

will; under the other their combination would be so complete and exclusive as to turn over the banking business into the control of an impregnable ring. Under his plan the banks could be kept out of politics; under the other they would dominate politics.

* * *

Mr. Harmon's Candidacy.

Mr. Judson Harmon, in whose bonnet the Presidential bee buzzes pertinaciously, is reported from Kansas City as having made this shrewd remark: "When I speak with Mr. Bryan, if I speak before him the audience won't hear me, and if I follow him there is no audience left to speak to." What a foolish little bee, then, to keep on buzzing so in Mr. Harmon's bonnet. And Mr. Harmon's little bee is not the only foolish one. Several anxious statesmen might draw a political moral from Mr. Harmon's experience.

* * *

Old-Age Pensions.

Pensions for the aged, a policy that is pushing to the front and with which the British government finds it necessary already to deal, presents some practical difficulties and one very important problem of principle. Why should old age pensions be paid out of taxation? That is the question of principle. And it is a difficult question when taxation is imposed regardless of whether the taxpayer earns what he pays, or gets it as a gift from the public; for it seems like taxing some for the benefit of others. But if taxes were imposed only upon land values, the problem of principle would be easy enough. In that case the aged would draw their pensions from ground rent, a common fund in which they are entitled to participate not as a charity but of right. Ground rent, the evident property of the whole community, is now used to pension land owners with. It would be better used as a pension fund for the aged.

* * *

Ownership and Regulation.

President Wilson of Princeton University sees "no radical difference in principle between government ownership and government regulation of the discretionary kind." Neither do we. There is no radical difference. The only difference is that government ownership of public utilities would eradicate the evils of private ownership of government, whereas government regulation will intensify them. But regulation has the merit of being a necessary step toward ownership. The people, already aroused to the iniquity of private ownership

of government functions, will probably have to see for themselves the futility of regulation before they go the length of applying the only effective remedy.

* * *

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S POLICY.

The policy of Theodore Roosevelt is the policy of English toryism. Roosevelt would not pass or repeal any law that would take away privilege; all he wants is to control privilege by law.

Secretary Garfield, asking how special privileged classes should be dealt with, gives the Rooseveltian answer: "Subject to a careful control." This is exactly the doctrine of Lord Beaconsfield (Benjamin Disraeli), acknowledged the ablest exponent of English toryism of the century. Speaking of a great corporation in England Lord Beaconsfield said: "Restricted and controlled by the state, so powerful a corporation may be only fruitful of public advantage."

Writing of Lord Beaconsfield a biographer says: "Instead of excusing and avoiding he assumed that a government of privilege rather than that based on rights, is the best possible government. No doubt Disraeli's speeches are the best embodiment of tory principle." Like Roosevelt this man talked much of the welfare of the people, but never of their rights. Beaconsfield on one occasion said he hoped the House of Commons would "sanction no step that has a preference for democracy, but that they will maintain the ordered state of free England in which we live." By "ordered state" Beaconsfield meant the grading of society from the king to the laborer; the existence of classes, defined and controlled by law.

According to Beaconsfield there had been in England "established a society of classes which gives vigor and variety to life." This appears the Roosevelt ideal, for does he not solemnly admonish us that unless we "regulate" privilege it may be abolished by dangerous innovators?—something truly terrible in your tory mind.

Beaconsfield believed in what he called "legislative interference," the same that we now know as "regulation." This is an old tory device and did not escape the notice of Thomas Jefferson. Writing to John Adams in 1816 of English tories, Jefferson said: "Their efforts will be to quiet things by the palliatives of reformation; to nibble a little at pensions and sinecures; to bite off a bit here and a bit there to amuse the people." Precisely what Roosevelt is doing, nothing more nor less.

Jefferson did not believe in regulation, but he advocated "laying the ax at the roots of privilege."

