

soning is so absurd that one needs to know nothing of statistics to expose him. But the exposure is so much more circumstantial when made by statistical experts. For one exposure some years ago we are indebted to Frederick C. Waite, of the department of agriculture. It was in connection with the misleading Aldrich committee's report on prices and wages. Another exposure has been made more recently by H. L. Bliss, of Chicago, in the American Journal of Sociology. His last article appears in the July number. It is impossible to summarize Mr. Bliss's exposure briefly, he having already condensed it almost to the limits of condensation, but it will be sufficient to say that Bliss, like Waite, confirms the inference which Wright's pretentious magazine articles have given rise to, that his sociological conclusions are worthless.

A former judge at Buffalo is trying to bring influence to bear upon the next legislature of New York to abolish the old-time practice still prevailing among the judges of that state, of "charging the jury," in a verdict-making speech. He proposes the substitution of the Illinois practice of confining the instructions of judges in cases on trial before them to statements of the law, made in writing. If this reform goes through, it will be a great relief to the bar of New York. So much abuse has the practice of delivering "charges" suffered in that state, that most cases are understood to depend more upon the judge than the jury. A bright judge can secure almost any kind of verdict he wants. Nor can appellate courts afford relief against the worst abuses of the system. Of one New York judge it used to be said that stenographic notes were not enough to carry his "charges" properly before the higher court. A camera and a phonograph were needed besides. He has been known to state the law of a case to a jury with such verbal accuracy that no flaw appeared in the record, and yet with intonations of the voice and shrugs of the shoulder

and smirks of the face, so significant as to falsify his words. For the sake of a better administration of the law everywhere, and for the further removal of temptation from judges to become advocates, to say nothing of the rights of New York litigants, it is to be hoped that the Buffalo ex-judge may be successful in his efforts to abolish a practice which, in the name of justice, lends itself to such outrages upon justice.

We told briefly last week of the largest real estate sale in the city of Chicago. A lot of land not much more than a quarter of an acre in extent—11,866½ square feet, to be exact—located at the corner of State and Madison streets, was sold by Levi Z. Leiter to Marshall Field, for \$2,100,000. This was for the lot alone, the value of the improvements not entering into the price. Subsequently it appeared that just before closing this sale, Mr. Leiter had leased the lot for 99 years to Schlessinger & Mayer, at an annual ground rent of \$112,000. The rental shows that Field bought the property at a low price. If ground rent be taken as five per cent. of selling value, the selling value of this lot would be \$2,240,000—\$140,000 in excess of what Field paid. But five per cent. is more than gilt edge investments are worth; and as capital is rushing to buy bonds at three per cent., it would not be unfair to estimate ground rent as three per cent. of true value, which would make the true value of the property in question about \$3,733,333.

Now, it is an important question, since Field, Leiter, and Schlessinger & Mayer are dealing with this great value as if it were theirs, to decide to whom it in justice belongs. Nearly four million dollars is not such a trifle that its honest ownership may be ignored. Neither is the ground rental upon which it is calculated, namely \$112,000 a year. Does that rental belong to Leiter. Of course not; he has sold to Field. Does it then belong to Field? That depends upon

whether Leiter owned it when he sold. That Leiter had legal title to it is true; but if we stop to inquire what it is that he had legal title to, we shall instantly see how basely absurd it is to regard his legal title as just. This \$112,000 a year, what does it depend upon? Upon nothing that Field has ever done. Upon nothing that Leiter has ever done. Upon nothing that Schlessinger & Mayer have ever done. Upon nothing even that the city of Chicago or all the people of Chicago or of the world have ever done. It depends solely upon what the people of the city of Chicago will do in the future. It is, in other words, a premium upon the labor of the people of Chicago next year, the year after, the year after that, and so on for a century. Who could possibly have the moral right either to sell or to buy that premium? Assuredly not Mr. Leiter, nor Mr. Field, nor Schlessinger & Mayer. Their just contribution to the amount will be slight at the best. Could the city of Chicago, then, or the state of Illinois, justly sell the future earnings of five generations of Chicago people? It would be as sensible to say that they could sell the people themselves. There is in fact no justification for a condition in which two or three men are permitted by law to traffic and deal, for their own profit, in those future earnings of people whose natural rights are equal to theirs. Legalized plundering like this, tends to bring the law into contempt with the plundered.

OUR FOREIGN POLIOY.

