

own doors, so that they can see how good it is." One felt disposed (after this effort to prejudice, if I may so speak, the Divine Mind) to rise to a question of privilege and to move that the other side be now heard in prayer.

I observed recently that a clergyman had prayed for the actors who were appearing in town, asking that they might no longer be engaged in demoralizing and ruining the youth of the place, but that they might be led to devote such talents as they possessed to better purposes. Thereupon one of the actors brought a suit against the clergyman for libel. The case was novel; I shall await with great interest the final judicial decision. May we consider that prayer, like the deliverances of the confessional, constitutes a privileged communication? It will be a somewhat dangerous precedent if it is judicially ruled that a man may say what he please about his neighbors if only he throw the accusation into the form of a prayer, and address his remarks ostensibly to the Divine Being. But then, on the other hand, the view might be taken that, if the person who prays is sincere and is a Christian, he has prefaced his petition with the prayer that God's will may be done, and if so, he is perhaps seeking that his prayer may not only be unanswered, but be turned back on itself and made a plea for the other side. Perhaps there is something to be said under this head in favor of the liturgical churches, where, although the hearer may interpret the prayer on the one side or on the other, yet he cannot very well prove anything that could be made a ground for a libel suit against the officiating clergyman, since emphasis and intonation and expression could hardly be brought into court.



Christ's Teachings on Social Topics

IX.—Christ's Standard of Values¹

By Lyman Abbott

Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?—Matthew vi., 25.

There is only one answer to that question. The life is more than meat, and the body is more than raiment. This, then, states Christ's standard of values. Things are made for men, not men for things; and success is to be measured by the development of character, not by the accumulation of wealth.

And yet, though this seems a self-evident proposition, it is practically denied, and has been from the foundation of the world. The old political economy, if it does not actually deny, at all events entirely ignores it. Political economy is the science of accumulating and distributing wealth. It concerns itself simply with wealth. It has nothing to do with the effect on men of the process of accumulating or distributing that wealth. "Political economy," says John Stuart Mill, "is concerned with man solely as a being who desires wealth, and who is capable of judging of the comparative efficacy of means to that end." Again, "Political economy considers mankind as occupied solely in acquiring and consuming wealth." And yet it is supposed that the study of political economy is the study which is to teach us the relations between labor and capital. Its standard of values is wholly material. That is the best system which accumulates wealth the best, or certainly the best system which accumulates and distributes wealth the best. What is its effect on individual men, whether it is making them wiser, better, happier, truer, nobler—that it has nothing to do with. Society is a machine, and the machine that grinds out the greatest material grist is, according to political economy, the best machine. If it does not affirm this, at all events this is the only aspect of life that it concerns itself with. And yet political economy is the science which is supposed to teach us the relations between labor and capital.

On this assumption of political economy, that man is solely occupied in accumulating wealth, our mercantile standards are based. Of course, here on a Sunday even-

ing, under this great roof and during this sacred service, your measurements of life will be somewhat different, but to-morrow largely they will be mercantile measurements. The successful man is the man who has made wealth. The man who has lost wealth has failed. What is this but to say that the standards of life are material standards? The newspaper that can advertise that it has the largest circulation and takes in the greatest receipts for advertising and the greatest receipts for subscribers, and can have some affidavits to prove it, and some able and learned men to testify that they have examined the books and are satisfied that it is the case, flaunts its flag of great prosperity. It is not the question what the newspaper is doing to make men wiser or better or happier or more virtuous, but how much money it is making. That is the measure. Colleges are, to a considerable extent, measured in the same way. What is the college's endowment? How large are its buildings? How much money has it in its treasury? Even churches and ministers are measured by this yardstick. Is the church a rich church? Are all its pews rented? Does it pay a good price to its minister, and a good price to its choir? What is its financial standing? The Nation is tested in the same way. We are told with jubilation that in twenty-five years the wealth of America has increased from fourteen thousand millions to forty-four thousand millions, and these dollar-marks are given as the best evidence of the Nation's prosperity. And then details are given. We are told how many million dollars the agricultural products were. We are told that one-third of the gold output of the whole world comes from the United States. We are told that in ten years' time the United States built, on an average, sixteen thousand miles of railroad each year—enough to go two-thirds around the globe. We are told that private capital, without any proclamation, has built in a single year more miles of railroad than Russia is proposing to build in its famous railroad from the Siberian frontier to the Pacific coast. These facts—the amount of our corn crop and our cotton crop and our manufactured products and our railroad-building and the increase of our general wealth from fourteen thousand millions to forty-four thousand millions—are the tests and evidence of the greatness of our Nation. The tests are material tests.

