

ARTICLE VIII.

A SIDE-LIGHT ON LUTHER.

BY PROFESSOR R. CLYDE FORD.

ONE of the most interesting of the many contemporaneous accounts of Luther is the one contained in the "Sabata" of Johann Jakob Kessler, a chronicler of the period between 1523 and 1539.

Kessler was born (1502) of poor parents at St. Gall, Switzerland. He attended the monastery school in his native town,—a school not so famous now as in the days of Notker and Ekkehard, when St. Gall was the home of learning north of the Alps,—and afterwards studied theology in Basel. About this time rumors of what was doing at the university of Wittenberg reached him, and, anxious to know of the reformers and their doctrines from personal contact, he set out for Germany with a single companion in the early spring of 1522. He returned to Switzerland the next year and took up the saddler's trade. For a time he remained in obscurity; but the leaven of Luther's teaching was working, and Kessler became teacher, writer, preacher, in the new movement. In 1537 he was installed as evangelical pastor at St. Gall, and after many years became superintendent of the diocese in which his native town was located. He died March 15, 1574.

His chronicle, the quaint and disjointed style of which we have tried to preserve in our translation, narrates, among other things, an accidental meeting with the great reformer when he had left the Wartburg for a secret trip to Wittenberg. It begins like this:—

As we journeyed toward Wittenberg to study the Holy Scriptures, a terrible storm, God knows, came upon us near Jena in Thuringia, and after a good deal of seeking in the city for herbergage where we might stay overnight we were not able to find any. Shelter was denied us everywhere; for it was Carnival time, when people do not concern themselves much for the pilgrim or the stranger. So we turned away from the town to go further to see if we could not reach some village where one would give us shelter. By the city gate an honest man met us, spoke to us friendly, and asked where we were going so late, saying we would not find anywheres near, on account of the darkness, either house or home where we would be received. Moreover it was an easy matter to miss the road and lose one's self; therefore he would advise us to remain where we were.

We answered: "Father, we have visited all the inns to which we have been directed, this way and that; everywhere people have refused us, and denied us quarters, and of necessity we must go further." Then he asked if we had inquired at the Black Bear. We said: "We have never heard of it; tell us, good sir, where we may find it." Then he showed it to us a little way out of the city. And when we saw the Black Bear, though all the landlords had refused us lodging before, behold, here, the landlord received us at the door, graciously offered to keep us, and led us into the house.

There we found a man, sitting alone by the table, with a little book open before him. He greeted us friendly, invited us to approach and sit by the table; though, if we may mention it, our shoes were so dirty that we could not enter the room at ease, for shame at their appearance, and had sat down upon a bench by the door. Then he offered us something to drink, a thing we could not refuse. When we perceived his friendliness and cordiality, we sat down by him, as he had asked, and had a quart of wine brought out, so that we could return the compliment to him. We suspected nothing else than that he was a knight who, according to the custom of the country, sat there dressed in leather cap, trunk-hose and doublet, without armor, a sword by his side, with his right hand resting on the hilt of it, and his other holding the book. His eyes were black and deep, flashing and shining like a star, so that one could not look at them easily.

Soon he asked us where we were born, yet answered the question himself; "You are Swiss. Where in Switzerland do you come from?" We answered: "From St. Gall." Then he said: "If you are going from here, as I understand, to Wittenberg, you will find good countrymen there,—Doctor Hieronymus Schurf and his brother, Doctor Augustinus Schurf." "We have letters to them," we said. Then we asked him: "Sir, can you tell us whether Martin Luther is now in Wittenberg, or where he may be?"

He answered: "I have certain information that Luther is not at Wit-

tenberg just now; he will, however, soon arrive there. But Philip Melancthon is there; he teaches Greek, as others also teach Hebrew. Honestly, I advise you to study both, for they are necessary to understand the Holy Scriptures." Said we: "God be praised! If God spares our lives, we will not desist till we hear and see the man (Luther); for, on his account, we have undertaken this journey, since we heard that he will overthrow both mass and priesthood. Because we have been brought up and destined from childhood to be priests, we will gladly hear what sort of instruction he will give us, and in what manner he will bring his purposes to pass."

After such words he asked: "Where have you formerly studied?" "At Basel." Then he said: "How is it at Basel? Is Erasmus Roterodamus there yet? What is he doing?"

"Sir," we answered, "so far as we know, everything there is all right; and Erasmus is there, but no one knows what he is doing, for he keeps very quiet and secluded."

These questions from the knight seemed very strange to us; and that he should be able to speak of the Schurfs, Melancthon and Erasmus; likewise, concerning the claims of the Greek and Hebrew languages. Moreover, he spoke now and then a few Latin words, so that it would seem to us he was some other person than a common knight.

"Friends," he asked us, "what do people in Switzerland think of Luther?"

"Sir, there are there, as everywhere, various opinions. Many cannot sufficiently exalt him, and thank God that he has disclosed His wisdom through him, and exposed errors. Many, however, and especially the clergy, condemn him as an intolerable heretic."

"Yes, I can imagine," he said, "it's the priests."

