

any exception), a percentage for safety ranging from 15 to 50, averaging 30 per cent."

When this statement of the case was published, men—and even newspapers—of the most conservative type protested against the Court's decision in a manner not heard before in New York. Personal corruption was not charged or even intimated, but the fact that the Court failed to consider the expert testimony regarding cost submitted to it by the Commission, and failed to require the experts of its own appointment to submit any estimates, led men to attribute the Court's decision to personal hostility to the principle of municipal ownership. The fact that this principle was not only accepted by the majority of the Chamber of Commerce and of the Legislature, but made mandatory by an overwhelming majority of the voters of the city, has caused the present status of affairs to produce deep and widespread indignation, and a determination among many public-spirited citizens that a way shall be found by which the will of the city shall be obeyed. The fact that the opposition of abutting property-owners along the route proposed by the Commission came almost exclusively from lower Broadway makes it possible that a slight change in the route will enable the Commission to proceed. Until every possibility of this kind has been exhausted, and the Legislature has had an opportunity to give the city the new powers needed to secure municipal ownership, the present trusted Commission ought not to abandon their posts.

New York has learned too late that men of the stamp of Dr. Gilman are not to be secured except by prompt and united action. The distinguished President of the Johns Hopkins University received an unofficial request on May 18 that he should consent to the presentation of his name for the office of Superintendent of Schools in this city. The suggestion, he writes, took him by surprise, but it was apparent to him that "the position referred to is to-day one of the most important positions, if not the most important, in American education. . . . The great city, soon to be 'Greater New York,' with its enormous outlays for schools, has secured, through the influence of a committee of one hundred representative citizens, a new law, permitting, in many respects, the reorganization of its system of public instruction. An opportunity like this for the introduction of modern methods, adapted to the requirements of all classes in the community, has never, so far as I am aware, occurred before. I should consider it a privilege and an honor to take a responsible part in a work of such magnitude and such far-reaching influences, for surely the improvement of schools in the metropolis would be for the advantage of the whole country and the whole world. The studies and observations of a life devoted to the advancement of education could not be directed to a nobler object." Moved by these considerations, Dr. Gilman permitted his name to be used, but on the day on which the election was to be held no action was taken, and a postponement of a week followed. That week the friends of the Johns Hopkins University made the most of, and they brought the claims of the University to bear upon Dr. Gilman with such force that they persuaded him that he ought not to leave that institution. At the meeting of the Board of Education on Thursday last his name was not presented, and Mr. Jasper was re-elected by a vote of 13 to 6 to the position of Superintendent of Public Schools for the coming six years. In the judgment of *The Outlook*, the failure to secure Dr. Gilman was little short of a calamity, and the re-election of Mr. Jasper is distinctly a retrograde step. The friends of educational

reform in this city have a lesson to learn in this matter. When they act again they must act at once, and they must act together. Their failure to displace Mr. Jasper throws upon them the necessity of thorough organization for permanent work. The first step has been taken in the destruction of the trustee system, but this is only the first step. New York needs for the renovation of its educational system as thorough an organization as was needed to overthrow Tammany. Dr. Gilman's words, quoted above, indicate the magnitude of the work and its importance.



A full report of the proceedings of the Presbyterian General Assembly will be found on another page. We congratulate the Assembly on the end of its panic and the recovery of its cooler judgment. Peace and liberty are the two fruits which this Assembly presents to the Church; in truth these two fruits generally grow on the same tree. Daniel Webster's famous "Liberty and union, one and inseparable," is more than a happy phrase; it is the expression of a universal law. The spirit of this Assembly is partly due to a natural reaction, but not a little credit is to be given to Dr. Booth, the retiring Moderator, and Dr. Withrow, the present Moderator—both conservative men, though one was elected as a conservative and the other as a liberal. The conflict over the Societies of Christian Endeavor was settled by leaving the young people practically free to do their work for Christ in their own way, subject only to such right of supervision by the local Presbyteries as inheres in the constitution of the Church. The attempted union with the Episcopal Church was wisely laid aside for the present, since the phrase "local episcopate" clearly meant one thing to Presbyterians and something quite different to a large and influential body in the Episcopal Church. A unity based on words employed with a double meaning would have been a false pretense. Practically, the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Methodist Churches by their official action now stand committed to a union based, not on a platform, but on a recognition of each other's loyalty to Church and an appreciation of each other's work and worth. We hope that the resolution respecting the Theological Seminaries will prove to be simply an easy method of closing a controversy without demanding of either party a formal retraction. In the interest of theological education it is to be hoped that the Presbyterian Seminaries will not sacrifice their independence and make themselves subject to a mass-meeting, which has in its preceding sessions illustrated the well-attested truth that a mass-meeting can never be depended on to be judicial. The New York "Sun" professes to be in trouble lest the Presbyterian Assembly has lost its faith in laying aside its polemical temper. "Its Westminster Confession of Faith still remains, but already it is a dead letter. The majority of New York Presbyterians either reject its cardinal doctrines or are indifferent as to them. They do not read the book, and care nothing about it. The Bible is still read in their churches and sermons are preached on its texts, but the old veneration for it as the absolute and infallible Word of God has passed away. The citadel of Calvinistic orthodoxy has substantially capitulated." These apprehensions are quite needless, even if they are genuine. The faith of the Presbyterian Church is in Christ and in the principle "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." If it had surrendered this principle, it would have ceased to be a Protestant Church. In coming back to this principle it comes back to essential Calvinism, the liberty of the children of God, set free by their loyalty to him from all other sovereignty.