Now, Christ says that is not the test. The test is character. The railroads, the shipping, the banks, the gold, the corn crop, the cotton crop, are for men, and the question is, What sort of men are you making? And that is the only question. More than that. Political economy defends itself in putting the material standard to the front, for, it is said, you must make money before you can spend it, and the first thing to do is to attain the material prosperity. When you have gotten your money, then you may build schools and churches, you may print newspapers and books, you may serve the spiritual and intellectual ends of mankind; but first get your money. Christ says, No, seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness. Character comes first. When you have the character, when you have the men produced—men of integrity, men of uprightness, men of divine nature—then wealth will be added. Man first, wealth afterwards, says Christ. Wealth first, then man, says political economy. Wealth the standard of value, says political economy. Man the standard of value, says Christ.

All things in life are to be measured by this standard. The life is more than meat. The body is more than raiment. By this you are to measure religion and religious institutions. That community is not the most religious which has the most splendid cathedrals, the most gorgeous ritual, the most beautiful music; it is that which has the best men. Not in Italy, with its splendid St. Peter's, not in Spain and France, with their magnificent cathedrals, centuries in building, in which nations you find the greatest proportion of illiteracy, but in Puritan New England, with its plain school-houses and its plain meeting-houses, in which in the olden time every man and woman and child could read, is the greatest and the best religious life.

By this you are to measure government. Not that is the greatest government which governs the best to-day, but that which by the very process of government is developing the best manhood for to-morrow. It may be that

¹ Sermon preached at Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, Sunday evening, February 16, 1896; reported stenographically by Henry Winans and revised by the author. For the previous sermons in this series and two sermons introductory to the series see The Outlook for January 4 and 18, February 1, 8, 15, 22, and 29, March 7 and 14, and April 4.

Dublin is better governed than New York—was—I hope it is not worse governed than New York was—but that is not, after all, the vital question. Take two Irish brothers, one in Ireland, one in the United States, and then wait fifty years and compare the grandchildren. That is the measure of government. And the government that puts the vote into hands that do not know how to use it, and teaches them how to use it in the using, that is the better government of the two. For government is to be measured by the man it makes, not primarily by the government it offers to-day.

So all educational systems are to be measured by the product in character that comes from them. Men tell us that China has a public-school system older than the United States. Men tell us that Germany has a better public-school system than the United States; measured by scholarly standards perhaps it is; but, with all its faults, I will put the public-school system of the United States of America on one side, and the public-school system of Germany on the other, and, measured by the kind of character that comes out, stand by the American system. Men point to the defects of the American system and say the public-school system will not do—we must have church schools. I recognize the faults of the American public-school system, and I hope to see a higher moral standard and better moral instruction in them; but I will take them as they stand to-day, and will put the public-school system on the one side, and the parochial system of Italy, of France, of Great Britain, or of the Lutheran or Roman Catholic Church in our own land on the other side, and will stand by the State system, because it turns out the better men of the two. Religion, government, education, are to be measured by the men they produce.

So is the industrial system. You cannot apply one standard of value in the one case, and another standard of value in the other. The social and industrial system is to be measured, not by the wealth it produces, but by the men it produces; not by the abundance of the material things, but by the kind of men developed in the process. Man is the standard of value, not things. An industrial system, then, must produce good men and good women, or tend to produce them. If it does not, it fails, measured by Christ's standard.

This was the evil of slavery. It was not that sometimes men were ill-treated; it was not that the slaves were poorly housed and fed; it was not that they were not paid wages; it was this: their manhood was suppressed; there was no true home, no permanent and protected family, no permission of education, no hope for development, no real stimulant and inspiration to life in the higher and nobler forms of it. This was the curse of American slavery.

The modern industrial system, measured by this standard, is better than the systems which it has supplanted. It is far better than slavery. Let any man compare the American workingmen in the North and the slaves in the South, man for man, and answer which has produced the better manhood. It is better than feudalism. Let any man compare the independent workingmen of England to-day with the villeins and serfs of the England of the sixteenth century, and man for man the workingman of the England of to-day is better than the workingman of serfdom and feudalism.