During this conversation we had begun to feel at home with him, and my companion took up the book that lay before him, and opened it. It was a Hebrew psalter. Then he quickly put it down again, and the knight took it. From this we were more in doubt than ever as to who he was, and my friend said: "I would give a finger from this hand to understand that language." "You will understand it without trouble," he replied, "provided you apply yourself to it diligently. I also desire to pursue it further; so I exercise myself in it daily."

In the meantime the day had closed, and it had become dark, and the landlord approached the table. When he learned of our great eagerness and desire to see Martin Luther, he said: "Dear friends, if you had been here two days ago, you would have succeeded, for he sat by the table"—he pointed with his finger—"in *that* place." We were very much put out because we had been delayed, and poured out our ill humor on the bad roads which had hindered us. But we said: "Nevertheless, we are glad that we sit in the house and at the table where he sat." At this the landlord had to laugh, and left the room.

A little while after, the landlord called me out of the room. I was startled, and wondered what improper thing I had done, or what was attributed to me without any blame on my part. The landlord said to me: "Since I see you are honestly anxious to see and hear Luther—that is he who sits by you."

I thought he was joking, and replied: "Yes, Landlord, you would like to fool me, and satisfy my desires by substituting somebody else for Luther." He answered: "It is certainly he; but don't act as if you recognized him." I did not dispute the point with him, but could not believe it. I went back to the room again, seated myself by the table, and wanted to tell my friend what the host had disclosed to me. Finally I turned to him, and whispered slyly: "The landlord has told me that that man is Luther." Like myself, he would not believe it, and said: "Perhaps he said it was Hutten, and you did not clearly understand."

Now, because the soldier dress and manner reminded me more of Hutten than of Luther the monk, I was persuaded that he had said, "It is Hutten," since the beginnings of both names sound almost alike. Whatever I said later was spoken as if to the knight, Ulrich von Hutten.

In the meantime, two of the merchants who also wanted to remain over night came in, and, after they had taken off their cloaks and spurs, one placed an unbound book near him. Then Martin asked what sort of a book it was. He said: "It is Doctor Luther's exposition of some of the Gospels and Epistles, recently printed and sent out. Have you never seen it?" Martin replied: "It will reach me soon." Just now the landlord said: "Take your places at the table, we will eat"; but we asked him to make allowance for us, and give us something cheaper. Then the man said: "Kind friends, sit down by the gentlemen at the table, and I will wait upon you properly." When Martin heard this, he said: "Come over here, I will settle the score with the landlord."

During the meal Martin spoke many godly, friendly things, so that the merchants and we were silent, paying more attention to his words than to the food. During these remarks he lamented, sighing deeply, that, while at this very time the lords and princes were assembled in the Diet at Nuremberg, on account of the word of God, this pending controversy, and the grievances of the German nation, still they were inclined to nothing except to pass the short time in sleighing, costly tournaments, debauchery, and arrogance, when the fear of God and earnest petitions to Him would be to more account. "But such are our Christian princes." He said, furthermore, he was of the hope that the evangelical truth would bring forth more fruit among our children and descendants, who are not poisoned by papal error, but are resting on the truth and the word of God, than among the parents in whom the errors are so rooted that they cannot easily be dislodged.

Thereupon the merchants expressed their opinion, and the elder one

said: "I am a simple and ordinary layman, and don't understand the business very well; but this I say: As the case appears to me, Luther must be either an angel from heaven or a devil from hell. Out of love for him, I should like to pay him ten gulden, so I might make him my confessor; for I believe he would, and could, instruct my conscience." In the meantime the landlord had approached and whispered: "Don't worry about the bill, Martin has settled for your supper." That pleased us very much, not on account of the money or the food, but because this man had entertained us so hospitably. After supper the merchants arose, and went to the stable to look after their horses. Martin remained alone with us in the room, and we thanked him for his kindness and generosity, and let him understand that we took him for Ulrich von Hutten. But he said, "I am not he."

Just then the landlord came in, and Martin said: "I have become a nobleman to-night; for these Swiss think I am Ulrich von Hutten." "You are not," said the landlord; "you are Martin Luther." He smiled: "These think I am Hutten, you think I am Luther; soon I shall be Marcolfus." Saying this, he took a large beer-glass and said, according to the custom of the land: "Swiss, let us drink a friendly glass to our welfare." As I was about to accept it from him, he changed it for a glass of wine, saying: "Beer is unusual with you; drink this wine." Then he arose, threw his soldier's cloak about his shoulders, and gave us his hand in farewell, adding: "When you come to Wittenberg, give my regards to Doctor Hieronymus Schurf." We said: "We will gladly do so; but what name shall we give, so he may understand the greeting?" Said he, "Say nothing except, 'He who will come sends greeting'—he will understand at once." Thus he left us and went to rest.

