

and an American standard of living, and thus to preserve the home market to labor.

3. It may be expected to provide a proper Government revenue.

But then the question comes: Does it do all these things and not interfere with the cost of living or with our foreign trade? There's the rub. There is where the bad features of the bill are evident—features which tend to restrict business both domestic and foreign and not to expand it. Such restriction will make us poorer by unduly augmenting prices and by decreasing our ability to pay taxes. And as we are, so is the Government. Before long the Government will find itself in need of collecting the interest on the ten-billion-dollar debt our allies owe us; and trade restriction will prevent, or at least hinder, them from paying that interest.

A trade restriction bill was certainly not demanded by the people at large.

Before the war we were a debtor nation. As such we gave small consideration to what our exports might suffer from a high tariff. Since the war we have become a creditor nation—and the leading creditor nation. If, under our former condition, there was some demand for as large a freedom as possible, that demand is now immensely intensified, for we want our debtors to pay their debts to us.

If we do not buy, we cannot sell. Let us protect our products wherever possible; as foreigners, however, cannot pay gold for our goods but can pay only other goods, we must permit the entrance of those goods up to the very point at which they would destroy our own varied production. Our people want a protective tariff, but not a super-tariff.

FAITH IN WEALTH

IN our day we should call him a cowboy, but in the book which preserves his rather radical and inflammatory speeches he is called a herdman. His name was Amos. If any preacher talked nowadays the way Amos did, he would be very unpopular in certain influential quarters.

"Hear this word, ye kine of Bashan, that are in the mountain of Samaria, which oppress the poor, which crush the needy, which say to their masters, Bring and let us drink. The Lord God hath sworn by his holiness, that, lo, the days shall come upon you, that he will take you away with hooks, and your posterity with fishhooks." That is very strong language to address to influential and wealthy people; but Amos was not afraid to utter his woe upon those "that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch them-

selves upon their couches, and eat the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst of the stall; that chant to the sound of the viol, and invent to themselves instruments of music, like David; that drink wine in bowls, and anoint themselves with the chief ointments: but they are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph."

From the time of Amos, over twenty-five hundred years ago, until to-day very strong language has been used concerning the indifference of those who trust in the power of their wealth to the privations of the poor and to the need for social reconstruction. The men who have used this strong language have often been misunderstood. In almost every case they have been called revolutionaries, as if the doctor who diagnosed a disease were the cause of it. Again and again men who are now honored as prophets were persecuted because they warned the powerful that if they did not mend their ways they would bring evil upon themselves. We have before our very eyes a sample of this thing. Repeatedly the Czar in Russia and his gang were told of what would happen to them and to the whole nation if they persisted in their ways. The Czar was very religious, and he and his family were scrupulous in observing the requirements of the Orthodox Church; but they did not listen to the prophets. And now that which was predicted has come to pass, but worse than any one had imagined. Those who sought to rouse the conscience of the powerful in the old régime were not Bolsheviks. They were doing the only thing which, if it had succeeded, could have prevented Bolshevism; and they came very near doing it.

It is this sublime faith in the power of wealth, which is not the faith of a great number of conscientious and serviceable men of wealth to-day, that Jesus had in mind when he said that it was easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.

It is because of this faith in the power of wealth that men try to use wealth for the purpose of preventing change. Their faith is exactly the same as that of the Socialists. They hold to the economic theory of history. They differ from the Socialists in applying their philosophy to a different end. Most of them are entirely unconscious of any attempt to use their power unfairly; they simply conceive of wealth as power which can be used to stop people from thinking for themselves, or from making the changes in the social order that the people wish but the owners of wealth dislike. Their point of view seems very reasonable. We reported the other day, for example, a gift to the

Baptist Home Mission Board to which was attached a creed which had to be accepted as a condition by the recipients. This gift has been defended by the chief organ of the denomination on the ground that it is only imposed upon those workers who are supported by the income from the gift. That seems very reasonable. The rich man seems to have a right to say: "If you want my money, you must believe, or say you believe, what I tell you to believe." The same argument was used a while ago by a group of men in Pittsburgh. These men, constituting an employers' association of that city, did not like the social programme of the Young Women's Christian Association. When the local Young Women's Christian Association attempted to raise some money, this association told the women that it would make no contribution unless the local Christian Association repudiated the action of their National body. In like manner, this same employers' association denounced the Federal Council of Churches as under the control of radical and Bolshevik elements in the churches, and it said that many members of the employers' association "are expressing themselves as determined to discontinue financial support of their respective churches unless they withdraw all moral and financial support from the Federal Council."

It is this attitude of mind which is satirized in the story in this issue entitled "The Daniel Jazz and the Rabbi." It makes itself felt in many churches. We have testimony to that effect in letters which have come to us in the course of our Third Prize Contest from members of ministers' families. The sense of the subordination of the minister's mind and the minister's household to those who through their wealth or social position have the power, which they use, consciously or unconsciously, to impose their will has found expression time and time again in such letters as these, in articles, in short stories, and in novels.

On another page we print three letters elicited by the question raised in The Outlook four weeks ago, "Is the Church Losing the People?" Each of those letters gives a different reason for the failure of the Church to accomplish what it ought to be accomplishing. One writer says that it is the inability of many ministers to give their congregations food for thought. Another says that it is the failure of theological seminaries to adapt their training of men to the facts of the modern world. And the third says that it is the fact that church leaders as a rule put denominational interest above religion. It is still another cause that is described in the satirical story in the form of a letter

from "Molly Amos" (whose last name may have been chosen as a reminder of the prophet who warned the kine of Bashan).