The introduction of organization and the introduction of machinery have, on the whole, greatly improved the condition of the workingman. It is said that machinery has thrown men out of employment; it is said that machinery grinds them up and prevents them from developing manhood, and there is truth in that; nevertheless, on the whole, the introduction of machinery has improved the character as well as the condition of the workingmen. In illustration compare China, where all labor is without machinery, and the United States, where all labor is with machinery. In vain Carlyle and Ruskin call on us to turn about and march with our faces to the past and our backs to the future. The question is not whether the present system is better than feudalism, better than slavery, but whether it is perfect; whether there remains anything else to do; whether the present industrial system is producing the best men

and the best women that a true industrial system could produce. No! it is not.

In the first place, our present industrial system is not giving steady and permanent employment to all willing laborers. Mr. Charles Booth, the London statistician, and one the value of whose reports on the condition of London is recognized by all scientific men, shows us that from ten to twenty per cent. of the population of London are living on the verge of starvation; willing to work, the large majority of them, but either finding only casual work, or finding none at all, and living on charity. This is the famous submerged tenth. No industrial system is turning out the right kind of men and women which leaves from ten to fifteen per cent. of the population of its greatest city without the opportunity to earn an honest livelihood. Cross the Channel to France. In Paris the conditions are not so bad, but in Paris they are prevented from going in the same direction with great rapidity only by governmental action providing work for the unemployed. Cross the ocean to America. The best-informed students of conditions of social life in New York and Brooklyn testify to us that there are hundreds, and oftentimes thousands, of men vainly seeking employment in these great cities. Strike out all the tramps who do not want to work and think they do, strike out the invalids who cannot work—strike those all out, still it remains true that in our great cities there are scores, hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands of men and women who would gladly earn their bread by the sweat of their brow and cannot do it. The opportunity is not afforded to them. In the year 1885 a careful statistician estimates that there were nearly a million willing workers out of employment in the United States, and the United States of America has been called the Eldorado of the workingmen. Commercial crises recur with frightful rapidity, taking money out of the pockets of capitalists and bread out of the mouths of children of workingmen. That is not a healthful state of society which makes such recurrences possible. Whether they are due to unjust taxation, to ill-advised labor organization, to spendthrift habits, to a poorly managed currency, to misdirection of energies, or to all combined, is not the question; the simple question now is this: Is that labor system perfect which makes it possible that hundreds and thousands of men should be thrust out of the possibility of earning a livelihood? "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread," said God. Then every man has a right to earn his daily bread in the sweat of his face; and there is enough to be done in providing God's children with the needed equipment for life, to give at least bread, shelter, and clothing to every one of God's children.

The second thing which the present industrial system not only does not do, but, as interpreted by many of its prophets and supporters, does not attempt to do, is to give a living wage to every wage-earner. The system out of which we are gradually emerging, the system of individualism, the system of the Manchester School, affirms that the capitalist shall hire labor in the cheapest market, and the laborer shall sell his labor in the highest market; in other words, that every man who hires labor is to pay as little for it as he can. Under that system the tendency is to a depression of wages. What is the result of this system where it has brought forth unhindered its full fruition? Ask Italy. Emigration was taking place from Italy, and the Italians were urged not to emigrate but to remain with their motherland and maintain the nation, and this was their answer:

What do you mean by the nation? Do you refer to the most miserable of the inhabitants of the land? If so, we are indeed the nation. Look at our pale and emaciated faces, our bodies worn out with over-fatigue and insufficient food. We sow and reap corn, but never taste white bread; we cultivate the vine, but a drop of wine never touches our lips. We raise cattle, but never eat meat; we are covered with rags, we live in wretched hovels; in winter we suffer from the cold, and both winter and summer from the pangs of hunger. Can a land which does not provide its inhabitants, who are willing to work, with sufficient to live upon, be considered by them as a fatherland?

Ask the Continent of Europe:

The mean mortality among the well-to-do is, at the utmost, one to sixty. Now, the population of Europe being a third of a

thousand millions, the mortality, if all were fortunate, should not exceed five millions. It is three times five millions. What have we done with these ten millions of human beings killed before their time? If it be true that we have duties that we owe towards others, are we not responsible for the servitude, the cold, the hunger, the miseries of every sort, which doom the unfortunate to untimely deaths?