Afterwards the merchants came back again, had the landlord bring them something to drink, and over it they discussed the guest who had sat by them and who he was. But the landlord let it be understood that he took him for Luther. The merchants were persuaded, and were vexed that they had spoken of him so thoughtlessly, and declared that they would get up early next morning, before he rode away, and ask him not to be angry with them, or think the worse of them, because they had not recognized him. They did this, and found him in the stable. But Martin said: "You said last night at supper you would give ten gulden to confess to Luther. If you do confess to him some time, you will see if I am Martin Luther." He said nothing more concerning himself, but mounted and rode away toward Wittenberg.

The same day we journeyed on toward Naumberg, and we came into a village—it lies at the base of a height called Orlamunde, I think, and the village Nasshausen—through which a stream flows that had left its banks on account of the violent rains, and partly washed away the bridge, so that one could not cross with a horse. We turned into this

village, and in the inn accidentally met the two merchants, who entertained us here for Luther's sake very generously.

The next Saturday, the day before the first Sunday in Lent, we called upon Doctor Hieronymus Schurf in order to present our letters. As we were called into the room, behold, we found the knight Martin, as at Jena. And with him were Philip Melanchthon, Justus Jodocus Jonas, Nicolaus Amsdorf and Doctor Augustinus Schurf, and they were telling him what had taken place in Wittenberg during his absence. He greeted us and laughed, pointed with his finger and said: "This is Philip Melanchthon, of whom I told you."

ARTICLE IX.

THE NEW POLITICAL ECONOMY.

BY PROFESSOR FRANK PARSONS.

THE science of political economy is undergoing a change almost as remarkable as that which took place in astronomy in the Copernican era. In the old astronomy the earth was the center around which all other things, including the sun and the stars, were made to circle. In the old economy material wealth was the center round which all other things, including even life itself, were made to revolve. The new astronomy knows that the earth is not the center but only a planet moving about the sun, and the new economy knows that material wealth and the desire for it are not the central facts, but only subordinate parts of a great system, of which manhood and womanhood, character, mind, soul, affections, ideals, and development are the controlling elements, the real foci of power. The new astronomy stands off and looks at the world in its true relation to the rest of the universe, and the new economy stands off and looks at material wealth in its true relations to life and progress.

The differences between the new political economy and the old are of fundamental importance; some of them may be stated as follows:—

First. The old economy lived by itself and did business on the individualistic plan. It formed no intimate associations with other sociologic sciences and did not recognize them when it met them on the street. The new economy recognizes its relatives, lives in the family group, and

works in close association with all the other members of it. This is a matter of the utmost moment. It will not do to deal with material wealth as a thing by itself; it must be studied as part of a great whole. The science of wealth must be *coördinated* with ethics, psychology, government, art, evolution, and every other body of thought that affects human life. If your economy is not in harmony with your morals and your government, if the science of wealth does not conform to the principles of ethics and development, your social science is not an organic whole but a heap of broken fragments. The arch will not stand unless each stone is chiseled with reference to the rest. Political economy must be formed so that it will not refuse to fit its fellow sciences, but will take its place as a perfect stone in the arch of sociology.

If your government says, "Democracy, power in the people," and your economy says, "Aristocracy, plutocracy, power in the few"; if your jurisprudence says, "Justice," and your economy says, "Get rich"; if your ethics and your religion say, "Love, service, devotion," and your economy says, "Self-interest, conquest, mastery,"—there is civil war in your social science.

An economic system not in accord with the political system might subvert the government, and an industrialism out of harmony with ethics might debase society, or result in destruction, misuse, or waste of energy and wealth, or even ruin civilization as a whole, and so fail to accomplish the purposes of an industrial system, which are to create wealth, not to waste or destroy it; develop civilization, not endanger it; and elevate humanity, not debase it. A true science of wealth must tell us how to avoid these dangers, and secure these benefits so far as they depend on industry.

The old political economy neglected ethics, and, in spite of its name, endeavored for the most part to separate the

industrial and political systems. The new recognizes their indissoluble union, and justifies its title by coördinating their study and treatment. Ideals and political institutions are vital factors in industrial affairs, and industrial institutions are no less vital factors in morality, religion, art, and politics. A true political economy must harmonize with jurisprudence, ethics, æsthetics, evolution, and social science in all its parts. Man is the most important factor in wealth production, and the object of it also; wherefore, all sciences relating to man and disclosing the laws that determine his character and condition, have a bearing on political economy. It is just as impossible to construct a true, complete, and proper science of wealth or industry by the study of wealth alone, without reference to its relations with political and social life, as it would be to build a science of the stomach or heart by studying them alone, without reference to their relations with brain and nerves, lungs, liver, kidneys, and skin.

The standard economists tell us that "political economy is the science of wealth, the body of knowledge that relates to wealth,"¹ and yet they omit as a rule the ethical, political, and social relations of industry, which constitute the most important parts of this knowledge.² That one

¹ Walker's Political Economy, pp. 1, 3-4.

