

MISCELLANY

THE PLEA OF LABOR.

For The Public.

I do not want the earth. I only ask
That portion of its plenty which is mine;
That I may live the life which God's de-
sign

Marked not for slothful ease nor endless
task.

I will not fawn at Fortune's feet, nor bask
Contented where reflected glories shine,
Until the coming day when wrath divine
Shall tear away from Mammon's face the
mask.

Give me fair recompense for dangers
faced;

Give me but fair reward for labor done;

A chance to breathe of God's pure air a
breath,

And time for rest in all the hours of haste,
That I may see the smiling of the sun
Ere darkness cometh in the guise of
death.

TOM CARDER, JR.

ESKIMO ART AND LITERATURE.

We take the following article from the
Literary Digest of November 15. As printed
in the Digest it is illustrated with naive
and vivacious pictures reproduced from
Mr. Moeller's book. The translation was
made especially for the Digest.

From Godthaab, Greenland, a vil-
lage of 300 or 400 inhabitants, comes
the news of the death of Lars Moel-
ler, the pioneer journalist of the Es-
kimo race. The Gartenlaube (Berlin)
prints the following account of this
unique character, and of his labors
on behalf of Eskimo art and litera-
ture:

More than 40 years ago, the Danish
authorities, who have always endeavored
to develop the capabilities of the Eskimo,
discovered Moeller's intellectual superior-
ity to the mass of his race, and assisted him
to go to Copenhagen and learn the printer's
trade. Upon his return to Godthaab in 1860
he opened a printing-office and issued a
book of illustrations of Eskimo life, all
drawn and engraved by natives.

Subsequently Moeller founded an illus-
trated journal in the Eskimo language to
which he contributed drawings, verses, and
news items. He accompanied Nordenskiöld
in some of his journeyings, and the explor-
er speaks highly of his intelligence and
artistic talent.

Moeller also introduced photography
among his people, working until recently
with an old-fashioned camera and wet
plates, but producing excellent results. It
must be remembered that in Greenland
photography is beset with difficulties. The
work is necessarily confined to the short
summer, and even then it is often inter-
rupted by fogs. But Moeller took advantage
of every moment of sunshine to photograph
the wild scenery of Greenland, sending his
pictures to Copenhagen for sale. He did a
good business in portrait photography, too,
for his countrymen are as vain as other
people.

A hundred men hasten to get rich.
All fail, save one, and he gobbles up
the other 99.—Schoolmaster.

RAILROADS TO ABOLISH PASSES.

According to the New York Com-
mercial of November 21, the railroads
in the Trunk Line association are to
issue fewer complimentary passes in
future, and to show less favor to pol-
iticians. Not only will they enforce
the anti-pass pact more rigidly than
heretofore, but the President's pri-
vate lists are to be restricted. The
politicians, who have been altogeth-
er too generous in the use of free
transportation for themselves and
friends, are to be curbed. On this sub-
ject the Commercial says:

It is not believed these barnacles can be
absolutely and entirely removed, but it is
thought they can be trimmed down so as
not to be so much of a drag and imposition
on transportation departments as well as
less able to supply passes or free tickets
to friends and others who have not the re-
motest right to ride over a railroad with-
out paying fare.

The ability thus to take advantage of the
railroads has been a great boon to many
politicians to whom the privilege has been
invaluable in maintaining a prestige
among influential constituents.

It is hoped, but not expected, that
the railroads will be as good as their
word, and stop issuing passes to
those "who have not the remotest
right to ride without paying fare." But
this brings up an important ques-
tion—who are entitled to free rides?

Surely all senators and congress-
men, and all state legislators and
councilmen in large cities who vote
lands, franchises, and other favors,
worth millions, to the railroads, are
entitled to some recognition. They
will not, without some consideration,
vote to give the railroads what be-
longs to the people. How many con-
gressmen, for instance, would this
winter vote for Babcock's bill for a
"Union Station" in Washington, if
their passes were taken away from
them? This station is to be built
practically by the city of Washington
and donated to the railroads. The do-
nation, which will include the right of
way to the station, is estimated to
be worth some \$50,000,000 to the rail-
roads. For this one act the railroads
could well afford to carry free, for 20
years, not only the congressmen who
vote for it, but all of their near rela-
tions.

