

ing to dictate; I am not in a position to dictate. What authority have I, or what power, to coerce anybody? If I was the head of a railroad corporation I might have the power to coerce or to withdraw employment from those who would not vote as I desired; if I was a manufacturer and employed a large number of men I might do what many manufacturers did in 1896, namely, give the employes a choice between voting a given ticket and idleness. But what power have I? I have none, and I have no desire to dictate. I have no power to grant favors to you; if anybody does what I advise, he must do it, not from hope of reward from me, but from hope of reward from his own conscience. I have no power, I repeat, to confer favors on you; I have no power to give you office. If I had that power there would be many men with me who are now talking about harmony and the reorganization of the Democratic party.

What is it that they are afraid of? I will tell you. If a group of men are assembled in a room contemplating larceny, and a little child comes in among them and says, "Thou shalt not steal," he will put them all to rout. They will not be afraid of the child, but they will be afraid of the doctrine that he proclaims. And so, it is not because I have power to coerce, or to command, or to dictate, but because the doctrine of honesty is a doctrine that the reorganizers have never yet dared to meet and which they will not meet in this campaign. I want to preach the doctrine of honesty and I want to preach it, first, because it is right, and because people ought to do right without stopping to count the consequences; and, second, because I believe that in doing right we lay the best foundation for complete and permanent success. So, whether you reason from the standpoint of expediency or from the standpoint of principle, you will be brought to an honest course in this campaign. You have heard some say that I am disturbing the harmony of the party. I have had men within the last few days tell me that instead of criticising things that I believe to be wrong, instead of pointing out dangers that I believe to exist, I ought to "pour oil on the troubled waters"—I have examined the oil that they want me to use and find that it is Standard Oil. I am not willing to use that kind of oil; I am not willing to harmonize on that basis.

I desire to present to you what I believe to be a moral issue, and to appeal to you to fight this battle upon the moral issues involved. I want to appeal to you to make the Democratic party the champion of morality in politics. I want you to help put the Democratic party in a po-

sition where it will arouse the conscience of the American people—the conscience which is the most potent power in the world when it is once awakened.

#### AN OHIO MAN'S ESTIMATE OF HANNA THE MAN.

The Public's remarks anent Riley's effusion regarding Hanna's death (p. 779) are exceedingly apropos. Such is the shriveled fruit of genius when it prostitutes itself for profit. For, despite this doggerel, which all friends of the poet must regret, Riley is a genius; and genius, perforce, must live. But this unfortunate eulogistic expression in Hudibrastic verse should be regretted by the friends of the dead senator, not less than by those of the author. Emphasizing those things which Hanna was not, is calculated to direct an unpleasant attention to what he really was.

And, instead of your merely suggesting the potentialities of post-mortem criticism, were it not well to have utilized the occasion for candid statement? There can be no intrinsic impropriety in expressing a just estimate of the dead. Death does not defy one who in life was but common clay. And in the case of a public man of such prominence, his character and career are public property, subject to analysis and for use as an object lesson in those things to emulate or to avoid. The epitaph is, more often than otherwise, a monumental lie. Mortuary mendacity should receive no more respect than is accorded to any other kind. And, in view of the volume of platitudinous praise, superlative sentiment and ardent absurdity that has been uttered concerning Hanna since his demise, there should be some honest pronouncement for the sake of wholesome judgment and to give a truer perspective to the popular mind.

Imprimis, to be entirely just, there was much to admire in Hanna's make-up, if there was little to commend in his achievements. There always is something admirable in the strong man who can compel success from adverse conditions and wrest victory from the desperate clutch of a near defeat. Hanna was a man of tremendous personal force, a man of courage, a man of independence and initiative. In a public capacity hard as granite, quite as heartless and altogether as unyielding, he was nevertheless in his private life a person of kindly nature and generous impulses. He was devoted to his family and faithful to his friends.