² Here and there in the standard books some reference is made to ethical and social considerations and the higher aspects of wealth and industry. (See for a strong paragraph of this sort Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, Bk. iii. c. iv, "Thirdly.") But it is the business of the new economy to deal with the moral and social effects of industry in its various forms, not in an incidental, fragmentary, or partial manner, but systematically and exhaustively, as the supreme object and sole justification of a science of wealth above the level of mere intellectual gymnastics. As a rule the leading economists quietly exclude the ethical and social factors in production, and silently neglect the *human* and *progressive*, as distinguished from the mere *mechanico-commercial*, aspects of wealth, production, and distribution. Sometimes the student of economics is expressly told that he must not concern himself with political, ethical, or social considerations, but must confine his attention to finding out

system of producing and distributing wealth develops conscience and character, sympathy and mutualistic life, while another system has the opposite tendency, is a fact relating to wealth that is vastly more momentous than any amount of knowledge about the law of supply and demand. The effects of morals and government upon industry, and the moral, political, and social effects of wealth and of different methods of producing, distributing, holding, and using it, are fundamental items in "the body of knowledge that relates to wealth,"—supreme elements of political economy, which, if omitted, leave the science of wealth without its most vital parts, and unable to fulfil the chief purpose for which it has any warrant of existence.

If honesty, conscience, good-will, education, and free institutions enable a community to produce more wealth than if it were dishonest, conscienceless, ignorant, and full of ill-feeling and slavishness, then honesty, conscience, good-will, education, and free institutions, and whatever tends to strengthen and develop them, are factors in productive power, and whatever has a contrary tendency opposes wealth production. If under some circumstances private how wealth is produced, exchanged, distributed, and consumed. "The more strictly the several branches of inquiry are kept apart the better it will be for each and for all" (Walker, p. 1). No reason is given by Walker for this, and he does not himself keep the inquiries strictly apart in all cases (see, for example, pp. 269, 304, 317); neither is there any warrant for doing so in his premises. He says that political economy is the science of wealth, and science is "knowledge coördinated, arranged, and systematized" (Century Dictionary). But coördination is directly contrary to keeping inquiries strictly apart. It is true, of course, that the economist should not pursue his studies to bolster political, social, or religious prejudices; but it is not true that he should neglect to consider industrial facts in the light of ethical and political facts and principles, or refuse to investigate the effects of industrial processes upon morals and civilization. He should clear his mind to the utmost, not only of religious and political prejudices, but of economic prejudices also, and seek the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, about wealth; and to do this he must certainly study its relations with morality, government, and civilization.

monopoly of land and capital is opposed to freedom and democracy and unfavorable to the highest development of the human factor in production, while coöperative effort favors morality and the elevation of man; if conflict and antagonism are destructive, while union and harmony are creative; if partnership in profits and control, public spirit, careful training and wise organization, are more potent for effective production than the opposing forces of a chaotic struggle for existence; if certain industrial arrangements enable an unseen agency to intercept a large part of the wealth produced, so that the reward of labor does not increase in due proportion with the increasing productiveness of labor, whereby class differences are widened, wealth-congestion and poverty-congestion intensified, the people divided instead of united, the nation sundered instead of cemented; if industrial conditions disfranchise men, and political conditions determine the production and distribution of wealth; if civilization and wealth-diffusion multiply production while they diminish the birth-rate; if union, arbitration, education, justice, and even brother-love may fix wages, and politics may settle the hours and conditions of labor;—surely such important matters, indissolubly connected with wealth and the various methods and conditions of its production and distribution, fall within “the body of knowledge that relates to wealth.”¹

¹ We may even find, when we study the *whole* body of knowledge that relates to wealth, that the “Malthusian Law,” “The Iron Law of Wages,” “The Law of Demand and Supply,” and the whole “Theory of Values and Exchanges” are not fundamental laws of industry at all, but only imperfect statements of passing phases, based on a study of *part* of the facts relating to wealth, and likely to be swept away by the correlation of industry with ethics and jurisprudence. Already it is recognized that the “Malthusian Law” is not a law when moral considerations are taken into account, and that respect for labor and sympathy with the laboring classes may become a force in determining the rate of wages and overturn the “Iron Law” (see Walker, pp. 269, 304). Many do not pay competitive wages now, nor put the price on their goods and services re-

Second. The old political economy was static,¹ the new is dynamic. The old economy took things at rest, the new gives large attention to movement. The old economy generally assumes existing conditions to be right and eternal, and satisfies itself with trying to formulate the laws of industry as they are; as though logic should seek to determine only how men do reason, and not also how they ought to reason; or chemistry should study only existing combinations, and not the effects of possible combinations also.

The new economy not only seeks to understand the present industrial system, but also endeavors to grasp the conditions of a truly scientific system, and to discover how the transition to such a system may best be made. It studies the *movement* of the past and present; points out the evils and dangers of present industrial conditions, compares them with similar evils and dangers in other countries and other times; notes the consequences indicated by historic analogy and scientific prevision; tries to determine how the dangers may be averted and the evils abolished; discusses the means of retaining, enlarging, and strengthening what is good; and carefully formulates the best methods of developing and improving the production and quired by the "Law of Demand and Supply." And it is not impossible that all the learning about demand and supply, gold and silver monies, prices, values, exchanges, etc., that fills the books on economics, may in a few years give place to expanded treatments of subjects that now peep timidly out of the pages here and there with the melancholy air of unappreciative guests crushed by the coldness of their hosts.