Whether for right or wrong or good or ill, the annexation of Hawaii marks the beginning of a new era in American national life. Of the popularity of this first step in the direction of acquiring and colonizing territory in distant parts of the globe and extending our political power beyond our natural boundaries, there can be no denial. Were it unpopular it could never have been consummated in the face, as it was, of all our traditions. The people were not taken unawares by congress; their own manifest wishes were

obeyed. The cry against further national isolation touches a responsive chord in the public mind, and national ambition sweeps us on into the whirlpool of international politics. Dread it as we may, nothing can now prevent the United States from taking its place, as the expression goes, among the great nations of the earth. Conditions favor it, Europe expects it, and our own people are eager for it.

The undeniable aspiration of the American people for national aggrandizement, for an equal place among the Powers, and an equal voice with them in dictating the destinies of the world, is too strong to be suppressed. We cannot meet the demand for territorial expansion, for instance, with mere negation. If we try to do so the inevitable result will be imperialism. Simply to oppose territorial expansion is to resist a resistless current of sentiment in favor of extending the greatness and glory of this nation; it is also to strengthen the imperialists by weakening opposition to them. But while the American aspiration for aggrandizement cannot be suppressed, it can be guided. Not with a policy of negation and obstruction, then, but with an affirmative policy, with a policy which, while resisting imperialism, shall recognize the patriotic aspiration that imperialism feeds upon, and afford it satisfactory and legitimate opportunities for expression, must we be prepared to deal with the growing ambition for national aggrandizement. Such a policy is ready at hand in the spirit of the Monroe doctrine.

Historically, the Monroe doctrine begins, and except for the Mexican episode of 1865, it ends, with the period of the South America revolts against Spain. The Holy Alliance of European sovereigns, formed for the purpose of forcibly reaffirming the divine right of kings, was then giving aid and comfort to Spain, and President Monroe, with the encouragement if not at the suggestion of Great Britain, warned them off. In his message of 1823 he declared that this country would consider any attempt on the part of the Holy Alliance of European monarchs "to extend their system to any portion of

this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety," and that any effort on their part to oppress our sister republics in the western hemisphere, or to control their destiny, would be regarded by us "as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States." In the same message and in the same connection President Monroe said: "The American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers." These are the limitations of the Monroe doctrine, historically. But in American thought, that doctrine has always meant more than appears upon the surface of its history. In spirit it antedates the Holy Alliance, and it survives long after that reactionary compact has become a mere historical curiosity. The spirit of the Monroe doctrine is the spirit of '76. It is the spirit of republicanism.

The Monroe doctrine then, as it is understood and believed in by the American people, means not only that monarchy must not be further extended in this hemisphere, but that ultimately the principle of monarchy that has already acquired lodgment here must depart and republicanism take its place. In that meaning the doctrine is almost completely realized. Republican government prevails in form, and in growing degree in substance also, virtually upon the whole continent to the south of us; and it prevails in substance as well as form to the north of us, for it were absurd to think of Canada as a monarchy or the dependency of a monarchy, when in all the essentials that go to distinguish republics from monarchies, Canada is as republican as we are. On some of the adjacent islands the old colonial system of continental Europe does still exist; but it no longer flourishes even there. And with Spain expelled from this hemisphere—the very mildest condition of peace that Americans would patiently accept,—and the people of Cuba and Puerto Rico encouraged to set up republics, it might be reasonably affirmed that the spirit of the Monroe doctrine had conquered the western world.

Yet this doctrine would not then have been exhausted, if the sphere of American influence is to be extended beyond the American continents. If we are about to step into the arena of the world's politics as one of the great Powers, and there begin a career which the annexation of Hawaii and our relations to the Philippines seems to have opened up to us, and upon which our people give every indication of eagerness to enter, then we ought to carry the spirit of the Monroe doctrine with us. That doctrine must animate the American policy to the uttermost limits of the American sphere of influence, wherever those limits may extend.

If we are to widen our sphere of influence beyond the boundaries which President Monroe recognized in 1823, we nevertheless cannot afford to abandon the essence of the Monroe doctrine, as we should do were we to emulate the European powers in their policy of conquest, subjugation, land grabbing and colonization. All this would be hostile to the spirit of the Monroe doctrine. It should be our policy, and to the utmost of our influence in international politics we should make it the policy of the other Powers, to recognize, protect and foster the principle of self-government wherever within our sphere of influence that principle becomes manifest. In so doing we should bring to our nation a greatness and shed upon its flag a glory infinitely superior to the greatness and glory which any people had ever before achieved. The United States would be known and honored now and for all time not as one of the despoilers, but par excellence as the leader among nations. Her guns would be feared only by tyrants, while her flag would be loved wherever upon sea or land its colors were seen. What nobler national aggrandizement could honorable ambition desire?

