

poverty, and that "a prosperous and contented India could defy six Russias."—Yellow fever has broken out in Rio Janeiro; the representatives of foreign powers have refused Admiral da Gama's request for recognition as a belligerent; the fighting continues in a desultory sort of way; there have as yet been no naval engagements between the Nictheroy and President Peixoto's other new ships and those of the insurgents.—Sir Samuel White Baker, the distinguished African explorer, died on December 30 at Newton Abbot, Devonshire, at the age of seventy-two.—The Manchester ship canal was opened on New Year's Day with a procession of twenty-five laden ocean-going vessels, witnessed by 100,000 spectators.—John Y. McKane has been indicted by the Grand Jury on eleven separate charges of unlawful conduct at the Gravesend, L. I., election.



A Great Opportunity

The Outlook commented last week on the test to which our National spirit and our National organization are being subjected by the condition of things during the present winter. Emphasis must also be laid on the fact that, while we are now confronting a great peril, we are also offered a great opportunity. Never, perhaps, in the history of the world has there been a greater opportunity of dissipating false impressions and of establishing true relations between the different classes which compose society. Many of the greatest perils which society has to face, and to which it has more than once succumbed, have arisen from the mutual ignorance of different sections of society. It is probable that if any real knowledge of the sentiments and the resources of the North had been possessed by the South thirty years ago there would have been no Civil War. It took a tremendous struggle to make the two sections in any way adequately acquainted with each other. Between the privileged and the less fortunate classes in France before the Revolution there was a great gulf of ignorance set, across which very few on either side were able to look. There were a few men who discerned the situation of things, who knew what the peasantry in the country and the populace in the great cities were suffering and what they were feeling, and who knew, on the other hand, the situation and sentiments of the privileged classes. But a tremendous upheaval took place before the mass of people had any idea that the old order of things was in danger.

The Outlook has always held that the only danger from industrial and social disturbances in this country would arise from an ignorance of conditions or from the indifference of the more fortunate classes toward the unfortunate classes. During the last ten years both the ignorance and the indifference have very largely vanished. Never before has there been such widespread knowledge of social and industrial conditions; never before has there been such active, intelligent, and sympathetic interest in the welfare of those upon whom the daily burdens of life rest heaviest. There is still much to be done, however; for there are a host of well-to-people to whom the problem of the poor is a vague phrase which means nothing, so far as their personal co-operation in its solution is concerned; and there are still a great many among the poorer classes who regard the rich with aversion, if not with hatred. There is a great opportunity this winter to awaken the interest of the well-to-do, on the one hand, and to dissipate the false impression among the poor, on the other hand. There is the greatest opportunity of the century to make the two great classes of society better acquainted

with each other, and to bring them into harmony with each other. If the great mass of those who are suffering from the depression of the times are made to feel this winter, by wise, intelligent, and far-reaching methods of relief, that their interests are understood and their needs cared for by the classes to whom they look up as more fortunate than themselves, a vast amount of antagonism will die; and with its disappearance will come a new sense of human companionship and a dawning hope of human fellowship which will be precious beyond all price in the future history of the country. A community in which the interest of one class for another is demonstrated, not by a lavish charity, but by a wise and self-respecting fellowship of interests, will have no place for the revolutionary Socialist or the self-immolating Anarchist. If the present suffering shall have as its outcome a new demonstration of the solidarity of society, in a truer knowledge, a warmer sympathy, and a more comprehensive and practical helpfulness between the two classes, it cannot cost too much. Such an outcome would mean more to the churches and to the religious life of the country than any other form of revival of religious enthusiasm; for it would be a new and unprecedented illustration of the Fatherhood of God, interpreted and revealed in the brotherhood of man.



How Not to Do It

It is somewhat discouraging, in such a time of distress as this, to find all manner of plans proposed for relief that have been tried in times past and have against them the testimony of experience. From New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh, St. Louis—all our great cities—come the same monotonous report of thousands of men and women willing to work, but without work, and on the verge of starvation. What are we, who are not on the verge of starvation, going to do about it? It is something to know what not to do.

Laissez faire, natural law, survival of the fittest, prove a lamentable failure. These unemployed are not "the fittest." Most of them can do only one thing well, and that one thing no one just now wishes done; and they are helpless. The "fittest" are not cold or hungry, though their incomes may be lessened. The much-glorified natural law and survival of the fittest has been tried; and under the trial millions have died of starvation in China, millions in India, and thousands if not millions in ancient Rome, and in France under the Bourbons.

Indulging in day-dreams about nationalization of land and industries is equally futile for the present exigency. We are stupid, it is true, if we do not recognize the fact that this army of unemployed is itself an indictment of our civilization, and a demand on us to better it. But, meantime, the army is on the edge of starvation. The question of organizing a victory may be postponed till to-morrow; the question of commissariat confronts us to-day. "Here," says General Booth, "is John Jones, in his hungry raggedness, asking for work that he may live and not die of sheer starvation in the midst of the wealthiest city in the world. What is to be done with John Jones?" That is the question. The nationalization of industries may prevent the production of another John Jones in 1894; but this is January, 1894, and John Jones cannot wait.

Equally idle is moralizing to him or to his wife and children about thrift. Doubtless a large proportion of the hungry and the cold are unthrifty; but doubtless also a large proportion of them have had very little incentive to thrift, very little education in thrift, and not much opportunity for thrift. Again we quote General Booth: "Thrift is a

great virtue, no doubt; but how is thrift to benefit those who have nothing? What is the use of the Gospel of Thrift to a man who had nothing to eat yesterday, and has not threepence to-day to pay for his lodging to-night?"

