberculosis, most of which are easily preventable. The shuttles used in many mills are known as "suction shuttles": in threading them the weaver sucks the thread or yarn through an opening, incidentally filling his throat and lungs with lint, promoting bronchial troubles and inhaling tuberculosis germs deposited by a diseased worker. Shuttles used thus by tubercular operatives and well alike, become direct causes of infection. Attempts to prohibit their use have been stoutly opposed by employers. Capitalists would rather kill off a large percentage of their workers every year than go to the expense of new equipment. Human life is cheaper than machinery.

Tuberculosis is, for reasons not yet understood, a greater menace to some races than to others. Poles, Italians and members of the numerous Slav races are comparatively immune; while the Irish are peculiarly susceptible, especially in the second generation on American soil, and native-born Americans of all origins contract this disease far more easily than immigrants. We cannot dismiss this as a problem that only remotely concerns us—there is none more intimate or pressing. At the same time, it is not a problem of America alone; 40 per cent. of the deaths from disease in Germany are from tuberculosis. And there, as here, money is spent too exclusively on cure of individuals. It is said that \$60,000,000 have been spent in recent years in building workmen's homes and

\$20,000,000 for hospitals and sanatoriums, in the vain hope of coping with the scourge.

Socially speaking, the only way to cure tuberculosis is to prevent it. And this is not difficult, because we now know that the real cause of this disease is malnutrition, underfeeding. The bacilli or "germs" of tuberculosis are practically omnipresent in the air, and every person takes them into his system. The only reason why we do not all of us fall victims to this disease, apart from constitutional immunity of some, is that most of us are able to maintain well-nourished and vigorous bodies. The bacilli cannot effect lodgment in a healthy body; we breathe them in, and they attempt to make a home in our throats and lungs and our bodies rally their forces and kill them before they can do any damage. But when bacilli enter a body weakened by underfeeding, or lodge in throats and lungs inflamed by dust or poisonous gases, they find a fertile soil for growth. Tuberculosis is a disease of tenements and factories, in the main, and flourishes among the poor. Comparatively few of the well-to-do are attacked, and among them the disease is curable in the majority of cases, if taken in hand in time, by giving the body what it has lacked, plenty of nourishing food and fresh air. These expensive luxuries are quite beyond the reach of the poor, so they die.

A large proportion of working people, using that term in its usual sense of manual workers, suffer from anæmia, or poverty of the blood, because they are continually underfed. This does not mean that they do not have "enough to eat" in the ordinary usage of

those words; it means that they do not have enough nourishing food to keep their bodies up to a fair standard of efficiency. It is one thing to silence the cravings of hunger; it is quite a different thing to satisfy the needs of the body. To gratify the appetite is not necessarily to be fed. Malnutrition includes not merely underfeeding, in the sense of insufficient quantity of food, but improper feeding, the giving of unfit and contaminated food. Malnutrition in this sense is the cause of the frightful infant mortality that prevails throughout our country, especially in our cities. Three hundred thousand infants under a year old die every year in the United States. One calls this mortality frightful, because it is believed that, while malnutrition is responsible for the death of 50 per cent. of people of all ages, it causes 85 per cent. of infant mortality. That this high rate is due to easily preventable causes is necessary inference from the fact that in the poor quarters of our cities 373 infants of every thousand die before completing their first year, while in the better residence districts the mortality is 156 in the thousand. And that even this is extravagantly high is proved by the fact that in New Zealand infant mortality is sixty-eight to the thousand. We have only recently begun to think of New Zealand as a civilized country, but it has surpassed us greatly in one of the prime essentials of civilization, providing security for human life.

Cure of malnutrition is therefore something more and other than insuring more food and cheaper food for all people: it also means good food. Much of that

sold in the markets, even that bought at high prices by the rich, is not good food. The campaign for pure-food laws has brought to light many adulterations and substitutions that are hurtful, as well as some that are merely dishonest; and enforcement of such laws as we have has done something to improve the quality of our foods. But in many cases the law does not attempt to prevent some of the most serious impairments of our daily foods. This is especially true of the cereals that form so large a part of our diet. All cereals have an outer husk, composed mainly of mineral matter and of no food value. But immediately inside of this husk is a thin, dark-colored layer, which contains phosphates and organic substances that constitute an essential part of cereal food value. One of these constituents is a crystalline organic base, to which the name "vitamine" has been given. The vitamines are found in all cereals and their presence in food is necessary to proper metabolism. Their absence causes progressive degeneration of the nervous system, culminating in fatal disease.

In the Orient, where rice is the staple cereal, and with many people the chief food, the preparation of this grain for market removes the whole of this brown outer envelope, leaving the polished, glistening white rice with which all are familiar. There is little nutriment in this but starch. The result of an exclusive diet of this rice is the disease known as *beri-beri*, a polyneuritis that finally manifests itself in disorders as apparently different as paralysis, hypertrophy of the heart and dropsy. Since rice is less used among us,

the danger of our contracting *beri-beri* is slight; but the same (or, at all events, a similar) disease is caused by an exclusive diet of bread made from the ordinary white wheat flour of commerce, which is the staple of diet in many families. Thousands of poor people make two meals every day of bread and tea exclusively, and their bread is made from white flour. The process of making our ordinary white flour ingeniously removes from it every trace of the vitamins whose presence is essential to health. When Sylvester Graham taught our grandmothers to make bread of flour composed of the whole wheat berry, he was on the right track, though he did not have the correct scientific basis for his teaching. Still better than the "graham" flour of commerce is a "whole wheat" flour, that eliminates the silicate husk, while it retains the phosphates and vitamins so essential to nutrition. People who have a varied diet are not seriously harmed by the absence of vitamins in their bread; other articles of food supply the missing ingredient. But people who rely on bread as a chief food should by all means choose that made of whole wheat flour.¹

Ignorance, as we see from this, may be the cause of malnutrition, no less than poverty. No doubt the infant mortality of the tenements is much increased by ignorance. When medical inspectors find mothers giving such viands as sausage and cabbage to infants

¹ As this is not a treatise on dietetics, these sample instances must suffice. For further particulars, readers are referred to "Starving America," an excellent popular discussion of dietetics, from the commercial as well as the hygienic point of view.

of a few weeks, it is evident that more food and better food is not the only need of such people; they also need elementary instruction in the care of infants. It is the greater intelligence of the well-to-do, no less than their ability to provide better food, that decreases the death-rate among their children. And so any program for the prevention of disease must include, as one of its most prominent features, systematic popular lectures, illustrated with the lantern and the moving picture, that will teach the poor how to care for their children. Good housing and a living wage will come near completing the list of things to be done, so far as the homes of the poor enter into the problem.

The establishment, with the opening of the year 1913, of a Children's Bureau in the Department of Commerce and Labor will accomplish much, by systematic study of the facts and collection of them into trustworthy statistics, toward solution of our problem. The first report, made in January, 1914, by the chief of this new Bureau, Julia C. Lathrop, is not only the first document of the kind printed by our Federal government, but one of unusual significance in itself. It takes as its starting point the figures of the Census Bureau, that 300,000 infants die annually in the United States, of whom at least half would live if known measures of hygiene and sanitation were applied in our communities. Subjects for immediate inquiry by the Bureau are said to be: infant mortality, birth rate, orphanage, juvenile courts, desertion, dangerous occupations, accidents and diseases of children, employment, and legislation affecting chil-

dren. Not all of these are directly connected with the problem of disease, but all are connected with social problems that we are greatly interested to understand and solve. We have reason to congratulate ourselves that Uncle Sam, at our urgent bidding, has at last undertaken to do as much for our children as he long ago did for our cattle and hogs.¹

It is not popular ignorance, perhaps, that is the greatest bar to progress in dealing with disease. Quite as general, and far more disgraceful, is the ignorance of our legislators, journalists, ministers, and the rest of our educated class who lead and express public opinion. Not only are they densely ignorant of the problem as a whole, but they are not in the least aware of what has been done to make its solution possible both in theory and in practice. They do not know, and they are reluctant to believe when told, what has actually been done here and there to cope successfully with disease. It is almost a wilful ignorance on their part, for knowledge is so easily accessible. There is already a literature of public hygiene almost as large as the literature of bridge or golf. And yet, each time a remedial measure is suggested it is received and debated as if it were an absolutely new and untried idea, and our most intelligent citizens will gravely pronounce absurd and impracticable that which European countries have had in successful operation for more

¹ This is not quite exact. Last year (1913) Uncle Sam spent \$7,699,191 on the Bureaus devoted to the welfare of animals and crops, and a beggarly \$31,000 for children. Chief Lathrop asks for \$165,000 for 1914.

than a generation. This is one of the most discouraging features of the situation and is possibly the chief cause of our slow progress.

In order to lessen ignorance, popular or otherwise, States and municipalities should provide suitable literature for general circulation, and supplement this with illustrated lectures about personal health and home sanitation. The sooner this is done on a large scale, systematically, persistently, the better will become the prospect of overcoming disease. Much of this instruction could be given in factories and stores. Instruction in first aid should be given to all workers, and every workshop where machinery is used should be required by law to keep at hand all appliances necessary to treat accidents. Increased efficiency of workers would repay all costs. The trades unions might be encouraged also to have such instruction given at their meetings. Boards of health should be empowered to inspect all places where people are employed, not merely as now to see that the premises are kept in good sanitary condition, but to have general oversight of the health of the workers. This would imply that power should be intrusted to them to require those likely to become ill or incapacitated, and in consequence to become a burden to family or community, to undergo suitable medical or surgical treatment. In short, to keep men well is more economical than to cure them after they have become sick.

Conditions of workers and buildings are often a disgrace to our present means of caring for the public health. It is not necessary to go at length into

loathsome and sickening particulars, that have been discovered by inspectors, official and volunteer, and published where all might read them who would. It is enough to say that in canneries and other factories for preparation of foods, workers have been found in large numbers who suffer from virulent eye, skin, and scalp diseases; while buildings were overrun with fleas, rats, and other vermin. We may be certain that if people realized the conditions under which their foods are often prepared, they would not only refuse to buy and eat them, but would make such emphatic protest that something would be speedily done by negligent or corrupt officials who now wink at such a state of things. Our national carelessness in such things is really astounding. The objections that both employers and employed almost always make to any improvement in such conditions invariably disappear as both become assured that this is part of that increase of efficiency that society is now seeking, and finds so profitable whenever it is attained.

Next to underfeeding, overcrowding stands as the great cause of disease, and the bad ventilation, or no ventilation, that invariably accompanies overcrowding. This is especially manifest in most of the "occupational diseases," which might be reduced to negligible proportions by requiring decent sanitation of all workshops and stores, admission of abundant light, free use of water, and scientific ventilation to remove dust and poisonous gases, as well as to admit fresh air. The gravity of occupational diseases is not rightly apprehended, because the total number of victims to each

disorder seems small; yet, in proportion to the number of workers, deaths or total disabilities are often alarmingly large. Some of these diseases are as old as trades themselves. So long as there have been tailors and shoemakers, certain diseases have attacked workers of these trades, in consequence of their sedentary and stooping labor. But rise of new industries and new conditions of work has been occasion for many new diseases and aggravation of many old.

Authorities on occupational diseases have suggested their division into four classes: Those due to dust, to chemical poisons, to germ infections, and to the physical conditions of labor.

Diseases of the respiratory organs are caused or aggravated by dust. An inflamed condition of the mucous membranes results from constant breathing of dust-laden air, which favorably disposes workers to contract tuberculosis, bronchitis, pneumonia. Dyspepsia and diseases of the digestive tract come next. The metal polisher lives on the average only fifteen years after learning his trade. The stone-cutter's trade is most hazardous of all, his chance of death being much greater than that of the soldier in battle. An average mortality of about 25 in 1,000 in the dusty trades from tuberculosis alone, and of about 300 from all diseases, speaks eloquently of the dangers faced by those who practice them. Most of this mortality could be prevented by use of fans and scientific ventilation.

Chemical poisoning is quite as dangerous and equally preventable. All workers in lead are subject to this danger, and the number of trades in which

lead is used in some form is legion. Lead poisoning is the more dangerous because it is so insidious and is cumulative, not immediate. For months or even years the worker notices nothing, when suddenly the cumulative force of the poison in the system asserts itself and he collapses. Indigestion, lack of appetite and other symptoms may give him warning; or paralysis may suddenly disable him entirely. Transient or temporary blindness, deafness, loss of taste and smell, are some of the other results. Lead poisoning does not kill so many outright as some other forms of occupational diseases, but the damage it does to general health and efficiency is often more serious economically than death would be. In this case air and water are the great preventives. If shops and factories where lead is used were properly ventilated, and if workers were not only encouraged but compelled to practice frequent ablutions, absorption of lead would be greatly reduced and the health of workers much benefited. A certain amount of danger is inseparable from use of poisons in manufactures, but care will eliminate the greater part of the risk.

Trades in which mercury and phosphorus are used are more dangerous than the lead trades, as these poisons act more quickly and are more rapidly absorbed. Mercury is absorbed through the skin, and also as dust and vapor through the lungs. Its effects are manifested in "salivation" and loss of teeth, and later by ulcerations on the body or in the internal organs. It is much more likely to be fatal than lead poisoning. The fumes of phosphorus are inhaled by match

workers, and a frequent effect is what is known in the trade as "fossy" jaw, ulceration of the teeth and decay of the jaw bone, accompanied with great suffering and often terminating in death. It seems impossible to take sufficient precautions to make phosphorus safe to handle, and the only course is to use some other substance in the making of matches.¹ This has now been done by some manufacturers, and should be required from all. People can help by refusing to buy the ordinary cheap "parlor" match. No matter how cheaply the phosphorus match of commerce can be made and sold, any article is too dear whose making requires the needless sacrifice of human life.

Many occupations bring workers incidentally or accidentally in contact with infected materials, from which they contract diseases. This is inseparable from certain occupations, and cannot be minimized by any known process. This is true of tanners and furriers; the skins that form the raw material of their trades come from animals in all parts of the world, and contain germs of various diseases. Any process of disinfection would injure the skin or fur or both, and the workers have to take their chance. Anthrax and tetanus are among the diseases thus contracted; fortunately the cases are infrequent, for they are generally fatal. Those in the woolen, shoddy, and paper industries, in which the sorting over of old rags is part of the work, often acquire diseases from infected rags. These, however, are almost entirely preventable

¹ On phosphorus poisoning in industries, see a valuable paper in the *Bulletins of the Bureau of Labor*, Vol. XX, pp. 31 seq.

through disinfection by live steam, and diseases of this kind should be classified henceforth under the head of criminal negligence.

There remain the diseases caused by physical conditions of labor, including the various forms of over-exertion. These are most numerous of all, and if it were necessary for our purpose they might be subdivided into several sections. Some of these diseases are relatively new. There is caisson disease, which attacks those who labor in laying foundations to our modern skyscrapers, and building tunnels under rivers, requiring them to spend some hours each day in compressed air. The transition from normal air pressure to that of several atmospheres in the caisson, and *vice versa*, is each time a strain on the body, which after a while results in dizziness, neuralgic pains, and a form of paralysis known among workers as "the bends," which usually terminates in death. New York now limits work under air pressure of over twenty-eight pounds to three hours a period, with at least an hour's intermission. Great heat and rapid changes of temperature among glass workers, iron workers, and paper makers are fruitful causes of disease. Precautions easily taken would greatly reduce these dangers. Overwork is possible anywhere and occurs almost everywhere. It may be defined as incurring more fatigue in any one day than can be made good by the night's rest. Where this habitually takes place, there must be regular physical degeneration, until the point of breakdown is reached. The remedy for this is the introduction of all labor-saving methods and **devices**

possible (not so-called labor-saving machinery, be it noted), and the shortening of the hours of labor as rapidly as possible.

With regard to most of these occupational diseases, proper statutes regulating sanitation of stores and factories, drawn by sanitary experts, and based on investigations already made by government experts, providing for effective inspection by boards of health, with power to close any building until it is made to comply with the law, must be our chief reliance. Such statutes in all our States would work wonders toward prevention of this form of disease, and advancement of public health.

III

Only the parsimony and indifference of the people, first of all, and the corruption and inefficiency of the men they have chosen as legislators in the second place, prevent the speedy eradication of several diseases that now scourge the American people. More of our people die every year of typhoid than were slain in the war between Japan and Russia; more die every week than went down with the *Titanic*. Every one of these deaths is preventable with our present knowledge of the disease. In fact, they should not be called deaths, but murders. With a pure water supply most cases could never occur; reasonable precautions would prevent the carrying of contagion by other means. But inoculation with anti-typhoid serum is a practically complete preventive. This has been absolutely proved

by the experience of our Army and Navy in the past few years. In 1911 there were 222 cases of typhoid in the Navy. In 1912 the requirement of inoculation became operative and among the 26,000 persons in the service there was but one case of typhoid, and that was very mild and issued in speedy recovery. A circular of the War Department, issued in February, 1913, says that in the war of 1898, among 120,000 soldiers, there were 20,730 cases of typhoid and 1,590 deaths. In 1912 among 61,405 officers and men in the United States proper there were 18 cases of typhoid. The ratio decreased from 6.74 in 1901 to .376 in the first six months of 1912. The difference that has taken place in little more than a decade is strikingly shown in this comparison: in 1898, among 10,759 men encamped at Jacksonville, Florida, there were 1,729 cases; in 1911, in a similar encampment at San Antonio, Texas, 62,801 were gathered with only a single case. Could there be a more effective demonstration that typhoid is preventable, and that the multitudes who die of it every year are a totally unnecessary sacrifice?

Yet there are among us, unfortunately, thousands of poor deluded fools who continue to protest against all forms of inoculation and vaccination, and anti-toxins and serums, and oppose with even more vehemence the vivisection by means of which these remedies have been discovered and made available. It is, indeed, well for the prospects of the race and social improvement in the coming years that these unconscious enemies of their kind are as uninfluential as they

are relatively few. And yet they are both sufficiently numerous and sufficiently successful in affecting the attitude of many toward medical progress to justify us in recalling what vivisection has done, and what we may therefore hope it will do in future. Vivisection, in its technical meaning, includes any and every experiment made upon the living body. When Captain Lazear offered himself as the subject of an experiment to determine whether the bite of a mosquito would convey yellow fever, he was engaged in the horrible practice of vivisection in its most horrible form—experimentation on a human being. But he offered himself for this purpose because determination of a scientific fact, on which the welfare and safety of mankind greatly depended, could be reached in no other way. He lost his life and we honor him as a hero, but if that point could as well have been determined by having a mosquito bite a rabbit his fitting epitaph would be, "Died as the fool dieth."

That men have the right to use the lower animals in any way that will advance the interests of mankind is an ethical principle that the great majority will not question for ages to come, if ever. Denial of this principle is too sublimated ethics for a race that consumes animal food daily. We shall do well for a few centuries to come if we approximate more nearly the ethics of Jesus, who said to his disciples: "Ye are of more value than many sparrows," and "Of how much more value then is a man than a sheep?" Unnecessary cruelty is quite another matter, and no reasonable person would deny that experimentation with animals

should be restricted to experts conducting scientific research, and that everything should be done to make such experimentation as humane as possible. This comes far short indeed of a sweeping denial of the right of vivisection.

That medicine is to-day in any sense a science and has progressed beyond the mediæval empiricism is due almost wholly to vivisection. Every time that we call in a physician we experience the benefits of such investigation and participate in the discoveries made. A list was prepared some years ago by Dr. W. W. Keen, of Philadelphia, one of the foremost surgeons of America, briefly setting forth the progress of medical science by this means. It deserves the most careful reading and even pondering:

1. The discovery and development of the antiseptic method which has made possible all the wonderful results of modern surgery.
2. The practical development of modern abdominal surgery, including operations on the stomach, intestines, appendix, liver, gall stones, pancreas, spleen, kidneys, etc.
3. The development of the modern surgery of the brain.
4. The new surgery of the chest, including the surgery of the heart, lungs, aorta, esophagus, etc.
5. The almost complete preventing of lockjaw after operations and even after accidents.
6. The reduction of the death rate after compound fractures from two out of three, i. e., sixty-six in a hundred, to less than one in a hundred.
7. The reduction of the death rate of ovariectomy

from two out of three, or sixty-six in a hundred, to two or three out of a hundred.

8. The reduction of the death rate after operations like hernia, amputation of the breast and of most tumors so that it is now almost a negligible factor.

9. The abolition wherever the proper measures are taken, in this country and the canal zone, of yellow fever.

10. An enormous diminution of the ravages of malaria, and, in some places, its total abolition.

11. The reduction of the death rate of hydrophobia from 12 to 14 per cent. of persons bitten to 0.77 per cent.

12. The development of a method of direct transfusion of blood which has already saved very many lives.

13. The reduction through the use of antitoxin of the death rate of diphtheria all over the civilized world. This reduction shows a change from a mortality of 79.9 deaths per 100,000 of population in 1894, to 19 deaths per 100,000 in 1905.

14. The reduction of the mortality of epidemic cerebro-spinal meningitis from 75 or even 90-odd per cent. in the absence of serum treatment, to 20 per cent. and less when the specific serum is used.

15. The cutting down of the death rate of tuberculosis by from 30 to 50 per cent. This is due not to treatment by serum or vaccines, but to methods of prevention based on the knowledge of the cause of tuberculosis.

16. In the British army and navy Malta fever has been abolished. In 1905, before the successful researches on this disease, it attacked nearly 1,300 soldiers and sailors. In 1907 the army had only eleven cases; in 1908, five cases; in 1909, one case.

17. The almost complete abolition of childbed fever, the chief former peril of maternity. Its mortality has

been reduced from five to ten up even to fifty-seven in every hundred mothers to one in 1,250 mothers.

18. The discovery of a remedy (Salvarsan), which bids fair to protect innocent wives and unborn children, besides many others in the community at large, from the horrible curse of syphilis.

19. The discovery of a vaccine against typhoid fever; which in the recent army maneuvers on the Mexican border prevented the development of typhoid among the soldiers, which in hospitals has greatly reduced its incidence among nurses, and which is now coming into general use in all places where infection is possible. The improved sanitation, which has helped to reduce the typhoid death rate in this country, is itself largely the result of bacteriologic experimentation.

20. Many recent activities indicate that we are gradually nearing the discovery of the cause, and then we hope of the cure, of several of the dreadful scourges of humanity: as cancer, infantile paralysis, pellagra; and that diseases of the tropics, such as sleeping sickness, etc., are about to come under man's control.

21. Finally, it may be pointed out that animals themselves have been enormously benefited, for by discovering the causes, and in many cases the means of preventing tuberculosis, rinderpest, anthrax, glanders, hog cholera, chicken cholera, lumpy jaw, distemper and other diseases of animals, animal suffering has been greatly diminished.

Any one who can study this list of discoveries made through experimentation on animals, nearly every one of which would have been impossible by any other means, and is capable of weighing the vast good to

mankind that will for all time to come result from these advances in knowledge, and can still oppose vivisection, convicts himself of incapacity to comprehend scientific proof or of culpable indifference to the welfare of humanity. He must be treated like any other enemy of society: ignored so far as he is harmless, suppressed when he becomes dangerous. When his opposition to the good of his fellows becomes a menace to public health there is no way but to apply force. The right of the community to protect itself is superior to the right of the individual to refuse or neglect necessary precautions against disease, and superior to the ethical crotchets of a small minority.

IV

In the meantime, though we are making steady progress toward the prevention of disease, we must do more and not less for the relief of the sick. No word that has been written is intended to discourage or condemn curative measures, only to direct attention to the more important as well as more neglected work of prevention. We may well be proud of the work of our boards of health. Considering their limitations, by insufficient laws and inadequate financial support, and often lax or hostile public opinion, they have accomplished marvels, and have been more free from "graft" and corruption than almost any other of our public institutions. We should strengthen their hands and praise their efforts much more freely. They

will not do their duty any less faithfully for a little generous and well-timed applause.

At the same time we must remember that a hospital, an asylum, founded and supported by the rich, is not a thing to which society can point with pride as some worthy achievement; it is rather a badge of shame, a confession of failure. Charity is not a solution of the problem of poverty, but an evasion; not a forsaking of social sins, but an attempt to compound for them. In great, rich America there ought to be no poverty, no charitable institutions, because every one ought to have sufficient for his needs. Whatever provision in a social way is found to be necessary for the treatment of disease should be made by society as a whole—should be no charity, but a common enterprise for mutual good.

Some kind of insurance of wage earners against sickness, however, is a greatly needed step forward, a form of social justice that cannot long be denied, especially where the sickness is caused by occupation. Of course, what the worker chiefly wants is not sick benefits, but health. It is good when sick to know that the whole family are not to suffer from hunger and cold because the breadwinner is disabled, but it is still better when the breadwinner is able to work and earn steady wages. Nevertheless, while bending all energies to the prevention of disease, society should not neglect provision for those who meanwhile become its victims. Society cannot escape this obligation, because society is chiefly blameworthy for the continuance of disease.

