

and early manhood an effective writer and speaker. For three months in the Chartist agitation he and his partner published the "Democratic Circular" at Glasgow. It was suppressed by a purblind government, which regarded Mr. Harrower as especially dangerous because he opposed the policy of physical force, and advocated policies of persuasion, the effect of which the aristocratic elements feared more than violence. Coming to the United States in 1850, his democracy drew him naturally into the abolition movement, and later into the land movement when Henry George's writings came his way. Among his neighbors he was personally loved, and his influence was democratic wherever it extended. He was a man who modestly united a rugged intellect with a "listening heart."

+ +

The Los Angeles Labor Case.

Last week we copied the editorial of a labor organ, The Coast Seamen's Journal, on the charges of murder made against J. J. McNamara and his brother, the former the secretary of the Bridge and Structural Iron Workers, now in jail at Los Angeles pending trial. We did so for the purpose of contrasting it with Mr. Roosevelt's denunciation of labor leaders in an Outlook editorial. While silent about the gigantic campaign for making public opinion against the accused, Mr. Roosevelt emptied hogsheads of wrath upon labor leaders for trying to make public opinion in the opposite direction. Yet it seems to be the fact that labor leaders are almost alone in not trying to make public opinion either way. Not only is this the attitude of the Coast Seamen's Journal, but it is also that of the American Federation of Labor, of which Samuel Gompers is president. In its Weekly News Letter of April 29th, that national labor organization made this definite assertion:

No good citizen, be he a member of a labor organization or not, desires crime to go unpunished. If the men charged with this terrible catastrophe be proven guilty then punishment should be inflicted.

But rightly enough that assertion is accompanied with this further expression:

The question of guilt or innocence of the crime charged is not a matter to be determined by detectives or antagonistic employers' associations, but by an impartial jury after both sides have had their day in court.

+

Why are those expressions of labor papers and organizations ignored by writers like Mr. Roosevelt and periodicals like The Outlook? Is it explained by these further declarations of the Fed-

eration of Labor which appear in the same article of its Weekly News Letter?

To the minds of labor men experienced in the struggle for the right, there is a conspiracy, interminable in its ramifications, and more dangerous than is generally believed. Organized labor's sphere of influence has rapidly and potentially increased in the past half decade and in this land of dollars the captains of industry realize that the men of labor are becoming an ever increasing force for the amelioration of all forms of abuses against humanity.

Perhaps there is no such conspiracy against labor organizations. Mr. Roosevelt evidently thinks there is none; but he is only an honorary member, and honorary members of trade unions may not have the experience necessary to form a good judgment. If the accusations against the McNamaras are just, why were the forms of law for the protection of innocence so indecently disregarded by the persons making the arrests? If the McNamaras are not victims of some Big Business conspiracy such as labor unionists suspect, why were they treated differently in extradition proceedings from accused persons not pursued by Big Business? If the McNamaras are not victims of a Big Business conspiracy against organized labor, why are its enemies and fairweather friends—horse, foot and dragoons, Blanche, Tray and sweetheart—so busy at making hostile public opinion, and so solicitous that labor leaders hush their noise and let the hanging bee proceed with Big Business decorum?

+ +

Mammon Worship.

A wealthy manufacturer, not a hundred miles from Chicago, recently told contemptuously of an artist who also had lived not a hundred miles from Chicago, and had killed himself because of the absolute misery of his poverty. Was the artist's misery, or the plutocrat's contempt for it, the greater dishonor to our social order?

+ + +

THE SLUM.

If the slum of a great city were produced by the people who live in it, its suppression would be a hopeless task. But the slum is a product of social tendencies,—of social pressure operating steadily in one direction; and there is nothing quite so irresistible as a tendency.