Then here comes the Charles Lamb philanthropist, himself giving and exhorting others to "give and ask no questions." And yet even he half confesses that this is no true charity, but only a payment for a pictorial aspect of life which cannot be omitted from the stage without injury to the play. "Rake not into the bowels of unwelcome truth to save a halfpenny. It is good to believe him. If he be not all that he pretendeth, *give*, and, under a personated father of a family, think, if thou pleasest, that thou hast relieved an indigent bachelor." But this mimic and unthinking charity—which is, in truth, no charity at all, since love is never thoughtless—has been tried on a great scale, and, like all falsehoods, only with injury. Literalism insisted on exact obedience to Christ's counsel: "Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away." To give to the poor was at one time in the history of the Roman Catholic Church the first of saintly virtues. "One of the first consequences," says Mr. Lecky, "of the exuberant charity of the Church was to multiply impostors and mendicants." It is as true of such careless and sentimental philanthropists now as then that "the poverty they have relieved has been insignificant compared with the poverty they have caused." It would be worse than folly for Protestants to fall into the error from which the Roman Catholic Church has extricated itself. It no longer "gives and asks no questions."

There is proposed a wholesale charity—the giving away of food and clothing to all applicants, the opening of churches or barracks where any one may have a bed for the asking, the attempt to erase God's law and write in lieu thereof, He that will not work, nevertheless he shall eat. This, too, has been tried on a great scale—a scale greater than proposed in New York and Chicago, and with limitations that promised to mitigate the evils of an indiscriminate charity. We quote, with abbreviations, from Froude's "Cæsar":

"The younger Gracchus brought forward and carried through, with enthusiastic clapping of every pair of hands in Rome that were hardened with labor, a proposal that there be public granaries in the city, maintained and filled at the cost of the State, and that corn should be sold at a rate artificially cheap to the poor free citizens. . . . The effect was to gather into the city a mob of needy, unemployed voters, living on the charity of the State, to crowd the circus and clamor at the elections. . . . This constituency was well contented with what it had obtained—a life in the city, supported at the public expense, with politics and games for its amusements. It had not the least inclination to be drafted off into settlements in Spain or Africa, where there would be work instead of pleasant idleness."

When Gracchus proposed this and other features of permanent reform, his beggar constituency deserted him, he was slain, and Rome and her impoverished plebeians were worse off than before. To repeat, in a slightly different form, this experiment would be worse than a mistake, it would be a blunder.

Reacting against these thoughtless and lazy forms of pseudo-charity, we are in some danger of falling into a third, that of officialism. Organized charity is just now the public watchword; and organized charity is very important, provided charity is organized, and not something else. But we cannot hire paid officials to exercise our virtues for us. The Buddhist who sets a prayer-wheel

going to say his prayers for him, and the American who sets a piece of human machinery going to exercise his love for him, are twins. There is as much of devotion in the one as of real philanthropy in the other. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, is the divine command. We do not fulfill it by organizing a society and paying a secretary to love our neighbor for us. Who knows but that priest and Levite might, when they arrived at Jerusalem, have hired some one to go down and look up that half-dead traveler? If they did, so doing would not have made them the peer of the good Samaritan.

It is enough for one short article to tell "how not to do it." Yet, not to leave this article with so wholly unsatisfactory a conclusion, we may close it with a quotation from the Rev. Samuel A. Barnett, of Toynbee Hall, which may serve as a text for something further on this subject in a future issue: "If to-morrow every one who cares for the poor would become the friend of one poor person—forsaking all others—there would next week be no insoluble problem of the unemployed, and London would be within measurable distance of becoming a city of happy homes."



The Church and State Question

A correspondent in another column asks us why we do not demand a constitutional provision prohibiting the exemption of colleges and churches from taxation, as well as one prohibiting appropriation of public moneys to institutions under denominational or ecclesiastical control. There are two reasons why we do not comply with his suggestion.

I. We are seeking to accomplish an immediate and practical result, to prevent a present serious evil and a prospective and real peril to American institutions. In endeavoring to secure this result, we seek the co-operation of as large a body of citizens as possible. Substantially all Protestants agree that the State ought not to make appropriations to institutions under denominational or ecclesiastical control; and with them agree a very large proportion, if not an absolute majority, of Roman Catholic laymen. All that is necessary is to call the attention of this body of citizens to the danger of such appropriations, and to the very simple method of preventing them in the future. This done, we may reasonably hope to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of New York State in the approaching Constitutional Convention as will put an end to such appropriations. If, on the other hand, we demand an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the Legislature from exempting from taxation colleges, hospitals, and churches, we should array against us the opposition of a very great number of those who would support the other amendment, and should secure the support of only a comparatively small body of citizens. If the reform which our correspondent calls for is as sound as he thinks it is, we should not demand it at the present juncture, because the only result of such demand would be to lose the reform of immediate importance, without gaining the reform of less importance.

II. But we do not oppose exempting colleges, benevolent organizations, and churches from taxation. It is a great mistake, in our judgment, to confound the demand that appropriations for churches cease with the demand that the exemption of churches from taxation cease. On what principle taxation should be adjusted is a very difficult question, and the most eminent economic students have not reached any agreement upon it. Whether the State should directly or indirectly grant subsidies to the