Insurance against accident is as important as insurance against disease. The business, not the individual, should bear this burden, which will be passed on to society in price of product. In the matter of compensating workmen for accidents Wisconsin is a pioneer State, as in so many other economic and social reforms. A compensation act has been in force about two years, and up to January 1, 1914, there had been 6,894 claims under the act for compensation. Of these all but 156 were settled automatically; the smaller number required arbitration by the Industrial Commission. The injured workmen were paid \$396,354.73, which went to the injured persons direct. Hitherto, the courts have awarded each year about \$220,000 as damages for injuries, only a small part of which ever reached the workmen, the greater part being absorbed in the expenses of litigation. Interests hitherto conflicting have coöperated in promoting safety, and this has reduced the number of accidents greatly. A certain percentage of accidents is inevitable, but there is no doubt that this percentage may be reduced, by proper carefulness, to an almost vanishing point; and that whatever remains should be treated as part of the cost of production.

The United States Steel Corporation claims to spend every year \$5,000,000 for the welfare of its 30,000 workers, of which \$2,000,000 is for the sick and injured. It has made "safety first" the motto everywhere, and in six years \$2,500,000 has been spent to prevent accidents, while \$750,000 is now devoted each year to maintaining and improving such devices. In

addition to these things, an old-age pension fund of nearly \$12,000,000 has been established. I cannot vouch for the correctness of these figures, but the mere fact that this great corporation thinks it worth while to make public such claims shows how the importance of social welfare has increased within a decade. At the same time, it must be recognized that there is a prejudice among workers against benefit funds of a private character. It is freely charged and widely believed that certain firms and corporations which have made much of their philanthropic work for their employees so administer benefit funds (mostly composed of sums withheld from wages) as to swell their own profits and make the "benefits" to employees illusory. Only a public system, administered by State officials, can ever be free from suspicion of some ulterior object.

It has been previously pointed out that social betterments, as well as social evils, are interlocked, like the directorates of some of our great financial institutions. It therefore follows that betterment in one direction almost of necessity leads to other betterments. In Germany, for example, the State provision against sickness has greatly stimulated the crusade against disease, in hope of reducing sickness to the minimum and so decreasing the burden of sick benefits. Sanatoriums for tuberculous patients, hospitals for the treatment of many other forms of disease, convalescent homes, and like public and private institutions, have sprung up in large numbers all over Germany. Indeed, it is agreed among those who have studied the operation of social insurance in Germany that the

chief result of the system, at any rate its most valuable result, has not been the direct monetary benefits to the workers, but the immense educative influence it has had. Benefits, or any other form of financial relief, can only minimize and palliate industrial evils; education tends to remove them. The worker is not slow to learn that better than insurance is to need no insurance; to have possession and free use of all the powers of body and mind is much more to his interest than any sort of compensation for their loss. Given health, employment, and fair wages, insurance is only an anchor to windward in desperate cases, the main value of which is to give a sense of security to the workers that greatly promotes their happiness and efficiency.

The experience of Germany shows another thing: one valuable result of social insurance is marked stimulus to the progress of medicine and surgery. The medical profession has been put on its mettle by the increased social demand for the best treatment and the quickest results, and in consequence there have been remarkable discoveries. Progress in surgery has perhaps been most remarkable, at least it is most spectacular. Photographs lately published show wonderful results in the surgical treatment of cases of industrial accidents. One series shows a man horribly mutilated, having lost the greater part of both arms and both legs; a trunk and four stumps was what the surgeons had to work upon. Such a man would, only a few years ago, have been regarded as a hopeless cripple, condemned for the rest of his life to be a

burden to himself and his family, or to society. The next view shows the man fitted with artificial arms and legs, and finally he is pictured at a bench in a factory, again earning his living like any other workman—no, unlike any other, but still earning it. There seems no limit this side of the grave to what modern science and ingenuity can accomplish, and through the pulmotor it has even succeeded in restoring the dead to life. Many of the things that are now everyday matters would have been hailed as undoubted miracles in any past age, and there is no reason to question that still more wonderful things will be achieved in the future.

One of the names that the followers of Jesus have delighted to give him is the Great Physician. The record tells us that he went about the towns of Galilee “proclaiming the Good News of the kingdom and healing all manner of disease.” No idea of the Gospel can leave out the healing of the sick and the prevention of disease without leaving out the Christ himself.

V

The new science of eugenics, so highly lauded and so often ridiculed, is intended as the ultimate solution of the problem of disease. It promises at least to dispose of those diseases that occur by transmission from one generation to another, including mere tendency to disease, or constitutional weakness. The State will ultimately be compelled, in self-defense, to

set some limits to the marriage of the unfit. The advance in medicine and surgery, the multiplication of charities, and the growth of philanthropic sentiment are now preserving thousands of lives that in former times were extinguished by the stern law of the survival of the fittest. We are thus carefully preserving the mentally and physically degenerate folk who used to perish miserably, and they are propagating their kind faster than the normal population increases. The descendants of such people constitute an increasing reservoir of disease, vice, and crime, and especially of prostitution. This cannot be suffered to continue unchecked without danger, nay, certainty of general race degeneration.

Since the State undertakes now to regulate marriage, and issues marriage licenses, it has already assumed the right to say who shall and who shall not be united in lawful wedlock. It is but a step further in principle for the State, as the organ of society, to require a physician's certificate of sound mental and bodily condition, before a license will be issued. No man or woman affected by a contagious or transmissible disease, such as tuberculosis or syphilis, is fit to marry; and to ensure its own protection society has right as well as power to say that the unfit shall not marry. It is right in principle to do all this, but at present inexpedient, as the example of Wisconsin has shown. That State took the lead in requiring presentation of a medical certificate of fitness at the license bureau, with the double result of driving thousands out of the State for the performance of the marriage

ceremony, and the forming of many illicit unions by those too poor or too something else to take this trouble. In other words, the law is evaded or defied, because it has not behind it a sufficient public sentiment. A long process of popular education will be necessary before such a statute will be effective.

Nevertheless, by whatever means may be necessary, the principle must be applied. It may be necessary to take more stringent measures to prevent illicit unions of the unfit who are debarred from legal marriage, even to the extent of compulsory sterilization of such persons. This would be comparatively easy in the case of such as are gathered in institutions. Society cannot long evade the compulsion of facts, and will find itself constrained to put an effectual end to this means of race degeneration. It is only an unethical squeamishness that prevents us from looking the problem fairly in the face, discussing it thoroughly until all the conditions are understood, and then adopting with intelligent firmness the one sovereign remedy.

CHAPTER IX

THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY

IN our survey of social ills we have found poverty at the bottom of all, as sole cause, chief cause, or aggravating cause. For several years past we have had to face this social condition: the greatest crops in the history of our nation gathered in (valued in 1913 at \$10,000,000,000 in round numbers), abundance of food for our own people and a large surplus for other countries less fortunate, and the highest prices for food that our people have ever paid. Something wrong? Who can doubt it? What is wrong? Who can doubt that!

“The rich man must work to get an appetite for his dinner; the poor man must work to get a dinner for his appetite.” The old jest is true, though it is no jesting matter. But there is this further important difference: When both have done their work, the rich man has too much dinner and the poor man not enough. At one end of the social scale men are dying of starvation, at the other end of surfeit. God said to Adam: “By the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread,” but Mammon says to his subjects: “By the sweat of another’s face shalt thou eat pie.” Dives still fares sumptuously every day, while Lazarus sits at his gate and humbly asks to be fed with the crumbs

that fall from his table. The thing that is wrong is that the product of the earth is so unequally divided—that the many live in misery and the few in luxury. Even before we begin to search for cause and cure, the very existence of the fact outrages our sense of justice, rouses to protest all the finer instincts of our humanity.

It is well to face at the outset the staggering proportions of our problem. Mr. Robert Hunter, one of the highest authorities on the subject, declares that not fewer than 10,000,000 persons in the United States live in poverty—that is to say, in actual destitution and suffering. The number of persons in acute distress is variable, from not less than 14 per cent. in prosperous times to 20 per cent. in bad times. There is another great element of our population that continually lives in a condition that may also be described as poverty, inasmuch as they never have quite enough for their wants. It is not merely that their desires are unsatisfied—when it comes to that none of us have all that we desire—but they lack food, shelter, and clothing sufficient to keep them in good health and economic efficiency. Three-fourths of our male wage-earners receive less than \$750 a year, the lowest sum on which a normal family can live a normal life. Half of the women wage-earners, as we have already seen, fail to receive a living wage.

I

Poverty is as unnecessary as disease, is as curable as disease, and for the same reason: we now know the

cause and hence we know just where to apply the cure. And, as with disease, the only cure is prevention.

The cause of poverty may be stated in a single word, **EXPLOITATION**. Exploitation is the power of man to use his fellow man for his own profit. It runs the whole gamut from chattel slavery through serfdom to wage slavery. Exploitation enables a man to enjoy what he has not earned, by robbing his brother of what the latter has earned. This produces the wealth of the few and the poverty of the many. There may be contributing causes, but this is fundamental and chief.

But how did exploitation come to be? It developed gradually out of a simpler and juster system. In a primitive state of society, where all are trying to get a living and succeeding indifferently, let us imagine two men, A and B. A has a weaker body or is less inclined to physical exertion, but is intelligent, while B has strong muscles and not much else. A proposes that they join forces, A contributing his wit and skill and B doing most of the work. The result is that the two, working thus, produce considerably more than they had both produced working separately. It is a good arrangement for both, so good that C and D ask or are asked after a time to join. The scheme works perfectly, so long as each man plays fair and the product is equally shared; and all are equally satisfied. In some such way originated the prehistoric communistic groups.

But after a time A sets that bright mind of his at work on the problem how to get more than an equal

share. First he devises a way by which land, instead of being held in common, is allotted in parcels to each one of the tribe or group, and in process of time the principle of private ownership of land is established. Then he engages E, F, and G to work for him, and by way of inducement offers them a fixed amount of product, instead of an equal share of product. They accept, and, after paying them, he has a surplus which he exchanges for other commodities and rapidly increases in wealth. Later he hires H, I, and J, who have in some way lost possession of land, at a lower wage; and, if they are dissatisfied, lets them go and hires others for still less, until finally the share of the workers in the product, instead of being equal, is only enough to give them a bare subsistence. This is the capitalistic system, exploitation, profit.

But, as time passes on, E, F, G and the rest of their alphabetical brothers become more intelligent; they at length comprehend the situation; and one fine day they announce to capitalist A: "We are going to end this way of doing business. You have used your superior intelligence to defraud us of the larger part of our product. We are tired of working to make you wealthy. We propose to use the accumulated tools and experience of the race in production, but to return to the original method of sharing alike in the product. If you wish to work and share with us, very well, but if not, go your ways." That is social reform in a nutshell. The coming revolution is to be, as Hyndman well puts it, "a complete economic and ethical and social transformation, from competition to

coöperation, from domination to equality, from slavery to freedom." Socializing industry means that every man will be guaranteed the product of his own labor. Nobody can object to this, save one who is bent on seizing the product of another's labor. But few among us can see these things as they are, for the wealthy class look at everything through colored spectacles whose name is Greed, while over the eyes of the working class is a bandage whose name is Ignorance.

Exploitation became successful first of all because a portion of society was able to appropriate to itself the land that was the heritage of all. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are inalienable human rights. Every American is taught that and most Americans profess to believe it. Every human being has the same right to live as every other, no more, no less. That necessarily includes the principle that every man has the same right as every other to gain the means of living, and that again implies equal access to the earth from which alone a living can be secured. Land, like air, water, and light, is nature's gift to the race; the Gospel of Jesus is emphatic on that point. It belongs to everybody and can be the exclusive possession of nobody. Custom or statute can give to individuals a legal title to exclusive ownership of land, but nothing can give an ethical title. Ethically, the ownership of land is robbery of the many by the few, and because of that robbery we have a civilization spoiled by wealth at the top and by poverty at the bottom.

Those who have seized upon the common heritage of all men and now claim exclusive ownership of it

are simply robbers of their fellows. This use of the word "robbers" and "robbery" is intended as the true description of the ethical character of the transaction, not its legal or recognized character. This particular form of robbery has been legalized in many nations for centuries, and has therefore become socially respectable, without, however, changing the essential character of the action. Slavery once had behind it centuries of legal authority and social approval, but nothing could give an ethical character to the holding in bondage of one man by another. But this legalizing and social sanction does greatly affect the question of personal guilt. The extreme abolitionists of the last century were wrong in declaring that every slaveholder was guilty of the unpardonable sin, and the social reformer of to-day would be equally wrong in declaring every landowner to be a thief. The working man who has invested his painfully saved dollars in a bit of land that he may build a house wherein he and his may have a home of their own is a very different person from a burglar or a footpad. It is the system that is wrong, not the individual.

We can understand now what has caused the sudden prominence in the United States of social and economic problems, so that the man in the street is talking about subjects that two decades ago were discussed only by a few experts. The safety-valve has been tied down and the steam-pressure has risen dangerously near the bursting point. There is no outlet to-day for surplus laborers to flow toward unoccupied land. The old song is no longer true, Uncle Sam

is *not* rich enough to give us all a farm. Little land that can be profitably worked—practically none—is available for settlers. Not even cheap land is any longer to be bought, save that which is arid or exhausted or far from any possible market. The people's land has all been stolen. A favorite exhortation of some to the workless laborer of the East has been, Go West and take up a farm. It would be as sensible to exhort a Western laborer who is out of work to go East and take up a factory. The one is as feasible as the other, for in these days either demands capital—the one thing that the workless man has not and cannot get.

It is quite true, as the Secretary of Agriculture has pointed out, that less than half the arable land is actually tilled—or approximately 400,000,000 out of 935,000,000 acres. But this vast area is kept from cultivation by private ownership, and is held in this unproductive state until the time comes when it will be profitable to cultivate it.

Beginning with and resting upon this misappropriation of land, a great system of exploitation has been built up. Those who found themselves without land were compelled to labor for those who did possess it; and thus a class of hired laborers came into existence. The land was not sufficient to furnish all of them employment as their numbers grew, and some became domestic servants. As commerce and handicrafts increased, larger numbers were demanded as helpers in these new activities. When the new era of machinery and the factory began, there was a tremendous in-

crease of those who worked for a wage. Now society is divided into two great classes, the employers of labor and those who are employed. The growth of the system, once started, was almost automatic, certainly normal. We can trace each stage of its progress clearly.

And throughout the system the one feature runs and constitutes its characteristic: exploitation, the gaining of profit. Men no longer have equal right to live. There is nothing to prevent, at the present rate of advance, a few hundred men, or even a single man, from ultimately owning the entire resources of America, while the rest of the 90,000,000—or the 200,000,000, as they probably would be by that time—would lie completely at their mercy, dependent upon them for their very life. That is to say, there is nothing in our present laws or economic system to prevent the reduction of our social system to this ultimate absurdity; but long before such result could be reached revolution would put summary stop to the process. Yet to any sober thinker the present social order is precisely as indefensible on any principles of justice as one-man ownership would be.

Business professes above all things to be practical; its boast is that it takes things as it finds them. But this, which it regards as justification for all things, is its sentence of condemnation. It is man's task not to take the world as he finds it, in the sense of being complacently satisfied with whatever is, but to make the world that he finds a better world to live and work in. But modern business has contented itself with

devising machinery to make profits to pile up capital to make more profits to pile up more capital—and so on *ad infinitum*. This is not progress; it is swinging around a circle and getting nowhere. Modern industrialism has as its noble end the employment of the smallest possible number of workers, at the least possible wage, for the longest possible work day, at the hardest possible toil, to make the largest possible profit.¹ Hence profit always and of necessity involves getting more than one gives. It is appropriating labor power or its product without giving an equivalent. When the highwayman does this with violence we call it robbery; when the confidence man does it by a trick we call it swindling; when the manufacturer or merchant does it we call it business. All three take advantage of human weakness, ignorance, or necessity. The ethical quality of highway robbery, selling “gold” bricks, and business is precisely the same. Our social ethics make a distinction, but there is no difference.

Yes, there is one important practical difference: profit is an eminently respectable form of theft. It supports thousands of pious people; it maintains churches and foreign missions; it endows schools; it makes possible (and necessary) all our hospitals and asylums and sanatoriums. But it remains theft, for it is the taking of product from those who have produced it and giving it to others who have produced nothing. This is done under process of law and in the most seemly ways, but it violates the law “Thou shalt not steal.” It is the guilt of society, not of the indi-

¹ Henderson, “Pay-Day,” p. 49.

vidual, and when society becomes awake to the essentially unethical nature of business it will be not far from the kingdom of God.

I once thought and said—may God forgive!—that it was the duty of some men to get rich and use their wealth for the kingdom of God. Many still hold that view, little understanding what “getting rich” means and how impossible it is that the kingdom which is righteousness, joy, and peace can be forwarded by the unrighteous Mammon. “Business enterprise” is the euphonious name of all manner of rottenness and wickedness, and “business success” involves violation of every law, human or divine, that stands in the way, by men of steel-wire nerves and asbestos morals. Said Charles S. Mellen in his testimony before the Interstate Commerce Commission, May 14, 1914: “All I was after was results for the New Haven road, and I would have done business with the devil himself had it been necessary.” The only exceptional thing about this declaration is its cynical frankness. Getting rich is possible only by robbery of one’s brother, spoliation of the helpless, exploitation of the weak. One understands sometimes too late that the money one makes is the price of innocent blood, and knows something of the horror of Judas as he contemplates his gains. Not many of the capitalistic class, however, have come as yet to join the late Joseph Fels, who said, “I purpose to use my fortune in overthrowing the damnable system which enables me to acquire it.” In the day of Jehovah’s faithfulness the prophet tells us that “Holiness to Jehovah” was to be engraved on the bells of

the horses, and every household pot should be as holy as those in the Temple. In our day "Exploitation of the weak" may be read by the discerning eye on every product of man; all things are involved in a common degradation. It is woven into every yard of cloth, it is watermarked on every sheet of paper, it is chiseled on the portal of every building, it is cast into every tool, it is the tag-mark of every piece of merchandise.

What does our favorite American word "succeed" mean, conjugated in all its moods and tenses? Clever exploitation, nothing more. Mr. John D. Rockefeller, in one of his autobiographic contributions, said that the foundation of his fortune was the saving of \$50 and loaning it to a farmer at interest. He thus made the great discovery, as he put it, that "he could make his money work for him." What he really discovered was, of course, that he could make the farmer work for him—money never works—and he was quite correct in saying that is the origin of his fortune. He has been making men work for him ever since. That is the story of all fortunes, large or small. Anybody who possesses a dollar or a dollar's worth beyond the product of his own labor has acquired the product of some other man's labor.

Karl Marx defined wealth as the accumulation of commodities. It was that in primitive times, perhaps it still should be that, but it is that no longer. Most of what is now called "wealth" is not wealth at all. Real wealth is something that has been dug out of the earth and shaped by human labor into something useful. Real wealth may be touched and weighed and

measured. A few millions only of the vast fortune credited to Mr. Rockefeller are visible to the eye, but the great bulk of his "wealth" does not consist in so many barrels of oil, so many tons of copper and coal, so many buildings and acres, but in his ability to produce through the labor of others indefinite quantities of oil and copper in years to come. In other words, the larger part of his wealth does not really exist: it is merely a mortgage on the future, command of the services of other men, power to assess a tax on wealth yet to be produced. This "wealth" consists of pieces of paper, called "stocks," on which dividends are to be paid out of future earnings; and other pieces of paper, called "bonds," on which interest must be paid out of the products of industry.

The "wealth" of this great captain of industry turns out, therefore, on analysis, to consist mainly of two elements: first, the power he has under the law to diminish the real wealth of the coming generation; second, ability to control the labor of other men through his ownership of the means of production. It is inevitable that there should be serious inquiry into the ethical foundations of such privilege. What right can any man plead to the possession of such power? Men talk of the "sacredness of property." But in what sense is there sacredness in the right to tax the industry of the future? In the various enterprises that this single man controls there are employed a great host of men, whose life and happiness and that of their families are dependent on him. He wields a power greater than that which we usually describe

as "despotic" and less subject to checks, over a number of men, women, and children larger than the population of entire States. And the question now before the house is, whether such power shall be permitted to continue—whether it is founded on any equitable principle in the first place, and whether it is a safe power in a democracy. Or, to go even closer to the root of things, whether a democracy is possible where such economic despotism exists.

If any human right deserves to be called "inalienable" it is the right to work, for the right to work is synonymous with the right to live. But under capitalism work is not a right but a favor, to be granted or withheld at the will of an employer, who will give work only to so many and under such conditions as will promise him profit. It is no exaggeration, therefore, but precise statement of fact, to say that under our present industrial system all outside of the capitalist class are living on sufferance. If they were denied opportunity of work, any of them could continue to live only until they had consumed their present small possessions. This is complete perversion of the social function of wealth or property. The true function of property is to support life; it is a reserve of society, like a sum in the savings bank, to be drawn on at need or to establish a new enterprise. The capitalistic system has turned property into the deadliest foe of life. Every consideration of safety, of comfort, of improvement in the arts of living, is sacrificed to the great god Profit.

Every invention that could increase or cheapen pro-

duction has been eagerly seized by capitalists, provided only profit could be foreseen; if it were more profitable to suppress an invention than to use it, that has been done; but inventions and improvements designed merely to make life safer and labor easier have been introduced only by the strong arm of law, and after a hard struggle. Why not? Great is Profit of the capitalists. Fifty years ago John Stuart Mill wrote: "It is questionable if all the mechanical inventions yet made have lightened the day's toil of any human being." It is even more doubtful to-day than when these words were written. As a result of this system capitalized wealth has been increasing in geometric ratios. The accumulations of each generation are laid by capitalism as an additional burden on the productive energies of the generation to come. The system must break down of its own weight; the time will come, if it has not come already, when men can no longer pay this tax and live.

"Capital," says Professor Small, "is as different from capitalism as water from drowning."¹ Society needs capital; the capitalist lags superfluous on the stage. A few rich individuals and groups now control the land, mines, timber, water-power and other natural resources of the country, and are in a fair way to own the arable soil also; and have added to these the factories, machinery, and other means of production. All the sources of wealth are either in their possession, or rapidly tending thither. Great wealth grows like the small boy's snow ball, only it

¹ "Between Two Eras," p. 329.

needs nobody to turn it over. The chief evils of society grow out of this condition of things, and the others are greatly aggravated by it. The remedy is as simple as the condition: take ownership of natural resources and tools of production from the few and give these things to the many, the workers whose labor alone now makes them or can ever make them productive. Until every man has the right to work, opportunity to convert his labor power into means of living, and to enjoy what he produces, there will be poverty, there will be disease, there will be vice, there will be crime in ever-increasing mass.

The great fortunes have been justified by economists and moralists on the ground that exceptional industrial and financial genius deserves an exceptional reward; and society can well afford to pay such reward, because possibility of capturing so great a prize is continual stimulus to ability. But some facts are hard to reconcile with this attempted defense. The late J. Pierpont Morgan was entitled, we are assured, to his hundred millions (more or less) because he was the one great financial genius of his generation. But one day Mr. Morgan dies—and nothing happens. If his eulogists were correct the loss of the one great financial genius of the age ought to produce something like a cataclysm in High Finance, but, as matter of fact, the death of one of his thousand-dollar-a-year clerks would have made quite as much trouble. Indeed, it might have been harder to find another good clerk than to find a successor to Mr. Morgan. The necessity of the Morgans to society has been much ex-

aggerated—the black-whiskered pirate of that name two centuries ago was as much needed as the great financier.

Indeed, the banker and the pirate have much more in common than a name. Men of Wall Street are often spoken of by those who should have more sense as if they had done great things in building up our railways and developing our great industries. The fact is just the contrary. The Morgans never produce a dollar's equivalent of wealth in all their baleful history. All the railways, all the great industries, have been developed by the capital, the sacrifices, and the labors of others. The Morgans do nothing but manipulate pieces of paper, and gather into their coffers the wealth that others have produced. When enterprises have been advanced by others to a point where they see an opportunity, they step in and by "reorganizations" and "consolidations," involving much "watering" of stocks and "cutting of melons," they get to themselves great wealth—and incidentally they often ruin the property. This is piracy made respectable, but piracy still.

II

Exploitation is the guilt, not of individuals, but of an industrial system which operates automatically, without reference to the will or character of individuals. The income of one of our great industrial nobles is said this year to be \$70,000,000. He may go to Europe for a year—it would be the least harmful

thing he could do, possibly—he may even die, but next year his income, or that of his estate, will be \$80,000,000. A great fortune can no longer be dissipated by spendthrift heirs—if it could, some of the Vanderbilts and Goulds would now be looking for jobs—they can only spend the income, and that with difficulty. “From shirtsleeves to shirtsleeves” no longer describes a social fact. And what is the source of this vast income? Nothing that this great noble does; he has ceased to work; “his money works for him”—that is, compels other men to work for him. This income of his is interest, dividends, profit, paid out of the annual product of labor. Every wage-earner is taxed that this income may be paid. It must be paid, first of all, like all other income; and the laborer will be paid out of what may be left. There are about 35,000,000 productive workers in the United States, and each of them paid this man last year two dollars out of his hard earnings. For what?

