

everywhere, but scientific study, such as is cultivated at the German universities, has as yet gained a secure foot-hold only at about three of our colleges; even at these institutions Germanic and comparative philology are in their infancy. When the importance of these studies is urged upon members of the faculties or the boards of trustees, the same reply is always received, viz., that the classics absorb so much time, that within the short course of four years, no room can be found for serious scientific study. If a man wishes to become a scientific specialist, it is said, let him enter one of the scientific schools, and if he wishes to study modern philology, let him go to Germany.

Now all this has a certain show of reason. Yet it is not an answer to the question, but an evasion of it. It is the business of our great educational institutions to supply just the kind of knowledge which will equip a man most completely, if not for his special profession, then in a more general way, for the struggle for existence. His education should enable him to utilize to the very best advantage the conditions which surround him. That this should be the aim of all training, collegiate and elementary, few, outside of college faculties, will dispute. But how do our colleges meet this universal demand? By requiring of every applicant for admission that he shall have spent from three to five years in familiarizing himself with the grammar and literature of two exceedingly difficult ancient languages, which he never will either speak or write correctly, and which, in nine cases out of ten, will be of no practical value to him whatever. Thereupon follow four additional years of training in these same defunct languages, minute study of prosodic rules, accents, and other scholarly niceties, while the modern languages and the useful sciences hold an inferior and half-recognized position as matters of secondary importance.

Now, what is really the cause of this anomalous arrangement? Simply the fact that since the study of Latin grammar was first introduced, into Europe, in the sixth century (although as a literary study Latin could hardly be said to have had any existence until the day of Poggio, in the fifteenth), humanity has accepted the stale truisms regarding its use mechanically, as it does any inherited belief, and has shrunk from examining the validity of these claims by the light of modern knowledge. There is no question that in the Middle Ages, when every science except mathematics was in its infancy, the introduction of the classics was a movement of enormous importance. It was so much better than any means of intellectual training which had previously existed that very likely the old *trivium* and *quadrivium* did represent the best college course which could be devised with the literary and scientific resources of that time. But is that any reason why, with the unparalleled progress of the arts and sciences which the last century has witnessed, we should still continue to look with this exclusive reverence upon the Greek and Roman writers? We will yield to no one in appreciation of their beauties, but, even granting all that their advocates claim, can they by any possibility be entitled to usurp so large a share of the time and energy of our youth, to the exclusion of knowledge which has so much more direct bearing upon the affairs of life?

There is hardly a man of keen sense and insight who, after having left college, does not have daily occasion to regret his inability to account rationally for the phenomena which everywhere thrust themselves upon his attention. If he is a merchant, there are a hundred facts which he must take into consideration in determining his daily sales and purchases, and the more accurately he can estimate the effects of present and prospective events upon the market, the surer he is of success and the swifter his road to fortune. But how much time is given to the study of sociology and political economy in the academic curriculum, as compared to Latin and Greek? It is only within the last two or three years that these studies have received any attention whatever, for few would seriously contend that the so-called political economy which is cultivated in many of our old-fashioned colleges is in any sense a science, or has any tendency to sharpen one's powers of rational observation in after life. But a most important step has now been taken in the recognition of these studies, in their modern acceptation, as legitimately belonging to an academic course.

What we have said in regard to sociology applies, *mutatis mutandis*, with equal force to other sciences. Physics, zoölogy, geology, etc., interpret the deep and essential rationality of nature's methods, and in connection with biology enable man to form an approximate estimate of his own place in the physical universe. There is beauty as well as strength in all true knowledge, and as means of mental training alone, even a rudimentary acquaintance with these sciences is, in its way, quite as valuable as the epistolary and rhetorical elegance and the refinement supposed to be derived from the study of the classics. So long as we are all born into this world and are to live by our faculty to utilize its resources, it is our first business to explore its properties, its history, and the mode of its development. There is, however, no reason why we should not devote part of our time to the study, also, of those two remarkable eras of civilization represented by the Greeks and the Romans; and if a man looks forward to a profession in which acquaintance with the ancient classics is of practical value, by all means let him adhere to the present college course. But these professions are very few. We are of opinion that, as refining influences and agencies of culture, the sciences, if taught with the same thoroughness and care as the classics have hitherto been taught, will yield results not to be despised. Indeed, the gradual remodeling of our college course in the spirit here indicated is merely a question of time, and all that the ultra conservatives can accomplish is merely to delay the reform.

Christianity and Commerce.