¹ "All that one has, as an economist, to do is to find out how wealth is produced, exchanged, distributed, and consumed" (Walker, p. 1). Why may not the economist find out also how wealth *has been*, and how it *may be* produced, distributed, and consumed, and study the total effects, actual and probable, moral, intellectual, political, and social, of each method? Why not study how to *improve* the general methods of producing and distributing wealth? Surely reason gives no authority for excluding such inquiries from "the body of knowledge that relates to wealth."

distribution of wealth. The old was at rest, the new is in motion.

Third. The aims and standards of the old economy differ largely from those of the new. The old economy aims at merchandise, the new aims at manhood. The old economy generally looks to the increase of property as its object, regardless of the effect upon men,—it values merchandise more than manhood,—like a man who should spend all his time building the floor to his house, never giving a thought to the walls or roof or interior decoration—like the turtle who worked so long and so hard at making a pair of glasses so he could see better, that he lost his eyesight during the process.

The new political economy understands that a man is worth more than a railroad, a coal-mine, or a bank vault; that manhood and noble living are the supreme objects of all laws and institutions, including industrial and political institutions; and that wealth is of value only as a means to these objects, surpassing its reason for existence and becoming a curse, when, instead of acting as the servant of manhood, and the producer of nobility, it makes man its slave, and nobility its drudge.

Money and merchandise are valuable because they procure ease, comfort, health, culture of the body, mind and soul,—because they promote manhood and noble living,—yet in the rush for wealth all the benefits that wealth can give, and others infinitely beyond its power, are trampled in the dust. And the old political economy sits calmly by, taking notes of the process, as though it were eminently wise for a man to give his head for a bit of bread, and altogether proper to sacrifice a sovereign on the altar of his rightful slave. The reason is clear. The old political economy takes no note of the relative values of man and merchandise, and gives little attention to their interactions—the effects of each upon the other. It fails to rec-

ognize that manhood is the supreme product of a nation's industries—the highest wealth—the mightiest power for the creation even of that material wealth about which it is so solicitous. Keep all your machinery and capital, mines and factories, railroads and cities, but banish all the people now in America, and put barbarians in their places, and what would the wealth product be in this country next year? Our people could produce more barehanded than uncivilized men in the midst of unlimited capital and machinery, but without the honesty, self-control, habits of industry, training of hand and brain, knowledge, skill, ability to coöperate, etc., that make possible the wealth productions of the United States to-day. The old economy aims at merchandise, forgetting the purpose beyond, and it even neglects to inquire how to secure the most powerful factor in mercantile production. Its purpose is a false one, and its method of accomplishing even that false purpose is very imperfect. Intelligence and soul count more than capital, even on the low plane of material production. But political economy does not trouble itself about intelligence and soul, though the inferior factor, capital, claims its most abundant care.

The new political economy clearly recognizes the fundamental fact that manhood is the highest object of human endeavor, and the most efficient means of accomplishing all human purposes, even the production of material wealth. It is apt to be very misleading, and the source of grievous errors, to enumerate land, labor, and capital as the factors of wealth production. The formula ought to include mental qualities, character, social conditions, history, state of civilization, and all the infinite forces which make up the worker and his environment, and determine the product of his life, intellectual and material, individual and social, and which largely escape inclusion under the terms land, labor, and capital, as they are employed in cur-

rent political economy. It is better to say that the factors of production are land, labor, capital, civilization, or social conditions, and manhood,—then the truth appears on the face of the law, and the deductions from it stand a better chance of being correct.

John Stuart Mill admits that a true definition of wealth must include mind and character; yet, like Adam Smith, Ricardo, and others, he separates material wealth, and makes it substantially the sole subject of his treatise on political economy, practically confining the science of wealth to a consideration of the least important sort of wealth; as though astronomy confined itself to the moon, or physiology to the feet, with no due consideration of related facts, or correlation with treatises that did consider them, and no recognition of final objects and fundamental purposes and their relation to the subject under treatment. It would be no less sensible for men to devote themselves exclusively or disproportionately to studying how to increase the size of their feet, than to devote themselves exclusively or disproportionately to studying how to increase the amount of material wealth. And it would be no more remarkable to see men living simply to cultivate and carry about their feet, than to see them living solely to accumulate money.

John Stuart Mill redeemed himself in his autobiography, and each edition of his *Political Economy* was better than the last. But there are only a few faint glimmers of the dawn in any of the "standard works of the old masters." It is not necessary for political economy to contain a treatise on ethics or government or psychology any more than on engineering or the mechanic arts, agriculture or the composition of soils and minerals; but it is necessary that it should *recognize* the principles of ethics, government, psychology, etc., and test its results by them, otherwise it must fail to accomplish the *constructive* work which