The greater the amount of capital, real or fictitious (and the larger part is fictitious), that such men as this have “invested” in various enterprises, the more workers must pay them out of their product, and the smaller will be the amount left for those whose labor produces all the wealth of the nation. Will anybody look at these facts soberly and say that this is a rational system, defensible by any person possessed of sound reason? Will anybody look at them in the light of ethics and say that this system is not inherently wicked, that it is not a plain breach of the commandment, “Thou shalt not steal”?

It is true that there was exploitation before the industrial revolution. None of our social ills are new; most of them are of hoary antiquity; but steam and machinery have caused them to grow like Alice in Wonderland after she tasted the mushroom. In a few decades moderate evils have become colossal. All social organization is reversal of the law of nature. In nature there is fierce struggle for existence in which the fittest survive; social organization is limiting the power of the strong and clever to exploit the weak. Civilization is enforcement of artificial equality in place of natural inequality. Our present industrial system is barbarism, pure and simple, not civilization, because it permits rule of the strong and compels slavery of the weak. Progress requires a more complete socialization of industrial forces, and is possible on no other terms.

Capitalism aims only at making the largest possible margin of profit, even if thereby it makes the smallest possible margin of life. The humane and Christian character of some capitalists may do something to ameliorate the system, but can do little or nothing to modify its essential inhumanity. On the other hand, there is often exhibition by the working class of solidarity and spirit of sacrifice for the common good, that even the Christian Church, with all its preaching of brotherhood and inculcation of sacrifice, cannot parallel. For too often the preaching of the Church is "just preaching." In church men profess the creed of brotherhood; they repeat together the commandment of Jesus to love one another. They go next day

to business, and in every word and act profess the creed of hatred; the strong trample the weaker under foot, the shrewd strips the less shrewd of his last dollar. And the worst of it is that men do not see this hypocrisy; they are quite unconscious of this intellectual contradiction and moral suicide; they talk with straight face of "carrying their Christianity into business"!

As we have seen, individual ownership of the soil is one great pillar of exploitation, while ownership of tools is the other. Man is the only animal who can use tools, and the progress of civilization may be accurately traced by the invention of new and more efficient tools. So long as these were simple and inexpensive no harm was done by permitting private ownership of them. But in these latter days the simple tool has been replaced in industry by the complex and expensive machine. A generation ago even, a few days (or, at most, a few weeks) of labor would supply any worker with a set of tools for his trade; now not a lifetime's labor would make a poor man the owner of the machine by which he gets his bread. This costliness of tools throws all production into the hands of the capitalist class. The poor man, robbed, on the one hand, of his access to the soil, and, on the other, of ownership of his tools, is the veritable slave of the tool-and-land-owning employer—a wage slave, to be sure, not a chattel slave, but slave nevertheless; for the essence of slavery is dependence on the will of another for means of life.

Consider what this means to the worker. Tele-

graph operators receive from \$25 to \$80 a month. Two operators working a wire between New York and Philadelphia can handle 500 messages in a nine-hour day. At 25 cents a message the company receives for this service \$125, of which it pays the operators from \$2 to \$3 each, and has \$120 profit. What person of any sanity will defend the equity of such a transaction? Consider what it means to the public. The Bureau of Labor, in its report to Congress March 3, 1913, showed that, while under the last agreement miners' wages had been increased \$4,000,000, the operating companies had increased prices of coal, ostensibly to recoup this loss, but really to the amount of \$17,450,000. The companies, therefore, gained \$13,450,000 by a transaction that, in advance, they protested would be utterly ruinous to them, pocketing an additional \$3 for every \$1 paid in increased wages—and the consumer of coal pays all. Under cloak of doing justice to the poor miner, albeit a justice wrung from them by an aroused public opinion, the operators commit a new robbery.

Exploitation is just as indefensible on principles of the Gospel as it is on economic principles. It is the great immorality, the fundamental evil of society, not only because of its observed anti-social effects, but because it is a breach of the command of Jesus, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." For no man would submit to be exploited if he had any means of self-defense. The exploiter's attempts at partial recompense in the various forms of charity, philanthropy, pensions, and profit-sharing are confession, but not

restitution. They neither imply repentance nor promise amendment. "Most philanthropy," says Professor Ward, "is mere temporary patchwork which has to be done over and over again. It does not aim or desire to do the kind of good that will prevent the recurrence of the conditions that have made it necessary. It is static, not dynamic."¹ The United Charities Society of Chicago found that 70,000 persons applied for aid in that city in 1912. The cases were carefully investigated, and the following causes are given for the poverty of 17,000 cases:

Unemployment, 4,620; acute illness, 4,311; insufficient earnings, 1,576; chronic physical disability, 1,443; tuberculosis, 1,361; maternity, 1,285; *intemperance*, 1,205; accident, 674; old age, 634; *moral deficiency*, 468; *imprisonment*, 388; *idleness*, 360; bad housing, 318; *begging tendency*, 272; subnormal mind, 239; insanity, 237; *venereal disease*, 202; industrial accident, 188; immigrant within three years, 177; incompetence, 157; epilepsy, 140; occupational disease, 46.

The list should be attentively pondered by those excellent persons in our churches who still insist that poverty is due to defective character, and can be completely cured by the practice of industry, sobriety, and economy. The italicized cases are the only ones that can with any plausibility be attributed to defects of character; all the rest, and perhaps these also, should be charged to remediable social conditions, remediable because poverty is the root of all. No individual char-

¹ "Applied Sociology," p. 29.

acter can overcome these unfavorable social conditions under all circumstances; and organized charity has about as much effect on them as it has on the revolutions of Jupiter's moons.

It is growing perception of these facts among the working class that so embitters them, and inclines them at times to the use of forcible means of redress. How many who read the newspapers have reflected that men in the midst of a Christian civilization are not moved to undertake crimes like those of the McNamaras and their associates, until there has been bred in them an overmastering sense of wrong and injustice, for which the laws provide no remedy—which society, indeed, refuses seriously to consider? But, in all the mass of comment on such crimes, how many influential voices have been lifted up to urge inquiry into the cause of this sense of injustice? How many have asked whether American workingmen have wrongs for which redress is impossible under our social system? And, if it should turn out on inquiry that they have such wrongs, could we expect them to submit to them without violent protest?

If we will not consider the justice of our attitude, perhaps we may be more accessible to ideas of its expensiveness. It was publicly stated that the trial of the McNamaras and their associates, thirty-eight men in all, cost the government a million dollars. But not one dollar was expended by the government to find out what caused the crime, and if the cause is removable. Does this strike the thoughtful taxpayer as good economy? Is this the best return he can expect for

his money? Our lavish charities are just so much money thrown away. If an equivalent sum were burned every year, quite as much would be accomplished in the way of decreasing human misery. The exploiter turns out more nakedness in a day than Dorcas can clothe in a year, causes more disease in a week than St. Francis can relieve in a lifetime, drives more men and women into vice and crime in a year than the Salvation Army can rescue in a century. And we are only just beginning to question whether this exploiter, if he gives sterilized milk to a few babies, may not be the highest type of character and citizenship!

III

The fundamental condition of physical life is sufficiency of food, sufficient not only in quantity to satisfy hunger, but in quality to nourish the body. Many have "enough to eat" and yet are unfed, because they lack what is known in dietetics as "a well-balanced ration." Enough is produced to feed all our people. Why, then, do they lack food? Why this high cost of living, which one of our American multi-millionaires gravely assures us is really the cost of high living? Is it true that the poor are not really poor, but only extravagant? Deficiency of food is far more serious than deficiency of clothing or bad housing. A well-nourished body may be subjected to cold and dirt and bad air and feel them as hardships perhaps, but not as dangers. In the past two decades the cost of

living has risen twice as fast as wages, and, though wages have risen slowly, what does it profit a man to have his wages increased ten per cent. and his cost of living twenty per cent.? Perhaps he may comfort himself with the reflection that he is better off than his fellow whose wages have not been raised at all, and still better off than his other fellow who is out of work and has no wages, but that is cold comfort. When one is hungry he cannot chuckle much because his neighbor is hungrier still, and perhaps half-frozen to boot.

Here is one "why." The value of the food products of the United States, estimated on the basis of the official returns, is \$6,000,000,000, while their cost to consumers is not far from \$13,000,000,000. The difference, considerably more than 100 per cent., is the necessary cost of transportation and handling, plus the unnecessary dividends on watered stocks and the profits of middlemen. The consumer has it in his power largely to eliminate the middleman, especially with the aid of the parcels post, and if he continues to suffer from this source it will be his own fault. The ease, safety, and profitableness of coöperative buying has been so fully demonstrated by European combinations of consumers that there remains nothing to say on the subject; all that is lacking is action. In colloquial phrase, this matter is now "up to" the consumer himself.

But the cost of transportation and handling is another matter. Watered stocks are beyond the consumer's reach. We are only beginning to appreciate

the scandalous things that have been done by our great financiers, who are said to be so indispensable to us. The Adams Express Company began business with a valise as its total assets, and was capitalized out of its earnings. Its capital stock to-day represents no investment whatever by stockholders, but only sums that have been skilfully extracted from the people's pockets without getting the thieves put in jail. In some corporations dividends are paid on "water," but the Adams Express dividends are paid on air. The same is true in the main of all the other express companies; investments, if any, have been so small as to be negligible; capitalization represents earning power, not investment; and the public is still paying to these buccaneering corporations a heavy annual tax on its willingness to let the companies continue their robbery.

The railways are a little better, but not so much in principle as in degree. A physical valuation of the railways in the State of Kansas was undertaken a few years ago, with this result as to the Union Pacific: Actual cost value per mile, \$27,297; could be reproduced for \$36,976 per mile; is taxed at a valuation of \$40,860 per mile; is capitalized at \$146,391 per mile. It has, therefore, to earn dividends on over \$100,000 per mile of pure "water," so-called investments that represent no payment of money in the past and no value of any kind in the present. And, of course, the Union Pacific has been clamoring, with other railways, that it must have higher rates for freight or it could not live!

It is now seriously proposed that a physical valuation of all railways shall be undertaken as a preliminary to possible acquisition of them by the government and the substitution of public for private ownership. This means, of course, the ultimate squeezing from their capitalization of the enormous quantity of "water" or fictitious value. This proposition has awakened once more those who on such occasions bewail the hardship to innocent owners that would necessarily result. However unethical the original transactions, it is said, the stocks have passed into other hands; people have bought in good faith and paid good money for them. Now the truth is, as a little reflection will show any one, that this wail about widows and orphans and other innocents has no foundation in fact. When the squeezing process begins there will be no innocent owners. The facts about fictitious capitalization have been published far and wide. No person intelligent enough to get possession of a sum of money to invest in railway stocks can be rationally presumed to be ignorant of these facts. If he hereafter buys, or hereafter retains ownership of these securities, he does it with full knowledge of their origin and nature, and of the possibility of government action in the matter, and he is taking a gambler's chance on their future value. If he loses, he should bear his loss when it comes, as gamblers say, "like a dead game sport."

Mr. Thomas W. Lawson's writings on High Finance have had a wide circulation, and have been described as a "howling success"—three parts howl to one

of success, no doubt. The author may be as big a humbug as many people believe him to be, but his knowledge of finance and practical acquaintance with "securities" of all kinds are unquestioned. His figures have not been questioned by the world of High Finance, and may, therefore, be accepted as substantially correct. He tells us that of the \$60,000,000,000 of stocks on the American market \$40,000,000,000 represents pure "water"; nevertheless \$2,000,000,000 is paid on this fictitious value each year in dividends. This is pure theft and robbery, if there ever was such a thing. This is exploitation in its highest flower. It is a tax paid each year to the rich by the poor, nearly equal to the entire national debt.¹ One can imagine with what a cry of protest the country would receive the proposition to pay off the national debt in a single year, yet this would lay a burden of taxation on the people hardly greater than this annual tribute that we pay to a band of men in comparison with whom the pirates and *condottieri* of former ages were babes. This tribute is paid in the form of an enhanced price of every article of food or clothing or household use that the poor man buys. Is it any wonder that cost of living is so high, and need we search further for one of the great causes of social distress?

If one at first suspects Mr. Lawson of gross exaggeration, as soon as he begins to look at specific instances he makes discoveries in the light of which any

¹ The "World Almanac" gives the gross national debt, October 1, 1913, as \$2,342,926,174.66, and the net debt, after deducting cash in the Treasury, as \$1,048,645,985.64.

assertion seems credible. Here is a single case out of scores. In six years the capital of the New York, New Haven and Hartford railway was inflated by various feats of re-Morganization from \$85,000,000 to \$350,000,000. It was such transactions as these, no doubt, that President Wilson had in mind when, in one of his campaign speeches, he said: "The banking system of the country doesn't need to be indicted: it is convicted." Involuntarily we have all been partners in this business—silent partners, who have received no share of the profits. Every dollar we have deposited in a bank has inevitably found its way to Wall Street, and has been a part of the resources of High Finance in its piratical enterprises.

There has been much controversy of late over the question whether a Money Trust exists. The answer seems to depend chiefly on a definition. The term may be admitted to be a metaphor rather than a scientific description. Nobody who uses the phrase supposes that there is a charter and stockholders and directors, such as a trust implies. What people mean is that there is an actual controlling combination of the great financial interests. There is, in other words, "an established identity and community of interest between a few leaders of finance, which has been created and is held together through stockholdings, interlocking directorates, and other forms of domination over banks, trust companies, railroads, public service and industrial corporations, which has resulted in vast and growing concentration and control of money and credit in the hands of a comparatively few men." If

such a condition exists, Money Trust is by no means a bad name for it.

Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, in the Pujo investigation, denied that there was a Money Trust or that such a thing could possibly be under our legal and economic system. But specific testimony in the same investigation showed that, by a system of interlocking directorates, about 180 men, directors and partners in eighteen firms, banks, and trust companies, actually controlled \$25,000,000,000 of capital. Among these men three were acknowledged leaders. The total banking power of the United States was said by the Comptroller of the Currency to be \$23,000,000,000 in 1913. This Wall Street group, which three men can swing as a unit, controls a money interest more than equal to all the banking capital, reserves, and banknotes in circulation. And yet men presumably intelligent expect others who are reputed to be intelligent to believe them when they declare on honor, and sometimes on oath, that there is no Money Trust.

Mr. George F. Baker, head of the First National Bank of New York, one of the greatest financial institutions of the country, and himself one of the three Wall Street leaders, admitted that there is such control of financial resources by a few men as is described above. Such control, he said, "might not be dangerous, but still it has gone about far enough. In good hands I do not say that it would do any harm. If it got into bad hands it would be very bad." By "good hands" Mr. Baker naturally means his own hands, the Morgan group. But to the people at large

it seems that any hands are "bad hands" to control so vast and irresponsible power as this. Nor can any man who really thinks be surprised that American society is seething with the spirit of revolution as these facts become understood by the masses who toil in hopeless bondage that the Morgans may pile up millions.

And the new banking law, enacted in 1914, was so manipulated during its passage, with the full approval of President Wilson, that it has delivered over the financial resources of the nation more completely than ever to the "interests." When the organization of the regional banks has been completed, and the system is in full working order, people will comprehend how they have been betrayed by the men who were pretending to serve them. They will awaken to the fact that the Money Trust, instead of being curbed, has been given greatly increased powers. That, through its control of credit, it has every commercial enterprise by the throat, and can compel it to obey or strangle it. When the people once understand what has been done, what they will do to the politicians who enacted this law will be something well worth witnessing.

But even if these facts are true, and there is a Money Trust, it is said that nothing can be done about it. The conditions have come about as a natural development and cannot be altered by legislation—as well try to keep back the tides by statute as resist the sweep of economic events. "How can you unscramble eggs?" asked Mr. Morgan on one occasion. When he

said it, this was regarded as not only a good joke but unanswerable argument—by Big Business, and as something of a puzzler by others. But the house of Morgan has unscrambled one basket of eggs since his death by retiring from twenty-seven interlocking directorates. It announced that it did this as a mere beginning,¹ and in deference to what it recognized as a strong public sentiment. The New York, New Haven and Hartford railway, which had been brought into virtual bankruptcy by the Morgan policies, has likewise found no difficulty in relinquishing its control of the Boston and Maine railway, the Eastern Steamship Company, and about a score of other corporations larger or smaller. It has also been found possible to undo the reorganization of the Rock Island system in 1902, by which \$140,000,000 of “water” was injected into its stock. This was accomplished by the now familiar device of organizing a “holding company,” a railway that existed on paper only. It is a simple matter to reverse the process and revive the original corporations and managements. Some eggs have been unscrambled; therefore all can be; such is the reasoning of people not obfuscated by the ideas and methods of High Finance. The reasoning may be hasty, the logic faulty, and the facts otherwise. But in this matter we are all citizens of Missouri; we insist on being shown.

How could such a state of things have come about in a “free” country? Because our country never has been really free. Because our conception of freedom

¹ The firm still held fifty directorates in forty-two companies.

has been liberty of the individual to do anything in the realm of economics that he chose to do. We have limited freedom to matters within the scope of government, to civic rights and privileges. Our indifference to economic freedom, until the shoe began to pinch our tender corns, has permitted economic anarchy, and this has brought about in a natural way union among exploiters and disorganization among the exploited. "The wolves hunt in packs, while the watchdogs snap at one another," says Professor Ross. And our present plight is also largely due to the fact that a great proportion of our Christian people are still wasting their time in little skirmishes with the lesser social evils, and never get into the big battle at all. They still, like their forebears, place personal righteousness above social welfare, and cannot see that the great sins of our day, the unforgivable sins, are social transgressions.

IV

New Zealand has given countries of older civilization a lesson in the possibility of decreasing exploitation, with the prospect of one day ending it altogether. It is a country with an area of 104,751 square miles—a little more than that of the Middle States—with a population of 1,108,468 (in 1911), fewer by 100,000 than Connecticut had in 1910. A generation ago it seemed certain that the country would be divided into great landed estates. Large areas were bought up and held for speculative purposes. All the evils of

the older civilization seemed about to be produced in an aggravated form. This process of land spoliation was checked in 1871 by a graduated tax, and in 1891 by a compulsory purchase act. The government has retained and acquired land, until it controls the larger and better part, which is let on perpetual lease, with revaluation every twenty-one years. No one is to have over 320 acres. Under this policy the number of farms has doubled.

In like manner the State has taken control of industrial affairs. Compulsory arbitration was enacted in 1894, in a broad statute that applied to all registering associations of workers or employers. Strikes and lockouts are prohibited: in case of a dispute arising, a local board of conciliation may be called by either party to undertake a settlement. If this board fails, the case is tried by an arbitration court, consisting of two members chosen by the workers, two by registered associations of employers, and one supreme court judge appointed by the government. Disobedience of the decision of this court is punishable as contempt. Varying accounts are given of the operation of this system, because those who have written about it have found in it what they looked for; it cannot be said to have had dispassionate, scientific study. It seems clear, however, that it is better than the former system of industrial war. Naturally, it has failed to give complete satisfaction to either employers or employees, but, as most strikes and lockouts end in a compromise, compulsory arbitration on the whole may be said to work fairly. That neither party is satisfied with a

decision in a labor controversy, so far from proving the decision to be unjust, is presumptive evidence of its substantial justice; for experience shows that each party demands more than is just.

In other social experiments New Zealand has also led the way. It has had a system of old-age pensions for fourteen years; it has had seventeen years of woman suffrage. Voters of both sexes must use their right of suffrage or lose it. Government loans are made to settlers and farmers at low rate of interest; government savings banks and government life insurance at cost have been provided. Of course, the State has taken ownership of all natural monopolies: coal mines, railways, telegraphs, and telephones. Incidentally it may be remarked that a telephone costs \$15 a year or less, and that more telegraph messages per capita are transmitted in New Zealand than in any country in the world—the reason being that the cheapness, celerity, and secrecy of the service are nowhere else equaled.

But New Zealand is only on the way toward abolition of exploitation: the goal is yet hardly in sight. This is because the wage system is still retained as the basis of industrialism. Wages and exploitation are inseparable. Wages can never rise so high as to abolish exploitation, because the moment wages reach a point where no profit remains to the capitalist, it is for his interest to give up his business rather than continue it. He may temporarily continue without profit, and even at a loss, but it must be with a rational hope of recouping his losses by future profits. Wages can

never equal the value of the product of labor under capitalism; on the contrary, they must be much lower as a rule, because of the deductions necessary under the present system. The margin between product of labor and payment of wages must not only cover the net profits of the employer, but many other things that are usually charged to cost of production. It covers, for instance, rent, interest on loans, salaries, advertising, taxes. All these have to be subtracted from surplus value, that is, the excess of value of product over wages of the workers. It is clear that wages cannot rise high enough to be even approximately equal to value of product. The capitalistic system means under all possible circumstances exploitation of wage-workers. It is impossible to abolish this exploitation without abolishing the system itself. It is impossible greatly to lessen the exploitation, which does not rest on the will of the employer, but on the industrial system.

The indirect social effects of many of these items in the account of exploitation are quite as important as their direct economic significance. For instance, the great place that advertising has come to take in the system has had an effect on the press that nobody could have anticipated a generation ago. Newspapers and magazines have come under the domination of capitalism by a necessary process, and, as a result, have become means of spreading ignorance rather than intelligence. Between their suppression of unwelcome truth and their perversion of fact they would be an even more serious menace to popular welfare

than they are, if the people were not generally aware of their habitual untruthfulness. A single newspaper in New York receives from a large department store the sum of \$300,000 a year for advertising. Would it be possible to procure the publication in that newspaper of any matter disagreeable to the management of that department store? Only a remarkably credulous person would believe that such a thing could be done. Advertisers may be guilty of disgraceful crimes, they may be prosecuted by the government for customs frauds, and no whisper of the facts will be permitted to reach the public through the newspapers that they subsidize. The slimy trail of capitalism is over every social institution.

IV.

The complaint against the ancient Jeshurun was that he waxed fat and kicked; the modern Jeshurun is too fat to kick, but he is suffering from the same disease, an overdose of prosperity. The Christian religion is being smothered in comfort, and, because of its decline, America is fast going the way of the great Roman empire, in which the cynical and inhuman exploitation of other classes by the aristocracy finally depleted the resources of the Mediterranean nations, to the degree that made them an easy prey to the Teuton. Still exploitation continues among us, exploitation of those already poor, for the enrichment of those already rich. It is still true that to him that hath

shall be given and he shall have abundance, while from him that hath not even that which he hath shall be taken away. Will the people who profess to believe the Gospel of Jesus continue to let this go on without protest, without seeking a remedy?

A remedy? The exploiter is prompt with his reply: There is no remedy; we need no remedy; the natural laws of society may be trusted in the long run to give every man all that is justly his. If we meddle with those laws we are more likely to do harm than good. Shall we accept this as sufficient? Then let us bow down before the god of Things As They Are and do all in our power to keep them so. Let everything, even the law, perish rather than make any change in the industrial system. In words that are now classic, "What's a little thing like the Constitution between friends?" Sternly repress every symptom of dissatisfaction among the workers. If the laborer troubles you, and particularly if he has the impudence to strike, have a policeman smash him over the head and then put him in jail. If the regular policeman is not "on the job," hire some thugs to do his work for him. Let us go further and restore the good old English law of pious young Edward VI, of fragrant Protestant memory, and, if any man refuses longer to work at the same wages that formerly satisfied him, brand him in the forehead with the letter F (which they say stood for Falsity). If treatment of these effective sorts had been administered to the strikers at Lawrence and Little Falls and Paterson (to all is, of course, meant; it was given to some

without much effect), they would have been "taught their place" and would have gone meekly back to work for what their employers chose to give them. We lack the courage to apply such measures ruthlessly, but we are visibly improving every year, and we shall become quite perfect in time. So screw down the safety-valve; pile on the coal; make Big Business hum! And by and by, when we all go skyward together, we can spend the abundant leisure of eternity in wondering how it happened.

But there is another answer heard, the answer to which our discussion has led by an inexorable logic: destroy exploitation. Make the wage system impossible. Transform capitalism into coöperative production. Make workers once more owners of the means of production, so that they may be certain of receiving the full product of their labor—less the small deduction that must always be made for the good of society. Death and taxes will continue to be the great certainties of this world so long as men live. The product is already large enough for the needs of all; it is capable of indefinite increase; and there are wastes that we might eliminate and thus double the present available wealth. There is no reason why poverty should continue.

As to the details of this change, by precisely what steps we shall proceed and what form of industrial and social organization will result, there is much theorizing but no knowledge. A learned and wise friend used to say that he liked to hear people prophesy, for then he at least knew what would not take

place. Society and industrialism were not made to order to fit theories, and they will not be remade to fit theories. They grew into their present forms and they will grow into new forms. All speculation about the future is worse than wasted time and energy. What we need to bend every energy toward is immediate improvement of present conditions of living. The first steps are plain enough. It will aid to abolish exploitation if we, first of all, decide upon common ownership of common natural resources: including, at the very least, the forests, mines, and water power. It will be a second step if we conclude to assert common ownership of all means of transportation, as we have already of roads and waterways. This will make all railways and canals and steamship lines and the airships of the future public property, to be operated at public cost and public profit. It will be a further step if we resolve to make all means of communication public property, as we now do the post. This will mean common ownership of telegraphs, telephones, ocean cables, wireless systems.