No, railroads are too well managed
to make such a horrible mistake as to
cut off passes to their legislative
friends. Not until they possess
everything worth having above
ground, or until they absolutely con-
trol legislators, through campaign
funds and political bosses, can the
railroads afford to stop the supply of
passes to politicians. It is not be-

lieved that they are near enough to
either of these goals to make such ac-
tion safe. And yet they are very
powerful. B. W. H.

ROOSEVELT'S ATTACKS ON PRES- IDENTS.

The Columbia (Mo.) Herald, which
enjoys the distinction of being one of
the "handsomest country newspapers
in America," and which is also one of
the ablest Democratic newspapers in
the country, has been reading the
books written by Theodore Roosevelt.
Naturally Roosevelt's "Life of Thomas
H. Benton" interests a Missourian.
Editor Williams, of the Herald, says
that while abroad the two most
talked-of Americans that came to his
notice were Missourians—Benton and
the mule. Editor Williams has been
reading Roosevelt's "Life of Benton"
and has made some copious extracts
therefrom.

It will be remembered that about a
year ago Republican organs were
filled with violent criticisms of men
who dared to speak slightly of a
president, and criticisms of a pre-
sident were likened to anarchy. Indeed,
the assassination of William McKinley
was attributed to the newspapers and
speakers who criticised Mr. McKinley
and his policies, and these same Re-
publican organs demanded a federal
law limiting free speech and free
press. These facts are recalled for
the purpose of emphasizing some of
the extracts the Columbia Herald has
made from Roosevelt's "Life of
Thomas H. Benton."

Speaking of Thomas Jefferson, Au-
thor Roosevelt says:

The scholarly, timid and shifty doc-
trinaire. . . . Was the father of nullifica-
tion and therefore of secession. . . .
Cheap pseudo-classicism that he borrowed
from the French revolutionists. . . .
Constitutionally unable to put a proper
value on truthfulness.

Of Martin Van Buren, Author Roose-
velt said:

Faithfully served the mammon of un-
righteousness. . . . Succeeded because
of and not in spite of his moral shortcomings.

This is what Author Roosevelt
wrote concerning Franklin Pierce:

A small politician, of low capacity and
mean surrounding, proud to act as the
servile tool of men worse than himself.

When Author Roosevelt wrote of
James K. Polk this is what he said:

Excepting Tyler, the very smallest of
the small presidents between Jackson and
Lincoln.

Of President Monroe, Author Roose-
velt wrote as follows:

Colorless, high-bred gentleman of no es-
pecial ability, but well fitted to act as pre-
sidential figurehead.

But Author Roosevelt's opinion of John Tyler is especially interesting. He said:

He has been called a mediocre man; but this is unwarranted flattery. He was a politician of monumental littleness. . . . His chief mental and moral attributes were peevishness, fretful obstinacy, inconsistency, incapacity to make up his mind, together with inordinate vanity.

If we remember aright, similar estimates of presidents made by other gentlemen were denounced as "anarchy" and "abuse of the freedom of speech" by the writer of the above estimates of presidents. And if memory is not playing us false we recall a number of remarks to the effect that such "attacks" on a president were responsible for "anarchy," and that those who made them should be held responsible along with the assassin for any crime committed because of their "influence upon weak and irresponsible minds." Is it patriotism to defame a president after death, and anarchy to criticise him while living?

A comparison of Author Roosevelt's words with President Roosevelt's words will bring to light many interesting things.—The Commoner.