Cross the Channel and ask Great Britain. I quote from Francis A. Walker's "Wages Question" a description, quoted from English authority, of the condition of the agricultural laborer:

In the West of England [this a modern book] the laborer breakfasts on teakettle broth—hot water poured on bread and flavored with onions; dines on bread and hard cheese at 2d. a pound, with cider very washy and sour; and sups on potatoes or cabbage greased with a tiny bit of fat bacon. He seldom more than sees or smells butcher's meat. The cottages, as a rule, are not fit to house pigs in. Of 309 cottages at Ramsbottom, one of the best districts in Lancashire, 137 had but one bedroom each, the aggregate occupants being 777.

Come to this country. What have you here? Here, where the wages have been going up; here, where the rate of interest has been going down. In the latest statistics I can find, the average wages for five million two hundred thousand day-laborers was two hundred dollars a year—two-thirds of a dollar, sixty-six cents a day, to support a family on. In the manufacturing districts, including the skilled labor, three hundred and sixty-four dollars a year—a little over one dollar a day average. I impugn the doctrine of political economy that it is the duty of the employer to pay the lowest wages that he can, and I stand for the opposite doctrine that it is the duty of the employer to pay the largest wages that he can, as it is the duty of the employed to render the largest service that he can. Selfishness never will solve the labor problem. There is a certain product of labor: it is the duty of the man who is supervising the labor, and who controls the operation, to pay to the workmen a fair and just proportion of that product. The average rate of wages is one of the elements that determines that fair and just proportion; but it is only one of the elements. We have not reached the Christian foundation of industry until we have come to recognize that it is ruinous to grind up men, women, and children in order to make cheap goods. What is a living wage I shall not undertake to discuss. It is at least enough to provide for food, shelter, and clothing. It ought to provide books, pictures, education. It ought to enable the man to earn the livelihood for his wife and his little children. And it is not enough to be wasted in drink and in gambling.

In the third place, an industrial system which meets Christ's standard, and which is producing men and good men, will either provide a system of industry which is itself educative, or will allow leisure time for the processes of education. When I have sometimes plead for what is called the eight-hour day, men have asked me, Do you work only eight hours? No, I work a good deal more than eight hours, so far as I can judge. I tried to figure it up the other day, and I should think my average was ten hours a day, and it sometimes comes to be eleven or twelve hours. But all my work is educative. The process of the industry itself is making me, or ought to be making me, a wiser, larger, better man. But when a man's whole employment in the factory is going through one or two technical motions of drudgery from morning till night, there is no education in it. He is but a hand, he is but a bit of machinery. He must find his education outside the factory; he does not find it within. There is a great difference between skilled labor and intelligent labor. The tendency of machinery is to make skilled labor; that is, men who make, but with consummate skill, one thing. It is not the tendency of a mechanical system of industry to make intelligent labor—that is, men capable of doing a great variety of things. In olden times, in England, the carpenter could build the whole house from foundation to roof; but the man who works in a planing-mill cannot do that, or, if he can, it is despite the system of industry, not because of it. Says Ruskin:

We have much studied and much perfected of late the great civilized invention of the division of labor; only we give it a

false name. It is not, truly speaking, the labor that is divided, but the men—divided into the mere segments of men—broken into small fragments and crumbs of life; so that all the little piece of intelligence that is left in a man is not enough to make a pin, or a nail, but exhausts itself in making the point of a pin or the head of a nail. Now it is a good and desirable thing, truly, to make many pins in a day; but if we could only see with what crystal sand their points were polished—sand of human soul, much to be magnified before it can be discerned for what it is—we should think there might be some loss in it also. And the great cry that rises from all our manufacturing cities, louder than their furnace-blast, is all in very deed for this—that we manufacture everything there except men; we blanch cotton, and strengthen steel, and refine sugar, and shape pottery; but to brighten, to strengthen, to refine, or to form a single living spirit never enters into our estimate of advantages.