The doing of these things promises to keep us busy for some years to come, and they would be just a neat beginning. The next step would be common ownership of the great industrial enterprises. We shall have government control of these within a decade, and from that to government ownership would be no long step. It may even be taken before some of the others; for this is an attempt to show logical methods of procedure, not the actual chronology, which may be quite different. When the Steel Trust and the Oil

Trust and the Sugar Trust and the Woolen Trust and the Whiskey Trust and a few others have been taken over by the government and are operated for the public good instead of private profit, we shall have proceeded far enough on the road toward coöperative production and the elimination of exploitation to know just what to do next.¹ Nobody now living need be ashamed to confess that he does not know. If anybody says otherwise he is either self-deceived or a deceiver.

VI

But may not profit-sharing be a solution of the industrial problem? Fresh attention has been directed to this solution by the proposal of the head of the Ford Automobile Company to distribute \$10,000,000 of profits among the workers during the year 1914. Mr. Ford has been a workingman, and, now that he is a capitalist, he has still some bowels of compassion for the class from which he rose. He knows that men who work for wages do not desire charity or philanthropy, but justice; and he professes it as his belief

¹ Besides the industrial changes, certain fiscal reforms would go far to lessen exploitation, by turning some of its accumulations into the common fund: a progressive land tax, gradually increased until the full rental value is taken; a graduated income tax, increasing rapidly for all incomes over \$100,000; a graduated inheritance tax, on the same principle. These three sources of revenue would be ample for all public purposes, and leave the entire product of labor to be enjoyed by the producers.

that this is a measure of justice—the workers have earned this \$10,000,000 and it equitably belongs to them. The men will henceforth work in three eight-hour shifts, so that a larger number than before will be employed. The minimum wage paid will be \$5 a day, and some workers will receive more than twice that. Earnings varying from \$1,599 to \$3,000 a year in this factory will contrast remarkably with the less than \$500, which is said to be the average annual earnings of workers.

The comments and discussion on Mr. Ford's proposal may be classified under two heads: objections on the part of capitalists and their defenders that Mr. Ford's undertaking is unwise and that he has promised too much; objections on the part of workers and their friends that Mr. Ford's offer, generous as it is, promises too little.

The head of a large rolling mill makes a typical spokesman of the former class.¹ He is much afraid that the Ford enterprise will be misunderstood and do great harm, by arousing hopes impossible of fulfilment and making labor organizations more unreasonable in their demands. He argues that the Ford Company has conducted so exceptional a business, and has enjoyed profits so extraordinary, that it has no parallel among American industries. Few concerns can pay six per cent. on their capital. "We must, therefore, understand that this is a magic proposition

¹ George M. Verity, president of the American Rolling Mill Company, Middletown, Ohio, in the "Outlook" of March 21, 1914.

that cannot be duplicated once in ten thousand times, if at all."

It is, indeed, improbable that the proposition will be duplicated, but not for the reason given. Why is the business of the Ford Company so exceptional? It is well known that as keen competition exists in the automobile industry as in any other form of manufacture. These profits do not represent any monopoly or unfair advantage, resulting from natural resources controlled or from undue favoritism on the part of railroads. Has there been a moment, from their beginning until now, when the oil and steel industries could say as much? The capitalists will have to try again—that argument will convince nobody. It is well known that enormous dividends have been earned and declared (though sometimes partially concealed by bonuses of stock or bonds) by many great industrial and commercial enterprises.

It is quite right, however, to say that the Ford Company is exceptional; in one respect it is absolutely unique. It was incorporated with \$2,000,000 capital stock, actual cash investment. Last year it paid profits of \$29,000,000 (another statement says \$25,000,000, but we need not bother about a trifling discrepancy of \$4,000,000). Now it is an accepted principle of High Finance that a going concern should be capitalized, not on the actual investment, but on earning capacity. And so, if Mr. Ford had been a great financier, and not a mere manufacturer with a sense of justice, he would have proceeded promptly to capitalize his company on this basis of earnings, in which case he could

have issued from \$400,000,000 to \$500,000,000 of additional stock, on which a dividend of four to six per cent. could be paid out of earnings. At one stroke he might thus have put himself in the Rockefeller-Carnegie class and made the second-rate fortunes of such as the Morgans look like the proverbial thirty cents. He could thenceforth have done as other financier-manufacturers do—he could have resisted every demand of his employees for better wages, on the ground that if wages were raised dividends could not be paid to stockholders. And he could have pulled out the tremolo stop and talked about those poor widows and orphans. But he did none of these things. Mr. Ford has proved himself to be a good manufacturer, and some are like to think him a good man, but nobody will ever accuse him of being a good financier. He missed the Great Opportunity Of His Life.

The real reason why this is a “magic proposition that cannot be duplicated once in ten thousand times” is, not that there are not hundreds of concerns quite as “exceptional” as the Ford Company, but because, among all of our captains of industry, there is thus far only one Ford—but this one man who has been able to resist the temptation to make a quick fortune through dishonest capitalization; only one man who, having risen from the ranks of the workers, has had the grace to remember the pit whence he was digged. The rest have forgotten their origin as quickly as possible and have gone to live on Fifth Avenue and marry their daughter to a duke. When we recall the early lives of nearly all our American millionaires, and behold

their unsympathetic attitude toward the toilers, they become at once difficult to comprehend and impossible to forgive. There is no reason whatever, save greed and flint-hearted selfishness, why similar profit-sharing could not be adopted in scores of our larger industries, and still leave fair profits on the actual investment. The obstacles are not industrial, but human and "financial."

The second class of objections are in part captious and ungrateful, and in part theoretic. To the theoretic objections it should be obvious to reply that Mr. Ford has not undertaken to remake the whole social order and establish his business on an ideal basis. He has only undertaken the practical problem of managing a single business in accord with his own sense of justice and to promote the welfare of his own employees. There are soap-box orators on every corner who will undertake to settle the affairs of the whole world on five minutes' notice. Let us not be ungrateful to the one man who has shown some insight and some human feeling in trying to solve his own personal problem.

At the same time it is proper to recognize that real criticism of Mr. Ford's experiment has been and will be directed at this point: granting its personal generosity, and conceding the doubtful point that it is likely to be followed on a considerable scale, the net result of profit-sharing can only be to prolong the life of the present industrial system. It retains the wage system and exploitation, while it considerably reduces the evils of exploitation in those industries where it ob-

tains. If profit-sharing of this kind became at all general in the large industries, it would tend to make the fortunate workers who received its benefits callous to the ills under which the larger part of the workers would still groan. It would build up a little aristocracy of workers who would form a class by themselves, and so far weaken the solidarity that labor is now slowly gaining. Workmen who enjoyed incomes of \$1,500 to \$3,000 a year might well be so content with their own lot as to take little interest in improving the lot of others. But, as there is little prospect that the Ford experiment will be imitated, the hope of the workers will be strengthened to demand a more radical measure of industrial reform and social readjustment.

Some of our Churches and ministers shrink from all radical measures. They are not attempting anything for the real solution of the problem of poverty, or of any other social problem, but are occupying themselves with what they call social service. They wonder that they accomplish so little, but they are really doing all that a puling, piddling thing can be expected to accomplish. What goes under the name of social service is as valuable as most milk-and-water reforms. It is a house of refuge for people whose consciences are troubled about existing conditions, but who lack intelligence or courage to recognize and apply the cure. Until all things that men need in common and use in common shall be owned in common; until all men work at some productive labor and en-

joy the fruits of their labor; we shall have poverty and crime and vice and disease.

But you are promoting class feeling, objects some horrified reader, and how do you reconcile that with the Gospel of Jesus? It really seems to me that, so long as one class robs another, one may try to rouse the robbed to struggle against the robber and overcome him, without any impairment of the message of Jesus. But let us remember always that the class consciousness of the worker is feeble as compared to the class consciousness of exploiters and dividend-hunters. The worker is slowly becoming conscious that he has been robbed, that he is oppressed and denied justice; but the exploiting class has long been held together as a unit by the cohesive force of plunder. The remedy for class feeling, if any really deplore it, is to stop the robbery of one class by another and see to it that justice is done. This will not be atonement for the past, but it will be some security for the future. The descendants of the men who spilled the tea into Boston harbor and gathered on the green at Lexington will never tamely submit to injustice. They will seek redress, by peaceable means if possible, by violent means if they must, but submit—never!

The great bulk of the working class have proved themselves exceedingly slow in the acquirement of class consciousness, and still slower in ability to combine in common action. They have proved over and over again that they cannot get the most elementary ideas about their own welfare into their heads without a surgical operation. But to be clubbed over the head

by a brutal policeman, or one of the thugs called special officers that are so great favorites in these days with the employing class, is a very good substitute for surgical operations. It has knocked into many a head the idea that the interests of capital and labor are opposed and irreconcilable, instead of identical, as it has been the fashion of economists to assert. This is no new experience, however; all social reforms have to be carried against the determined opposition of those who are most to benefit from them. The average worker would as soon vote against his own interests as eat, and would rather die than think.

The workers organized into trades unions and represented by the American Federation of Labor proclaim in no uncertain terms that they have no quarrel with the present system of exploitation, no desire to do away with the legalized robbery of the weak by the strong called profit. No, what they demand is merely a larger share of the swag. Their past and present portion of the plunder is too small to please them; give them a greater percentage and the plundering may go on forever, for them. Admirable ethics!

The objection to class feeling, however, grows out of entire misapprehension of its origin and nature. A few words ought to make this much beclouded matter clear. By far the largest part of the activities of any society, and of all its individual members, are concerned with the production and distribution of the necessaries of life: the majority of mankind are never emancipated from the daily struggle to procure food, clothing and shelter. These are determining factors

of life. The psychological processes of men are mainly controlled by this physical necessity. Every man's mental state, what we call his stock of ideas, is the product of the constantly repeated experiences of this struggle for existence, and the sense perceptions that come to him during the struggle. Class distinctions, class psychology, and, therefore, class consciousness become possible, nay inescapable, the moment the original conditions of life become modified through common effort—whenever the accumulated wealth of the community makes it possible for the stronger, physically and mentally, to exploit the weaker. Class feeling is the result of exploitation, and the only way to eradicate it from society is to eliminate exploitation.

To abolish poverty has been declared by the Federation of Christian Churches to be the goal of Christian effort. It may well be doubted if those who framed this declaration, or those who have welcomed it, have any real apprehension of its meaning. But at all events, the Churches have undertaken a man's job, one that may well enlist all the energies and rouse all the enthusiasm of Christians. It is a goal that their Master would have heartily approved. It is making the Gospel of Jesus mean something to an unbelieving and justly incredulous world. For the Church has hitherto been playing with the problem, not seriously trying to solve it. The Church has been too long content to enact the Good Samaritan, to pour oil and wine on the wounds made by brigands, but it is now summoned to clean up the road to Jericho and put down

brigandage. The Church still gives quinine and cannot be induced to undertake the drainage of the swamps. "Millions for charity, but not a cent for justice" has been well said to be her motto.

And we cannot wonder. The Church has always been in an alliance, more or less unconscious, with the powers that prey. The exploiter and the priest have been twin brothers; capitalism and the Church are to-day twin forces. How long? "Issachar is a strong ass, couching between two burdens" is a text that might have been taken to describe the laborer of a former generation; but the laborer of to-day is tired of his burdens and he no longer couches. He has risen; he has shaken himself; he is beginning to feel his strength, though as yet he has used it with all the intelligence of the ass. But he is learning. And the time is approaching, it may be almost here, when, if the wrongs of society are not set right by those who have caused them and those who have profited by them, they will be set right by those who have suffered from them. Woe worth the day! By terrible things in righteousness will God answer us, if we delay to do justice.

The Church will ere long have to make its ultimate choice between exploiters and exploited, between those who do and those who suffer wrong, between those who try to do justice and those who make justice a mockery. Some say the Church has already chosen, and chosen the side of the oppressor. There are facts that point that way, sinister facts, deplorable facts. But one cannot believe that organized Christianity has

deliberately made up its mind to turn the back on the teachings of the Nazarene. One cannot believe that it has committed the great apostasy and denied the Gospel of Jesus—yet. But the final choice cannot be long postponed. The Church cannot serve God *and* Mammon, and already the voice comes, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve." The day has passed when the clergy can dine with the rich and preach at the poor. A be-content-with-your-lot religion and a beyond-the-stars Heaven can no longer be used as a soothing syrup to silence the cries of the oppressed.

Some of these words will be thought irreverent by some readers, but reverence for reality is more religious than reverence for the past. Those Christians who hope to resist the sweep of the world toward righteousness by accusations of "heresy" and thundering anathemas are as wise as those Boxers who withstood modern artillery by beating gongs. When the first railway trains ran across the Western plains the Indians thought to lasso the locomotive and pull it from the track. The result was disastrous—for the Indians. But lassoing a locomotive is a wholly practicable thing compared to stopping the drift of society toward universal justice, peace, and prosperity. Upon the wall of any Church that opposes triumphant democracy may already be seen the TEKEL, UPHARSIN.

CHAPTER X

THE PROBLEM OF "LAWLESSNESS"

WE hear much about the "lawlessness" of the American people; much in the way of outcry and denunciation, little in the way of analysis and search for cause and remedy. Few pause in their denunciations to inquire, Is this lawlessness a symptom of disease or an evidence of health? Let us lay aside our reverence for venerable phrases and seek for truth. What is "law and order"? Why should we respect it? Nothing can be long respected unless it is respectable; and the question therefore assumes this form: Is the system that we call law and order worthy of respect?

To answer this, we must examine the system. Law and order is the body of rules and regulations designed to protect and preserve existing social arrangements. Sociology establishes the principle that government and laws will always represent the interests strong enough to control. When organization of the social group takes the form of a landed aristocracy, government will embody in legislation and enforce with all its civil and military powers ethical ideas peculiar to a landed aristocracy. This is why in England crimes against property have for ages been punished with more severity than crimes against the person, murder

alone excepted. The laws against poaching are an excellent illustration of the influence of aristocratic ethics on law.

In all civilized lands to-day the dominant social order is capitalistic; the old aristocracy and the new industrial princes have joined forces; money rules the world. Law and order is, therefore, a system designed to protect and preserve capitalism. Any system must be judged by its purpose. Law and order, then, must be held to be as respectable as capitalism, and no more so. The controlling interests secure the election of lawmakers who will do their bidding. If that is not representative government, what would be? The lawmakers represent those who really elect them, not those who meekly vote for them.

Defenders of the present system will attempt in vain, therefore, to invest law and order with any sacrosanct character. It is like the source from which it sprang, tainted with injustice and unethical principles in every part. It is worthy of respect only as a barrier against social chaos. Most of us approve law and order, merely because we are not anarchists. For a long time to come the meek and unselfish and weak will need protection against the strong and selfish and brutal. But that protection should be composed of a maximum of justice and a minimum of force, whereas, as our closer examination will show us, existing law and order may be not unfairly described as a minimum of justice and a maximum of force.

To be sure, law has always professed as its end the

securing of justice between man and man. But in practice, law is of necessity the expression of the ideas of justice entertained by the ruling class. One man cannot be trusted to be just in his conduct toward others, else there would be no need of law; no more can one class be trusted to be just to another class. But law is the way in which the capitalistic class thinks other classes ought to conduct themselves, and how capitalists should treat other classes. Order is the compulsion of the other classes by the capitalistic class to accept this definition of conduct and rights. Order means that the policeman with his club, and the soldier with rifle and bayonet and cannon, will compel the other classes to do what the capitalistic class thinks they ought to do. When analyzed to the bottom, do law and order mean anything else than this? Capital says to labor: Be law-abiding: we make, interpret, and administer the law. Can such a system, in the nature of things, be any close approximation to justice? And if not, is it respectable?

Again, law professes to have as its end the greatest good of the greatest number. It is a fine-sounding maxim that has deceived generations. Because every ruling class, in making the law, interprets this maxim to mean that the greatest number is Number One. In other words, the ruling class looks out for its own interests first of all. Only when it believes these to be secured does it turn its attention to the interests of others, and it never really cares much for any interests save its own. Its benevolence and philanthropy are languid, spasmodic and lukewarm; its selfishness

is active, continuous and powerful. The capitalistic ideal of law and order is the creation and maintenance, by statutes, courts, and physical force, of those conditions under which exploitation of the worker can be conducted without interference or interruption. Any who presume to interfere or interrupt are to be suppressed with neatness and dispatch.

I

The whole legal system of the United States is therefore established on an indefensible basis, is fundamentally unjust and certain to be defective in detail. To illustrate this adequately would require a large volume, and in the pages here available only a few instances can be given.

Two great classes of abuses should be carefully considered by any who would comprehend the nature and social effects of the present system. The first of these is procedure by injunction, together with its supplement: the power of the court to punish for contempt. Workers are justified in maintaining that this branch of the law is generally used for their oppression. The injunction has been used by courts with utmost recklessness of constitutional and statute rights of workers, with respect for nothing but wishes of employers. In the great steel strike workers were enjoined "from peaceably discussing the merits of their claim with the men that were at work, even though the latter might raise no objection." In a similar case peaceful picket-

ing was declared illegal by English courts, and Parliament promptly passed a statute making it legal. But Congress and legislatures have done nothing for the relief of American workingmen. Why? In the case of the Sun Printing Company the Supreme Court of New York in 1899 enjoined the striking printers from giving their side of the controversy to the public, while the *Sun* was free to print whatever it chose. In 1900 the Cigarmakers International Union were enjoined from approaching their former employers, even for the purpose of securing an amicable settlement; and from paying money to the strikers to support their families during the strike. Could tyranny go further in Russia? What becomes of our constitutional guarantees of personal liberty and freedom of speech under such decisions?

And if such tyrannical interference of the courts is disobeyed the courts claim and exercise the right to punish the disobedience as contempt, inflicting fines and imprisonments at their pleasure. Thus the citizen is deprived of his constitutional right of trial by jury, and a judicial despotism is created that would be intolerable in any country, but is peculiarly intolerable when it is found to exist only in a country that professes to secure to every man his inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The plea on which such injunctions are justified is that they are necessary to protect property rights, so endangered that a less summary method might result in irreparable loss. The injunction is granted on an *ex parte* affidavit which recites facts that are alleged

to justify action. But the court never takes into account this: that, if the facts recited in the affidavit do not exist, or if other facts not cited would wholly alter the complexion of the case, an irreparable hurt may be done to the party against whom the injunction is issued. This is precisely what usually happens. For the affidavits are always partisan, and not infrequently stuffed with perjury; their object is merely to deceive the court, which nevertheless could not be deceived were it not a willing party to the deception. The object for which the injunction is issued in a labor controversy, as every citizen knows but the judge, is not to protect property or rights of person, but to defeat the strike. The injunction happens to be the most powerful weapon that the law just now puts into the hand of the capitalist, and courts devoted to his interests obligingly hand out this weapon to him whenever he demands it.

All have read about the tyranny of Charles I and the revolution that it provoked in England. But to how many readers has it occurred that an exactly similar tyranny is in process of establishment in our own country? Let us remind ourselves of the judicial machinery by which the Stuart tyranny was upheld and exercised—the courts of the Star Chamber and High Commission—how by ingenious construction of Acts of Parliament and gradually stretching their prerogatives these courts finally threatened to make a new system of law by judicial decision, to overthrow the ancient laws of England and so deprive Englishmen of the right secured to them by Magna Charta, that

no man should be deprived of liberty or property save by verdict of a jury of his peers. Under the rule of Laud and Strafford, the chief ministers of Charles, Englishmen were tried without jury, denied privilege of counsel, refused subpœna of witnesses; and these courts proceeded by summary action against alleged offenders and inflicted on them every penalty except death.

This is the exact process in which our courts are engaged to-day, and they have already gone far to parallel the most high-handed outrages of the Star Chamber and High Commission. Under pretext of protecting endangered property rights, they violate fundamental human rights, issuing injunctions that forbid such free speech and action as Englishmen and Americans have enjoyed from time immemorial; and then, under further pretext of preserving their own dignity and authority, they punish disobedience to their commands by fine and imprisonment at their pleasure, without trial by jury. In time to come, Samuel Gompers and John Mitchell will be lauded as patriots like John Hampden for courageously resisting such judicial tyranny, while the judges who practice it will stand in the pillory of history alongside of Laud and Strafford and the judges who upheld the legality of ship-money. The parallel may yet go further: Laud and Strafford and their royal master lost their heads in the revolution they provoked.

Preachers of the Gospel of Jesus should clear their minds of cant, and no longer exhort men to respect that which is not respectable, no longer call justice

that which is the essence of tyranny, no longer praise conduct that is criminal. For there is no form of criminality so deeply heinous, so deadly in its social consequences as that of the judge whose function is to administer justice, but who sets himself deliberately to administer injustice. How would it do for the clergy to preach a few sermons on such texts as "Cursed be he that perverteth the judgment of the stranger, fatherless, and widow, and all the people shall say, Amen"?¹

This judicial tyranny is the more remarkable in a "free" country, because it is a relic of absolute monarchy. In ancient theory, the king was the fountain of all justice and judges were but his deputies. An insult offered them was an insult to the king; disobedience to their mandates was equivalent to treason. Punishment for contempt was inflicted for offenses committed in the presence of the court. Later courts of equity assumed the same character and powers. In their present form contempt proceedings are of recent origin, though based on this ancient precedent. The injunction was also until recently granted sparingly, and only in real emergencies. The great extension of these powers, assumed from the first by courts without authority of law, and stretched to the breaking point and beyond within the last few decades, recalls to mind that such powers never were conferred on courts by the people, through any constitution or statute. Now that these usurped powers are constantly and notoriously abused, inquiry into their foun-

¹ Deut. 27:19.

dition becomes necessary and inevitable. And such inquiry makes it plain to the layman, however the lawyer may deceive himself, that the judge is himself a lawbreaker whenever he punishes any man for any offense (except perhaps flagrant misbehavior in the court room) without trial by jury and a verdict of guilt. The law under which the judge acts is a law made by judges, and never sanctioned by the people, save by their silence—a silence of ignorance.

What is called "law and order" too often means, therefore, simply the lawlessness of judges. The lawlessness of a judge is no more respectable than the lawlessness of a mob—indeed, it is less respectable. The mob nearly always has the purpose to execute what we commonly call justice, and it often does execute "justice," in an irregular and unlawful manner doing what judge and jury and sheriff might and should do in the premises. The danger of mob-law is that the mob is peculiarly liable to be wrong as to the fact, and so to punish an innocent person. A judge is certain to be more accurately informed as to the fact, but the danger of judge-law is that the judge often has no intention to do justice, or entirely misunderstands what justice is. Now, if we were compelled to choose between the two forms of lawlessness: the mob, intending justice, but liable to be wrong as to fact, and the judge, right as to fact but intending injustice, many considerations might lead us to say: Give us mob-law rather than judge-law. But we are not yet compelled to make this choice. An old maxim says, Of two evils choose the less; but a better rule

is, Of two evils choose neither. We can reform our judicial system and take from judges the power to make law. We can and must see to it that the power of courts to grant injunctions is very strictly limited, and that their power to punish for contempt, other than misbehavior in court, is wholly abolished. Any man who is accused of disobeying the mandate of a court should be indicted and tried by a jury in another court, as for any other crime. When a judge proceeds summarily for alleged contempt, he violates the fundamental maxim of equity that forbids a judge to sit in a case in which he is personally interested. Judges have proved to a demonstration that they cannot be trusted with either of these powers, and that their present use of them is incompatible with the institutions of a free country.

These are the views of a layman in the law, but they have the support of the best professional authority. In an address delivered in New York, in January, 1914, Chief Justice Walter Clark, of the North Carolina Supreme Court, said that all the powers of government, both Federal and State, lie at the feet of a judicial oligarchy. "The overwhelming preponderance of the judiciary," he declared, is "without a line in the constitution to authorize it." We may fairly set this against the amazing pronouncement of the Supreme Court of Idaho that "the inherent power of the court to punish for contempt cannot be interfered with or abridged by the legislature." We shall see what the people will do to this doctrine of "inherent power" of the courts they have created to ad-

minister justice, how they will treat this new notion of judicial divine right. Americans are still fully persuaded that, if there is any "divine right" that will bear inspection, it is the right of the people to rule themselves, not to be ruled by kings, legislators, or judges.

Only a decade ago it was still the general belief that our courts were the one institution left us that was worthy of entire respect, untouched by corruption, administering justice with even hand to poor and rich alike. Our political education has proceeded so rapidly that almost our last vestige of respect for our courts has vanished. We see our judges as they are: the poor creatures of the predatory corporations and the venal bosses. Even those among them who are technically "honest" are constitutionally and professionally disposed to favor wealth and privilege against manhood and equal rights. And when they are disposed to do justice they are so bound hand and foot by precedents and rules of procedure that they are utterly unable to see the real equity of a case.¹

II

The second great abuse in the present system of "law and order" is the power usurped by the courts of

¹ President Taft said, in a now famous speech, "I love courts; I love judges. They are my ideals on earth that typify what we shall meet in heaven under a just God." We may or may not hope to meet Mr. Taft in such a heaven as he conceives, but some of us hope one day to appear before a very different God.

declaring statutes unconstitutional. Let Chief Justice Clark be heard again: "The overwhelming preponderance of the judiciary was unexpectedly created in 1803 by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, without a line of the Constitution to authorize it, when that body assumed the right to veto any act of Congress it chose to hold unconstitutional . . . This doctrine was promptly seized upon as a boon by the special interests and by all who believed at heart in the government of the many for the benefit of the few. It has virtually made the courts the dominant power in every State in the Union. Whenever any progressive statute has not been in accord with the economic views entertained by the courts, they have generally exercised their power to declare such statute unconstitutional, because it was not 'due process of law.'"