Perhaps the most distinguishing trait of Hanna's character was loyalty. He was unswervingly loyal to any cause he might espouse; he was loyal to his friends; he was loyal to his own personal

interests. But there is reason to believe he would sacrifice something of his personal interests to serve a friend. This, as is the case with most rare things, is truly admirable.

Senator Hanna's unusual ability is something that must be universally admitted. He possessed great powers of organization and a remarkable administrative genius. He may not have been exactly a leader of men, but he certainly succeeded in controlling them. He was upright in business, as rectitude is reckoned in the commercial world of to-day. As much cannot be said for his political methods.

But Hanna was nothing of a statesman, as the elegiac eulogists would have us believe. He was a practical politician and a successful one. A successful politician may be briefly defined as one who has succeeded in solving the problem of how to buy the largest number of votes for the smallest amount of money. Hanna was also the type of the business man in politics. And the business man considers close buying commendable always.

It is to be doubted that Hanna had a mentality sufficiently exalted to grasp the higher principles of actual statesmanship. He was not a man of fine fiber. His was that excessive coarseness which so often is the complement of exceeding strength. Allied to capitalistic interests, he was thoroughly class-conscious. To his mind, with its narrow economic understanding and limited altruistic attributes, bounded wholly by a commercial comprehension, imperialistic expansion seemed proper and wise and the apotheosis of progress.

As a reformer, too, Hanna is worthy of remark. His transformation from labor crusher to labor sympathizer was so sudden, so complete and so incongruous as to constitute a phenomenon. But the object of the change was so obvious that it never deceived any discerning person.

As an employer Hanna was the uncompromising foe of labor organization. He destroyed the Seamen's union on the lakes, for that purpose hiring a known murderer to direct a gang of thugs that infested the docks to intimidate and assault and, on occasions, to assassinate. His oppression of the Spring Valley miners is a matter of industrial history, while the hard struggle and bitter defeat of the Boilermakers' and Iron Shipbuilders' union in the strike at the Globe shipyards in Cleveland is but a consistent chapter from the same stern story.

After Hanna was permitted to take his contested seat in the Senate and became the acknowledged high priest of the party of plutocracy, he ostensibly originated and veritably stood sponsor for a pe-

cular creation known as the Civic Federation. The avowed mission of the organization was to adjust differences existing or which might arise between capital and labor; but in whose favor the adjustment would be made, was a point upon which the promoters of the Federation did not commit themselves.

In the opinion of many thoughtful persons the primal purpose of the Federation was to beguile the workingman with pleasant pledges and then betray him; to disarm him under promise of protection and then leave him helpless, at the mercy of the enemy, to contemplate the folly of a suicidal surrender to pretended friends. The further opinion was held that in carrying out this plan the Federation received the cooperation of certain labor leaders.

Under the most charitable characterization, the successive efforts of the Federation have spelled failure. Its first folly and crowning crime, the settlement of the miners' strike in the Pennsylvania anthracite region under the conditions provided, was the most flagrant farce ever enacted in the name of arbitration. Fair and favorable as may appear their specious phrasing, the articles of agreement, under even a superficial analysis, resolve themselves to a complete surrender on part of the miners. And so runs the record from first to finish.

And this is Hanna. It will be long before the world will see his like again, and perhaps it is well for the world that this is so.

WALTER HURT.

Camden, Ohio.

#### EUGENE F. WARE ON JOHN JAMES INGALLS.

Up was he stuck;  
And in the upness  
Of his stultitude,  
He fell!  
—The Pilgrim.

"Thou shalt not kill."

Except:

By locked exits, subway explosions,  
adulterated food, slums, fire-damp, fast  
trains, sweat-shops.

In short, in the regular course of  
trade.—Life.

There is no natural reason why the inhabitants of one country should wish to fly at the throats of the people of another country. There never would be war if the passions of the ignorant and heedless were not played upon by the shrewd and unscrupulous for purposes of personal aggrandizement, either of wealth or power. The beating of tom-toms at the slightest provocation and the ostentatious preparations for war

by the rulers of great nations serve to kindle the passions of the masses to their own undoing.—Robert Baker.