To say that this faith in the power of wealth, this attitude of mind satirized in the story of the rabbi's wife, is negligible to-day would be an error; but it would be as great an error to say that it controls either the synagogues or the churches. It is to be encountered everywhere; but since the days of Amos and Isaiah and the great unknown prophet of the Captivity, since the day when the Man of Nazareth drove the traders from the temple, since the day of the Apostle James, whose advice, "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you," was probably not heeded and very certainly not welcomed, this faith in the power of money to direct the minds of men and to preserve them from evil has distinctly diminished. It is true that we still find it in the churches, but no more than in the universities, and not by any means dominant there. There is much evidence that the American people desire in their preachers both courage of conviction and freedom of speech. Sometimes the preacher may ascribe to the narrow-mindedness or the materialism of his congregation an antagonism which is really rooted in his own rawness or discourtesy. Many preachers can testify that they have spoken with the utmost liberty their opinions on disputed questions and have found that their opinions have been respected, provided that they have treated the contrary opinions with respect. In America men like Charles G. Finney, Henry Ward Beecher, Theodore Parker, Dwight L. Moody, and Phillips Brooks, to mention only men who are no longer living, have expressed theological opinions and ideals of life and social conceptions which have been most contentious; but it is safe to say that they could not have expressed these opinions with the freedom they did had it not been for the Church behind them. The opposition they encountered was as much outside as within the Church, and the liberty they exercised was as great as that of any leader in any other calling. There is no evidence that any institution—political, commercial, or educational—surpasses the Church and the organizations which it has created either in unselfish devotion to the public welfare or in the liberty in which that service is rendered. There is no freer platform in America than the pulpit. There are pulpits that are not free, and there are ministers not capable of exercising freedom; but they are exceptions. There are few pulpits which the right man could not render free; and there are few ministers who cannot be trusted

to exercise their freedom with more discretion than is expected of an Assemblyman or Congressman. The surest passport to the respect of any congregation is the minister's respect for himself and his message.

RED RUSSIA REAPS WHAT SHE HAS SOWN

HERBERT HOOVER in one sentence of a statement of the restrictions under which America will help starving Russia declares unemotionally but convincingly the cause of the famine. He says: "The present conditions in Russia are the result of progressive impoverishment of the Russian people under Soviet control."

Bolshevism is an absolutism of the industrial proletariat backed by the bayonets of paid soldiers who have no other means of support. The Bolshevik Government at its beginning ignored and oppressed the peasants upon whose labor the food of Russia depended. Lately it has shown some evidence of coming to its senses. But its concessions to agriculture were too late. Famine and disease are sweeping over vast areas of Russia on the Volga and even in Siberia. America and Europe are called upon for relief.

The actual state of things existing in Russia to-day may be indicated by a condensed paraphrase of a few of the facts as reported in special correspondence and cable despatches in the New York "Times" on the day The Outlook goes to press: From Riga a correspondent cables that from twenty to forty million people seem doomed to death in Russia; sufferers from famine and disease are streaming in little groups toward towns; in one province, Samara, sixty thousand deserted children have to be cared for; transportation has broken down. From Berlin a cabled letter says that the Russian masses are near the point of revolt; the Soviets, it is said, hope to hold on to power, not by feeding the people, but by feeding the Red army and the workers in a few big factories, and to put down counter-revolution with machine guns; the Mensheviks (moderate Socialists) in Petrograd issue circulars which say: "We demand more bread. It is high time to return to common sense and overthrow the Soviet régime." From the Volga region come stories of the most horrible suffering from cholera infection; the peasants are mad with superstition and resist medical and sanitary aid; "at every station crowds of lean, sick, and dying humanity outstretch their hands to travelers and utter hideous appeals for food." One correspondent asserts that six million people are moving on Moscow—not

an army, but a starving mob. News like this is coming every day; with all allowance for exaggeration and excitement, there is ample evidence of a condition horrible, almost unexampled, and of serious danger to Europe at large.

It must be a bitter humiliation for Lenine and Trotsky to be told roundly that the Soviets can be dealt with only under restrictions showing that America has no faith in Bolshevik honor or truth. Not only must American prisoners be released, but they must be outside Soviet territory before relief begins. Notice is given that no recognition of Soviet rule is implied. Precautions are to be taken to see that supplies do not fall into the hands of the Red army. The American Relief Association is to be assured of non-interference by the Russian Government. It is to have a free hand in organization and administration of relief. All these things have been demanded by Mr. Hoover as head of the Relief Association or by Secretary Hughes. Reluctantly and surlily the conditions have been accepted. The work of mercy and humanity will begin.

Trotsky is said to have denied a detailed cable report that in a speech before the Soviet's Central Committee he bitterly assailed Lenine's policy of compromise and conciliation with Western capitalism and openly urged a military mass advance of Russian legions into Poland as the first move in a programme of assault against western Europe. Whether the report or the denial is true we do not know. The mere fact that it was widely accepted as a natural consequence of the breakdown of the theories of Bolshevism is significant.

The Soviets never had a majority of the Russian people behind them. They have kept their power through three things: brute force, the fear of foreign invasion among many non-Bolshevik Russians, the belief of others that revolution was impossible but that moderate ideas could be gradually infused into the Soviets and their original and wild theories transformed into those of Socialism or democracy. The Lenine régime rests on bayonets; if the soldiers join the revolting populace, as now seems more than possible, the end is near at hand.

What the outcome will be no man may say. Economic folly, political theory madly at odds with history and human nature, cruelty and oppression, are not replaced in a day or a year by prosperity and sane government. But the world is ready and anxious to help Russia if once her steps are turned in the right direction. Already men like Milukov are being consulted by Russians who hate alike imperialism and anarchy and stand for self-government of Russia by the Russian people.