The Federal Constitution gives to the Supreme Court created under that instrument the power to declare invalid any law enacted by a State that is inconsistent with the national Constitution or the statutes of Congress and treaties. Such a power it was necessary to vest in the Federal court in order to prevent endless conflict and confusion. But the Federal Constitution did not give to the Supreme Court power to invalidate a statute of Congress, nor does any State Constitution give to its courts power to invalidate a statute of the legislature. This is power assumed by the courts, another great stretch of judicial prerogative. Inasmuch as a fundamental principle of constitutions is that all powers not conferred are reserved

to the people, the declaring of statutes unconstitutional is itself unconstitutional. It is pure judicial usurpation, and the power, while sometimes wisely exercised, is so much more often abused to frustrate the people's will, that it must be taken from the courts. Judges have themselves raised the issue whether their will or the will of the people shall be the law of the land, and they have no right to complain if, in consequence, the people regard them as enemies.

When a layman speaks bold words like these, the conservative element among us lift hands of holy horror and exclaim. But does anything said above go further than these words from the late Justice Harlan, of the United States Supreme Court: "When the American people come to the conclusion that the judiciary of this land is usurping to itself the functions of the legislative department of the government we will find trouble. Ninety millions of people—all sorts of people—are not going to submit to the usurpation by the judiciary of the functions of other parts of the government and the power on its part to declare what is the public policy of the United States." ¹

Whenever this question is raised somebody is sure to urge the importance of preserving an "independent judiciary." Independent judges in a democracy? Independent of whom? If by that is meant that judges are to be independent of the people there is an end of

¹ Much more to the same effect will be found in Justice Harlan's remarkable dissenting opinion in the Standard Oil Company *versus* United States, 221 U. S. Reports.

democracy—in that case we have judicial oligarchy. Are we willing to submit to that? Are we ready to be ruled by judges as our ancestors were by kings? By their strained interpretations, which not infrequently reverse the intended meaning of a statute, by their reckless declarations that this or that statute which judges do not approve is unconstitutional, our courts have finally landed us in this ridiculous situation: Despotic Russia and semi-despotic Germany and Austria, together with monarchic Great Britain and Italy and even Spain, may have liberal laws for the righting of social wrongs, but democratic United States, "free America," may not have such laws. The sacred bench forbids. The will of the people, the decisions of their representatives, are not to count. Our constitutions are no longer charts of progress; they have been made by courts the shield of privilege and social wrong, unsurmountable barriers to the people's demand for reform. And this is the political system, this is the government that we have boasted for these generations to be the most liberal, the most enlightened and the most free in the world!

Behold and admire then, dearly beloved, this "law and order" which we are exhorted, in the name of liberty and the interests of society, even in the name of morality and religion, to respect and uphold. It is not to be denied by one who coolly surveys the whole matter that our courts, judges, lawyers, police, jails, prisons—the whole system of law and order—constitute together what deserves to be named a system for administration of injustice and defense of oppression.

It becomes a fair question for debate whether they do not oftener prevent justice than promote justice. While professing to secure liberty, they are doing their utmost to destroy liberty. No appeal to the character of individuals will affect this conviction. For this is no question between "good" judges and "bad" judges—comparatively few of our judges have been "bad." It is a question between enlightened and unenlightened judges, between men who are in bondage to precedents and outworn principles and men who are in sympathy with their own times and share the highest ethical and social ideals of their fellows. It is not a question of "good law" (as lawyers understand that phrase) versus "bad law." The decisions that do so much wrong to the people are nearly all "good law." That is just the trouble; for in these cases the better the law the greater the injustice. The precise need is that the law be changed.

Here is where not only the judiciary, but substantially the whole legal profession, fails to comprehend. The evolution of production from hand manufacture to machine, from simple tools to complex, from the little shop to the great factory has made a revolution in the status of the laborer. It has changed him from a condition of independence to a condition of dependence, from freeman into wage-slave. The old legal maxims and rules no longer apply. But our courts are blind to this great change. The highest court of our greatest State not long ago used this language: "It cannot be conceived how the cigarmaker is to be improved in his health or his morals by forcing him

from his home and its hallowed associations and beneficent influences to ply his trade elsewhere." If the learned judge who wrote this opinion knows anything about a New York tenement his words are nauseous cant; if not, he displays ignorance of commonest social facts for which a child ought to blush.

This is the sin of our judges, that they have failed to understand their own social order. They have not yet discovered that the old saws of Coke and Blackstone no longer fit modern facts. They are engaged in applying a collection of legal precedents, accumulated through the experience of a society that has passed away, to a society with unprecedented conditions. They have gained no glimpse of the fact that there has been a greater change in economic and social conditions in the last hundred years than in any thousand years of the world's previous history—that there is more change now in every decade than in any century previous to the eighteenth. Laws and institutions of a century ago, not to say several centuries old, are no more applicable to the world in which we are living than to the planet Mars. The law must bend to the new conditions or it must break.

Again, lest this be thought the extravagance of an uninstructed layman, let us hear from one of the foremost lawyers of the United States, Frederic R. Coudert, of New York : "In this last generation economic changes have so modified actual human relations that the American law of to-day reflects the views of the dead rather than of the living, and is in many re-

spects far behind that of England, France or Germany.”¹

Nor is it any reply to Mr. Coudert's tremendous indictment to say that our judges are honest, if mistaken. It is true that capitalism does not bribe judges—as a rule; the Archbald case proved that it sometimes does—not because it is too virtuous, however, but because it has no need. The interests of the legal profession are mainly with capitalism; lawyers would starve if they depended on the poor for a living; and from the ranks of men so biased by economic interest and lifelong habit judges must perforce be selected. Men elected or appointed to judicial positions are almost wholly lawyers whose practice has been as counsel of corporations and other “malefactors of great wealth,” and whose experiences, sympathies and whole view of law and of life are on the side of the capitalist. Why waste money in bribery of one who is already the creature of capitalism, devoted to its interests, thinking only its thoughts? The little brothers of the rich may be confidently trusted to decide all questions “right.”

III

Possibly the deepest grievance against “law and order” cherished by the working class is the conviction that the system is so unfairly administered. Even with all its defects, it might be borne with more patience, if there was one law for all. But the small

¹“Certainty and Justice,” p. 305.

thief is sent to jail; the big thief is sent to Congress. Before a judge, afterwards impeached for corruption, two smugglers were brought on the same day. One was a poor Greek, consumptive, without friends, who had committed a slight technical offense, and he was sent to prison for long months. Another was a rich merchant, who had been systematically defrauding the government for years, to the amount of at least a million dollars, and perhaps many times that; he was let off with a fine of \$25,000, notwithstanding the district attorney pressed for a jail sentence as the only effective penalty. And these two cases are typical of the everyday working of the whole system: one law for the rich, another for the poor; a maximum of protection for property, a minimum of protection for the person.

The virtuous denunciations of the McNamaras and other criminals of the working class, with which press and pulpit ring from time to time, are more loud than convincing. Our ethical instructors presume on the short memory of the public. But some have not forgotten that, not so many years ago, the heads of the Standard Oil Trust were indicted and tried for the crime of conspiring to blow up a rival refinery. It was lawless destruction of property quite as flagrant as anything of which the McNamaras were guilty. But there was this significant difference between the two cases: the millionaires were not convicted. No Detective Burns was employed by the State to procure evidence against them. More recently, the head of the Woolen Trust was indicted and tried for con-

spiracy to plant dynamite in Lawrence, Massachusetts, in order to discredit the striking employees of his mills. No evidence was found in either case directly to connect the eminently respectable men at the head of these trusts with a disgraceful crime. We should be foolish to expect such evidence. Men like these are wise in their day and generation. They call their henchmen, put a large sum of money into their hands, and say something like this: "You need not account for this money; don't tell me what you do—I don't want to know—but get results." And the law holds them guiltless, since the law is not made for the Rockefellers and Woods, but is made by the Rockefellers and Woods for the McNamaras.

A leader of public opinion and a professed teacher of Christian ethics, the *Outlook*, approves the acquittal of Wood, on the ground that paying out a large sum of money not to be accounted for is a very different thing from a criminal conspiracy. This is probably law, but it is not sense or justice. On the contrary, if law is to correspond with equity, it must be held that such an act is the very essence of the conspiracy, to which the money is indispensable. While statutes, courts and Christian moralists take their present view of the matter, the chief offender in a criminal conspiracy, the man who makes criminal outrages possible by financing them—the man who hires crimes to be committed, to speak without disguise—will escape legal responsibility and almost all public contumely, provided he takes pains to keep himself ignorant of the details. So long as such

ethics are taught by Christian teachers of high standing, so long will Christianity be a scoff and a mock on the lips of the workers. And deservedly so, for such teachers have turned their backs on the Master who commanded his followers to "judge righteous judgment."

Why do Christian teachers vie with the hirelings of the kept press in defending capitalist ethics? Because they are themselves beneficiaries of capitalism and biased in its favor.¹ Whether the bias is conscious or unconscious it is not necessary to consider; the effect is that they become partners in all forms of social guilt. Every dividend paid by an American railway represents swindling and manslaughter: every dollar reeks with fraud and drips with blood. Every dividend paid by the Steel Trust is the product of theft and the price of human lives. In less degree this is true of all the profits of industrialism. When a preacher, an editor, a president of a university, whose pockets bulge with money so gained, shrieks about the crimes committed by workingmen and deals out high moral advice concerning the preservation of law and order—that is, the maintenance of the present system of rascality and murder—he affords a sight to provoke men to laughter and angels to tears.

¹ The assertion that the press and the university and the Church are subsidized and controlled by Capitalism is sometimes denied and oftener doubted. But Mr. Mellen testified that the New Haven Railway employed Professor Bruce Wyman, of Harvard, at \$10,000 a year to deliver lectures in the interest of his road; and admitted that a thousand New England newspapers were practically in its pay through a "campaign for publicity."

It must be apparent to the most careless observer that the mass of American people are fast losing confidence in their laws, their leaders and their government. Is there any other cause for this than their perception that the laws are unjust and oppressive, their leaders insincere and rascally and the government weak and ineffective for good, though all too effective for evil? But there is still another serious complaint against the law: it fails to secure justice between man and man. It is not true, as some say, that the poor man can no longer obtain justice; often he can and does; his grievance is that he has no certainty of getting justice. The chances are at least a hundred to one against him. Nearly every State in the Union has in its fundamental law an assertion of equal rights for all citizens: that every man is entitled to equal protection of person and property, to equal redress of injuries through legal process, "justice equally and without denial, promptly and without delay." Beautiful sentiments! But the facts?

Suppose a rich man wrongs a poor man; suppose the employee of a great corporation is wronged; what is his chance of redress? Poor men do win verdicts in such cases—sometimes—but usually only to have them set aside on appeal again and again, until, if they finally win, the costs eat up the verdict and the net result is denial of redress. A poor Irish workman lost his sight by a delayed explosion in a stone quarry. This happened in 1897; and in 1900 a jury gave him a verdict of \$20,000 which the higher court set aside. The case dragged on, and in 1913 a jury again found

a verdict of \$10,000, and at last accounts the case was still dragging along. The court records are full of cases like this. Law and order means that every disadvantage and obstacle will be thrown in the way of the poor man, if he asks for justice, and that every advantage and assistance will be given to his adversary, the rich man or rich corporation. This has become so notorious a fact that even President Taft acknowledged it, in an address delivered at Chicago, September 16, 1909: "We must make it so that the poor man will have as nearly as possible an equal opportunity in litigating with the rich man; and under present conditions, ashamed as we may be of it, this is not the fact."

Mr. Frederick W. Taylor, in an examination as witness before the Industrial Relations Commission at Washington (April, 1914) maintained that, as between employer and employee, "in 999 times out of 1,000 justice is done. If it were not so this would be a horrible world to live in." But the number daily increases of those who believe the fact to be that barely once in a thousand times is justice done and that consequently this is a horrible world to live in.

IV

In the struggle between capital and labor the courts have upheld capital with a uniformity that becomes monotonous when one examines the record. In doing this, judges have often cast consistency and reason

to the winds. For example, the Supreme Court of the United States has declared the blacklist legal and the boycott illegal, notwithstanding the fact that they are essentially the same. For when the workers declare a boycott, they blacklist employers; and when employers blacklist employees they declare a boycott on labor. But when it comes to "law and order," sauce for goose is not sauce for gander. In the case of Boyer versus Western Union Telegraph Company, the court held: "An employer having discharged employees belonging to a labor union has the right to keep a book containing their names, and showing the reason of their discharge, and to invite inspection thereof by other employers, even though the latter therefore refuse to hire the discharged employees." But in the case of Gompers, Mitchell and Morrison versus Bucks Stove and Range Company, the court held that it was an unlawful conspiracy for workers to print in their papers such statements as "unfair" or "we don't patronize," because these were verbal acts against property.¹

The law of this "free" country, therefore, is that employers may make it impossible for a man to sell his labor anywhere, and so turn him into a pauper or a tramp, but if he and his fellow workers attempt to prevent employers from selling their product such workers become criminals. When the employers do a thing, it is "combination" and legal; when employees

¹ The courts of twenty-five States have also decided that the boycott is illegal. Laidler, "Boycotts and the Labor Problem," p. 236.

do precisely the same thing, it is "conspiracy" and a crime. And this is no abstract question of law; for under this decision Gompers and Mitchell and Morrison have been sentenced to nine months' imprisonment and a heavy fine. A higher court may relieve them from this sentence on appeal, but it is an ineffaceable stigma on "law and order" that it should ever have been imposed.¹ Under the same decision a jury has rendered a verdict of \$80,000 against the hat-makers of Danbury, Connecticut, which under the Sherman act must be multiplied by three, and with added costs amounts to a quarter million dollars' penalty assessed on these working men for doing what the plaintiff in the suit, the manufacturing hatters, might do with the full approval of the court.² Is anybody, not hopelessly biased by his economic interests, so lost to all sense of fairness and decency as to call this justice?

And the injustice of these blowing-hot-and-cold decisions becomes harder to bear when we consider how this came to be law: it is the result of a forced construction by the courts of the Sherman act. Now, the Sherman act, as everybody knows, was passed by

¹ In June, 1914, the United States Supreme Court reversed this decision of the lower court on a technicality (holding that the statute of limitations invalidated the sentence) without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case. It is still uncertain, therefore, whether these men would have been lawfully convicted had action been taken sooner.

² On December 18, 1913, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the verdict given in the District Court of Connecticut, October 11, 1912. The case has, of course, been appealed to the Supreme Court.

Congress in obedience to an imperative popular demand that something be done to limit corporate power. It was the first of those measures designed to "bust the Trusts." Under it numerous suits and prosecutions have been begun, and some have been ended, against great corporations, all of which have failed to produce any result worth mentioning. The last tooth of the Sherman act, as regards the Trusts, was pulled by the Supreme Court when it read into the statute the word "reasonable,"¹ which Congress had refused to insert by amendment,—a thing that President Taft had said in a message the court had no right to do, and which the court in a previous decision had itself declared would be an assumption on its part of legislative powers. Nevertheless, it cheerfully assumed these powers, and so amended the Sherman act as to make it quite innocuous to Trusts. But the same court supplied the act with a full set of teeth as regards workingmen, who were never in the minds of the lawmakers when they enacted the statute. Under pretext that the proceedings of labor organizations affect inter-State commerce, they have been brought under jurisdiction of this act, and on this strained and far-fetched interpretation the boycott

¹The Supreme Court followed up its doctrine of "reasonable" restraint of trade, with a twin doctrine of reasonable adulteration, in interpreting the pure food law. It held that it is not unlawful to use poisonous substances in preparing food, and even to leave them in the food, unless it can be proved that poison is present in sufficient quantities to endanger health. Thus, instead of putting on the manufacturer the burden of proving that his food is good, on the public is thrown the burden of proving it to be bad.

has been condemned in the Federal courts and is punishable under contempt proceedings. This is a fair instance of the ways numberless in which the courts are to-day encroaching on our liberties. Laws intended for protection of the people are turned by courts into laws for oppression of the people. And in the sacred name of "law and order" we are bidden tamely to submit or be regarded as enemies of society.

But it is not the courts alone that we have to consider in this matter; it is the whole auxiliary machinery of "law and order." How is this machinery used? In any even-handed way between rich and poor, between workers and employers? It is used exactly as courts are used, uniformly to uphold the interests of capitalism. There is no variation in the facts, in whatever community there may be controversy between employers and employed. The police are invariably employed in the interest of employers, nominally to preserve law and order, really to break the strike. Invariably? No, there has been a single recorded exception. The mayor of Indianapolis, in 1913, refused to permit use of the police of that city in this manner, but he was speedily forced to resign, and under his successor the good old game of skull-cracking and wanton arrests went merrily on. Everywhere the official preservers of law and order are guilty of brutal violence, make unlawful arrests, and in other ways demonstrate their ability to bring forth from labor troubles a sanguinary peace.

They are invariably supported in their proceedings by the approval of our "best citizens," that is, members of the capitalistic class who wish the revolt of wage-slaves against the system that oppresses them to be subdued at any sacrifice. Not infrequently, indeed generally, the pulpit is also loud in approval of the police and in disapproval of the strikers. And in times of industrial peace, ministers who thus range themselves against the workers are often heard to wonder why the American workingman has lost his interest in religion and can no longer be induced to come to church.

Law and order must be judged by their fruits. So judged, the conclusion is unavoidable that they are intended to keep down the lower classes, not to restrain the higher, who by their conduct declare that they hold themselves to be above law. Respect such law and order? Who can, except those whose interests it promotes and is intended to promote? Until such things as we have been considering cease to be, until law is so reformed and its administration so improved that they cannot be, it will remain true that in this country of theoretical equal rights there is one law for the rich and another for the poor. This is not, as we teach our children to sing, "the land of the free and the home of the brave," but the land of the rich and the home of the slave. We must insist on one law for all, or we shall soon have law for none. If there is not reform, and that right speedily, there will be revolution.

V

Greatest grievance of all is the fact that, whenever the system they have themselves established fails at any point to achieve its purpose of protecting the present social order, the beneficiaries and representatives of that order never hesitate to violate their own system and fall back on pure brute force without color of law. They are like a gambler who insists on playing with loaded dice, and when, in spite of that advantage, he sees himself about to lose, sweeps all the stakes from the table and pockets them, and draws his pistol on any player who objects.

Theodore Roosevelt, who professes to be the friend of the poor laborer, said in a Decoration Day speech, in 1911, that he was hated because men knew that he wouldn't let the Constitution stand in the way of punishing them if they did wrong. Let that sink into your consciousness, reader: when Mr. Roosevelt decides—and of course his decision is infallible and irreformable—that certain men deserve to be punished, he will not let a little obstacle like the Constitution stand in his way. The importance of this declaration consists mainly in the fact that Mr. Roosevelt is the *enfant terrible* of American politics; he has blurred out what the entire capitalistic class thinks and does. The history of the past few years is full of instances in which those who held in their hands power to punish have not let the Constitution stand in their way. And thus far the men who have power are represen-

tatives of the capitalistic order, and they have punished men who were misguided enough, criminal enough (from their point of view) to challenge that order and oppose it. One sometimes wonders if they ever think, and, if they do, whether it never occurs to them that they are furnishing terrible precedents for revolutionaries? For the only party that has much to lose by the subversion of law and order is the capitalistic. The workers, as Marx and Engels long ago reminded them, have nothing to lose but their chains.

A few recent cases, in which the dominant order has shown its contempt for law, will better enable us to comprehend the principles and procedure of capitalism. One case was the strike of the workers in the woolen mills of Lawrence, Massachusetts, the main facts of which the subsidized press did not succeed entirely in suppressing—thanks, not to the press, but to a Congressional investigation. People have not yet had time to forget the brutality of police and militia during that strike. They have not forgotten how a chief of police overrode all laws, and even all constitutional guarantees, and prevented parents from sending their starving children where they might be fed. And probably they have not forgotten the burst of indignation from the whole country, nor the haste with which that particular injustice was revoked. Nor will people soon forget the attempt to fasten the crime of constructive murder upon two of the leaders of the strike, Ettor and Giovanetti, and the keeping them in jail eight months without bail, when their only real

offense, as every intelligent citizen in the United States knew, was that they had led a successful strike, which made known to the whole nation the practical operation of "Schedule K," and the conditions under which a great body of workingmen were compelled to labor and live. Because a woman was killed during the street disturbances (as many still believe, by a policeman), these men were to be sent to the electric chair, if the beneficiaries of Schedule K could compass it. But during the same troubles one of the brave militia who had been called in to preserve "law and order" bayoneted a young boy in the back, inflicting a wound from which he died, and no attempt was ever made to hold anybody responsible for that cowardly murder.

A second case was on the other side of the continent, in San Diego, California. Some of the so-called best citizens of that town organized a band of vigilantes, who patrolled the streets under arms, and seized and beat and drove from town every man suspected of connection with the Industrial Workers of the World. One would naturally suppose that the members of this organization had been guilty of some great outrage to provoke such action—that they had blown up some building and killed its inmates, perhaps. Nothing of the kind: their only offense was that they had been conducting a vigorous and successful propaganda, by holding meetings on the street corners, and insisted on exercising their rights as American citizens to free assembly and free speech. The citizens determined to crush out the society. In

doing this they were guilty of outrages that would put an Apache Indian to the blush. One victim was covered with hot tar, rolled in the sand, and then the vigilantes branded his back with the letters I. W. W., using for the purpose the tips of their lighted cigars. A man was arrested and beaten nearly to death for the heinous crime of wearing a red necktie. One man was arrested for reading the Bible aloud, and another for reading the Declaration of Independence.¹ One can understand these two arrests: The very mention of the Bible and the Declaration in such a place as San Diego had become would be such condemnation of the town as could not be tolerated by any self-respecting vigilantes or police. They even turned the fire hose on citizens engaged in peaceful religious meetings!

A third case came from Louisiana, where the Lumber Trust for weeks waged civil war, not only against their striking employees, but the people at large. All pretense of lawful government was abandoned in several counties; troops and armed mercenaries marched and countermarched through the towns and country roads, shooting and marauding at their pleasure. Men were arrested and imprisoned daily, without war-

¹ Over 300 persons were arrested and imprisoned during this reign of terror at San Diego, 989 were assaulted and beaten, two were killed outright, and 55 were illegally exiled. And our subsidized newspapers told their readers almost nothing about this. Several of the persons arrested were convicted of alleged offenses, but the proceedings were so disgracefully unjust that Governor Johnson promptly pardoned them. Most of the persons arrested were set at liberty without trial, or even any formal charge against them.

rant, bail or counsel. And, after these minions of the Trust had killed several members of the brotherhood of timber workers, forty other members were lodged in jail on the charge of having caused the death of their fellows. It is indeed a pity that the power of Trusts ends with the grave, otherwise the shades of the men whom they had done to death would doubtless have been arrested and charged with their own murder!

The annals of Stuart tyranny will be searched in vain for a parallel to what the capitalistic order did in the strike of the coal miners of West Virginia. The owners of the mines were also owners of the houses in which the miners lived. The striking miners were evicted from their houses and compelled to live during the rigors of winter in tents and huts on the hillsides. Having been unable, even with the aid of the powers of nature, to subdue these men and force them to return to work without redress of grievances, the owners prevailed on the governor to declare martial law, under the pretext that the strike was an "insurrection" under the meaning of the law—a palpable lie from which neither the capitalists nor their tools in office shrank for a moment. The *Labor Argus*, a newspaper of Charleston, criticized the governor and the courts and militia for their methods. Governor Hatfield ordered the paper suppressed, and its plant was confiscated and its editors imprisoned. The governor had the assurance to announce that he did this in the interest of "law and order." This sublimity of impudence holds the record for the pres-

ent, and so far surpasses any previous achievement that it is almost worthy of admiration.

Miners were arrested on various charges, tried by courts martial, with such rights to calling of witnesses and counsel as it pleased the court to give them, and without verdict of jury. Among those arrested was "Mother" Jones, a woman over eighty years of age, whose services to miners have gained her a national repute. She and others obtained a writ of habeas corpus and were brought before the Supreme Court of the State. February 28, 1913, that court rendered its decision, through presiding Judge Poffenberger, in these words: "We think that, inasmuch as the statute says the Governor may arrest and detain certain persons who are aiding and abetting insurrection until the insurrection is suppressed and order restored, it authorizes him to do so in such cases as this, and there is not a violation of the constitutional provision against the preservation [deprivation?] of life, liberty and property without due process of law."

