

cluded in this graphic indictment by a well-known writer:

The party was the country to Mr. Hanna, and, as the Sun says, his way of keeping his party in power was not a nice way. The game of politics was played to win. The offices of the country, with their salaries and "chances" were to be used to the party's advantage. He treated the South as a captured province. He filled the Federal offices in that section of the country with profligates and worse. He was the outspoken foe of all attempts to purify the public service. He was the friend and champion of the spoilsman. He was the arch-enemy of the merit system. He was for using for the party's gain all the machinery which had been laboriously constructed for the public weal.

If these grave charges have weight, and Senator Hanna's defenders prefer justification to denial, the question recurs concerning the fitness of your eulogy. How could "a whole-souled child of God who believed in success and who knew how to succeed by using infinite powers," engage in such godless work and so misuse those powers for finite corruption.

Unhappily posthumous praise of unworthy men by worthy eulogists is no rarity. It is rare that such eulogy is ever adopted by the historian of the times. It will not be in this instance. Rather he will record that in a degenerate day, through a degenerate party, the foes of democratic government essayed the subversion of the republic. As of old, they resorted to material temptations in order to weaken idealism, tempting greed by the display and glamor of wealth. In Senator Hanna they found concentrated the highest qualities for an effective instrument, all the more effective from possession of qualities that have human charm. His type pervades the history of all decadent republics.

"Many men know how to flatter, few know how to praise," says the Greek apothegm. May I suggest that, better for the fame of the dead senator and more worthy of your own, would have been a funeral discourse in the spirit of Aeschines's oration when he debated whether Athens should grant Demosthenes a crown:—

Most of all, fellow-citizens, if your sons ask whose example they shall imitate, what will you say? For you know well it is not music, nor the gymnasium, nor the schools that mold young men; it is much more the public proclamations, the public example. If you take one whose life has no high purpose, one who mocks at morals, and crown him in the theater, every boy who sees it is corrupted. When a bad man suffers his deserts, the people learn;—on the contrary, when a man votes against what is noble and just, and then comes home to teach his son, the boy will very properly say:

"Your lesson is impertinent and a bore." Beware, therefore, Athenians, remembering posterity will rejudge your judgment, and that the character of a city is determined by the character of the men it crowns.

WM. LLÖYD GARRISON.

Lexington, February 24, 1904.

GERMAN SOCIALISM.

An extract from "Rise and Progress of Socialism in Germany," by William Jennings Bryan, published in the Chicago Sunday American of February 14. This article is one of a series of foreign articles written by Mr. Bryan, now appearing in the Chicago American.

THE GERMAN ELECTIONS.

In Germany Socialism as an economic theory is being urged by a strong and growing party. In the last general election the Socialists polled a little more than 3,000,000 votes out of a total of about 9,500,000. Measured by the popular vote it is now the strongest party in Germany.

The fact that with 31 per cent. of the vote it only has 81 members of the Reichstag out of a total of 397 is due, in part, to the fact that the Socialist vote is massed in the cities and in part to the fact that the population has increased more rapidly in the cities, and as there has been no recent redistricting the Socialist city districts are larger than the districts returning members of other parties.

GERMANY'S SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.

George von Vollmar, a member of the Reichstag, in a recent issue of the National Review thus states the general purpose of the Social Democratic party in Germany:

It is well known that Social Democracy in all countries, as its name indicates, aims in the first place at social and economic reform. It starts from the point of view that economic development, the substitution of machinery for hand implements, and the supplanting of small industries by gigantic industrial combinations deprive the worker in an ever increasing degree of the essential means of production, thereby converting him into a possessionless proletarian, and that the means of production are becoming the exclusive possession of a comparatively small number of capitalists, who constantly monopolize all the advantages which the gigantic increase in the productive capacity of human effort has brought about.

Thus, according to the Social Democrats, capital is master of all the springs of life and lays a yoke on the working classes in particular and the whole population in general, which ever becomes more and more unbearable.

