

own path, neither treading on the toes of the other.

Another editorial writer who seems to have adopted Sydney Smith's easy preventive of prejudice, belongs to the New York Evening Post. Having occasion in an editorial to refer to Henry George, this writer sneeringly remarked:

Nothing is more instructive than to read in the autobiography of the late Henry George how that apostle of justice was led to discover the iniquity of landed property through the destitution to which a persistent course of gambling in mining stocks had reduced him.

Here were three misstatements that might have been avoided had the writer risked acquiring a prejudice by turning to the "autobiography" from which, without turning to it, he inferred so much that might be important but isn't true. In the first place, he would have found no "autobiography" at all, unless some of George's letters in the biography by his son have changed the biography into an autobiography—something which only a detected prevaricator would assert to be the case. In the next place, having given up his futile search for an "autobiography" and turned to the biography, this humble imitator of Sydney Smith would have learned that George was never "reduced to destitution by a persistent course of gambling in mining stocks." He did frequently make investments unsuccessfully in that class of property, but long before he had thought of the land question. Sydney Smith's imitator would have found, furthermore, had he read the biography, that so far from being "led to discover the iniquity of landed property" through his bad luck in mining stock investments, George discovered it (page 210 of biography) quite accidentally through observing some of the phenomena of an era of land speculation in which he had no part, and while he was not destitute, nor under the influence of any gambling experience whatever.

Hard driven indeed must those

Colorado corporations and their friendly newspapers have been to exploit the uncorroborated confession of a criminal as evidence of the responsibility of certain union miners for the explosion at Independence (p. 328). One Chicago paper thought the confession quite probable because it was "so circumstantial." It has since been knocked to pieces by indisputable proof of alibis. The accused men were attending a convention at Denver when, according to the confession, they should have been much nearer the scene of the crime. The fact is that no confession implicating union miners in that crime is worth the paper and ink, unless it explains how the criminals could, without detection, make the elaborate preparations for the explosion necessary to be made on the ground, at a time when the ground was guarded by mine-owners' detectives.

AMERICAN 'ANTI-SEMITISM.

Harvard university has been mentioned as a place from which anti-Semitism is absent. In support of this view, personal relationships and individual expressions are frequently cited. But it is not likely that public sentiment at Harvard differs materially from public sentiment elsewhere; and in all probability any one wishing to prove that anti-Semitic sentiment does exist at Harvard could collect as many incidents and expressions to prove his case as are offered in support of the opposite side.

However that may be, it is a fact, of which as a Jew myself I am fully cognizant, that widespread antipathy to Jews exists. It is also a fact that this antipathy cannot be satisfactorily accounted for on the ground of religious bigotry, racial animosity, or even business rivalry.

Jews insist, as a rule, on attributing anti-Semitism to one of those three causes; or in some other way put the blame anywhere but with their own conduct. Individuals may be found among all nationalities and creeds, who will relate sorrowful experiences of continu-

ous harsh and unjust treatment from all with whom they have come in close contact, and have tried to befriend. It is seldom an error in a case of this kind to attribute the real blame to the individual aggrieved. So when a whole class see fit to indulge in continual tales of woe about their treatment by the rest of mankind, the fault is likely to be found with the complainant, rather than with those complained against. Jews have not as a rule the gift of seeing themselves as others see them.

If they had they would not be surprised at beholding prejudice aroused on account of actions showing the person committing them to be extraordinarily filled with conceit and vanity, and impelled by an irresistible desire to attract the attention and admiration of every one else, to his wealth—real or imaginary, to his extraordinary shrewdness, or even to qualities which ought to cause shame rather than pride.

In the discussion and settlement of great public questions, in which there is involved a conflict between greed and human rights, the Jews, with a few honorable exceptions, are invariably found on the wrong side. In this country we need but refer to the frantic support they almost unanimously gave in 1896 to the side of plutocracy, corruption, and legalized plunder. Other creeds and other nationalities were to be found on the same side, of course, but there was not the same unanimity, nor to the same degree such disregard of former partisan affiliations.

Again in 1900, although the issue was largely the question of putting an end to a war of subjugation against a weak nation struggling against greater wrongs than even the Jews of Russia are compelled to suffer, American Jews could not get over the ridiculous fear that justice to the Filipinos might possibly endanger their own money-bags, and frantically aided in heaping upon the American people the shame and disgrace of stamping with their approval a colossal crime.

The record of the Jews of the British Empire in the Boer struggle is as contemptible and disgraceful as that of their American compatriots in dealing with the

Filipinos. Yet how indignant and horrified were both American and British Jews at the news from Kishineff!

The Jews have still the lesson to learn that their own rights are not secure so long as the rights of others are trampled upon.