The language of the learned judge is somewhat incoherent, as is not infrequently the case in judicial opinions; but one gathers without difficulty that "due process of law," which has done so much to preserve property from interference, is but a barrier of straw against invasion of liberty and life. Against the greed of employers it interposes no obstacle, but when an eight hour day for women or some other measure for the benefit of workers is in question, it becomes a wall of adamant.

If it were possible to outdo these proceedings in

West Virginia, Paterson, New Jersey, is entitled to that honor. The strike of the silk workers there in the spring of 1913 was the signal for the suspension of all statutes and constitutions by Chief of Police Bimson and the local courts. Among the hundreds of illegal acts, the arrest of Messrs. Hayward, Lessig and Tresca, the three most prominent leaders of the workers, is preëminent. They were charged with unlawful assemb'age and sentenced to six months in jail by Recorder Carroll. The following November the Supreme Court of the State set aside the conviction, in an opinion of Chief Justice Bergen, in which he severely scored the court below, declaring that the record contained not one particle of testimony warranting the conviction.

But the general sentiment in Paterson was that "the I. W. W. must go," and with this the "best citizens" and the clergy entirely sympathized. Not one voice was raised in pulpit or press against these arbitrary and illegal and brutal proceedings. The Industrial Workers of the World were charged with being an anarchistic organization, practicers of violence and lawlessness: therefore to suppress them by anarchy, violence and lawlessness was quite proper. Probably the clergy of Paterson are now wondering why the workers hate ministers and will not come to church.

Patrick Quinlan, a labor leader not a citizen of Paterson, was convicted and received a jail sentence for addressing a meeting that he did not attend and for saying words that he never uttered. This added a touch of opera bouffe to otherwise somber doings.

Released on bail, he was again arrested and convicted for making a remark derogatory to the chief of police. Those not afraid to speak evil of dignities fared badly in Paterson in those days. Time and space would fail to tell of the brutal clubbings, the wanton arrests, the interference with meetings, that marked the course of the strike. Against law? Bimson was the law.

If we were dependent for knowledge of these facts on newspaper reports, we might well refuse them credence; but they have been abundantly established by testimony in a semi-judicial inquiry, conducted by the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations. The editor of the leading Paterson newspaper admitted the writing of editorials during the strike in which he advocated the driving of the Industrial Workers of the World out of Paterson, by violence if necessary. "Business men" of high standing, after the passions aroused by the strike had had a year to subside, testified that they believed the I. W. W. to be "not for the good of the community," and that it was therefore the duty of the police to drive them out of the city. They admitted that this would be "technically illegal," that it would be a violation of his oath for a policeman to take such action; but that the officer would be justified in violating law and oath, "if thereby he could serve the interests of the community," that is, the interests of employers and "business men." Since that is the idea of "law and order" that is held by prominent citizens of Paterson, nobody should be surprised by what occurred there. But when the Mc-

Namaras violate law, what a commotion these same "business men" then make!

Having suppressed, at least temporarily, free assemblage and free speech, the authorities of Paterson resolved also to suppress freedom of the press. Alexander Scott edited and published a socialistic paper called the *Weekly Issue*, at Passaic, several miles from Paterson. He criticized the doings in Paterson, and chief Bimson as head doer, in an editorial of which the *New York Tribune* said: "We have read as severe criticisms of municipal administration and of their police as those of Scott in many papers published in many places." On the charge of attempting to subvert government, Scott was tried and convicted, and received an indeterminate sentence of from one to fifteen years in prison. The Supreme Court has not yet passed upon his case, but in the meantime these words from *Collier's* are worth considering: "We do not believe any court in America will sustain this law or the sentence of this editor. The passage of the law itself in the form in which it was passed is a shining example of legislative incompetence, and the trial of Scott is a piece of judicial folly."¹

A year ago we should have thought and said that

¹In April, 1914, the Supreme Court of New Jersey reversed the conviction of Scott. Justice Kalish, in his decision, severely criticized Judge Klenert, the trial judge, for not quashing the indictment or ordering a verdict of acquittal. He affirmed in strong terms the right of free speech and freedom of the press. The character of the "courts of justice" in Paterson during the strike is shown by the fact that every conviction, save one, has been reversed, and the one exception is still pending in the courts.

nothing could surpass the lawlessness of Paterson or the brutality of West Virginia, but the spring of 1914 gave the American people a new object-lesson of the exploitation of the class that works by the class that shirks. Almost simultaneous strikes occurred among the workers in the copper mines of Michigan and the coal mines of Colorado. There was nothing new or specially instructive in the Michigan strike, where, after a long struggle, the miners were compelled to return to work on the employers' terms. Nothing need be said regarding this matter, beyond the comment of the *New York World*:

“What the employers do as a matter of course, it is unlawful for the employees to do. The employers combine; they monopolize; they set aside law; they hire fighting men; they make war. Because the employers have had these advantages and have refused to arbitrate, they have won a famous victory over a naturally industrious and peaceable population, which has not been worn out so much as it has been starved out. Some triumphs are worth while and some are not. In this country injustice and hunger never yet made a conquest that endured.”

The facts about the Colorado struggle were for a time difficult to learn, owing to manipulation of the news by almost the whole of the American press; and so far as possible the facts have been kept from the people until now. But some things have been admitted or established under oath. The strikers made seven demands, five of which had been granted by acts of legislature, but persistently refused by the mine

owners. That these grievances of the miners were not imaginary, is fully established by this report of a Federal grand jury, in September, 1913: "That State laws have not been enforced so as to give all persons concerned benefits which are derivable therefrom; that coal companies have nominated, elected and controlled county officers; that county officers elected by the coal companies have shown undue activity in controlling elections, having in one instance changed the precinct boundaries, presumably to eliminate unfavorable votes of the miners, and have thus aroused not only political but social dissatisfaction; that many camp marshals, whose appointments and salaries are controlled by coal companies, have exercised a system of espionage and have resorted to arbitrary powers of police control, acting as judge and jury and passing sentence; that camp marshals have brutally assaulted miners; that miners cannot complain of real grievances without being discharged; that the scrip system is still in effect; that miners feel under an unjust obligation to trade at the company stores because of the attitude of mine superintendents; that check weighmen have been denied the miners." ¹

When the strike began, the usual tactics were employed by the operators: Guards were hired and armed, strike-breakers were brought in, and the governor was persuaded to call out the militia. The private guards were enrolled and uniformed as members

¹Speech of the Hon. Edward Keating, representative from Southern Colorado, in the House of Representatives, May 30, 1914.

of the militia and machine guns were added to their equipment. At this stage a Congressional Committee began an investigation, and among the witnesses called was Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., as the representative of his father, who owns a controlling interest in one of the largest corporations involved in the strike. Mr. Rockefeller said, among other things: "I have done what I regard as best in the interests of the employees and the large investment I represent. We have put the best men obtainable in charge, and are relying on their judgment. My conscience entirely acquits me. We would rather that the unfortunate conditions should continue and that we should lose all the millions invested than that American workmen should be deprived of their right to work for whom they please. That is the great principle at stake. It is a national issue."

In a later public statement Mr. Rockefeller said that less than ten per cent. of his employees are union men. The other 90 per cent., he affects to believe, are in such fear of their lives from this small minority, and so apprehensive that they may be compelled to work for shorter hours and higher wages than he offers them, that they have most unwillingly joined the strike. And he is nobly determined to protect them, if it costs a considerable part of his great fortune! There is, indeed, a principle at stake in this matter, but it is quite other than that stated by Mr. Rockefeller: it is the right of the employer to compel the miner to work the longest possible number of hours at the smallest possible wage, and to resist the union through

which alone the miner can deal collectively and therefore effectively with his employer.

Fifteen days after the capitalists had thus announced their ultimatum through Mr. Rockefeller, the "militia" opened fire on the tent-colony of miners at Ludlow. To escape the hail of bullets, the women and children crawled into pits that had been dug for shelter; but the canvas tents caught fire, and twenty-nine persons perished there—including two women and eleven little children, some of them babes in arms. Nothing but the prompt sending of Federal troops to Colorado by President Wilson prevented a bloody civil war. That the entire nation was horrified is no exaggeration. It brought home to many people, as nothing had ever done, as perhaps nothing else could ever have done, the fact that the ruling class of our country, the great capitalists, will stick at nothing: they are ready to exterminate all who oppose them, rather than have labor controversies settled on principles of justice and humanity.

The courts of Colorado, military or civil, will do nothing, or worse than nothing. Military tribunals have been busy ever since with "trials" that are a travesty of justice. Most of the guilty have been exonerated. One case was too flagrant for that: Lieutenant Linderfelt, of the militia, killed a Greek miner most obnoxious to the operators as one of the leaders of the strike, by beating him over the head with a rifle while he was under protection of a flag of truce. He admitted his act, and the court could do no less than find a verdict accordingly; but

as a penalty sentenced him to be reduced five files in rank! How well this compares with the sentences of the McNamaras!

One thing has been made clear by these events. At once and for all time to come, the right to employ armed guards must be taken from private persons and corporations. The maintenance of peace is a function of government; the State alone has the right to use force, and that only as a last resort. We have gone back to the private warfare of the Middle Ages. The new feudal nobles, called capitalists, have their *condottieri* and use them with as little scruple as marked the older feudalism. This is not law and order, but anarchy. At any cost, this private warfare must be suppressed. It is the negation of civilization and a reversion to barbarism. Let us say nothing more of the backwardness of Mexico in the ways of civilization and peace, until we have successfully solved this problem. In the meantime what has the Christian press and the Christian pulpit been saying about this matter? How has it been applying the Gospel of Jesus to this problem? There has been silence that might be felt!

VI

But are not the workers also violent and lawless? When forcible resistance is made to the social order, can society sit idly by and let things take their course? The question is pertinent, and there can be only one

reply. Those who proclaim the Gospel of Jesus must oppose all efforts to better social conditions by violence. They are servants of One who counsels submission to wrong rather than forcible redress. Socialism speaks with the same voice as religion on this point, though not with the same motive. The socialist perceives the teaching of history and experience to be clear, that violence always reacts against the cause it is intended to promote.

Let the advocates of the Gospel, however, take more care to insist that the principle be applied impartially to all classes of society. The minister of Christ should condemn cruel beatings and the shooting down of unarmed men and women and the bayoneting of boys, whether this is done by those who would destroy "law and order" or by those who think by such methods to uphold it. One ethical measuring-wand must be applied to all men, rich or poor. And of the two kinds of violence, disciples of the Carpenter of Galilee would do well to be more lenient in judgment of the violence of workers goaded to desperation by their wrongs, and striking out blindly against they know not whom or what, than of the coldly calculated violence of those who are striving to perpetuate these wrongs. Let teachers of Christian ethics reprobate the brutality of the servants of the law as strongly as the brutality of those whom they call the lawless. The followers of the poor and lowly Jesus ought to be found ranged with the oppressed, not with the oppressors. They should be able to see that murder is the same crime in the sight of God when done by

the rich and powerful as when done by the poor and ignorant. The clergy should proclaim from the house-tops that the possession of wealth and intelligence and power lays a heavy burden of obligation on the possessors to do justly and to love mercy, and that to pretend to walk humbly with God is no excuse for lack of these qualities. Piety is not a substitute for righteousness. In short, what is demanded is a practical reversal of the ethics taught in the average Christian pulpit to-day. Christianize "law and order," and it will be respected and there will be no violence to suppress.

Until such ethical principles as have been thus indicated are accepted and proclaimed, as an inseparable part of the Gospel of Jesus, there will remain a great gulf fixed between the workers and the Church. Until such ethics are embodied in law and order, let nobody expect to see law and order greeted with anything but derision and revolt by the workers. What many call "lawlessness" is a symptom of social health, not of social disease; it is a barometer of social evils. Resistance to injustice shows that the spirit of manhood is still alive. When a man or a class gets to the point where it takes abuse lying down, it has hardly manhood enough to be distinguished from the brutes. As Americans, we still boast that this is the one country under heaven in which the people will not remain supine under oppression and tamely submit to organized injustice.

In most of our American communities, we are compelled to conclude, there is no longer anything that

deserves the name of law or order. There is power, brutal force, but no law. Corporate power has shown its ability to break down every barrier that the civilization of five thousand years had succeeded in throwing about life and liberty. It has proceeded to suspend constitutions, nullify statutes, usurp all the functions of government, proclaim martial law and put men to death, banish them or imprison them at pleasure, without process of law. Corporate power has not merely done this once, it has done it in at least seven different States within the past five years, and has proved that it can and will do the like anywhere and as often as may be necessary. Could there be better preparation for a violent revolution than vast power thus lodged in the hands of an irresponsible few, power used without reference to law, controlling all the machinery of justice, and using police and courts in reckless oppression of all who stand in their way or oppose their will? Can men see their dearest liberties contemptuously denied, ruthlessly overridden, and avoid the conclusion that peaceful methods of agitation are useless, that the only possible redress left them is appeal to force?

"Law and order" has thus far been the Gibraltar of capitalism—this power to make, interpret and enforce laws. The class that possesses such power controls society. But continuance of the system depends on respect for it by capitalists themselves; and at present they are doing their very best to shatter it to bits. Nothing is so fatal to the existence of a law-abiding sentiment in any community as the well-

founded conviction that the law itself is unjust and its administration unfair. The supremacy of capitalism thus far has been due to its combination of wealth and intelligence. The worker has no wealth and has hitherto been also deficient in intelligence, but there has been a great awakening on his part and he is learning that his deliverance lies in concerted political action, which will take from the capitalistic class control of law. When the intelligence of the workers generally becomes equal to establishing a solidarity comparable to that of their oppressors, their battle will be virtually won. They can then make law correspond in fact to the ideal, make order signify justice and not injustice. Then law and order will be respected, because they will be worthy of respect. They will rest on the will of a free people, and will express their convictions of the rights of man. Let us pray that the twentieth century will witness the passing of the old world—this world in which the poor starve while the rich die of surfeit; this world where thousands laugh while millions weep; this world where the great masses toil without hope that the favored few may play without joy. Let us pray—and labor—that the twentieth century may witness the coming of a new world in which righteousness shall dwell—a world distinguished by a new religion and a new social order: the religion of Jesus and the Kingdom, and the human brotherhood that He came to establish.

The Gospel of Jesus in the twentieth century is the same as in the first: "The Kingdom of God is at hand: repent and believe the Glad Tidings."

APPENDIX

A. BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHAPTER I

- Royce, Josiah, *The Problem of Christianity*, 2 vols., New York, 1913.
- Smith, G. B., *Social Idealism and the Changing Theology*, New York, 1913.
- Smith, Samuel G., *Democracy and the Church*, New York, 1912.
- Rauschenbusch, Walter, *Christianizing the Social Order*, New York, 1913.
- Howerton, J. R., *The Church and Social Reform*, New York, 1913.
- Sims, P. M., *What Must the Church Do to Be Saved?* New York, 1913.
- Kutter, Hermann, *They Must; or, God and the Social Democracy*, Chicago, 1913.
- Womer, P. P., *The Church and the Labor Conflict*, New York, 1913.
- Trawick, A. M., *The City Church and Its Social Mission*, New York, 1912.
- The Country Church and Community Coöperation*, New York, 1912.
- Gill, C. O., and Pinchot. Gifford, *The Country Church*, New York, 1913.
- Holmes, J. H., *The Revolutionary Function of the Modern Church*, New York, 1912.

- Ross, E. A., *Sin and Society*, New York, 1913.
- Fiske, G. W., *The Challenge of the Country*, New York, 1912.
- Wallis, Louis, *Sociological Study of the Bible*, Chicago, 1912.
- Hall, T. C., *Social Solutions in the Light of Christian Ethics*, New York, 1910.
- Euchen, Rudolf, *Can We Still Be Christians?* New York, 1914.
- Mann, J. E. F., and others, *The Real Democracy*, New York, 1913.
- Adams, Brooks, *The Theory of Social Revolutions*, New York, 1914.
- Nearing, Scott, *Social Sanity*, New York, 1913.
- Downes, L., *The New Democracy*, Boston, 1910.
- Coffin, J. H., *The Socialized Conscience*, Baltimore, 1914.
- Schell, Hermann, *The New Ideals in the Gospel*, New York, 1914.
- Zueblin, Charles, *Democracy and the Overman*, New York, 1910.
- The Church, the People and the Age*, edited by Robert Scott and George William Gilmore, New York, 1914.
- Ward, H. F., *The Social Creed of the Churches*, New York, 1914.
- Tyler, J. M., *The Place of the Church in Evolution*, Boston, 1914.

CHAPTER II

- Small, Albion W., *Between Eras: from Capitalism to Democracy*, Kansas City, Mo., 1913.
- Devine, Edward T., *The Spirit of Social Work*, New York, 1911.

- Tolman, W. H., and Kendall, L. B., *Safety: Methods for Preventing Occupational and Other Accidents*, New York, 1913.
- Ellwood, Charles A., *Sociology in Its Psychological Aspects*, New York, 1912.
- Le Bon, Gustave, *The Psychology of Revolution*, New York, 1913.
- Boyd, J. H., *Workmen's Compensation and Industrial Insurance*, 2 vols., Indianapolis, 1913.
- Pouget, Émile, *Sabotage* (translated by Arturo Giovannitti), Chicago, 1913.
- Quick, Herbert, *On Board the Good Ship Earth*, Indianapolis, 1913.
- Wallace, Alfred Russel, *Social Environment and Moral Progress*, New York, 1913.
- Clark, J. B., *Social Justice Without Socialism*, Boston, 1914.
- Rubinow, I. M., *Social Insurance, with Special Reference to American Conditions*, New York, 1913.
- Hobson, John A., *Evolution of Modern Capitalism*, New York, 1894.
- Fisher, Irving, *Why Is the Dollar Shrinking?* New York, 1914.
- Lusk, Hugh N., *Social Welfare in New Zealand*, New York, 1913.
- Roberts, Elmer, *Monarchical Socialism in Germany*, New York, 1913.
- Goldmark, Josephine, *Fatigue and Efficiency*, New York, 1912.
- Skeels, Isaiah, *Cost and Price*, Cleveland, 1914.
- Martin, F. T., *The Passing of the Idle Rich*, New York, 1911.
- Foster, W. T., *The Social Emergency*, Boston, 1914.

Walling, W. E., *Progressivism and After*, New York, 1914.

CHAPTER III

Mill, J. S., *The Subjection of Women*. Many editions.

Densmore, E., *Sex Equality*, New York, 1907.

Schreiner, O., *Woman and Labor*, New York, 1911.

U. S. Labor Bureau, *Bulletin 73: Laws Relative to Employment of Women and Children*, Washington, 1907.

Fawcett, M., *Woman's Suffrage—a short history of a great movement*, New York, 1912.

Squire, Belle, *The Woman Movement in America*, New York, 1911.

Rembaugh, Bertha, *Political Status of Women in the United States*, New York, 1911.

White, F., *Laws on Marriage, Divorce and Property Rights of Women of All States*, New York, 1910.

Dorr, Rheta, *What Eight Million Women Want*, New York, 1910.

George, W. L., *Woman and To-Morrow*, New York, 1913.

Floyd, Dell, *Women and World Builders*, Chicago, 1913.

Key, Ellen, *Love and Marriage*, New York, 1911.

The Woman Movement, New York, 1912.

Abbot, Edith, *Women in Industry*, New York, 1910.

Van Kleeck, Ellen, *Women in the Bookbinding Trade*, New York, 1913.

Butler, Elizabeth B., *Women and the Trades (Pittsburgh Survey)*, New York, 1909.

Saleswomen in Mercantile Stores, New York, 1912.

Martin, Edward Sanford, *The Unrest of Women*, New York, 1913.

- Goldmark, J. C., *Handbook of Laws Regulating Women's Labor*, New York, 1912.
- Gilman, Charlotte Perkins, *Women and Economics*, New York, 1898.
- Morley, Edith J., *Women Workers in Seven Professions*, New York, 1914.
- Van Vorst, Mrs. John and Marie, *The Woman Who Toils*, New York, 1903.
- Cadbury, Edward, and others, *Women's Work and Wages*, New York, 1907.
- Bosworth, L. M., *The Living Wage of Women Workers*, New York, 1911.
- Nearing, Scott, and N. M. S., *Woman and Social Progress*, New York, 1912.

CHAPTER IV

- Nearing, Scott, *The Solution of the Problem of the Child*, New York, 1911.
- Keeling, Frederic, *Child Labour in the United Kingdom*, London, 1914.
- Engel, Sigmund, *The Elements of Child Protection*, translated from the German by Dr. Eden Paul, New York, 1912.
- Flexner and Baldwin, *Juvenile Courts and Probation*, New York, 1914.
- Clopper, Edward, *Child Labor in City Streets*, New York, 1912.
- Key, Ellen, *The Century of the Child*, New York, 1909.
- The Education of the Child*, New York, 1910.
- Henderson, C. Hanford, *Pay-Day*, Boston, 1911.
- Education and the Larger Life*, Boston, 1902.
- What Is It to be Educated?* Boston, 1914.

- Montessori, Maria, *The Montessori Method*, translated by Anna E. George, New York, 1912.
- Stevens, Ellen Yale, *A Guide to the Montessori Method*, New York, 1913.
- Smith, Anna Tolman, *The Montessori Method of Education*, U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin 17, 1912.
- Report of Commissioner of Education for 1912, 2 vols., Washington, 1913.
- King, Irving, *Education for Social Efficiency*, New York, 1913.
- Ferrer, Francisco, *The Origin and Ideals of the Modern School*, New York, 1913.
- Weeks, Arland D., *The Education of To-Morrow*, New York, 1913.
- Eggleston and Bruère, *The Work of the Rural School*, New York, 1913.
- Antin, Mary, *The Promised Land*, Boston, 1912.
- Ayres, Leonard, *Laggards in Our Schools*, New York, 1913.
- Holmes, William H., *School Organization and the Industrial Child*, Worcester, Mass., 1912.
- Snedden, David, *Problems of Educational Readjustment*, Boston, 1913.
- Best, R. N., and Ogden, C. K., *The Problem of the Continuation School and Its Successful Solution in Germany*, London, 1914.
- Leake, Albert H., *Industrial Education: Its Problems, Methods and Dangers*, Boston, 1913.
- Riis, Jacob, *Children of the Tenements*, New York, 1902.
- Addams, Jane, *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets*, New York, 1912.
- Bancroft, J. H., *Games for the Playground, Home, School and Gymnasium*, New York, 1909.

- Fisher, H. W., *Making Life Worth While*, New York, 1910.
- Groos, Karl, *The Play of Man*, New York, 1901.
- Gulick, L. H., *The Efficient Life*, New York, 1907.
- Groves, F. P., *A History of Education in Modern Times*, New York, 1913.

CHAPTER V

- De Forest and Veiller, *The Tenement House Problem*, 2 vols., New York, 1903.
- Veiller, Lawrence, *Housing Reform*, New York, 1910.
- Nettlefold, J. S., *Practical Housing*, Letchworth, Eng., 1908.
- Koester, Frank, *Modern City Planning and Maintenance*, New York, 1914.
- Howe, Frederick C., *European Cities at Work*, New York, 1913.
- Riis, Jacob, *The Battle with the Slum*, New York, 1902.
- How the Other Half Lives*, New York, 1890.
- Wilcox, D. F., *Municipal Franchises*, 2 vols., New York, 1914.
- Crawford, W. H., *Church and Slum*, New York, 1908.
- Slums of Baltimore*, New York, Chicago and Philadelphia, U. S. Labor Bureau, Washington, 1894.
- U. S. Bureau of Labor, *Bulletin 54: Housing of the Working People by Employers*. Washington, 1904.
- Many titles under Chapters VI and VII will also be found to contain pertinent matter.

CHAPTER VI

- The Social Evil in Chicago, a Study of Existing Conditions with Recommendations by the Vice Commission of Chicago*, Chicago, 1911.

- Report of the Vice Commission of Chicago, New York, 1912.
- Kneeland, G. J., Commercialized Prostitution in New York City, with an Introduction by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., New York, 1912.
- Philadelphia Vice Commission Report, New York, 1913.
- Janney, O. Edward, The White Slave Traffic, New York, 1911.
- Bell, E. A., War on the White Slave Trade, New York, 1909.
- Seligman, E. E. A., The Social Evil, New York, 1912.
- Addams, Jane, A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil, New York, 1912.
- Flexner, Abraham, Prostitution in Europe, New York, 1914.
- Kauffman, R. W., The House of Bondage, New York, 1910.
- Gordon, Ernest, The Anti-Alcohol Movement in Europe, New York, 1914.

CHAPTER VII

- An Open Letter to Society from Convict 1776, New York, 1911.
- Berkman, Alexander, Memoirs of an Anarchist, New York, 1912.
- Aschaffenburg, Gustav, Crime and Its Repression, Boston, 1913.
- Bonger, W. A., Criminality and Economic Conditions, Boston, 1913.
- Ferri, Enrico, Criminal Sociology, New York, 1912.
- Jones, George, A History of Penal Methods, London, 1914.