MISUNDERSTOOD.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites: for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men; for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites: for ye devour widows' houses and for a pretense make long prayer.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites: for ye pay tithe of mint, anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law,—judgment, mercy and faith: these ought ye to have done and not to leave the other undone.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites: for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites: for ye are like unto whited sepulchers, which indeed appear beautiful outward but are within full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites: for ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchers of the righteous;

And say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets.

Coming from the meek and lowly Jesus, that is rather strong language. He condoned the sins of thieves and murderers and prostitutes; he consorted with fellows of the baser sort; he had only sorrow for Judas who betrayed him, only gentle forgiveness for Peter who forswore him.

These scribes and Pharisees, then, must have been pretty bad men.

On the contrary. They were the very nicest people in Jerusalem. They were distinctly the better element. They were the wardens and vestry of Trinity, the stewards of the First Methodist, the elders of Westminster, the deacons of the Park Congregational. They were the pillars of society, the college presidents and trustees of boards. They were the men of unimpeachable probity and integrity.

And this came from Jesus who was a Jew to the tip of his fingers. No wonder he was crucified. If any clergyman to-day care to make an interesting experiment, let him read that chapter from Matthew, lean over the edge of his pulpit, shake his finger in the face of the front pews and tell them, That means you, do you understand, you, you!

What was the offense of the scribes and Pharisees that brought this terrific denunciation?

It was not lawlessness. Outside the Brahmin castes there were never men who kept the law so scrupulously. They were not like those representatives of the better element who lie to the assessor, who juggle with franchises, who corrupt the legislatures and defy the courts. They were ever so much better than that.

It was not rottenness, like the frivolous decadence of the Four Hundred. They were painfully moral, and the way they kept the Sabbath made it a dreadful day.

They were not mean. They made it a point to give tithes, and that is more liberal than Mr. Rockefeller, whose liberality is so prodigious that he has had a doxology sung to him by a national convention of a great church.

Imagine the buzz in the congregation, the indignation in the synagogue, upon this wholly unwarranted attack by a Jew of the peasant class against all the better element. Do you suppose there was no Baer in the sanhedrim to urge that such a pestilent anarchist ought to be put down?

People who can remember the wrath of all respectable classes against John Brown, of Ossawatamie, can guess something what it was like.

Their offense which brought this withering scorn, was simply that they stood for the established order of things. They insisted on their legal rights, their vested rights, that was all. They despised the poor. They

gave alms, plentifully enough, but they sat fast in the social order that made the mass dependent.

They advised the poor to be temperate and thrifty and save their money. They held that anybody could be successful who would be prudent and economical. They said that God never intended that all men should be equal, and it was absurd to suppose anything of the kind; let them be content in the station to which it had pleased God to call them, and thankful to their betters for giving them good counsel and establishing soup kitchens in the time of stress.

They were most exemplary citizens, patterns for their community. Jesus objected to the pattern.

They devoured widows' houses, but in the most respectable fashion. Mind you, the outside of the cup and platter was clean. They took nothing more than the law allowed, and the suggestion that it was robbery was wholly incomprehensible to them. Their conduct was absolutely correct. They had nothing to arbitrate, and they stood on clearly ascertained rights.

There may have been frauds and scallywags among them, but Jesus was not talking about them specially. He swept the whole class into his condemnation, and he referred pointedly to the most virtuous and righteous of them.

Why? Because they shut up the kingdom of heaven against men, the kingdom he came to proclaim, the reign of justice, mercy and faith, the kingdom that was to come in earth as it shall be in heaven.

What else does he mean by omitting the weightier matter of the law, which is first of all judgment? It was not police court judgment that they neglected. They were right up on the front seat when it came to good government. They furnished the president and vice president of the civic league. And if there had been a protective tariff in those days they would have been the foremost advocates of prosperity.

He meant social justice. Respectable, upright, kindhearted in a way, they stood for the perpetuation of injustice. And he came to establish the kingdom, the reign of the higher law, the state that is expressed by the brotherhood of man and founded on social justice.

They wouldn't have killed the prophets, oh, no. They did find it necessary to put down this disturber of the peace.