

lieve to be honest in their abhorrence of the whole thing, that "breaking the houses up" only spreads the disease? But, at all events, this is another item of practical politics. Does it or does it not fall within the scope of a clergyman's activities? There is not much chance of reforming those 230 women, I grant, though a clergyman has no right to assume anybody to be irreformable. But what of our sons and our clerks and our employés? And what of the unmentionable diseases which these wretched daughters of Eve, as if to avenge themselves on the light which they have abandoned forever, as if to fling back a curse into the Paradise they have forever lost, may bring some day to our spotless daughters?

A HINT.

And as to economical questions. There is a class of such, already sufficiently touched upon, which have an ethical side and which cannot, therefore, be foreign to the teacher of ethics. But, in a sense, all true economy, whether public or private, is a matter of morals, and may well interest the clergyman. And so one might venture the conjecture that a clergyman's interest in such questions will be justified, and in so far as they become questions of politics, his active concern in them permissible. Dr. McGlynn, however, will seem a warning to not a few of us. And in general my own view would be that the less of "single tax" and "organized labor" and "grinding monopolies" and "greedy capital" and the like the clergyman puts into his sermons and public utterances, the better. It may give him a feeling of "independence of the pews" and of special sympathy with the "downtrodden" on the whole agreeable to the feelings of a man who wants to be more independent than he knows he is, and who would like to be richer than he knows he ever will be; but, aside from that, the advantage is problematical.

GET THE FACTS.

I come now to questions which are purely political, but which have an ethical side. Take the matter of vote buying, and bargaining, and bamboozling spoken of at the beginning. What can the clergyman do about it? I answer: First, inform himself of the facts. Can every clergyman do this? Not, perhaps, in an exhaustive way, nor necessarily by his own investigations. Gifts and opportunities differ, and no one man undertakes to find out about everything by himself. But it is quite possible now to ascertain the facts. Rhode Island has been heard through the *Providence Journal*; several Western and other States, in a discursive way, through Professor Jenks in the *Century*, and Connecticut has been searched out in the way already alluded to.* With this little compendium of fact and theory any man who keeps his eyes and ears open and can put two and two together will presently have personal convictions in abundance.

* See articles by the author of this paper in the September and October *Forum*, 1892.