- Hopkins, Tighe, *Wards of the State: an Unofficial View of Prison and the Prisoners*, Boston, 1913.
- Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, Annual.
- Gross, Hans, *Criminal Psychology*, Boston, 1911.
- Lombroso, Cesare, *Crime, Its Causes and Remedies*, Boston, 1911.
- McConnell, R. M., *Criminal Responsibility and Social Constraint*, New York, 1912.
- Tarde, Gabriel, *Penal Philosophy*, Boston, 1912.
- Booth, Maud Ballington; *After Prison—What?* New York, 1903.
- Devon, J., *The Criminal and the Community*, New York, 1911.
- Life in Sing Sing, by Number 1500*, Indianapolis, 1904.
- De Lacy, W. H., *Treatment of Criminals by Probation*, 59th Congress, second session, Senate Document 12, Washington, 1906.
- Wines, F. H., *Punishment and Reformation*, New York, 1910.
- Correction and Prevention*, 4 vols., Russell Sage Foundation, 1913.
- Proceedings of the Annual Congress of the American Prison Association, Annual.
- Garofalo, Raffaele, *Criminology*, Boston, 1914.

CHAPTER VIII

- Moore, B., *Dawn of the Health Age*, London, 1911.
- Hutchinson, Woods, *Preventable Diseases*, Boston, 1909.
- Conquest of Consumption*, Boston, 1910.
- M'Vail, J. C., *Prevention of Infectious Diseases*, New York, 1907.

- Behring, E. A., *Suppression of Tuberculosis*, New York, 1904.
- Otis, E. O., *Tuberculosis—Its Cause, Cure and Prevention*, New York, 1914.
- Russell, F. H., *Control of Typhoid in the Army*, Washington, 1911.
- Abbott, A. C., *Hygiene of Transmissible Diseases*, Philadelphia, 1901.
- Doty, A. H., *Prevention of Infectious Diseases*, New York, 1911.
- National Association for Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis, *Proceedings*.
- International Congress on Tuberculosis, *Transactions*.
- Henry Phipps Institute, *Annual Reports of*, Philadelphia.
- Salesby, *Parenthood and Race Culture*, New York, 1912.
- Davenport, C. B., *Heredity in Relation to Eugenics*, New York, 1913.

CHAPTER IX

- Koester, Frank, *The Price of Inefficiency*, New York, 1913.
- La Fargue, Paul, *The Right to Be Lazy*, Chicago, 1907.
- McCann, A. W., *Starving America*, New York, 1913.
- Hunter, Robert, *Poverty*, New York, 1904.
- Devine, E. T., *Misery and Its Causes*, New York, 1909.
- Haggard, H. Rider, *Regeneration*, New York, 1910.
- Webb, Sidney and Beatrice, *Prevention of Destitution*, London, 1911.
- Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction*, Annual.
- Wallis, Graham, *The Great Society*, New York, 1914.

- U. S. Labor Bulletin, 53 and 54: Cost of Living and Retail Prices in the U. S., Washington, 1904.
Bulletin 64: Conditions of Living Among the Poor, 1906.
- Barnett, S. A. and H. O., Toward Social Reform, New York, 1909.
- Besant, Walter, and others, Poor in Great Cities, New York, 1900.
- Henderson, C. R., Introduction to the Study of Dependent, Defective and Delinquent Classes, Chicago, 1901.
- Kowntree, B. S., Land and Labor: Lessons from Belgium, New York, 1910.
- Beveridge, W. H., Unemployment, New York, 1909.
- Nearing, Scott, Financing the Wage-Earner's Family, New York, 1913.
- Reducing the Cost of Living, New York, 1914.
- Brandeis, Louis D., Other People's Money, and How the Bankers Use It, New York, 1914.

CHAPTER X

- Beard, Charles A., An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution, New York, 1913.
- Farrand, Max, The Framing of the Constitution, New Haven, 1913.
- Countryman, Edwin, The Supreme Court of the United States, Albany, 1913.
- Judson, F. N., The Judiciary and the People, New Haven, 1913.
- Moore, B. F., The Supreme Court and Unconstitutional Legislation, New York, 1913.
- Abbot, E. V., Justice and the Modern Law, Boston, 1913.
- Cleveland, F. A., Organized Democracy, New York, 1913.
- Coudert, F. R., Certainty and Justice, New York, 1913.

- Haines, C. G., *The American Doctrine of Judicial Supremacy*, New York, 1914.
- Laidler, H. W., *Boycotts and the Labor Struggle*, New York, 1914.
- Bulletins of the Labor Bureau, Washington, 1905-1914; contain full and accurate digests of statutes and decisions of courts pertaining to workers and industrial questions.
- Mitchell, John, *Organized Labor*, Philadelphia, 1913.
- Reform in the Administration of Justice*, Baltimore, 1914.
- Hunter, Robert, *Violence and the Labor Movement*, New York, 1914.

B. PROGRAMS FOR SOCIAL REFORM

THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY

Social and Industrial Reform.—Effective legislation looking to the prevention of industrial accidents, occupational diseases, overwork, involuntary unemployment, and other injurious effects incident to modern industry.

The fixing of minimum safety and health standards for the various occupations, and the exercise of the public authority of State and Nation, including the Federal control over interstate commerce and the taxing power, to maintain such standards.

The prohibition of child labor.

Minimum wage standards for working women, to provide a "living scale" in all industrial occupations.

The prohibition of night work for women and the establishment of an eight-hour day for women and young persons.

One day's rest in seven for all wage workers.

The eight-hour day in continuous twenty-four hour industries.

The abolition of the convict contract labor system; substituting a system of prison production for governmental consumption only, and the application of prisoners' earnings to the support of their dependent families.

Publicity as to wages, hours and conditions of labor; full reports upon industrial accidents and diseases, and the opening to public inspection of all tallies, weights, measures and check systems on labor products.

Standards of compensation for death by industrial accident and injury and trade diseases, which will transfer the burden of lost earnings from the families of working people to the industry, and thus to the community.

The protection of home life against the hazards of sickness, irregular employment and old age, through the adoption of a system of social insurance adapted to American use.

The development of the creative labor power of America by lifting the last load of illiteracy from American youth, and establishing continuation schools for industrial education under public control and encouraging agricultural education and demonstration in rural schools.

The establishment of industrial research laboratories to put the methods and discoveries of science at the service of American producers.

Political.¹—Direct primaries for the nomination of State and National officers, nation-wide preferential primaries for candidates for the presidency, direct election of United States Senators by the people. Urge on

¹ Most of the so-called "political" reforms in this platform and in that of the Socialists have a plain social bearing.

all States the short ballot, with responsibility to the people secured by the initiative, referendum and recall.

Remaining forests, coal and oil lands, water powers and other natural resources . . . are more likely to be wisely conserved and utilized for the general welfare if held in the public hands.

The Progressive party, believing that no people can justly claim to be a true democracy which denies political rights on account of sex, pledges itself to the task of securing equal suffrage to men and women alike.

Restriction of the power of courts:

First, when an act passed under the police power of the State is held unconstitutional under the State constitution by the courts, the people, after an ample interval for deliberation, shall have an opportunity to vote on the question whether they desire the act to become a law, notwithstanding such decision.

Second, every decision of the highest Appellate Court of a State declaring an act of the Legislature unconstitutional on the ground of its violation of the Federal Constitution, shall be subject to the same review by the Supreme Court of the United States as is now accorded to decisions sustaining such legislation.

A graduated inheritance tax as a means of equalizing the obligations of holders of property to government.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

Collective Ownership.—First, the collective ownership and democratic management of railroads, wire and wireless telegraphs and telephones, express service, steamboat lines and all other social means of transportation and communication and of all large-scale industries.

Second, the immediate acquirement by the municipalities, the States or the Federal Government of all grain elevators, stockyards, storage warehouses and other distributing agencies, in order to reduce the present extortionate cost of living.

Third, the extension of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests and water power.

Fourth, the further conservation and development of natural resources for the use and benefit of all the people:

- (a) By scientific forestation and timber protection.
- (b) By the reclamation of arid and swamp tracts.
- (c) By the storage of flood waters and the utilization of water power.
- (d) By the stoppage of the present extravagant waste of the soil and of the products of mines and oil wells.
- (e) By the development of highway and waterway systems.

Fifth, the collective ownership of land wherever practicable and, in cases where such ownership is impracticable, the appropriation by taxation of the annual rental value of all land held for speculation or exploitation.

Sixth, the collective ownership and democratic management of the banking and currency system.

Unemployment.—The immediate Government relief of the unemployed by the extension of all useful public works. All persons employed on such works to be engaged directly by the Government under a work day of not more than eight hours and at not less than the prevailing union wages. The Government also to establish employment bureaus; to lend money to States and municipalities, without interest, for the purpose of carrying on public works, and to take such other measures within

its power as will lessen the widespread misery of the workers caused by the misrule of the capitalist class.

Industrial Demands.—The conservation of human resources, particularly of the lives and well-being of the workers and their families:

First, by shortening the workday in keeping with the increased productiveness of machinery.

Second, by securing to every worker a rest period of not less than a day and a half in each week.

Third, by securing a more effective inspection of workshops, factories and mines.

Fourth, by forbidding the employment of children under sixteen years of age.

Fifth, by abolishing the brutal exploitation of convicts under the contract system, and prohibiting the sale of goods so produced in competition with other labor.

Sixth, by forbidding the interstate transportation of the products of child labor and of all uninspected factories and mines.

Seventh, by abolishing the profit system in government work, and substituting either the direct hire of labor or the awarding of contracts to coöperative groups of workers.

Eighth, by establishing minimum wage scales.

Ninth, by abolishing official charity and substituting a non-contributory system of old-age pensions, a general system of insurance by the State of all its members against unemployment and invalidism and a system of compulsory insurance by employers of their workers, without cost to the latter, against industrial diseases, accidents and death.

Political Demands.—First, absolute freedom of press, speech and assemblage.

Second, the adoption of a graduated income tax, the

increase of the rates of the present corporation tax and the extension of inheritance taxes, graduated in proportion to the value of the estate and to nearness of kin—the proceeds of these taxes to be employed in the socialization of industry.

Third, the gradual reduction of all tariff duties, particularly those on the necessaries of life. The Government to guarantee the reëmployment of wage-earners who may be disemployed by reason of changes in tariff schedules.

Fourth, the abolition of the monopoly ownership of patents and the substitution of collective ownership, with direct rewards to inventors by premiums or royalties.

Fifth, unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women.

Sixth, the adoption of the initiative, referendum and recall and of proportional representation, nationally as well as locally.

Seventh, the abolition of the Senate and of the veto power of the President.

Eighth, the election of the President and Vice-President by direct vote of the people.

Ninth, the abolition of the power usurped by the Supreme Court of the United States to pass upon the constitutionality of the legislation enacted by Congress. National laws to be repealed only by act of Congress or by a referendum vote of the whole people.

Tenth, the abolition of the present restrictions upon the amendment of the Constitution, so that that instrument may be amendable by a majority of the voters in a majority of the States.

Eleventh, the granting of the right of suffrage in the District of Columbia, with representation in Congress

and a democratic form of municipal government for purely local affairs.

Twelfth, the extension of democratic government to all United States territory.

Thirteenth, the enactment of further measures for general education and particularly for vocational education in useful pursuits. The Bureau of Education to be made a department.

Fourteenth, the enactment of further measures for the conservation of health. The creation of an independent Bureau of Health, with such restrictions as will secure full liberty to all schools of practice.

Fifteenth, the separation of the present Bureau of Labor from the Department of Commerce and Labor and its elevation to the rank of a department.¹

Sixteenth, abolition of all Federal District Courts and the United States Circuit Courts of Appeals. State courts to have jurisdiction in all cases arising between citizens of the several States and foreign corporations. The election of all judges for short terms.

Seventeenth, the immediate curbing of the power of the courts to issue injunctions.

Eighteenth, the free administration of justice.

Nineteenth, the calling of a convention for the revision of the Constitution of the United States.

FEDERATION OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA

We deem it the duty of all Christian people to concern themselves directly with certain practical industrial prob-

¹ This has now been done. William Banchop Wilson, of Pennsylvania, was nominated by President Woodrow Wilson the first Secretary of Labor and was duly confirmed by the Senate.

lems. To us it seems that the churches must stand—

For equal rights and complete justice for all men in all stations of life.

For the right of all men to the opportunity of self-maintenance, a right ever to be wisely and strongly safeguarded against encroachments of every kind.

For the right of workers to some protection against the hardships often resulting from the swift crises of industrial change.

For the principle of conciliation and arbitration in industrial dissensions.

For the protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, occupational disease, injuries and mortality.

For the abolition of child labor.

For such regulations of the conditions of toil for women as shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community.

For the suppression of the "sweating system."

For the gradual and reasonable reduction of the hours of labor to the lowest practicable point, and for that degree of leisure for all which is a condition of the highest human life.

For a release from employment one day in seven.

For a living wage as a minimum in every industry, and for the highest wage that each industry can afford.

For the most equitable division of the products of industry that can be ultimately devised.

For suitable provision for the old age of the workers and for those incapacitated by injury.

For the abolition of poverty.

INDEX

- Accident, insurance against, 276; surgical treatment of, 278.
- Adams Express Company, 306.
- Advertising, economic waste of, 76; effect on freedom of the press, 317.
- Ahab and Naboth's vineyard, 3.
- Alice in Wonderland, 299.
- Altenhoff, garden city of, 169.
- Altruism, of Comte, 25.
- American Federation of Labor, 21, 328.
- America, resources of, 48; not the leader of democracy, 49, 51; following the Roman Empire, 317.
- American Prison Association, 218.
- Americanitis, the slum disease, 148.
- Amos, origin of, 5; cited, 6.
- Anæmia, cause of, 256.
- Armaments, fallacy of, 243.
- Arbitration, in New Zealand, 314.
- Archbald case, 348.
- Aristocracy, among Hebrews, 3-7; versus democracy, 17; the new, of wealth, 52.
- Arkansas, and the contract system, 237.
- Arnold, Benedict, 71.
- Army and Navy, effect of standing, 199; typhoid in, 269.
- Australia, new capital of, 167.
- Automobile, and housing problem, 164.
- Baker, George F., quoted, 310.
- Baltimore, department stores of, 95. ✓
- Banks, Nathaniel P., III.
- Beatitudes, pretended respect for, 107.
- Bennett, Homer Clark, quoted, 190.
- Berlin, death-rate in, 153; model tenements of, 156; and city planning, 175; syphilis in, 185; anti-war demonstration in, 246.
- Berne, Socialist congress in, 246.
- "Best citizens," ethics of, 358, 365, 366.
- Bimson, chief of police, 365, 366.
- Blacklist, declared legal, 354.
- Blackstone, cited, 70, 347.
- "Bobbin Boy," III.
- Boards of health, and child labor, 117; power of, 262, 274.
- Boorriboola Gha, 33.
- Boston and Maine railway, "unscrambled," 312.

- Boston "tea party," 337.
- Boycott, declared illegal, 354.
- Brotherhood, in teachings of Jesus, 17; implications of, 19 *seq.*; and service, 24; among workers, 299.
- Bryce, Viscount, on garden cities, 168.
- Bucks Stove & Range Company, 354.
- Burns, detective, 349.
- Business, ethical character of, 290, 300. *v*
- Caisson disease, 267.
- Capital punishment, abolished for women, 88; indefensible, 234.
- Capitalism, waste of, 78; prevents progress, 91; and prostitution, 184; vicious circle of, 198; maintains vice, 209; founded on exploitation, 285; its use of inventions, 295; debases journalism, 316; opposed to labor, 328; dominant in society, 333; resorts to brute force, 359 *seq.*; ruthlessness of, 370, 371; defiant of law, 375.
- Capitalist, unnecessary, 295.
- Celibacy, encourages vice, 199.
- Charity, futility of, 69; tax on industry, 104, 105; social significance of, 275, 302, 304.
- Charles I, and his tyranny, 337.
- Chicago, department stores of, 95, 194; slums of, 148; its playgrounds, 166; absorbs Pullman, 169; segregation in, 204; poverty in, 302.
- Child, Bill of Rights of, 108; need of protecting, 111; exploitation of, 109.
- Child Labor, in canning factories, 110; too costly, 112; and play, 113; socially unnecessary, 115; unprofitable, 116; legislation on, 117; due to greed, 118, 143; and family life, 119; and education, 120 *seq.*; domestic and agricultural, 143; in streets, 144; regulation of, 146.
- Children's Bureau, 260.
- Church, leaning to aristocracy, 17; opposes true Gospel, 22; an object of service, 30; necessity of awakening, 34; must be leader, 35; a dynamo, 42; not advancing, 44; maintained by capitalists, 46; *quasi* partnership with vice, 206; preaching brotherhood, 299; wasting power, 313; shrinks from radical measures, 326; alliance with capitalism, 330; its future attitude, 331; workers' hatred of, 374.
- Cigar Makers' International Union, 336.
- City planning, in Australia, 167; in Germany, 174, 175.
- Civic pride, false, 155; in Germany, 173.
- Civilization, failure of, 54.
- Clark, Chief Justice Walter, quoted, 341.

- Clans, the Hebrew, 1; ethics of, 10.
- Classes, reason for, 60.
- Class consciousness, nature of, 327.
- Coal mines, and exploitation, 301.
- Colorado, penal farm of, 239; miners' strike in, 368; Federal grand jury's report, 369; courts of, 371.
- Collins, Justice, cited, 207.
- Collier's*, on Scott case, 367.
- Combination, or conspiracy, 355.
- Commissioner of Education, report of, 121.
- Commission on Industrial Relations, 366.
- Competition, opposed to Gospel, 82.
- Comptroller of Currency, 310.
- Comte, and altruism, 25.
- Conservation, what it implies, 103.
- Conservatism, Professor Ross on, 43; of judges, 106, 342.
- Constitution, Federal, and Supreme Court, 343; Mr. Roosevelt on, 359; overriden by capitalists, 360 *seq.*
- Consumers' League, on living wage, 193.
- Contempt proceedings, origin of, 339; should be abolished, 341.
- Contract system, in prisons, 236 *seq.*; Southern experience with, 238; in Oregon, 240.
- Conversion, kind needed, 14, 38.
- Corporations, Blackstone on 70; size of, a menace, 81.
- Cost of living, 118, 305.
- Coudert, Frederic R., quoted 347
- Courts, obstacles to social progress, 106; juvenile, in Philadelphia, 157; abuse of injunction law, 335 *seq.*; decrease of respect for, 342; powers of, 343; administer injustice, 345; uphold capitalism, 353; of Colorado 371.
- Courts, decisions cited, 51, 76, 143, 210, 336, 341, 364.
- Crime, cost of, 216 *seq.*; homicidal, 217, 234; among rich and poor, 219; caused by poverty, 220, 228; cannot be expiated, 222; nor avenged, 222, 223; cure for, 225, 227; punishment fails to prevent, 226; more humane treatment of, 227; indeterminate sentences for, 230; parole system and, 231; first offenders and, 232; and capital punishment, 234; and prisons, 234 *seq.*; and women, 242; war the greatest, 242.
- Cross, social significance of, 39
- Damien, Father, 252.
- Danbury, hatters of, 355.
- David, and Hebrew monarchy, 3.
- Death-rate, in slums, 153; of infants, 257, 260.
- Declaration of Independence, in San Diego, 362.

- Democracy, in teaching of Jesus, 17, 19, 53; as yet untried, 20, 21; America not the leader in, 49; industrial, 52, 55; hope of, 53; and legislation, 83; and vice, 208; opposed to war, 247; and independent judges, 344.
- Department Stores, women in, 95, 99; and the press, 317.
- Despotism, among the Hebrews, 2; industrial, 55; judicial, 336, 345; economic, 52, 55, 76, 293, 300, 334.
- Diaz, President of Mexico, 248.
- Dickens, on Podsnappery, 183.
- Disease, God not author of, 58, 251; the act of man, 251; economic significance of, 252; tuberculosis, 254 *seq.*; *beri beri*, 258; and ignorance, 260, 261; occupational, 263 *seq.*; typhoid, 268 *seq.*; and vivisection, 270 *seq.*; insurance against, 275.
- Dives and Lazarus, 282.
- "Divine right," of judges, 342.
- Dorcas, 304.
- Dresden, and her garden city, 171.
- "Due process of law," 364.
- Düsseldorf, and city planning, 176.
- Education, cost of, 121; and illiteracy, 122; theories of, 123; practical vs. cultural, 124; in public schools, 125 *seq.*; Froebel's contribution to, 129, 131; Montessori method in, 130; aim of, 132; secondary, 133 *seq.*; Booker Washington and, 134; and technical schools, 135; and physical culture, 138 *seq.*; and food, 140; and housing, 153; in hygiene, 260, 262.
- Edward VI, labor laws of, 318.
- Efficiency, forbids overstrain, 74; Secretary Redfield on, 80; and minimum wage, 103; opposed to child labor, 115; among girl workers, 198; and education, 262; and occupational disease, 265.
- Elijah, prophet, 5.
- Elisha, prophet, 5.
- England, repeals conspiracy laws, 51; adopts minimum wage, 102; illiteracy in, 122; treatment of criminals in, 226; picketing legalized in, 336; social legislation of, 345.
- Environment, a saved, 40; and character, 83, 250.
- Essen, garden city of Krupps, 169.
- Ethics, defects of current, 14; new, 41; capitalistic, 44; double standard of, 190; and environment, 83, 250; and wealth, 291; capitalist, defended, 351; should make distinctions, 373.
- Eugenics, 280 *seq.*
- Europe, segregation in, 205.
- Evangelism, new and old, 14.
- Evening Post*, quoted, 195.
- Expiation, and criminal law, 222.

- Exploitation, opposed to stewardship, 24; and the child, 109; origin of, 284; founded on property in land, 286 *seq.*; not guilt of individuals, 297; of telegraphers, 301; by express companies, 306; and freedom, 313; New Zealand's lesson on, 313 *seq.*; inseparable from wage system, 315; indirect effects of, 316; see Profit.
- Factories, earnings of women in, 95; tuberculosis in, 256; sanitation of, 263.
- Fatherhood of God, in Old Testament, 9; Jesus on, 11-13; means brotherhood of man, 18.
- Federation of Churches, on poverty, 329.
- Fels, Joseph, quoted, 291.
- Feminism, defined, 86.
- Ferrero, quoted, 90.
- Flexner, Abraham, quoted, 205.
- Food, deficiency of, 257; high prices of, 282. See Malnutrition.
- Ford Automobile Company, 321 *seq.*
- Foss, Governor, quoted, 218.
- France, first offenders in, 233.
- Froebel, and education, 129.
- Gambling, commercialized, 187.
- Garden cities, 168 *seq.* Pullman, 168. Altenhoff, 169; Port Sunlight, 169; Letchworth, 171; Hellerau, 171.
- Georgia, and juvenile crime, 233.
- Germany, illiteracy in, 122; secondary instruction in, 137; garden cities of, 171; and the slum problem, 172 *seq.*; municipal enterprises in, 176; and war scares, 244, 245; effect of social insurance on, 277.
- God, ideal of, taught by Jesus, 11, 221; not author of social injustice, 58; does not will disease, 58, 251.
- Golden Rule, 27, 107, 114.
- Gompers, Samuel, 338.
- Good Roads, how obtainable, 240.
- Good Samaritan, 253, 329.
- Gospel of Jesus, heart of, 13; means liberty, 16; on altruism, 25; new or old, 26; orthodox idea of, 68; forbids exploitation, 69, 301; forbids two ethical standards, 70; why socially ineffective, 71; condemns competition and monopoly, 82; relation to women, 89, 97; and social duties, 108; and schools, 129; and slums, 181; and vice, 206; and prayer, 251; and vivisection, 270; and disease, 279; and social ills, 318; making it mean something, 329; and labor problems, 372; condemns violence, 373; in twentieth century, 376.
- Graham, Sylvester, 259.
- Greed, and social evils, 151; see Exploitation, Profit.

- Hague, tribunal of, 72.
 Harlan, Justice, quoted, 344.
 Hatfield, Governor, 363.
 Hebrew, clans of, 1; monarchy among, 2; slavery among, 3; and social struggle, 3, 7, 9; their prophets, 5; clan ethics of, 10.
 Hellerau, garden city, 169.
 High Commission, tyranny of, 337, 338.
 High Finance, and the Morgans, 296, 297; and T. W. Lawson, 307; its exploits, 309; and Money Trust, 309 *seq.*; and Ford, 323.
 Homicides, comparative ratios of, 217; protection against, 234.
 Housing, good, 156; and private enterprise, 159; problem of, in Philadelphia, 164; see Slum.
 Howells, William D., quoted, 220.
 Huerta, and revolution in Mexico, 248.
 Humaneness, progress in, 226.
 Hunter, Robert, on poverty, 283.
 Hygiene, sex, 190.
 Hyndman (H. M.) on revolution, 285.
 Idaho, Supreme Court of, 341.
 Ignorance, cause of vice, 184, 189; of public men, 261; and infant mortality, 260; see Illiteracy.
 Illinois, State Senate, investigation by, 95.
 Illiteracy, in various countries, 122.
 Immigration, effect on illiteracy, 122; on slums, 148.
 "Inalienable rights," 294.
 Indianapolis, mayor of, 357.
 Individualism, failure of, 26.
 Industry, and education of girls, 98; effect of technical schools of Germany on, 138; socialization of, 286, 296, 319 *seq.*; and profit-sharing, 321 *seq.*
 Industrialism, end of, 290.
 Industrial Workers of the World, 21, 361, 365, 366.
 Inefficiency, deadly sin, 37; of capitalism, 78; and overwork, 74, 267.
 Infant mortality, 257, 260.
 Injunction, abuse of by courts, 335 *seq.*; justification of, 336; real object of, 337; should be limited, 341.
 Injustice, society refuses to consider, 303; see Justice, social.
 Insurance, fire, cause of crime, 220; social, 275.
 Interstate Commerce Commission, 291.
 Invention and capitalism, 295.
 Investigations, Illinois State Senate, 95; futility of, 186; Congressional at Lawrence, 360.
 Isaiah, prophet, 4, 5.
 Italy, social legislation of, 345.