The masses, as their insight into the general trend of affairs develops, become daily more and more conscious of the contrast between the exploiter and the exploited, and in all countries with an industrial development society is divided into two hostile camps, which wage war

on each other with ever increasing bitterness.

To this class-war is due the origin and continuous development of Social Democracy, the chief task of which is to unite these factions in an harmonious whole which they will direct to its true goal.

Industrial combination on a large scale can be converted from a source of misery and oppression into a source of the greatest prosperity and of harmonious perfection when the means of production cease to be the exclusive appanage of capital and are transferred to the hands of society at large.

The social revolution here indicated implies the liberation not only of the proletariat but of mankind as a whole, which suffers from the decomposing influence of existing class antagonism whereby all social progress is crippled.

AIMS OF THE GERMAN SOCIALISTS.

One of the most influential of the German Socialists, in answer to a series of questions submitted by me, said in substance:

First—The general aim of Socialists in Germany is the same as the aim of other Socialists throughout the world—namely, the establishment of a collective commonwealth based on democratic equality.

Second—The Socialists of Germany have organized a liberal party of unrivaled strength; they have educated the working classes to a very high standard of political intelligence and to a strong sense of their independence and of their social mission, as the living and progressive force in every social respect; they have promoted the organization of trade unions and have by their incessant agitation compelled the other parties and the Government to take up social and labor legislation.

Third—German Socialists at present are contending for a legal eight-hour and for the creation of a labor department in the Government, with labor offices and labor chambers throughout the country. In addition to these special reforms Socialists are urging various constitutional and democratic reforms in the State and municipalities—in the latter housing reforms, direct employment of labor, etc.

Fourth—There may be some difference of opinion among Socialists in regard to the competitive system, but being scientific evolutionists they all agree that competition was at one time a great step in advance and acted for generations as a social lever of industrial progress, but they believe that it has many evil consequences and that it is now being outgrown by capitalistic concerns whose power to oppress has become a real danger to the community. They contend that there is not much competition left with these monopolies and that as, on the other hand, education and the sense of civic responsibility are visibly growing and will grow more rapidly when Socialism gets hold of the public mind Socialists think that the time is approaching when all monopolies must and can safely be taken over by the State or municipality as the case may be. This would not destroy all competition at once—in industries not centralized some competition might continue to exist. In this respect also all Socialists are evolutionists,

however they may differ as to ways and means and political methods.

Fifth—As to the line between what are called natural monopolies and ordinary industries the question is partly answered by the preceding paragraph. There is a general consensus of opinion that natural monopolies should, in any case, be owned by the community.

I find that even in Germany there are degrees among Socialists, some like Bebel and Singer emphasizing the ultimate ends of Socialism, while others led by Bernstein are what might be called progressionists or opportunists—that is, they are willing to take the best they can get to-day and from that vantage ground press on to something better. It is certain that the Socialists of Germany are securing reforms, but so far they are reforms which have either already been secured in other countries or are advocated elsewhere by other parties as well as by the Socialist party.

THE QUESTION OF COMPETITION.

The whole question of Socialism hangs upon the question:

Is competition an evil or a good?

If it is an evil then monopolies are right and we have only to decide whether the monopolies should be owned by the state or by private individuals.

If, on the other hand, competition is a good thing, then it should be restored where it can be restored.

In the case of natural monopolies where it is impossible for competition to exist the government would administer the monopolies, not on the ground that competition is undesirable, but on the ground that in such cases it is impossible.

Those who believe that the right is sure of ultimate triumph will watch the struggle in Germany and profit by the lessons taught.

I am inclined to believe that in Germany political considerations are so mingled with economic theories that it is difficult as yet to know just what proportion of the 3,000,000 Socialist voters believe in "government ownership and operation of all the means of production and distribution."

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

The old age pension act was given as a sop to the Socialists, but it strengthened rather than weakened their contentions and their party.

It remains to be seen whether the new concessions which they seem likely to secure will still further augment their strength.