is the most important function of a social science. Astronomy, geology, biology, etc., may not contain a treatise on logic, but each must recognize the principles of logic, and test its conclusions by them. Prevision, construction, development, are chief among the services that a department of social science may render. A science of wealth that does not determine the *best* methods of producing and distributing wealth, nor tell us what our industrial institutions ought to be, is less than half a science of wealth. It is not necessary that political economy should determine the origin and nature of mind and conscience, nor discuss the imagination, affections, habit, association of ideas, etc., nor record the evolution of democracy, nor tell us in what justice, honesty, kindness, purity, and altruism consist, or why they are good—these things belong to ethics, government, psychology, etc.—but political economy must note the conclusions these sciences reach, and coördinate its own deductions with them,—it must recognize the value of intelligence and virtue and social conditions, duly subordinate material wealth to the higher wealth, place mind, character, institutions, and environment at the head of its list of the factors of production, make manhood the ultimate object of all its studies, found its system on the laws of development, and devote itself to instructing men how to organize an ideal industrialism, a truly scientific system of producing and distributing wealth, that will not waste more than it produces, nor destroy values higher than those it creates. This the new economy aims to do.

Some of the leading principles which the new political economy must keep in mind, and subject to which it must do its work, may now be stated, with a hint now and then of a few of their applications.

COÖRDINATION.

1. Correlation of the social sciences, so that each will recognize, understand, and mutually support all the rest. If an institution or method of business is contrary to the principles of justice and the law of love, then it is contrary to a true economy. If the purchase of labor as a commodity at the lowest market price, the purchase of human life for cash, not all at once beneath the sheriff's hammer, but on the installment plan, a day, a week, a month, or a year at a time, under the compulsion of necessity—if this is contrary to the highest welfare of mankind, then it is contrary to political economy.

PROGRESS.

2. We must study not only what the laws and methods of industry are, but what they ought to be. We must not only understand and test the present, we must seek the ideal and its realization. If the wage system is defective, we must determine the conditions of improvement, both palliative and radical. We must study short-hour laws, improved dwellings, public employment bureaus, etc. We must see if coöperation, or socialization, or some other plan may not be better than present methods; and, if so, how the change may be most easily, justly, and speedily accomplished, and the new plan tested under conditions that will give it a reasonable chance of success.

If many cannot get work at all, while others toil to exhaustion; if some who render large service have little, while others who render no service have much; if invention and civilization have multiplied productive power so that workmen produce twenty, fifty, or a hundredfold what they formerly could in the same length of time, and yet those workmen are some of them worse off than formerly, and others but little better off, and even the average condition, though much improved, is still far below the level

of economic justice, since the reward of labor, though increased, has by no means increased in due proportion with the increase in the productiveness of labor—the share of labor having risen in arithmetical ratio, while the share of those who own the great franchises and combinations, manufacturing and commercial enterprises, city estates and favored lands, has risen in geometric ratio, or even in exponential ratio; if privilege and monopoly take billions of dollars every year from industry, and hundreds of millions are gambled for and wasted by a few; if some of the means of satisfying human wants that are privately owned would be better used under public or coöperative ownership; if some are making money by corruption or oppression, or coining money out of the ruin of their fellow-men; if some industrial conditions tend to debase mankind and endanger free institutions,—then it is the business of political economy to study these matters and tell us what must be done to get rid of such economic evils and attain a more perfect industrial system.

THE FUNDAMENTAL TESTS.

3. The ultimate purpose of all institutions and of all human effort is happiness. Misery is not of sufficient importance to make it worth while to build industrial and social systems to manufacture and distribute *it*. The ultimate test of a social system is therefore the degree of perfection with which it produces the happiness of man. Happiness requires complete and noble living. An ignoble life causes pain to the person who lives it, and to every one who comes in contact with it; and an incomplete life, one that omits a part of the noble activities of which it is capable, loses the pleasures to itself and to others that would come with the omitted activities, and lowers the sum of the world's rightful joys. A secondary or derivative test of a true social system is, therefore, its tendency to pro-

duce noble and complete living. Noble and complete living requires perfect manhood and womanhood, for imperfect men and women cannot live perfect lives; so that still another secondary or derivative test, or perhaps, more accurately speaking, another form of the same fundamental test of a true social system, is its tendency to produce perfect manhood and womanhood.

Again, the spiritual element in happiness, in manhood, in noble and complete living, is love—not in the sense of the selfish passion that demands possession and control of the life of another, but love in the sense of sympathy, kindness, brotherly feeling; the love that makes sacrifices for the good of the loved one; the love that knows no way to be happy but to make others happy, that will not ask a pleasure at the cost of agony to others, nor seek a joy that comes as a burden on the back of pain. Every element of man's spiritual nature that is inconsistent with or contradictory to complete and perfect love, such as hate, revenge, injustice, cruelty, jealousy, etc., is a pain producer, while love multiplies the joys of existence a hundredfold. Mankind can never be completely happy till every human being instinctively recoils from doing any act the law of love would condemn, and spontaneously desires to do every act the law of love would command or suggest. So that still another derivative test of a true social system is the degree of its conformity to the law of love.

THE SUPREME PRODUCT.