SINCE the days when the Greeks had but one word with which to describe the retailer and the rascal, much improvement has taken place in the morals of trade. Fraud and knavery still exist, but the great volume of business in Europe and America is done by men who do not misrepresent their wares, and who do not intend to cheat their customers. Many cheap and worthless fabrics are manufactured, but most of those who deal in them reveal their true character to those who purchase them. In the majority of our larger business-

houses you can take the salesman's word; he will not tell you that the cloth is "all wool" when it is half cotton; he will not represent the plated ware as solid silver. There are knaves in all branches of business, but they do not ordinarily thrive in trade; the commercial value of common honesty has become tolerably evident to sagacious business men. In this respect there has been a great change for the better within a quarter of a century.

The principal evils connected with commercial life at the present day do not arise out of what is commonly called dishonesty. The worst malefactors in the business world to-day are men who do not lie nor cheat; whose word is good on the Exchange; who fulfill their contracts when they can, and who always intend to keep strictly within the letter of the law. Fraud is not their weapon; they have ample justification for all they do in the statutes of the State and the maxims of political economy. An aggressive selfishness that knows no pity and feels no shame can manage to perpetrate untold injuries without incurring the penalty of any human law.

This type of selfishness finds an ample opportunity in the present organization of industry and trade. The tendencies are all toward consolidation and monopoly. Great capitalists or great companies are steadily replacing the multitude of smaller makers and dealers. The industrial conditions are such that this process is likely to go on. Whatever may be true of biology, the law of natural selection seems to rule in commerce. "To him that hath shall be given, while from him that hath not shall be taken away," no longer seems a paradox.

These great accumulations of capital are, of course, mainly impersonal and immoral. The soullessness of corporations is a proverb. The people who draw the dividends come into no personal relations with the people who do the work; their traffic is with shares and per cents, not with spinners or brakemen. The great proprietors are not much better than the great companies. As wealth enlarges, the distance widens between employer and employed. It is impossible, of course, for one of our railroad magnates, or one of our great merchants or mill-owners, to know all the persons who gain their livelihood in his service, and the impossibility is one over which selfishness rejoices. The less of acquaintance there is between master and man, the less room there is for considerations of justice and humanity. Scrooge would much rather discuss labor as an abstract element in the cost of production than consider the wage of Bob Cratchit or the stipend paid to the widow Jones's daughter. So it comes about that the business carried on by merchant-princes or railroad-kings shows few signs of personal ownership or management. Machinery increases and humanity decreases. It sometimes happens that a man becomes, to all intents and purposes, a corporation. What becomes of his soul in the transmigration nobody knows, but it disappears. Can this be the process referred to in the pungent question, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

Not only do great accumulations of capital possess a natural advantage over small ones, but this advantage is pushed with the intent to destroy the small concerns. We have learned to talk very coolly of the big fish eating the little ones; that predatory habit seems

quite a matter of course. The great merchant or manufacturer deliberately sets to work to kill off his small competitors; by canceling his own profits and reducing his pay-rolls for a season, he drives them from the field. All this is done in the way of legal and "legitimate" traffic; whose business is it if the great dealer chooses to sell his wares for less than cost? Doubtless the public will pay, by and by, for the crushing out of competition; but the public is near-sighted in such matters, and readily unites with the strong in trampling down the weak. This work of extermination is often accompanied with the proffer of courtesy and even friendliness; it is not uncommon for the great railroads or the great mills to extend their protection to the little ones—"such protection as vultures give to lambs, covering them [with mortgages] and devouring them."

If the small capitalists are thus driven to the wall in their conflict with the great proprietors and the great companies, much less can laborers hold their own in the struggle for their share of the profits of production. The power of aggregated and organized capital to dictate terms to labor has been amply demonstrated. It is simply true to say that this power is exerted, not uniformly, but for the most part, in a perfectly selfish manner. The welfare of the work-people does not enter into the problem; the question is simply one of the percentage of profit. A great railroad company forces the wages of its brakemen from a dollar and a half down to a dollar and a quarter a day, in order that it may keep the dividends on its stock up to eight per cent. This is not illegal; it is not dishonest, according to the usual acceptance of that word; the company is free to fix its own tariff of wages; if the brakemen do not wish to work for a dollar and a quarter a day, they can take themselves off. The managers who make the reduction, and the directors who approve it, expect, however, that the workmen will submit. They do not, first of all, ask themselves how a man with a wife and five young children can live on a dollar and a quarter a day; they chiefly wish to know how the regular semi-annual dividend of four or five per cent. can be secured. Are not all these matters determined by the equivalence of supply and demand? Is not this economic law the guide of conscience and the end of controversy for every business man?

The last question brings us to the heart of the matter. For a pagan the answer is easy: need the Christian vex himself with scruples? How about the Golden Rule? Has that anything to do with business? "We that are strong," says an apostle, "ought to bear the burdens of the weak." Is there room to apply such a maxim as this in the relations of capitalists and laborers? "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others"—is that a maxim that should ever come into the mind when wages are lowered that dividends may be raised? What has the Christian rule to do with the transactions of commercial life?