The remedy is not in going back to hand work. Seven men, we are told on good authority, can in agriculture, with the advantages of improved machinery, feed a thousand men. In the olden days of the hand labor it was as much as a man could do to feed his own family. He who feeds a thousand by the introduction of machinery is taking drudgery off mankind and putting it on to God. God is grinding our grist for us, God is turning our wheels for us, God is doing our drudgery for us, and the result of that ought to be such a concentration of labor in a few hours that the man whose labor is drudgery will have time outside his hours of toil for development of heart and brain. What chance for the development of manhood in the baker who works, or did a few years ago, sixteen hours out of the twenty-four? What chance for the development of manhood in the horse-car conductors who a very few years ago were working twelve and thirteen hours out of the twenty-four, and to-day more than ten hours? What chance for the development of manhood in the iron-workers of Pennsylvania who are working twelve hours in the day three hundred and sixty-five days in the year? I am not finding fault with the heads of the establishments. I do not know what the ironmaster can do. There must be two or three shifts, and he could not make three shifts profitable, his neighbors having but two. It is not the man I indict, but the system, which so sets the standard and pace of labor that the development of character is impossible. It is only this last fall that a reformer (Heaven save the mark!) testified before a legislative committee in New York City that he, the reformer, employed in his shop on one of the avenues of New York shop-girls whose regular hours were from seven till nine every day except Saturday, and Saturday they were from seven until midnight, and Sunday morning they had to come and spend half the day putting the shop in order! What chance is there in such a place as that to become a woman? Men say, with a shrug of the shoulders and sarcastic inflection, You want nine hours' wages for eight hours' work! The answer is that it is not true that a man will do more work in ten hours than nine, more in eleven hours than in ten, more in twelve hours than in eleven. On the contrary, as the hours of labor have decreased, both the quality and the quantity of work have increased. There is a limit, of course; and we do not know where that limit is; but experience indicates that the system which makes the best men makes the best goods.

Mr. William Mather, of the Salford Iron Works in England, employs twelve hundred hands—molders, smiths, tin-plate workers, turners, brass-founders, boiler-makers, etc. On the 20th of February, 1893, the hours for all employees were reduced from fifty-three to forty-eight. The day was divided into two spells, with a single break for lunch, instead of three, as heretofore. At the end of the year the firm compared the results with the average of the six years preceding it. "As regards quantity of production," says Mr. Mather, "there was actually a larger output in the trial year." This increase in the amount of work done, despite the shortening of hours, Mr. Mather attributed "solely to the unimpaired and cheerful energy of every man and boy throughout the day."

In Australia, where the eight-hour day has been formally and officially adopted, wealth has grown more rapidly than in any other country on the globe. I put these facts before you as a modern interpretation of Christ's declaration, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness,

and all these things shall be added unto you." The best way to make good iron is to make good men. Irishmen were not made for railroads, but railroads were made for Irishmen; but the best way to make good railroads is to make good railroad-builders. Man first, wealth afterwards; and the larger the manhood, the greater the wealth. The reason why America is richer than any other country is because under its industrial system, with all its defects, men are made faster and men are made better than they are made in any other country on the globe.

There is one other condition of life. Home—sweet, bright, cheerful, happy home. And you cannot have a sweet, bright, cheerful, happy home when the children have to go to toil in the factory at six and eight years of age, as they did until legislation interfered to prevent; nor where the mother is taken from her nursing babe to add to the wages of the husband and the father; nor where the girls leave the mother to over-toil in the home that they may go to the shop and earn three dollars a week to buy gewgaws and jewelry and fancy things for themselves, and lower the wages of the girls who have no homes and are dependent on their own resources.

Did you ever think how difficult it would be to maintain home in some of the tenement-houses of New York and Brooklyn? I can think of nothing more extraordinarily irreligious than for a church to resist through all the courts up to the Court of Appeals a law requiring every tenement-house to have water on every floor for the sake of cleanliness. All honor to our fellow-townsmen Mr. White, who has organized that society which has now invested over a quarter of a million in model tenements in this city, and who has proved that capital invested in model tenements may at the same time make a fair return to the capitalist and make possible a home for the decent poor.