He would not, as Roosevelt, "limit" monopoly, for in a letter to James Madison he said: "The benefit of even limited monopolies is too doubtful to be opposed to that of their general suppression."

The real issue then is not the sham issue between the Hanna theory of "business first and last," and the Roosevelt "control" of privilege as in tory England; but whether there shall be any "special privileges," or simply "equal rights for all."

ALFRED H. HENDERSON.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, March 31, 1908.

The Union Square Meeting.

"Drive them into the East river!" commanded the police inspector. He addressed the magnificent mounted police of New York as "these splendid officers bore down upon the multitude like so many mounted soldiers of the Ney division." And down they bore upon a crowd of workingmen and women, many of whom fell beneath the hoofs of the animals. "On came the charging police cavalry, pushing on, on to the sidewalks with the curveting steeds." A crowd of peaceable citizens scattered in all directions before the onslaught, and then, after the meeting had been broken up, a bursting bomb was heard. This is the story as it came to us in Chicago through the New York dispatches of the Inter-Ocean on the 29th, dispatches which colored the story as brilliantly as possible in favor of the police.

+

The unemployed of New York had been invited to gather in Union Square on the 28th at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. Union Square is the traditional spot for open-air meetings in New York. For twenty-five years or more the porch of the cottage at the north end of the park has been the rostrum, and the broad street in front the auditorium for enormous meetings—political, labor, etc.—and the same porch has often served as a reviewing stand for parades. On occasions of meetings it has been customary to use carts as speakers' stands, in order to reach the outer edges of large crowds beyond the power of the speakers at the cottage to be heard. Police and park permits have been exacted, but only as a formality. Its purpose has been to guard against the confusion of two different meetings at once, and to enable the police to arrange for pro-

tecting the meetings from disturbance. The permit has always been regarded and treated as a reasonable regulation and not as an arbitrary authorization. Following the long established custom, the promoters of this meeting of the unemployed had applied in the usual way for the usual permit. But it was arbitrarily refused, and an appeal to the courts for an injunction against the police was denied as involving no assertion of property rights. To the unexplained action of the authorities in denying the permit the promoters of the meeting did not submit, but went on with preparations for their meeting, which began to assemble about 2 o'clock on the day in question—the 28th.

+

Finding large bodies of police in apparently hostile possession of the usual meeting place and turning crowds away, one of the executive committee for the meeting, Mr. Bruno L. Zimm, a sculptor, went to the cottage and accosted the police inspector—Schmittberger. The interview is thus reported in the Record-Herald's special dispatch, which originated with the New York Herald:

"What are these police here for?" asked Mr. Zimm. "Are you going to try to prevent us from meeting?"

"We are going to preserve order and break up any public meeting held without a permit," replied the Inspector.

There was a lively colloquy between the two men for two or three minutes, Zimm declaring that the police had no right to prevent any peaceable meeting, and the Inspector maintaining that he would allow no meeting whatever.

Finally the sculptor pulled a bulky book out of his pocket and began to open it.

"This is the Constitution of the United States and it is on this that we demand the right of free speech."

Inspector Schmittberger flourished his baton.

"This is bigger than the Constitution just now," he retorted. "Now move on."

+

By this time large numbers of people were pouring peaceably into the park and the streets in front, but the police ordered every one to move on. Incidentally, three wagons were driven up to be used at the meeting. They bore what the dispatches describe as "incendiary mottoes," namely, "We demand work," "Why should we go hungry?" "Public thievery makes private poverty." Chased away by the police, they went a block above the cottage, to Seventeenth street and Fourth avenue; but attempts at speaking here were instantly stopped by the police, who refused, however, to arrest any speaker. At 2 o'clock, the time for the meeting, a gathering estimated at 10,000 had assembled. Kept "on the move" by the police, this crowd marched slowly around the park, which is bounded by Seventeenth street, Fourth avenue, Fourteenth street and Broadway, and as the police drove them on someone started the "Marseillaise," which was