There is an evident tendency in our time leading religious organizations to go into business operations for the purpose of making money for their missionary and Christian enterprises. It is illustrated by the enormous building which the American Tract Society has erected; by a similar building erected by the Presbyterian Missionary Societies—the subject of warm debate in the General Assembly; by the vote of the Methodist General Conference to organize a denominational insurance company to do a general life, fire, lightning, and tornado business, and take the profits of the insurance for the denomination; as well as by land speculation on the part of clergymen in sporadic cases for their church work. We are satisfied that this is an injurious tendency, that the pecuniary benefits are always doubtful and the moral evils of it very considerable. The pecuniary benefits are doubtful because all business enterprises have a certain degree of uncertainty in them, and there is no special reason for supposing that the saints will be supernaturally preserved from these uncertainties by divine providence, or naturally preserved by their own superior shrewdness. The moral evils are very considerable, for they cannot enter into business competitions without the hazard of being tempted from the high vantage-ground which wholly unselfish and disinterested motives afford. The function of the Church is a comparatively simple one. It is to act as a herald of the Gospel, telling men the good news of the Incarnation, and as a teacher of the moral life, teaching men to observe all things which Christ has commanded. In doing this work the example of the Jewish Church, and the precepts of Christ to his disciples, are good guides to be followed. They both agree in leaving the Church dependent upon the free-will offerings of those to whom it ministers. When it abandons this financial basis and is supported by a government, by an endowment, or by business enterprises and speculations, it departs from the divine order and method. It is no longer able to appeal with the same force to the generous spirit of men for their contributions. It loses its power to develop their spiritual life by trusting to their generosity. It loses also the stimulus to its own faith in God and in man. The Church of Christ would better leave such business operations as buying and selling real estate, building and renting offices, insuring lives and edifices, and everything of that description, to business men, and, trusting to the generous support of mankind, and to the good providence of Him to whom all wealth belongs, devote itself with undivided energy to its work of preaching the Gospel of Christ and teaching Christian truth.

The festivities attending the coronation of the Czar, which have been so varied, brilliant, and exhausting, were overshadowed by a terrible calamity on Saturday. The popular fête of the week was to be a series of diversions and sports of various kinds, held on a plain on the outskirts of the city of Moscow. Provision had been made for feeding about four hundred thousand people. Great booths had been erected from which food, beer, and souvenir mugs were to be distributed. The crowd began gathering early in the morning, and it is estimated that more than half a million persons, mostly peasants from the neighboring provinces, had crowded into the plain. Everything went well until the time for the distribution of food came. Barriers had been erected in the vicinity of the booths, in order to keep the crowd back and to make the distribution in an orderly way possible, but the crowd, becoming impatient, began to press forward, the people in front were swept against the barriers surrounding the booths, the latter gave away, and the enormous crowd,

seized by one of those mysterious panics to which crowds are always subject, swept like a tidal wave forward, crushing down men, women, and children in the front ranks. The troops who were present were called in to assist in quieting the crowd, and when their work was done it was found that about twelve hundred persons had been killed and many others seriously wounded. The great plain looked like a battle-field. The scene during the panic is said to have been indescribable, and the disaster has cast a shadow over the coronation ceremonies. Absolutism in Russia seems to be doomed to rest under shadows. The Czar has given no promise of more liberal methods.

Proportional representation has just been voted upon in the canton of Berne in Switzerland, under circumstances that put that system in a new light. The fact that it is so widely employed in Switzerland has led many people to regard it as an outgrowth of the radical democracy for which Switzerland stands. In the Berne election, however, according to the London "Speaker," it was the Conservative parties which demanded the extension of the system to the election of the cantonal legislature, and the Radicals and Socialists who fought the proposition. In the cities the proposition carried, but the farmers of the Bernese Oberland voted almost solidly against it, and it was defeated by a majority of 3,000 in a vote of 60,000. The division among the voters was thus exactly opposite to that which most American advocates of proportional representation would have expected. The radical democrats, it appears, held to the system of making each representative responsible to the people of his locality, while those who have opposed the democratic movement wished to substitute party representation for district representation. In our own country proportional representation has generally found its friends among radicals and socialists, but this is probably due to the failure of radical groups to secure any representation under the district system.

### An Economic Fallacy

Last summer the law of New York State requiring that street-cleaners in the city of New York should be paid two dollars a day was violently attacked on the ground that it was the duty of the city to get its labor in the cheapest market. The law was defended by The Outlook on the ground that this economic aphorism was an exploded fallacy, and that it was the duty of the city to pay, not the smallest sum for which the work could be obtained, but what the work was really worth. We contended that this principle of a fair and honest wage would give the city fair and honest work, and was economically profitable as well as absolutely just. The result has proved the truth of our contention. Never were the streets of this city in so good a condition as to-day, and this partly because better wages have given the city better workmen. The procession of street-cleaners, of which we give some account in a paragraph on another page, is a witness that there is value to the employer in giving, not the lowest possible wage, but a fair and equitable one.

The economic aphorism that labor is a commodity to be purchased in the cheapest market is as economically false as it is ethically unjust. There is no such commodity as labor; it does not exist. When a workingman comes to the factory on a Monday morning, he has nothing to sell, he is empty-handed; he has come in order to produce something by his exertion, and that something, when it is produced, is to be sold, and part of the proceeds of that sale will of right belong to him because he has helped to