

scribes them, in the earlier periods of his predatory career.

One of the possible virtues of the pending trust legislation, from the point of view of trust magnates, was pointed out by Congressman Sulzer on the floor of the House on the 6th. Mr. Littlefield, the President's chosen shackler of cunning, had introduced a bill which looked very much like a real shackle. But when he brought his bill out of committee it had been curiously worked over, apparently by unseen hands. Referring to this, Mr. Sulzer said:

The gentleman from Maine (Mr. Littlefield) seems to me to be in an embarrassing position. He changed the title to his bill—he gave up his original bill—and substituted for it a weak, apologetic makeshift that will accomplish nothing or do great harm. Now, I want the members of this House to see how cleverly the trust lawyers amended the title of the original bill. If you will take the title of the original bill introduced by my friend from Maine, you will find it required "all" corporations to make "true" returns, and the trust lawyers some way or other induced the great trust buster from Maine to amend his bill so that it leaves out entirely "all" corporations and "true" returns. The entire bill—I mean the new trust bill—now before us is a hollow sham.

Whatever Senator Hanna's motives may have been in fathering a bill for pensioning the liberated slaves, his bill offers an impressive lesson on the subject of compensation in connection with the abolition of institutional wrongs. It reminds one of the subterfuge of the hero of "No. 5 John Street." He designed to live in the slums—to actually live there and become a companion of their denizens instead of an inquisitive and benevolent overseer. But he dared not let his friends know his purpose. They would have laughed at him. So he accounted for his absence from his aristocratic haunts by letting it leak out that he had gone to the Caspian sea to hunt ducks. There was nothing comical to his set about his traversing the continent of Europe and penetrating far into Asia to kill

ducks; but it would have seemed inexpressibly comical to them if they had known he had gone a mile away from upper tendom to make companions of poor people. This incident in Whiteing's interesting novel has its parallel in connection with Senator Hanna's slave-pension bill. Everybody is laughing at Hanna's bill to compensate the slaves for the years of unrequited servitude which the government imposed upon them, while nobody would laugh at a bill to compensate the owners for refusing any longer to impose that servitude upon the slaves. How we do laugh about serious things and grow serious about comical ones! If anyone were to be compensated it should be the slave and not the master, for it was the slave whom the government wronged by standing between him and freedom. The master was not wronged by the government's refusal to continue wronging the slave.

But neither master nor slave should be compensated now. Let bygones be bygones, and look out for the future. We still have wrongs akin to slavery to remedy, without turning back to the wickedness of other generations. If existing institutional wrongs were righted, the old slave masters would not want compensation and the old slaves would not need it. Each would earn enough for himself and keep his earnings. Did Mr. Hanna really wish to serve the Negro, for whose vote in the next Republican convention he is now so undisguisedly angling, he would get into harness with Tom L. Johnson and devote the rest of his life and his fortune to abolishing the tariffs that rob American workers, black and white, and the monopoly land tenures that disinherit them.

It must be somewhat startling to our imperial patriots who have assumed that peace prevails in the Philippines, to read this week of a battle within seven miles of Manila. A force of 200 "insurgents"—Filipino patriots as history will call them

—engaged the foreign (American) constabulary and was defeated only after what the dispatches call a severe engagement. It now leaks out that the Filipino force was part of a little patriot army under Gen. San Miguel, who has refused to abandon his country to its alien conquerors. This event makes two things pretty clear: first, that the American reports of pacification have been deceptive; and, second, that there are Filipinos who, like ourselves, have a hatred of foreign dominion even unto death.

A BOUNTY-FED REPUBLIC.

Two of America's industrial monarchs—men who have waded to the thrones they occupy through the slaughter of their fellow men's opportunities—are just now scoring what our dramatic critics would call "a huge success" in the character of philanthropists. That lively competition which they have abolished in the industries they controlled, they have carried into the domain of charity, and according to the latest bulletin it is by no means clear whether the ex-iron despot who has turned book-buyer to the world at large has not been outrun in munificence by the man to whom so many collegestudents owe their midnight "oil," and so many college professors their ethical doctrines. So that it seems there is use for our arch-monopolists after all; under cover of all their elaborate schemes for the destruction of our liberties, they are really hatching deep-laid plans for our benefit, reminding us of Pope's lines:

But still the great have kindness in reserve,
They helped to bury whom they helped to starve.

Whether the same people whose rights have perished in the upbuilding of the over-swollen wealth of Carnegie and Rockefeller are likely, through the overflow pipe of charity, to come by their own again—whether the gift of a library here and a college there is an adequate recompense for the hundreds of thousands of independent livelihoods that have been taken away, is not the question which now concerns us; the aspect of the case which overshadows every other is the fact that the richest Be

public the world ever saw is not ashamed to beg the necessities of life from its monopolist citizens. Who that cares for the nation's self-respect and independence can notice the way that representative bodies, church dignitaries, educational authorities, publicists and the people at large, fawn upon and coax these economic monstrosities without feeling that the manhood is going out of the American character? Would any self-respecting people allow Mr. Carnegie to choose their books, Mr. Rockefeller their teachers, or Mr. Baer to patronizingly undertake that they shall not have to pay more than five dollars a ton for their coal? Yet this is what we have come to.

