

Whose disreputable capers
 Long have caused me deep surprise.
 When I read your repetitions
 From these papers with positions,
 I'm reduced into conditions
 Almost speechless with surprise.

Almost speechless with surprise;
 I would gladly close my eyes
 To their reputable calumnies,
 But, cannot for SURPRISE.

BERTRAND SHADWELL.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY HAS A PRIOR CLAIM TO CRIMINAL AGGRESSION.

Senator Clark, of Arkansas, says that in view of the provocation given by Colombia, President Roosevelt might have been expected to have gone farther than he did in advancing the cause of Panama. In other words Senator Clark holds that if you cannot buy a thing you want at your own price you should flich it, by hook or by crook.

This man Clark evidently belongs heart and soul in the ranks of the criminal aggressors, that is to say, the Republican party, not to draw too fine a point on it. Democrats should beware of compromising with that policy. It is bad morals and bad politics.

Criminal Aggression may be right or it may be wrong. But let us have no dissembling. The Republicans have prior claim as champions of that policy, and Democrats have no right to it. If they believe it to be right they cease to be Democrats.

Carl Schurz has said that the Democrats did not seem to have the knack of getting into power. Well, as long as they insist on being so near like a Republican that the difference is not discernible to the naked eye, I see no reason why they should get into power.

They were taken at their word not long since and put into power, but they acted so much like Republicans that their splendid majorities were overwhelmingly reversed within two years thereafter.

The Republicans have taken a step backward by embracing Criminal Aggression, which history has condemned. The Country looks to the Democratic party to reinstate the ways of peace, the source of our greatness and progress.

Ratification of the present treaty would be a covert approval of governmental lawlessness. By so voting, those who disapprove what has been done will be selling their souls for a mess of pottage indeed.

The canal can wait. Honor once smirched is hard to cleanse.

As repentance is the only road to salvation, the Democratic Senators will surely be doing the country a great service by killing the treaty; paving the

way for a reparation of the wrong done, and a canal treaty of honorable and legitimate birth.

W. E. JACKSON.

929 Chestnut St., Philadelphia.
 Feb. 6, 1904.

BISHOP POTTER'S ELEPHANT.

The theme of Herbert S. Bigelow's address at the Vine street Congregational Church, in Cincinnati, on the evening of February 7, was suggested by a published interview with Bishop Potter, of New York, on the subject of Capital and Labor.

Bishop Potter takes the ground that wages are going up while interest is going down; that labor is annually getting a larger share of the profits of industry; that, if anyone is entitled to our sympathy, it is the capitalist; but that everything will come out all right, and that matters will regulate themselves. Trust to luck and cheer up. That is not the advice one would offer to a schoolboy who has a difficult problem to solve. No schoolboy would expect the problem to come out all right anyway. But with this problem of the distribution of wealth, the bishop tells us not to be worried; that it will solve itself.

To illustrate his notion of the relation between capital and labor, the bishop refers to the elephants that are used in the far East to load, unload and stack lumber.

Their intelligence seems wonderful, and their ability beyond conception. As you look closer, however, you see a little black figure on the neck of each elephant. . . . Watch him closely and you will see that his bare heel rests with an intermittent pressure on the neck of the huge animal he rides, and there you have the secret of the whole business. The brute obeys the man. . . . That is how the genius of capital uses labor—by invention, construction, organization and direction.

Is that the secret of the whole business? Does that metaphor go to the root of the matter? Does it not rather ignore a factor of very great importance?

The little black figure on the neck of the elephant is not a capitalist. He is a hired man. He is just as clearly a laborer as the elephant. He works with his head, it is true, while the animal works with his trunk. He is none the less a worker. The inventors, organizers and directors of industry are, properly speaking, working-men. The capitalist can buy one kind of labor as well as another. It often happens that laborer and capitalist are combined in one person, where a man not only owns but also superintends a factory. His share then will include his earning as a manager as well as the interest on his capital. Each man should

be rewarded according to his abilities. The vital question is this: Are there any who reap rewards, not by reason of their labor or their ability, but by reason of social advantages and monopoly privileges which are conferred upon them by law, and which make them masters, not only of the elephant of labor, but also of the man on his neck?

Our grievance is not that brains command a higher price than muscle; but that both brains and muscle are made the servants of monopoly. Of course it requires some brains to secure these monopolies. Likewise, it requires no small degree of intelligence to break a safe. But it makes a vast difference to the community whether a man uses his brains to ride elephants and add to the sum of wealth, or whether he uses them to ride legislatures and secure the power legally to take the wealth of others. Monopoly is the key to the whole matter. He who attempts to discuss this question and ignore monopoly, gives evidence that he has not himself escaped the confusion from which he promises to deliver others.

UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL. HE DON'T WANT HIS FRIENDS TO FIGHT.

Printed from the Original MS.

Mr. John Bull,

Sir: Seems to me you are a backin' up this Japanese-Russian fight, an' I don't like it. They are friends of mine—both of 'em; an' you'll back Japan till she once gets into a fight, an' then you won't be there. "Perfidious Albion," is your old reputation in Europe, John. Of course, if you could get me an' a lot of fellows in, so it was a sure thing, you would stand to it, and stop Russia, as you did in the Crimean war; but I don't see that I'm called, Washington and all my level-headed boys was always agin it.

More than that, I'm on both sides. I see that Russian progress south menaces Japan; and I see, too, that Russia has a right to get to salt water. Everybody has a right to land, water, air, and their own kind of government—their's my sentiments.

And, John, Russia ain't the barbarian you make her out. Every time I read somethin' in print specially mean about Russia, I look up an' see it's dated "London." You hain't said a good word for Russia, John, in forty years, all because you are afraid she'll come down in Asia and take your Indian empire. I don't believe the Indians would fret none.

Russia is barbarous, I guess—some-what—but let's give Russia a little Brit-