- Japan, and war scares, 244.
- Jehovah, exclusive worship of, 7, 8.
- Jeshurun, ancient and modern, 317.
- Jesus, his idea of God, 11-13; his teaching revolutionary, 15, 26; on brotherhood, 17; love and forgiveness, 18, 19; on stewardship, 24; on altruism, 25; prophet of democracy, 53; Great Physician, 279.
- Jones, "Mother," 364.
- John (Baptist), questions Jesus, 15.
- Johnson, fire commissioner, 220.
- Judas, 71, 291.
- Judges, Bourbon, 106; criminality of, 339; "divine right" of, 341; W. H. Taft on, 342; "independence" of, 344; fail to comprehend their time, 346; slaves of precedent, 342; little brothers of the rich, 348.
- Jury, right of trial by, 337.
- Juvenile offenders, in Philadelphia, 157; in Georgia, 233; in Wisconsin, 233.
- Kavanagh, Judge Marcus, quoted, 222.
- Keen, Dr. W. W., on vivisection, 271.
- Key, Ellen, quoted, 109.
- Kindergarten, 129.
- Kingdom, Jesus' teaching on, 13; means social transformation, 32; Ritschl on, 251.
- Krupps, their garden city, 169, and war scares, 245.
- Kutter, Hermann, quoted, 22.
- Labor, defined, 75; *vs.* play, 130.
- Labor Argus*, suppressed, 363.
- Laissez faire*, doctrine of, 81.
- Land, private property in, among Hebrews, 2-5; cause of discontent, 57; exploitation founded on, 286; and ethics, 287.
- Land tax, in New Zealand, 314.
- Laud (Archbishop), 338.
- Law, teaching of Hebrew, 9; administration of criminal, 218; defined, 332 *seq.*; made for and by whom, 350; does not secure justice, 352; President Taft on, 353; "due process of," 364.
- "Law and order," defined, 332 *seq.*; unfair administration of, 348 *seq.*; judged by fruits, 358; does not really exist, 375; must be Christianized, 376.
- Lawlessness, case of McNamaras, 303, 349, 367, 372; denunciations of, 332; of judges, 340; a symptom of health, 374.
- Lawrence, strike at, 93, 318, 350, 360 *seq.*
- Lawson, Thomas W., quoted, 307.
- Lazear, Captain, 252, 270.
- Lathrop, Julia C., report of, 260.

- Lead poisoning, 265.
- Legislation, on child labor, 117, 143, 147; on housing reform, 160, 161, 166; against vice trust, 200, 210; on public health, 268.
- Leipzig, and housing problem, 175.
- Leisure, social value of, 74; women's need of, 90.
- L'Enfant, Major, plan of Washington, 167.
- Letchworth, garden city, 169.
- Lever Brothers, establish garden city, 169.
- Lincoln, Abraham, 20, 65.
- Lindenfelt, Lieutenant, crime of, 371.
- Liquor, increasing consumption of, 212; solution of problem, 214.
- Little Falls, strike at, 93, 318.
- Living wage, 193; see Wage.
- London, slums of, 148; syphilis in, 185; and anti-war demonstration, 246.
- London, Samuel H., cited, 187.
- Louisiana, timber strike in, 362.
- Ludlow, massacre at, 371.
- Maccabees, and the social struggle, 9.
- Machiavelli, quoted, 59.
- McNamaras, case of, 303, 349, 367, 372.
- Machinery, "labor-saving," 80; fails to profit workers, 91.
- Madero, and revolution in Mexico, 248.
- Magna Charta, 337.
- Maine, prohibition in, 214.
- Malnutrition, effects of, 257; extent of, 304.
- Mammon, worship of, 21, 22, 282, 291, 331.
- Manhattan, land in, 67; prostitutes of, 187.
- Mann act, 210.
- Manual training, 133.
- Marriage, antidote to vice, 199; "virtuous," 201; state regulation of, 280.
- Marx, Karl, definition of wealth, 292; and Engels, 360.
- Maryland, repeals conspiracy laws, 51.
- Massachusetts, and child labor, 146; cost of crime in, 218.
- Mellen, Charles S., quoted, 291.
- Mercury poisoning, 265.
- Messiah, Hebrew ideal of, 8; in time of Jesus, 9, 15; limitations of, 10.
- Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, and model tenements, 178.
- Mexico, recent troubles in, 248; backwardness of, 372.
- Micah, prophet, 3, 5, 6.
- Michigan, copper strike in, 368.
- Middle Ages, and social justice, 72.
- Middleman, elimination of, 305.
- Mill, John Stuart, quoted, 295.
- Minimum wage, for women, 102; in Victoria, 103; em-

- ployes and, 104, 196; economic criticism of, 105; and child labor, 147; palliative only, 195.
 Ministers, teach capitalistic ethics, 44; attitude to workers, 41, 65, 93, 358, 373.
 Missions, new significance of, 32.
 Mitchell, John, 338.
 Mob, rule of, 340.
 Monopoly, and prices, 54; opposed to Gospel, 82; government ownership of, 315.
 Morgan, J. P., his profession of faith, 23, 80; social service of, 296, 297; on Money Trust, 310; on "unscrambling of eggs," 311.
 Mouth-hygiene, effect of, 141.
 Municipalities, and rapid transit, 164; enterprises of German, 176.
 Munich, and garden cities, 171, 175.

 Naboth's vineyard, 3.
 Napoleon, quoted, 72.
 Nazareth, Jesus in synagogue of, 16.
 Nehemiah, and the social struggle, 9.
 Nevada, and child labor, 146.
 New Hampshire, and child labor, 146.
 New York (State) and trades unions, 51; canning factories of, 110; and physical examination of children, 117; and child labor, 146; penal farm of, 239.
 New York (City) department stores of, 95; slums of, 148, 149; housing problem in, 160; living wage in, 193; incendiary fires in, 220; homicides in, 244.
 New York, New Haven & Hartford railway, 309, 312.
 New Zealand, infant mortality in, 257; social experiments in, 313 *seq.*
 Newspapers, affected by exploitation, 316; and advertising, 317.
 Nietzsche, scorn of Christianity, 17.
 Nomads, Hebrews originally, 1; the Rechabites, 4.
 Nordau, Max, quoted, 75.
 Nürnberg, and garden cities, 171.

 Ohio, penal farm of, 239.
 Oklahoma, and child labor, 146.
 Oligarchy, judicial, 345.
 Oregon, and penal system, 240.
 Overwork, effects of, 74, 267.

 Palliatives, futility of, 326.
 Paris, syphilis in, 185; anti-war demonstration in, 246.
 Parole system, 231.
 Paterson, strike at, 46, 93, 318, 365; investigation of, 366.
 Patriotism, false and true, 243.
 Penology, false, 221 *seq.*; true, 224, 229; and prisons, 236.
 Pensions, old age in New Zealand, 315.

- Pennsylvania, and women workers, 92; smaller cities of, 96; and child labor, 146.
- Philadelphia, department stores of, 95; slums of, 148; juvenile courts in, 157; and housing problem, 164; living wage in, 193.
- Philanthropy, social value of, 302.
- Phosphorus poisoning, 265.
- Picketing, in England and America, 336.
- Pitney, Judge, quoted, 76.
- Plague, Great Black, see Syphilis.
- Plague, Great White, see Tuberculosis.
- Plato, on end of State, 82.
- Play, value of, 113.
- Podsnap and Podsnappery, 183.
- Poffenberger, Judge, quoted, 364.
- Police, compact with vice, 187; uphold capitalism, 357.
- Port Sunlight, garden city, 169.
- Pouget, on social ethics, 27; cited, 75.
- Poverty, and slum, 152; in Berlin tenements, 157; cause of sexual vice, 188, 198; defined in social terms, 192; and crime, 220, 228; charity no cure for, 275; cause of all social ills, 282; Robert Hunter on, 283; and exploitation, 284; and socialization of industry, 296; investigation of, 302; sovereign cure of, 319; and profit-sharing, 321 *seq.*; Federation of Churches on, 329.
- Prayer, Gospel idea of, 251.
- Prisons, defects of, 235; reforms in, 236 *seq.*
- Prodigal Son, parable of, 12, 191.
- Profit, and child labor, 143; and housing problem, 163; and the saloon, 211; is theft, 290; everything sacrificed to, 294; see Exploitation.
- Profit-sharing, possibilities of, 321 *seq.*
- Prohibition, fails to prohibit, 213.
- Property, origin of private, 66; offenses against, 228; "sacredness" of, 293; true function of, 294.
- Prostitution, commercialization of, 182, 187; the sin of society, 183; and capitalism, 184; inevitable, 192; relation to wages, 193-195; futile remedies for, 200, 202 *seq.*; Dr. Flexner on, 205; and property, 206.
- Prussia, illiteracy in, 122.
- Pullman, town of, 168.
- Punishment, no cure for crime, 226.
- Queensbury, Marquis of, and industry, 81.
- Quinlan, Patrick, case of, 365.
- Rapid transit, and municipalities, 164.
- Rechabites, 4.

- Redemption, in Old Testament, 8, 10.
- Redfield, Secretary, on labor costs, 80.
- Rent, nature of, 67.
- Retardation in schools, causes and cure of, 127 *seq.*
- Retribution, Gospel idea of, 221.
- Revenge, forbidden by Jesus, 222; anti-social, 224.
- Revolution, proclaimed by Jesus, 15; Hyndman on the coming, 285; stages of, 320; in industry, 346, 347.
- Ritschl, Albrecht, quoted, 251.
- Rockefeller, John D., rise to wealth, 50; origin of fortune, 292; nature of his wealth, 293.
- Rockefeller, John D., jr., testimony on Colorado strike, 370.
- Rockefeller Bureau of Social Hygiene, 187.
- Rock Island railway, "unscrambled," 312.
- Roman Empire and its decay, 90.
- Ross, Professor E. A., quoted, 43, 313.
- Roosevelt, Theodore, and the Constitution, 359.
- Rosenthal murder, 188.
- Russell, Dr. James, quoted, 134.
- Russia, laws protecting women, 92; homicides in, 217; social legislation of, 345.
- Sabotage, criticisms of, 69.
- St. Francis, 304.
- Saloon, secret of its immunity, 187; commercialization, 212; how to banish, 213.
- Salvation, what it is, 13; orthodox doctrine of, 30; new ideal of, 38, 40.
- Salvation Army, 304.
- Samaritan, Good, 253, 329.
- San Diego and the I. W. W., 361, 362.
- Sanatoriums, 254, 256.
- Sanitation of factories, 263, 268.
- "Scab," ethical status of, 70.
- Schedule K and its beauties, 361.
- Schools, failure of public, 125 *seq.*; industrial and technical, 135; continuation, 136.
- Scotland, illiteracy in, 122.
- Scott, Alexander, case of, 367.
- Selling, waste in, 77.
- Seneca, quoted, 224.
- Sentences, equal, 226; indeterminate, 230.
- Segregation, and social vice, 203-205.
- Shaw, George Bernard, quoted, 182.
- Sherman Act, effect of, 355, 356.
- Sin, false distinctions about, 14; new definition of, 36; deadly, 37; social, 313.
- Slavery, among Hebrews, 3; chattel and wage, 76; social foundation of, 287; essence of, 300.
- Slum, in Europe, 149; and greed, 151; and death-rate, 153; not necessary, 154; and

- health, 158; and private enterprise, 159; and playgrounds, 166; problem in Germany, 172 *seq.*; in smaller cities, 180; and Gospel of Jesus, 181; and vice, 197.
- Small, Professor, quoted, 295.
- Social justice, futility of many efforts at, 34; and the land, 57, 62, 67; and inheritance, 68; in Middle Ages, 72; difficulty in attaining, 80; and ignorance, 102, 110; and indifference, 107; and good housing, 152.
- Social Service Commission, 94.
- Socialism, morality of, 196; Bismarck and, 178; and war, 246.
- Society, regeneration of, 28; how constituted, 61.
- Solomon, and Hebrew monarchy, 3.
- Spain, war with, 248; social legislation of, 345.
- Spencer, Herbert, on government, 82.
- Star Chamber, Court of, 337, 338.
- State, Plato on, 82.
- Steel Trust, on sabotage, 69; interest of in war, 245; relief work of, 276; favors to, 351.
- Sterilization, compulsory, 281.
- Stewardship, Jesus on, 24.
- Stocks, "watering" of, 306 *seq.*
- Strafford, 338.
- Strassburg, and housing problem, 175.
- Strikes, and injunctions, 337; at Lawrence, 93, 318, 350, 360 *seq.*; at Little Falls, 93, 318; in Louisiana, 362; at Paterson, 46, 93, 318, 365, 366; in Michigan, 368; in Colorado, 368 *seq.*
- Stuart tyranny, and America, 363.
- Suffrage, women, 86; in New Zealand, 315.
- Sun Printing Company, case of, 336.
- Surgery, stimulated by social insurance, 278; and vivisection, 270 *seq.*
- Syphilis, a penalty, 252; and eugenics, 280.
- Taft, William Howard, on social justice, 66; on judges, 342; on law, 353.
- Talent, career open to, 72.
- Taxation, by private persons, 54; of society by industries, 115; power of, 293.
- Taylor, Charles Keen, and physical culture, 141.
- Taylor, Frederick W., quoted, 353.
- Telegraphs, in New Zealand, 315; exploitation of operators, 301.
- Tenements, rear, 157, 158; model, 159 *seq.*; defined, 165; "dumb bell," 162; how financed in Germany, 178; manufactures in, 198.
- Testamentary rights, 67.
- Thrift, meaning of, 60.
- Toil, defined, 75.

- Tools, private ownership of, 300.
- Trades unions, 20, 51.
- Tribune*, New York, on Paterson troubles, 367.
- Trusts, Brewers', 212; Money, 309 *seq.*; socialization of, 321; Standard Oil, 349; Woolen, and Sherman Act, 356; Lumber, 362.
- Tuberculosis, a penalty, 252; cost of "cures," 254; prevalence of, 255; cause of, 256; in certain trades, 264; and eugenics, 280.
- Tuskegee Institute, 134.
- Typhoid, scourge of, 268; prevention of, 269.
- Unearned increment, 58, 67, 179.
- United Charities Society, on poverty, 302.
- University, of Wisconsin, 34; exists for culture, 124.
- Utah, and child labor, 146.
- Vaughn, Father, quoted, 29.
- Vciller, Lawrence, quoted, 158.
- Venereal disease, prevalence of, 185; see Syphilis.
- Vera Cruz, occupation of, 249.
- Vicarious suffering, 12.
- Vice, and the police, 187; and poverty, 188; economic causes of, 195; in guise of marriage, 201; segregation no remedy for, 203-205; and politics, 207, 208; and capitalism, 209; and the law, 210.
- Victoria, and the minimum wage, 103.
- Violence, forbidden by Jesus, 15; two kinds of, 373.
- Vitamines, and food values, 258.
- Vivisection, value of, 270 *seq.*
- Wage, a living, 193; child earners, 109; minimum, 102, 103, 104, 105, 147, 195, 196.
- Wage system, and progress, 106; and exploitation, 315.
- Wall Street, men of, 297; leaders in, 310.
- War, crime of, 242; and armaments, 243; professional obsession about, 244; war against, by workers, 246; private, by capitalism, 372.
- Ward, Professor, on philanthropy, 302.
- Washington (State) reformatory of, 240.
- Washington (City), plan of, 167, 174.
- Washington, Booker. and education, 134.
- Waste, of capitalism, 78; of human life, 79.
- "Water" (fictitious value) 306 *seq.*
- Wealth, ethical significance of, 291; nature of modern, 293; see Mammon.
- Weekly Issue*, and Paterson strike, 367.
- West Virginia, and coal strike, 363.
- Western Union Telegraph Company, 354.

- White, Alfred T., and model tenements, 159.
- White, Andrew D., quoted, 217.
- Wilson, President, and Mexican troubles, 309; on banking system, 309; surrender to Money Trust, 311.
- Wisconsin, university of, 34; and child labor, 146; and juvenile offenders, 233; and accident insurance, 276; and eugenics, 280.
- Wisdom of Sirach, 9.
- Women, "wrongs" of, 87; laws favorable to, 88; in industry, 92, 93; wages of, 94, 95; causes of economic deficiency of, 97; competition among, 99; lack of organization, 100; and domestic service, 101; minimum wage for, 102; effect of economic dependence on, 201.
- Wood, W. M., of Woolen Trust, 349, 350.
- Work, universal duty of, 57; right of all, 63; zoölogical morality of, 75.
- Workers, not ethically superior, 20; and "a full dinner pail," 50; their demands, 62; their needs, 64; ethics of, 70; women, 92; in clothing trades, 93; strike of, against war, 246; insurance of, 275, 276; taxed for non-workers, 298; slaves of capitalism, 300.
- World*, New York, on Michigan strike, 368.
- "World," new idea of, 36.
- Zebedee, sons of, 23.
- Zueblin, Professor, quoted, 50.

THE following pages contain advertisements of books by the same author or on kindred subjects.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

The Reformation in Germany

By HENRY C. VEDDER

Cloth, 8vo. \$3.00 net.

The story of the Reformation is here retold by Dr. Vedder in the light of newer historical theory and the results of a generation's research at hand. This is the first attempt, in the English language at least, to interpret the religious struggle of the sixteenth century in terms of economics. Founded on a careful study of the sources, the work takes due account of the mass of material that has accumulated, but recognizes also that the art of historical narration should not be secondary to the science of historical investigation. If the author's conclusions are accepted many an idol may be shattered many a theory consigned to the limbo of false ideas; but a clearer and truer appreciation of the significance and worth of the Reformation—what it really was and what it actually accomplished—should be the result. The approaching fifth centennial of the publication of Luther's theses makes the appearance of the volume most timely.

" . . . produced a most important addition to the literature of the subject. In my opinion his most noteworthy service has been the tracing out of the inner thought-relations and sequences of the various stages of the movement. This has not within my knowledge been done so well anywhere else."—*Review and Exposition*.

" . . . it is a pleasure to commend this volume as an unobstrusive display of originality, insight, and scholarship."—*The Dial*.

"A singularly lively and readable volume."—*New York Globe*.

PUBLISHED BY
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
64-66 Fifth Avenue
New York

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus

Cloth, 12mo. \$1.50 net.

Macmillan Standard Library Edition, \$.50.

"Henry C. Vedder's *Socialism and The Ethics of Jesus* begins with a brief history of socialistic principles and parties in modern times, together with a critical examination of the principles of the present-day socialism. This is followed by a study of the social ethics of Jesus, including both the fundamental principles and their chief practical applications and an outline of the history of Christianity sufficient to show to what degree the church has failed to realize the social ideal of Jesus. The whole leads to an inquiry concerning the fitting attitude of those who profess the religion of Jesus to social questions and socialism. It is a timely discussion of a popular theme. The book is the outgrowth of many years' study of the problems involved."—*New York Evening Post*.

"It is an able and strong comparison of the ethical principles of the Master and those of modern socialism. Accepting those of the great Teachers as the standard, the tenets proclaimed by the socialists of to-day are subjected to the test. The author's clear and incisive setting-forth of this comparison—or rather contrast—will serve to clear the atmosphere for thinking that has grown hazy on this subject."—*Christian World*.

"Alike a history, an interpretation, and a criticism of modern socialism, Prof. Vedder's work is of great interest and value."

—*The Pittsburgh Gazette-Times*.

"The work is one of rare investigation, of profound thought, and of devoted sympathy for human effort and human interests. The author has produced here a work of the first order, which deserves candid and full recognition at the hands of all students of human life in its present stage of progress and development."

—*Salt Lake Tribune*.

PUBLISHED BY
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
64-66 Fifth Avenue
New York

NEW BOOKS ON RELIGION

DR. RAUSCHENBUSCH'S NEW WORK

Social Redemption

By WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH, Author of "Christianizing the Social Order," "Christianity and the Social Crisis," etc. Cloth, 12mo. \$1.50 net.

Dr. Rauschenbusch here pursues to further conclusions the general theme of his previous books. He deals less, however, in this volume with economics and more with the problem of how the new social convictions may be practically embodied in the life and thought of the church so that they shall not be intruders but members of the household. Among the questions which he raises and which, in a measure, he answers, are the following: How Can the New Social Feeling of Responsibility Be Utilized in Evangelistic Appeals, How Will the New Ideas of the Social Sin and Social Redemption Affect the Whole Scheme of Theology, the Doctrine of Atonement, for Example, How Can the Religious Feelings Called Out by the New Social Vision Be Expressed and Satisfied in the Prayers, the Hymns and the Liturgy, Ought There to Be Sacraments of Social Redemption Just as There Are Religious Sacraments of Individual Redemption. These represent very live issues and Dr. Rauschenbusch's ability to cope with them has been amply demonstrated.

PUBLISHED BY
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
64-66 Fifth Avenue
New York

NEW BOOKS ON RELIGION

The Development of the Christian Religion

BY SHAILER MATHEWS, Author of "The Church and the Changing Order," "The Gospel and the Modern Man," etc. Cloth, 12mo. \$1.50 net.

Dr. Mathews here enters upon the little explored territory of social theology. His general position is that the scientific theologian should approach his task through the social sciences, particularly history, rather than through philosophy. The main thesis of the book is that doctrines grow out of the same social forces as express themselves in other forms of life. Dr. Mathews finds seven creative social minds and treats the development of the various Christian doctrines as they have emerged from the earlier of these minds and must be created by our modern social mind. Such a treatment of Christian doctrine serves to make theology a vital rather than a merely scholastic or ecclesiastical matter. The study of the social minds of the past, with their creative influence on Christianity, gives a point of view for the study of the intellectual needs of today's religion. This volume conserves the values of the religious thinking of the past, and is, in addition, a positive force in the reconstruction of the religious thinking of the day.

The Christian Life in the Modern World

By FRANCIS G. PEABODY, Author of "Jesus Christ and the Social Question," etc. Cloth, 12mo.

The purpose of this book is to meet the increasing impression that Christian idealism is inapplicable to the conditions of modern life and to indicate the terms and conditions on which these ideals may be perpetuated. There are chapters on The Practicability of the Christian Life, The Christian Life and the Modern Family, The Christian Life and the Business World, The Christian Life and the Making of Money, The Christian Life and the Using of Money, The Christian Life and the Modern State and The Christian Life and the Christian Church.

PUBLISHED BY
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
64-66 Fifth Avenue
New York

NEW BOOKS ON RELIGION

Modern Religious Movements in India

By J. W. FARQUHAR.

Illustrated. Cloth, 8vo. \$2.50 net.

This comprehensive survey of present day religious tendencies in India is of tremendous importance and significance to every student of religion. In it are described the various new religious organizations which, under the impact of the West, have arisen in India during the past century. The Brahma, Prarthana, Arya, and Deva Samajes, the Ramakrishna Movement, Theosophy, the Bharata Dharma Mahamandal, the Caste and Sect Conferences, the Social Reform Movement, and the efforts of Muhammedans, Parsis, Jains and Sikhs to accommodate their systems to the needs of modern times are all dealt with in turn. Portraits of the leaders are included in the volume. The original basis of this work is the Hartford Lamson Lectures on the Religions of the World, though in its printed form the material has been revised and enlarged.

Vital Elements of Preaching

By ARTHUR S. HOYT, Professor of Homiletics and Sociology in Auburn Theological Seminary, and Author of "The Work of Preaching" and "The Preacher." Cloth, 12mo. \$1.50 net.

The Work of Preaching, one of Dr. Hoyt's former books, deals with the sources and formation of the sermon for the present age. *The Preacher*, still another of his works, places emphasis upon a vital spiritual personality in giving the message. This volume touches the temper of the man both as to the truth and the lives of his hearers. "Preaching," writes Dr. Hoyt in his preface, "is a social virtue. Nothing can be more fundamental to the preacher than his humanity. The deepest needs and desires of the age must be felt in his life if his word interprets aright the gospel of the new man."

The author here discusses the psychology of preaching, though without formal and philosophic analysis. He always has in mind the question, How shall we speak so as to help men into the largest life?

PUBLISHED BY
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
64-66 Fifth Avenue
New York