When the Jews are willing to extend their love of justice, of liberty and of equality to others besides themselves, and devote some time and attention to the support of rather than opposition to movements with this end in view, they may be surprised to find anti-Semitism die a natural death. Such Jews as have, to the horror of their race, cast in their lot with some such movement, know that among their comrades in this struggle there is no prejudice except against wrong, no hate but of injustice. In this limited number, Dr. S. Solis Cohen, of Philadelphia is prominent. In a comparatively brief article entitled "What Zionism May Mean," and which all Jews, particularly Yale and Harvard graduates, might read to their profit, he says:

The ready acquiescence of well-to-do Jews in the social injustices by which they are surrounded, and from which they, equally with their Christian neighbors, derive wealth and comfort; the leading part that many of them take in the perpetuation of these smug injustices; the horror with which they regard those who question the wisdom or rightfulness of existing institutions; and, saddest of all, the facility with which Russian Jews, that 20 years ago were exploited by their American and German brethren, to-day enter the ranks of the exploiters, to rob where they were robbed and to oppress where they were oppressed—all these sorrowful but indisputable facts emphasize the need of Zionism.

I would add that Zionism has no place for lengthy statements of petty slights by either self-satisfied Jews or Gentiles. Dr. Cohen and such other Jews have realized the truth of the words of Henry George on this subject:

"The gospel of deliverance, let us not forget it, is the gospel of love, not of hate. He whom it emancipates will know neither Jew nor Gentile, nor Irishman nor Englishman, nor German nor Frenchman, nor European nor American, nor difference of color or of race, nor animosities of

class or condition. Let us set our feet on old prejudices, let us bury the old hates. There have been 'Holy Alliances' of kings. Let us strive for the Holy Alliance of the people!"

DANIEL KIEFER.

EQUALITY.

Uniformity of condition is by no means to be desired. That would make for social stagnation. What men must insist upon is equality of opportunity. If uniformity of condition were the social ideal either they that could and would rise above the common level would be arbitrarily held back, or else they would be compelled to support and carry forward all others, equally with themselves. How could social progress be made under conditions so formidable? The industrious man would be compelled to divide his hard-earned substance with the sluggard, thus putting a premium upon laziness, and penalizing thrift.

But both the monopolist and the lazy (and therefore penniless) man have a common interest in confounding the meaning of the term "equality," as used by democratic reformers. The monopolist purposes to discredit the reformer by dint of putting a ridiculous interpretation upon his demand of equality, and the sluggard adopts that interpretation because it expresses his desire. They both wish to get something for nothing. Under a regime of uniformity of condition the sluggard would get something for nothing; for if his condition were equal with that of the industrious it would necessarily be at the cost of the latter. Now, that would be ridiculously unjust; and the monopolist, knowing that the common sense of mankind would repudiate such a proposition, craftily puts precisely that proposition into the mouth of the reformer, thus purposely misrepresenting him.

Under the prevailing conditions the monopolist actually gets something for nothing; and, realizing that society would put an end to such injustice if it recognized it, and knew how to, and perceiving that equality of natural opportunity would effectually solve the problem, he cunningly

clothes the term "equality," as used by the reformer, with the signification attached to it by the possessionless sluggard, and so presents both as individuals having an identical aim. The result is that the reformer is regarded by the general public as being the champion of the shiftless and improvident, and thus the monopolist is enabled to continue his plundering of the befuddled public.

The voluntarily idle poor produce nothing, and the monopolist, as such, produces nothing; therefore it necessarily follows that, whatever either of them gets is derived from the industrious, who produce more than they consume.

I say that the monopolist, as such, produces nothing. Here again the defender of monopoly may befool the public. The monopolist may also be a producer, and this fact may be pointed out in controversion of what I have said. Of course, such an argument is irrelevant and puerile; but it will pass current with the unthinking just the same. A thief may also be a blacksmith, and, as such, a producer; but as a thief he merely appropriates what others have produced. Likewise, a monopolist may, in addition, be a producer; but as a monopolist he appropriates what others have produced.

Every man, monopolist or not, is in justice entitled to the equivalent of his product, and no more. For how can we get more except that some one else gets less? The individual may have a threefold income, as, a salary for service, interest on his capital, and tribute to his monopoly, if he have one. He is justly entitled to salary and interest, but not to the monopoly tribute. Monopoly affords opportunity to its beneficiaries in proportion to and because of, its deprivation of opportunity to general society. Equality of opportunity and monopoly cannot co-exist; either one destroys the other. Monopoly is inequality of opportunity.

Now, monopoly does not absorb all the increasing produce of industry, but it seeks to do so.

Take, for instance, the anthracite coal monopoly: Why does it not advance the price of coal to