The Germans are a studious and a thoughtful people, and just now they are absorbed in the consideration of

the aims and methods of the Socialist movement (mingled with a greater or less amount of governmental reform), and the world awaits their verdict with deep interest.

WHAT MIGHT BE DONE FOR CHICAGO.

A portion of an address made at the dinner of the Commercial Club of Chicago, at the Auditorium, February 27, 1904, by Judge Edward F. Dunne.

Gentlemen of the Commercial Club:

You have asked me to address you briefly about the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed Constitutional Amendment permitting a special charter for the city of Chicago.

I am thoroughly familiar with the terms of the proposed Constitutional Amendment, and was a member of the so-called convention which discussed its provisions and finally agreed upon the proposed amendment.

I am heartily in favor of the proposed Constitutional Amendment. I endeavored to have what I believed to be a better and more satisfactory amendment adopted by the so-called convention, but having failed in that I heartily voted for the proposed amendment that we adopted, and took great pleasure in personally urging its adoption upon members of the last legislature in Springfield. I am still heartily in favor of its adoption, and will do everything in my power in my humble way, to have this amendment to the Constitution approved of by the people and incorporated in the Constitution.

* * * * *

I am clearly of the opinion, however, that a much more simple and a much more thorough Constitutional Amendment could have been devised and recommended by this convention, than that which was recommended. The proposed Constitutional Amendment may answer for present purposes; but the city of Chicago is a rapidly growing community and its needs, necessities and demands will be constantly enlarging and changing, and as the years roll by, in my judgment, it will be found that the proposed Constitutional Amendment will not cover all its necessities and requirements. The city of Chicago has quadrupled in population in the last 24 years, and it is likely to increase that population in the same proportion. It would not surprise me if within 20 years there were 5,000,000 people in the County of Cook, and that this tremendous aggregation of people will be suffering within a few years from legislative evils and burdens not now contemplated and which cannot be foretold or predicted. Because of this fact I believed, as a member of that convention, and now believe, that a more

elastic, comprehensive and far-reaching amendment to the Constitution should have been adopted.

Those being my opinions, I had the honor, in that convention, to propose as a substitute for the amendment finally adopted the following:

Resolved that Art. IV of the Constitution of this State be amended by adding thereto a section to be numbered Sec. 34, which shall read as follows, to-wit:

"The General Assembly shall have power, anything in this Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding, to enact any and all laws which may be requested in writing by the City Council of the city of Chicago, or by ten per cent. of the legal voters of said city, said laws to be applicable only to said city, and to take effect only when approved by a majority of all the legal voters of said city voting thereon at the next municipal election held not less than 30 days after the enactment of said law or laws."

In moving the adoption of the above proposed amendment to the Constitution, I was honestly endeavoring to accomplish the same object aimed at by the other members of that body of gentlemen, to-wit: to give power to the city of Chicago to adopt a charter which would be adequate to its needs and necessities as distinguished from the needs and necessities of the State at large. If my scheme could and would attain that end, it had three advantages over the scheme finally adopted.

- 1st. It was more concise and succinct.
- 2nd. It was more simple and easily understood.
- 3rd. It was more comprehensive and elastic.

This was not disputed by any man in that convention, composed, as it was, of the ablest lawyers and shrewdest business men in the city of Chicago. It was assailed by them not on the ground that if passed it would not stand the test of judicial inquiry and examination, but that it was novel and revolutionary. Not a man on the floor of that convention, where were John P. Wilson, Thomas A. Moran, John H. Hamline, John S. Miller, E. Allen Frost, H. C. Mecartney, Walter S. Fisher, J. D. Andrews, and a host of other legal lights, claimed, that if my substitute should be adopted by the people that it would not stand the test of judicial inquiry, or that it could be overturned by a court of last resort. Any objections that could be urged against it in a court can be urged against the proposed Amendment to the Constitution finally adopted; but they are utterly without force as against both.

The only objections urged against the substitute resolution offered by myself were.

- 1st. That it was novel and revolutionary.