I am very well aware that my theme to-night is not a popular one. We like to applaud ourselves and glorify our Nation. I like to do it, too, and I like to hear it done. I am proud of being an American. I glory in the nineteenth century. I have no wish to go back to the past. I do not believe that the condition of the workingman is that of a slave, or worse than that of a slave, or anything like that of a slave. I resent the exaggerations which I read sometimes from the mouths of demagogues and in newspapers that are demagogical. But I am sure that the one standard of value is man, and that, whether it be religious institutions or political institutions or educational institutions or industrial institutions, everything in life is to be measured by its effect on manhood, and that we shall not have reached an ideal industrial organization in Christendom until we have one which gives an opportunity to every honest worker to earn his livelihood by honest toil, which gives to every honest worker a wage adequate not only for material existence but for spiritual and intellectual development, until we have so reduced the hours of toil that out of the drudgery shall be redeemed hours for education, for development, for heart and home and brain, and until we shall have concentrated our life on the home, and made the home the nursing-place of pure, honest, true hearts.

Mother's Work

By Mary F. Butts

If thy work be holding dimpled cheeks of babies to thy breast,
Fashioning small garments where the needle moves to inward tune,
Stitching dainty scallops for a little rounded wrist,
Or knitting a silk sheathing for feet as soft as rose-leaves,
Count thyself a sister of the gentle Judean woman,
Mother of a Saviour. How knowest thou the outcome
Of this beauteous bud of home? With thee lies the unfolding.

Make thy garden fragrant with tender self-denying.
With love purged pure by prayer, woo the opening blossom.
Thine a holy business set thee by the Father;

All its pains rewarded by gifts of honeyed kisses,
And angel looks that babies bring from heaven,
Claspings of soft arms, and murmurings of lovers
Innocent as birds in the dewy boughs of Maytime.

The Single-Tax Campaign in Delaware

By Priscilla Leonard

The single-tax campaign in Delaware at the present time is certainly an aggressive one. What with tents and stereopticons, a weekly newspaper, a regiment of uniformed propagandists tramping unweariedly through the little State, and haranguing the gaping agriculturist wherever he can be induced to listen; what with money pouring in from the single-taxers of every State in the Union, from Maine to Texas; what with orations from Henry George, Father McGlynn, and "Jerry" Simpson, to say nothing of numberless lesser lights; what with cart-loads of tracts and over a score of single-tax "clubs" through the State, each a center of light to lighten the darkness of Delaware ignorance—surely, with all these agencies of the new gospel at work, it will be the Diamond State's own fault if she is not converted and sitting at the feet of these modern apostles by the time the next Legislature meets, on the first day of 1897.

The single-tax doctrine has the merit of being exquisitely simple. Here is its main proposition, as expressed in its own newspaper, "Justice," published weekly in Wilmington: "In round numbers, about \$1,300,000 is raised in Delaware by the present system of taxation. The United States census gives the total valuation of Delaware real estate as \$129,182,087. As a rule, it has been found that land values are about equal to the value of the improvements, and therefore Delaware land values amount to about \$65,000,000. A tax of two per cent. on the land values of Delaware would, therefore, raise \$1,300,000, which is almost exactly the amount raised under the present system."

The clear argument is, therefore: "Accept our plan, which wipes out all these different and cumbersome taxes. Let banks, railroads, and liquor men go free, and the owner of land alone be the tax-bearer of the community. The experiment has never been tried; but it is sure to succeed, and will certainly bring the millennium. You are a small State, so it won't hurt you so much, anyway, if it shouldn't work out right. We don't own land in your State; we have no interest in this matter; we are sincere and disinterested apostles from outside, and so you can trust us to know your own needs better than you do yourselves. Come now; at the election next November give us full control; that is all we ask for. You are going to elect a Governor, all the elective officers, half the Senators, and all the Representatives—very well, give all these to us, and then we can show you our theory in practice, for the first time, at your sole expense. To be sure, we will have to upset everything in order to begin, but think of the beautiful object-lesson you will be to all the other States before we are through with you!"

In response to this enticing invitation Delaware really says very little, and appears to be concealing her feelings, if we may trust one of the New Jersey leaders of the movement, who says: "The Society for the Suppression of the Truth exists in Delaware, and has upon its roll of membership the leading newspapers, clergymen, and privileged classes, whose plan of operation is to maintain a dignified conspiracy of silence." The leading newspapers have said something, though, for one of them remarked lately that "the single-taxers promise too much—continuous work, increase of wages every day or two, no taxes, no hard times, no idle moments," and that such a "wonderful and mysterious cure-all" is foreign to the previous experience of political economists. The politicians, big and little, are also most unkindly indifferent. They say that the class which accepts such theories is not a numerous one in Delaware, and that it is not worth while to take the movement seriously.