"The franchise was corruptly purchased," whispered Rumor.

The church people shuddered perfunctorily and went their ways.

"The session of the legislature at which the franchise was passed," persisted Rumor, "was not opened with prayer."

The church people stood aghast.

"A blasphemy!" they exclaimed, in horror, and rose to a man, and carried an election for the fusion ticket.

First Reporter—The Daily Sensation has discharged its Cheföö correspondent.

Second Reporter—Why?

First Reporter—Found him too reliable.—Puck.

"Do you think the Administration was premature in recognizing the new republic?"

"The new what?"—San Francisco Star.

The war news jumps the open switch,  
And scares the heathen Jossky;  
But I can't tell a fakeovitch  
From a canardovsky!  
—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Do right though the skies fall, and  
then be sure they will not crush you.—  
Diary Consolidated Stock and Petroleum  
Exchange, of New York.

### BOOKS

#### IMMORTALITY OF ANIMALS.

Any plea for kindness to the lower animals should be welcomed in these days of savage vivisections, and Dr. Buckner's book ("The Immortality of Animals." By E. D. Buckner, M. D. Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs & Co.) is especially worthy of welcome. It is a sincere and thoughtful attempt to place the whole animal creation upon the same spiritual plane, with a view to securing thereby something of the same consideration from man for the lower animals that man has come to regard himself as obliged to give to his own kind. In pursuit of this purpose Dr. Buckner brings the question to religious, philosophical and scientific tests.

With reference to the religious tests, he appears to acknowledge a reason for human immortality to which he gives an importance much beyond its deserts, if indeed it deserves any importance at all. It is the argument that as righteousness is not always rewarded in this world and sin is not always punished, there must be a future life in order to

equalize such differences. Rightly enough he insists that this argument for immortality applies as well to the lower animals as to man. But does it apply to man? Must not the hypothesis of human immortality rest upon some fact inherent in man's nature?

The fact usually referred to is man's power of moral choice; and if this does not imply immortality, there would seem to be nothing outside of verbal revelation from which the inference might be drawn. But if the power of moral choice is essential, animals must be shown to have it or their immortality cannot be inferred. Dr. Buckner fails to make that proof.

Although he brings forward evidence to show that animals have the power of what he calls moral choice, his instances do not meet the contention that power to choose the right for its own sake, is the characteristic from which immortality is inferable.

It is questionable whether any other of the reasons the author advances will appeal to readers who, though they believe in immortality and love animals, rest their faith in immortality upon rational as distinguished from credal grounds. They would not be satisfied with Dr. Buckner's idea of mind as identical with soul, nor would they be likely to accept his view that the mind of a being which is capable of exercising will power with reference only to material or merely intellectual concerns, differs only in degree and not in kind from one that can exercise it with reference to moral principle. Neither would they admit that power to reason necessarily implies power to choose between right and wrong.

Granted that differences in mind are only differences of degree, and it certainly follows that if man's mind is immortal, the animal's mind also must be immortal. Granted that mind is a force, which, while it directs the material body is not a product of the material body, and it must be conceded that under the theory of indestructibility of forces, mind, whether of man or animal, is not annihilated when separated from the body by the phenomenon we call death. But the conclusion by no means follows that this force retains its individuality. And that, after all, is the real point involved in the immortality problem.

To show, then, that when the mind, which animals as well as men possess, leaves the body, it "wings its flight to God who gave it," as Dr. Buckner essays to do, falls short of showing that it is immortal. There is still no proof of immortal individuality—no proof of retention of identity. To merge again into the infinite mind-force whence the minds of animals and men are supposed to proceed, is not to be immortal in any other sense than that in which all forces may be said to be immortal. The vital point is whether in this immortality of mind individual identity is retained.