A large share of all the business men of this country profess and call themselves Christians, yet the thought of practicing in their business these plain rules of Christianity enters the minds of but few of them. The love that worketh no ill to his neighbor is not yet the law of commercial life. Not fraud or trickery, but

selfishness, undisguised and absolute, governs the realm of exchanges. Political economy assumes this as the normal principle; and not many are found who, in behalf of Christianity, venture to question the assumption. It seems to be taken for granted that Christian ethics has no place in the commercial realm: that this is one of the kingdoms of this world that never was given to Christ. Clearly the millennium is yet a great way off.

Nevertheless, it is coming. The signs of its coming are seen here and there upon the earth. It has been demonstrated that the affairs of great corporations may be successfully managed, even when much thought is given to the welfare of the people employed. The factory village that was once a wilderness has been seen to blossom like the rose, in bright fulfillment of the old prophet's vision. There are business houses in all our cities in which the interests of employer and employed appear to each to be mutual. There are business men who think habitually of the welfare of their neighbors; who forbear to push the advantage that wealth gives them to the destruction of their rivals; who fighten by their good-will the pressure of the economic laws. It is possible, even in these fierce times, for a business man to mix Christian kindness with thrift and enterprise. The day will come when the phenomenon will be less rare.

The Outrages in Russia.

EVERY day it is becoming more evident that no part of humanity can be hurt without pain to the whole body. The inhuman and almost incredible outrages upon the Jews in Russia have drawn forth a world-wide sympathy, and a protest almost unprecedented in its swiftness. The quick and burning indignation expressed so universally and so conspicuously in America is all the more significant owing to the unusual feeling of friendship existing between this country and Russia. But all Christendom has, with one voice, proclaimed its detestation of the crimes committed by the populace—nor is the Government acquitted of its supposed share in the guilt of the people.

"Men have been murdered, women outraged, children dashed to pieces or burned alive; whole streets occupied by Hebrews razed to the ground and desolated by fire; thousands of families reduced to beggary, and many banished from their homes. One hundred and sixty towns and villages feel this scourge of persecution. Three hundred houses and six hundred shops were plundered at Warsaw while a garrison of twenty thousand soldiers was kept within barracks and made no sign, and that, too, on the morning when in the name of Christ peace and good-will were proclaimed over all the earth." These are the words in which Mr. Everts, in his speech at Chickering Hall, summarized the situation in Russia, as described by the latest dispatches. It may be that there was exaggeration in these earlier reports, but there has been enough

cruelty and horror to warrant the general outburst of sympathy and anger. With such desolation either in progress or in danger of recurring, the first duty of the Russian Government is repression. It is claimed that the authorities have already done all in their power; but wherever there is non-interference, such as Mr. Everts has charged, other countries will hold the authorities responsible. The world will not be satisfied with excuses so long as there is one man in uniform who will obey the order of an officer. But after repression will come other and no less urgent duties—first and foremost must come whatever reparation may be possible,—and next, the persecuted race must be given (as even in Russia is now acknowledged) equal rights before the law. Even then the duty of the governing classes will not be completed. Without forgetting the glass-house in which we ourselves live,—we, who have seen the anti-negro riots of New York and the anti-Chinese riots of San Francisco,—it must still be said that Russia's most apparent duty is to civilize herself.

For it must be remembered that the Jews, everywhere, notwithstanding their inflexible exclusiveness, are, in a great measure, what they are made by the people among whom their lot is cast.* The amelioration of the condition of the masses in Russia will react upon the Israelites. Even if the latter are, as it is charged, bad citizens—it is not merely the fault of the laws which discriminate against them, but it is because they live in a community not wholly enlightened. Certainly, the race through which the Christian world has received its Bible and its religion, and that has shown an unequaled vitality during eighteen centuries of oppression,—surely such a people does not need to prove its power of development under fair and equal conditions.

It is, of course, not with a view of palliating infamies or excusing the guilty, either in high places or low, that we open our pages this month to a remarkable statement by a Russian writer of the views of her people on the subject of the Russian Jews. It is important to be informed of the alleged local occasions for dislike, and the special suspicions, even if groundless, which attach to the Jews of Russia. Besides, a nation which has been arraigned as Russia is at this moment arraigned before the civilized world, has the right to be heard in its own defense. The paper here printed is but the opening of a discussion in the pages of this magazine, which will not only have to do with the situation in Russia, but will deal fundamentally with the question of the relations between Israelites and Christians in America. We expect to lay before our readers, in the next number of *THE CENTURY*, a reply to the charges contained in Madame Ragozin's paper. Considering the extraordinary character of these charges, and the extremely mediæval aspect of some of them, it is no more than just that meantime there should be a "suspension of opinion."

* See "Was Lord Beaconsfield a Representative Jew?" in this number of *THE CENTURY MAGAZINE*.