You can see the slum on a small scale in almost any country village, though it is not called a slum there. A few poor families, so poor that they live on the very edge of destitution, make the village

slum. Whenever a death or sickness occurs in one of these families, the charitably disposed find "relief work" to do next door. This is charity at its best. As the village grows into a town, the number of its poor increases, their poverty deepens, and the slum begins to take form as a slum; when the town becomes a city, its poverty area widens until there are literally acres of it; and when the city becomes a metropolis, there are square miles of slum, streaked with "tenderloins" and "red light" districts.

For all this there is a competent cause. The cause is economic pressure, scarce opportunity to earn a decent living. Water never knows why it runs down hill. Neither do slum dwellers know why they are so conditioned. They do not reason it out. They cannot explain it. And if the powers of civil government were thrust into their hands on condition that they remedy these defects of a society of which they are part but not as members, they would be helpless to do it. Social regeneration can not come through its worst victims. Nor can it come from charity. When Bolton Hall said that charity is "an institution for relieving the condition and increasing the number of the poor," he stated a solemn truth. Charity scarcely touches the problem. There is no substitute for justice. Nature defies us to find one.

The only practical remedy for the slum is to reverse the tendency that produces it. Repressive legislation will not do. It fails as often as tried, and it has been tried times without number. Purity propagandas and anti-vice crusades are equally futile. Nothing permanent can be accomplished until those social currents which produce the slum are reversed.

It is a push from the outside, not a pull from the inside, that peoples the poverty stricken area of a big city. There is nothing there to pull. Pull is attraction and poverty is not attractive. The push on the outside is caused by an artificial narrowing of opportunities due to monopoly of land. The relation between the two may not be seen at a glance. Deep seated things never are, and this is socially subterranean. But the relation is there and easily demonstrated. Once relieve land monopoly pressure from the outside, and the same force that has made the slum will destroy it. It will do so by a process of elimination.

Every aspect of the slum is ugly; it does not possess a single virtue; it is all vice. The "struggle" against poverty in the slum is a virtue imported from the outside. You will find this struggle not only in the slum but throughout society, discoloring its life as a drop of ink discolors a

clean blotting pad. When once the tendency is reversed the slum will be destroyed in much less time than it takes to create one. The wonderful wealth-creating, and therefore poverty-abolishing, forces of the industrial world will do it.

But in this as in all other things, men exhaust every avenue for doing things wrong before trying to do them right. Our experiments with the slum have been failures to date. The slum persists—larger, more menacing than ever, and more hideous. To scatter the slum is to spread its contagion; to concentrate it is to parade its atrocity and foulness. To deny its existence is to play the ostrich. To abolish it by legal enactment directed against the thing itself, is folly. Scientific treatment alone will suffice.

When science discovered that the mosquito was responsible for the spread of yellow fever, how silly it made an armed posse look, quarantining a town. Shot guns for mosquitos! Yet it is by just such clumsy methods that society handles the slum question. We deal with the slum as we did with yellow fever—killing its victims instead of killing its cause.

HENRY H. HARDINGE.

* * *

PAY IN PROPORTION TO SERVICE.

If one could see all the private letters that discuss industrial problems, writer to reader and back again, one might better understand the ebb and flow of public opinion on industrial subjects, which is often surprising in its unexpectedness. Perhaps public sentiment is moved more in this way than by means of printed page or platform speech. Here is an example. We should like to give names, but that might not be safe. Our assurance goes with its publication, however, that the letter is from a railway official of good standing and high responsibilities, to a bank teller who had applied for a railway position, where he supposed that salaries were "advanced in proportion to services rendered." Omitting personal parts and names, the railway official's letter follows:

"If your salary as a bank-teller has not been 'advanced in proportion to services rendered,' your case is not exceptional, nor confined to employes in banks. It is true also of those who work for railroads, merchants, manufacturers and other employers.

"Not long ago the clerical force employed in the general offices of railroad companies was reduced about six per cent, office hours being lengthened six per cent, to make up for the shortage. The same was done by all other employers of labor. Thousands of men and women, able, willing and