4. Manhood is the supreme product of an industrial system. Material wealth is desirable only to such extent and under such conditions as make it conduce to noble living. The production of character and intelligence is the highest form of industry, and to its requirements all other industries should conform. Life is not for money, but money for life. Men should not live to take care of

machines, nor be banished by their introduction; machinery should exist to help men, not to subject them. As new machines are invented, men should not be thrown out of employment, but hours should be shortened and wages increased that men may have time to think and the means of culture. A system under which machines take precedence of men is not in accord with a true economy, for it subordinates the higher wealth to the lower.

THE STANDARD OF VALUE.

5. We must measure final values in terms of life and progress, not in terms of dollars and cents. A fireman is worth more than a locomotive, and a brakeman more than an express train, though he may not sell for so much. A sailor is worth more than a ship, though his exchange value may be far less. A boy is worth more than a coal-mine or a cotton-mill, a girl more than a clothing factory or a department store; a happy home more than the taxes from a dozen saloons. Money itself must have its value measured by its effects on life and development.

MUTUALISM.

6. The two great divisions of human relationship are severance and association. The second division falls into four great groups, which we may call Conflict, Mastery, Partnership, and Devotion; an ascending series,—the first two wasteful and debasing, the last two elevating and ennobling.

Whether it be the devotion of a mother to her child, of a lover to the loved one, of a soldier to his country, of a philanthropist to humanity, of an inventor to his great idea, of a scientist to the discovery of truth, of a poet, musician, or artist to the creation of beauty, of a philosopher or reformer to his high ideal, of a martyr to the cause he

loves,—everywhere devotion is recognized as the loftiest of relations.

There is a steady tendency of the lower forms of relation to pass into the higher. Institutions and emotions have their laws of selection and survival, as well as individuals and races. As population increases, the severance of distance gives way to contact in conflict or in union. Conflict merges into mastery or partnership or devotion. Mastery is almost as unstable as conflict—there is conflict in its heart, unless the mind of the slave is dead and the soul of the master forever asleep. It builds upon rebellion's soil. There is no rest, no permanence, no safety, till mastery is changed to partnership or devotion; and when once we have partnership, devotion is only a question of time for growing sympathy to change the crude justice, that is satisfied with the absence of aggression, into the higher justice we call love, that is satisfied only by the gift of our all for others. He that would be greatest among you must be your servant. Loving service is the highest ideal of life. Mutual help or mutualism is the perfect solvent for all social problems.

If these things are true, then a system of industry that fosters antagonisms, and teaches conquest, and permits oppression, is not in accord with a true economy. It is not adapted to producing the best wealth,—perfected manhood and noble lives.

The higher relations, partnership and devotion, are forms of coöperation. The competitive system is composed of conflicts and masteries, which are low relations. If progress is from lower forms to higher, there can be no doubt that coöperation will take the place of competition.

THE LAW OF DEVELOPMENT.

7. Development requires the encouragement of good and the repression of bad.

8. Experience and reason prove the value of liberty, justice, and union. In respect to union, our industries are about in the same condition as the states before the Federal Constitution went into effect. In respect to justice, those who do least to make the world better obtain the most wealth and power, and receive the most consideration. Those who build the palaces do not live in them. Those who create the wealth of the world do not enjoy it. In respect to liberty, no one is free who is dependent upon the arbitrary will of another for an opportunity to earn his daily bread.

Every living thing should have full freedom except where reason and experience demand a limitation, and then equal application of the limitation, and exemptions from it, to all under the same essential circumstances. Full liberty to do what is clearly right, no liberty to do what is clearly wrong. In the region of doubt, liberty for the sake of discovery and progress.

9. Justice, liberty, and development require the *diffusion* of wealth, power, knowledge, and virtue. A system that gives one man two hundred millions and another nothing, though he is honest and willing to work—a system under which half the people own practically nothing, $\frac{1}{8}$ of the people own more than $\frac{7}{8}$ of the wealth, and 1 per cent of the people own 55 per cent of the wealth, is a system that cannot well stand this ninth test.

10. Justice, liberty, and development also demand the *equalization*: (1) of opportunities for education, development, labor, and enjoyment; (2) of unearned increment; (3) of innocent burdens and difficulties, such as distance, climate, soil, accidents, sickness, death, taxes, etc.

11. Self-government is required by liberty, justice, and the law of development: (1) because of its educating, ennobling, and self-respect-producing effects; (2) because of the protection it offers against injustice and oppression.

12. Partnership is the most perfect relation in which men can *formally* combine. It involves self-government as an inherent part of itself, secures coherence and eliminates the wastes and debasements of conflict by unifying interests, promotes energy and economy, favors the diffusion of wealth, fosters liberty and justice, aids the building of character, and obeys in every way the Law of Development.

