

tions there still survives a notion about the protection of the "American citizen" or the "British subject," a notion which it is to be hoped we are also beginning to outgrow. Now, there is enough of truth and right in this idea to give it the color of favor. Of course a nation must protect its people, each individual person, wherever and whenever protection is needed and deserved. But to declaim about armies and navies to protect or avenge some wild prospector or speculator who has got into trouble in some corner of the world is quite absurd. Every sensible man who thinks a moment knows that it is absurd. And the absurdest part of the absurdity is the idea that national honor is involved, no matter what the "American citizen" may have been doing. Really such thoughts are too childish and silly to last much longer.

One trouble about the slowness with which we advance toward a better ideal of international peace and friendship lies with the conduct of our public schools. Children are taught formulas of patriotism, are drilled in a ritual of saluting the flag, are inspired with histories of belligerent heroes, while too little stress is laid on the greater stories of moral heroism and peaceful achievements. We need to realize more fully than we do that the public sentiment of tomorrow will depend upon the public school of today. And so we need to get into our public schools a finer sense of real patriotism, a higher ideal of civilization, and a nobler view of international dealings. We need histories to be written wherein Funston marching through bloodshed to the City of Mexico will be shown less glorious than Wilson and Bryan laboring quietly to establish right and justice without the horrors of war. JAMES H. DILLARD.

---

## INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

---

### INCONSISTENT SPECIAL PLEADERS.

Cincinnati, June 4.

What sort of an apology for a mind has a "statesman" who in the same identical speech will gravely advocate the exemption of coastwise vessels from the payment of Panama tolls on the ground that it will reduce railroad rates, and then turn right around and advocate the Interstate Commerce Commission's granting the railroads the right to advance rates. These "statesmen" during full thirty minutes get red in the face denouncing the wicked railroads as being the "real parties in interest" seeking the repeal of the free toll law, and then they get all "het up" about the "injustice of hampering those great arteries of trade" by delaying allowing them to advance rates. Almost in one breath we are told that free ship tolls will mean lower railroad rates and also that present railroad rates are

too low and should be advanced. We are warned that no one will profit by repealing the toll exemption law except the railroads and before you bat your eye you are admonished that higher railroad rates is the sole thing lacking for a return of prosperity. Certainly if it is a good thing to have free tolls that railroad rates may be reduced below the present level, the Interstate Commerce Commission should not allow rates to be advanced beyond the present level. On the other hand if present railroad rates are too low and should be advanced certainly anything like free tolls that would reduce them should not be. Can a thing both be and not be? Yea, it can, but only to the Gothic mind.

ALFRED H. HENDERSON.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of The Public for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, June 9, 1914.

---

### Congressional News.

The House passed on June 5 the three anti-trust measures, the Clayton bill, the Covington bill, and the Rayburn bill. The vote on the Clayton bill was 275 to 54. All the Democratic members, except White of Ohio voted for it, together with 42 Republicans, sixteen Progressives and William Kent. Before passage the bill was amended. One amendment exempts labor and farmers' organizations from prosecution as trusts. Another forbids, in cases involving labor disputes, issuing of injunctions prohibiting "any person or persons from terminating any relation of employment, or from ceasing to perform any work or labor, or from recommending, advising, or persuading others by peaceful means so to do, or from attending at or near a house or place where any person resides or works, or carries on business or happens to be, for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information, or of peacefully persuading any person to work or to abstain from working; or from ceasing to patronize or to employ any party to such dispute, or from recommending, advising or persuading others by peaceful means so to do; or from paying or giving to or withholding from, any person engaged in such dispute, any strike benefits or other moneys, or things of value, or from peaceably assembling at any place in a lawful manner, and for lawful purposes or from doing any act or thing which might lawfully be done in the absence of such dispute by any party thereto." Another amendment allows persons charged with indirect contempt a trial by jury. [See current volume, pages 514, 542.]



Other features of the Clayton bill are prohibi-