

oly schemers of the non-partisan corporations and their bi-partisan tools in politics.

At last the much mooted and carefully guarded report of Carroll D. Wright to the President on the anthracite coal strike has been released for publication. Mr. Roosevelt was quite justified in neglecting to publish it sooner. There is nothing in it to have made its publication worth while.

"No friends, no money, no work; better to die," were the despairing words which a Chicago suicide left behind him last week. This is one of the few cases of misery that come to light out of the many that exist in these piping times of plutocratic prosperity. Since this man had no money, of course he had no friends. That is the way the world wags on. He thought he had no money because he could get no work. It was a false analysis. Had he been able to get work he might, it is true, have had some money; and then he would have had some friends. The unfortunate man erred in supposing that the way to get much money is to get work. Had he laid his plans to get workers, instead of work, to get control of jobs for others instead of doing jobs himself, he could have had plenty of money and plenty of friends. Only in that case some one else would have died saying: "No money, no work, no friends."

Lord Milner has just imposed a head tax of \$10 on the natives of the Transvaal. This is twice as much as the head tax imposed by the Boers, but that is not the important consideration. What is important is the fact that the tax is imposed for the purpose of compelling the natives to seek employment of the whites and thereby glutting the labor market. If they needed no ready money, they could make a comfortable living among themselves without selling their labor. But when, as under this Milner decree, which went into effect on the 1st, every adult native male and every married native wom-

an must pay a tax in money of \$10 each annually, the exploiters of labor are assured a superabundant supply of labor from the native tribes for several months in the year. This is part of the process of Christianizing the heathen. Incidentally it fattens the dividends of the Christianizers.

The Rev. Thomas B. Gregory contributes many an interesting and stimulating signed editorial to the Chicago American; and not least among these in interest is one of the past week on the subject of child labor in factories. It rests upon the fact that the Illinois factory law, which prohibits the employment of children under 14 years of age, is in operation a farce. Mr. Gregory quotes in explanation the statement of the chief factory inspector of the state to the effect that "the main obstacle to the better enforcement of the factory law is the habit, on the part of parents, of signing false affidavits." It is discouraging to find that as keen and sympathetic an observer of social conditions as Mr. Gregory can be so far taken in by that explanation as to confine his comment to a futile appeal to parents to make true affidavits and to pastors to admonish parents of the sin of perjury. It is not signing of false affidavits by parents that makes the law inoperative. That is not the cause. It is only an effect of a deeper cause. When industrial opportunities are so restricted by monopoly that parents earn but a scant living when they work, that work is so scarce as to be a boon and the giving of it something like charity, and that the miserable wages of a child are necessary to eke out the poorest kind of a poor living—when these are the circumstances under which hosts of honest people have to live, it seems almost heartless to censure them for lying to employers about the ages of their children. Let us demand the right thing, not the wrong or foolish one. Let us demand that opportunities for productive work be multiplied by abolishing monopoly, and

the parental instinct will be enough to keep tender children out of factories. When society ceases to sin against parents by depriving them of natural opportunities to make a living for their families, parents will cease to sin against society by committing perjury to evade factory laws.

ROOSEVELT AND BRYAN.

These two men are preeminent in the United States to-day as personifications of the two great opposing tides that are deeply agitating the political seas. This does not mean, necessarily, that either is the leader of thought on the side with which his name is so conspicuously identified. It does not imply that his views control or that his leadership is acceptable. It does not ignore the fact that one of the two has attained his exalted conspicuity chiefly by official accident. Nor is it intended to be prophetic of the future. It merely states an incontrovertible fact of the moment.

Everyone feels it to be a fact, even those who are never so anxious to have it otherwise. The rush and push of a strenuous national life along the grewsome highways of colonial imperialism abroad and plutocratic evolution at home, inevitably bring up in the popular imagination the name of Theodore Roosevelt. Even Senator Hanna has sunk into a lower than secondary place. On the other hand, whenever and wherever the democratic impulse is felt, the name of William J. Bryan comes uppermost. Nothing could be more spontaneous than the tendency of his enemies in both parties, as well as his friends, to identify all unrelenting opposition to the "going thing" as "Bryanism."

It may not be uninteresting, therefore, to compare the two men.

I.

A comparison was made editorially in these columns four years ago (vol. i, No. 23, p. 5), which we reproduce now, both because it is appropriate and because it is out of print. What we then said, when each had just come out of the Spanish-American war with a military title, still holds good:

"Col. Theodore Roosevelt and Col.