Universal Partnership is the highest aim of social organization. Profit-sharing, coöperation, public ownership of monopolies,—anything that unifies interest, banishes conflict, and increases mutual helpfulness,—is in the right direction. In the ideal society, men will be coördinated, not as master and servant, but as partners,—coöperators. In no other way can universal human nature throw off the ignominies of servitude, and rise to the dignity of self-control—every man the master of nature and himself, no man the master of another. Democracy, when real, is nothing but partnership. The word is sometimes applied to organizations in which the government is nominally shared by the members, although really ruled by a class—these are democracies only in form and name, in substance they are aristocracies. In a real democracy, the will of the people has such immediate and vital control, that what the people want to have done is done, and what they do not wish to have done is not done. A nation may have a democracy, even a real one, in one portion of its affairs, and yet submit to aristocratic rule, or even monarchical despotism, in another portion. Some of our own people live under a real democracy in respect to local political affairs, an elective aristocracy in respect to the political affairs of state and nation, a hereditary aristocracy in respect to industrial affairs, and a monarchy in respect to religious affairs.

13. Economy and increase of resources are necessary to the highest development. Waste is to be reduced to a

minimum ; energy, education, character, skill, inventive power and organization, carried to a maximum.

14. Prevision is essential to life,—the more perfect it is (other things equal), the higher the life. It requires (1) assured employment and income; (2) wise adjustment of supply and demand; (3) elimination of all chance, as far as possible.

15. Stability in substantial measure is needful for reasonable prevision. Rapid or sudden changes are very costly. Instability and uncertainty destroy business, peace of mind, energy, progress,—modified men are required for modified institutions. Human nature is not a fluid or a ball of putty, to take a new shape in a moment; it is like the stream of the glacier,—a slow, strong pressure is needed to move it so that the atoms can readjust themselves without breakage. Not revolution, but consciously aided evolution, is what the law of development demands.

16. Replacement of nature's rough and costly method of *automatic selection* by the refined and rapid method of *intelligent selection* is one of the greatest aids to progress. The principles by which fine horses and cattle and dogs have been developed without the waste of time and life and the anguish of the "struggle for existence," should be, as far as possible, applied to the development of man.

17. We should *go to the sources of good and evil*, for that is where effort will yield the largest return. The birth and training of children are the most vital concerns. A community that allows vast multitudes of its children to be robbed of their childhood, imprisoned in factories, buried in sweat shops and department stores, brought up in the slums, on the streets, in the saloons, selling newspapers, blacking boots, carrying messages and bundles, when they ought to be in school or at play,—a community that has 36,000 children in its grammar schools and no room in its crowded high schools for more than 4500, showing that

it has no intention to give the great majority of children a thorough education,—a community that allows hundreds of women to sew from ten to sixteen hours a day, making dresses and trousers and shirts for one dollar to three dollars a week, and permits millions of girls and women to work long hours under unwholesome, dangerous, and immoral conditions in tobacco factories, cotton mills, bakeries, stores, sweat shops, and garrets, for wages that afford only a bare subsistence,—a community that allows the mothers of its future sovereigns and those sovereigns themselves to be treated in such a way, certainly needs to be told to look to the fountains.

THE ECONOMIC VALUE OF BROTHERHOOD.

18. The law of brother love is the fundamental principle from which all the others are deducible, and which alone can entirely eliminate conflict, produce a perfect community of interest, and carry mutual helpfulness to its limit. Love makes every power of wealth, position, education, and ability a trust for humanity,—obedience to its dictates is not self-sacrifice, but only the sacrifice of the lower self to the higher self. A man with a big brain or a strong body, if love rules him, will not try to make others serve him, but will seek to serve them. Love will make him feel that for every power he possesses more than others, he owes them that much more of service than they can owe him. Ability with love behind it means simply duty and delight to serve.

We teach our children in church and school that they should love their neighbors as themselves, but our industrialism teaches them to outwit and underbid their neighbors; to get their business away from them, pay them as little and make them pay as much as possible,—get money for ourselves no matter if it ruins them. Yet all the time we say we are brothers, and we pay thousands of ministers to preach the Brotherhood of Man.

We are not brothers. We ought to be, and our saying we are is a very encouraging sign, because it shows our ideals; and where our ideals are, we shall be some day. But we are not brothers now. Our actions belie our words. Imagine, if you can, a millionaire allowing his baby brother to be raised in the slums by the most degraded men and women in the land. Imagine a baby in the slums with a dozen millionaires for brothers and sisters, all of whom knew he was there, and was their lawful brother in direst need and sore distress. Imagine a baby in slum life with brothers and sisters worth sixty-five billions of property. You cannot do it. 'Yet that is what the brothers and sisters of every baby in the slums possess according to the brotherhood of man and the census of 1890—nearer seventy-five or eighty billions now probably; but it might as well be zero as far as the average slum baby is concerned.

The time will come, however, when there will be no slums; for the Brotherhood of Man has entered the market-place and the factory, and will transform them, and with them the homes of those who labor there. It is beginning to be understood that union, harmony, mutual help, and brotherliness are vital causes in economic phenomena, fundamental factors in the production and distribution both of material riches and the higher wealth. Conscience and coöperation, profit-sharing and labor copartnership, self-government and socialization, democracy and devotion, are gradually taking possession of the field of industry, and the New Political Economy is beginning to teach our youth that, from an economic standpoint, as well as from an ethical standpoint, conscience is better than conquest, union better than conflict, devotion better than mastery; and that service is the best riches, manhood the highest wealth, and brother love more to be desired than all the money in the world.