Since when did this spirit of alms-taking and subserviency take root in the national character? It is obviously a recent growth; it has nothing in common with the fearless spirit of the men who revolted against foreign oppression and made it a thing of the past, or with the daring self-sufficient spirit of the pioneers who carried the torch of civilization westward and armed with an axe and an old gun compelled reluctant nature to yield them a living. It is the opposite of all this. It is the inevitable accompaniment of the social and economic forces which have in recent years dug the ground from under the American citizen and left him at the mercy of the monopolistic corporation. Even in old countries accustomed to the worship of rank and wealth there is no such toadying to wealth or such disposition to ignore the sources of its acquisition as is furnished by the present trend of events in this great Republic.

How would a really self-respecting Republic treat such gifts as those of Carnegie and Rockefeller? A New York clergyman speaking of such gifts recently said: "Let us take all the money we can from such sources." How like a clergyman, who preaches a Kingdom that is not of this world! And yet there are exceptions. Over in England, some years ago, a Mr. Hooley, a bubble-millionaire and company promoter made a magnificent present to St. Paul's Cathedral. Shortly afterwards, the Hooley smash came and then it was seen at whose expense he was enabled to be so gen-

erous. The clergy of St. Paul's had the decency to return the money to the estate. They did not think that paying Paul was a sufficient atonement for robbing Peter.

But charity we are told is "restitution." It is not restitution. It is, if rightfully interpreted, merely adding insult to injury, and it would be so regarded if men were as great sticklers for fair play in the game of life as they are in the game of football or cards. A man who plays foul when it is only the livelihoods of millions of people that are at stake, is honored and treated like a demigod, whereas if he had been detected using loaded dice or hiding an ace up his sleeve, he would be expelled from all honorable society. The man who, in order to grab more wealth than he can ever get through, sacrifices all considerations of public welfare, commercial morality, and even legal honesty, instead of being left, as he ought to be left, to stagger under the pile of filthy lucre as best he can, and to struggle unaided through the eye of the needle, is allowed to ease his back and his conscience through the channel of philanthropy.

That channel ought not to be open to anyone except those who were just before they became generous. That our tyrant monopolists are permitted to use it shows that the chains of economic slavery not only have crippled the body, but the spirit of the nation, and are sapping the foundations of its manly virtues. After that the descent is easy. Given an enslaved public opinion and there is no form of aggression upon popular liberty that will not, henceforth, be safe, easy and even popular.

T. SCANLON.

DIRECT LEGISLATION FOR LOS ANGELES.

"Ad astra per aspera." Literally, "to the stars through roughness;" freely, "expect difficulties if you want success." It is the counterpart of that good English proverb, "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again." Either of these will describe how Los Angeles got direct legislation.

It only happened on December 1, 1902, that the people of that thriving Pacific city by a vote of 12,846 in favor, to 1,942 against, or more than

six to one, adopted a charter amendment for direct legislation. Really it is not fully assured yet, as the legislature must ratify or reject the amendment as a whole; but the legislature has never been known to reject a charter amendment that local feeling in a city wanted, and there is no probability that they will reject this one.

Three things are needed for a successful change in economic or political methods. First, an educated public sentiment; second, propitious circumstances; and third, a few determined and tactful men. The last is more than all the others put together; as the determined and tactful man, or men, educate the public and make propitious circumstances.

Los Angeles, the metropolis of southern California, the Mecca of the winter tourist, is inhabited by a people restless, energetic, pleasure-loving and open-minded. Its rapid growth has drawn the freer, more daring spirits to it. Its balmy climate, suitable for invalids and consumptives, has drawn many leisured rich to it, and there is about it an air of cultured ease contrasting strongly with its spirit of Western drive. This ample margin of time and money and the knowledge how to use the two is badly absent from many Western cities, and differentiates Los Angeles from them. Then the brilliant sunshine—they claim the sun shines 360 days out of the 365—and the crisp air, invigorating like champagne, have given a mercurial liveliness to the people of this city of Los Angeles, not seen elsewhere. Such is the soil.

The propitious circumstances were the fact that Los Angeles had long ago outgrown its charter and badly needed a new one, and secondly, that the constitution of California permits a city to make or amend its own charter, subject to ratification by the legislature. On the initiative petition signed by a certain number of the voters, the question of whether the city shall have a new charter is submitted to the voters. If they say Yes, a little later they elect a charter commission, which draws up the new charter or amendments to the old one, and after a suitable time for discussion, they are voted on by the people, and if accepted, go to the legislature, who cannot change but only accept or