In the policy of expansion which the United States is about to adopt—which indeed it has already adopted, and which the people are determined that in some form, about which their ideas are as yet vague, it shall promote, perfect and make triumphant—we have to choose either the greatness and glory that would follow a truly grand leader-

ship by this nation of all the others, under the inspiration of Jefferson and Monroe, or the bitter fruits of an ignoble struggle for conquest and plunder under the inspiration of the tribes of Hannas and Elkinse. Shall we expand as republicans, or as imperialists? as democrats or as monopolists? as missionaries of the gospel of liberty, justice and peace, or as the advance guard of a millionaire army of plunderers? Shall we be animated by the spirit of the Monroe doctrine, or by lust for conquest and dominion? These are questions which are gathering fast and pressing hard for an answer. And to refuse to answer them at all, is in effect to answer them as the imperialists desire. The current has set in for expansion. Resistance to it now would be futile even if it were desirable. What lies before us to do is to choose between republican expansion, and imperialistic expansion.

TRIUMPH OF THE COUNTINGROOM.

Time was, in the history of daily journalism, when the editorial department of newspapers was controlled by the editor. Though the editor were a salaried man, working for a corporation, he was master of the paper in all but countingroom details, as a captain is master of his ship. Those were the times of Greeley, of the Tribune, and Raymond, of the Times. Bennett, of the Herald, is not to be considered in this connection, for he was owner as well as editor of his paper. But Greeley and Raymond were hired editors. Yet their word was law to their respective papers. While they did not govern the countingroom in financial details, the countingroom did not govern them in anything. Neither did their subordinates take their cue from the countingroom. All that concerned the paper, as a purveyor of news and an organ of opinion, centered in the editor. He was the paper.

Yet, even in those early days, the conflict between the editorial room and the countingroom had begun. With men like Greeley and Raymond the business manager dared not trifle; but as against smaller men, the editors of other papers, this functionary was already trying to encroach

upon the editorial domain. Still, the function of the editor as master of the paper was too clearly defined and recognized for hired publishers to make much headway against hired editors in the conflict between their departments. The fight continued, however, until the editor was ousted from his chair, and the publisher, as the direct representative of the paper's financial backers, had taken his place; or, more accurately, until the publisher's chair was elevated above that of the editor.

Upon papers in which the owner is also editor this revolution is not particularly noticeable; the owner gives his orders to subordinate editors, as editor. But upon papers in which both editor and publisher are hired men, the triumph of the countingroom over the editorial room has long been an acknowledged, though a guardedly acknowledged, fact. The acknowledgement has been guarded, because on the side of the editor it does not comport with the traditional dignity of his position and the importance of his relations to the public to acknowledge with freedom that he has a boss; while on the side of the publisher, he realizes the importance of having the public suppose that the paper is governed by its editor. Subordinates in each department take their cue from their superiors. Nevertheless, on all hands it is well known that newspapers are controlled no longer by the editor, but by the publisher. He it is who determines what policy pays and what policy does not, what articles may offend the inside friends of the paper and what articles will please them; and so, regardless of the outside friends of the paper, whose sentiments the editor is traditionally supposed to cater to, the publisher gives orders to the editor.

A notable example of the power which the countingroom has acquired over the editorial room was incautiously offered the public by the publishers of the Chicago daily papers when they stopped publication for four days rather than submit to an increase of stereotypers' wages to the aggregate amount for the whole city of \$40 a day. No one who is at all familiar with the editorial mind needs to be told that this stoppage was or-

dered not by editors, but by publishers, and not with the hearty acquiescence of the editors, but against their judgment. If the editors did not openly protest, it was because they had fallen so completely into the condition of what socialists call "wage slaves" that they dared not even dispute with all the powerful countingroom.

Raymond had more than one conflict with striking employes, but he never stopped the Times. And if the publisher of the Tribune had proposed to Greeley to suspend publication rather than add a few cents more to his pay roll, Greeley would have denounced him as a profanely epithetical ass. It is inconceivable that any man with the editorial instinct half alive in his brain should be willing to suspend the publication of a paper of which he is editor for any reason whatever when news is to be had, much less for a petty saving when news is extraordinary. The Chicago suspension could have originated nowhere but in the countingroom. It was almost in the nature of a celebration of the triumph of the countingroom over the editorial department.

This triumph would be unaccountable but for the circumstances which have latterly grown up around all vocations. It is not the result of degeneracy among editors, concurrently with higher intellectual development in the countingroom. Quite the contrary. It is but another manifestation of the monopolistic tendency of the time, which shows itself in all departments of industry, not even excepting that of the lawyer. Rich men own newspapers now, not as a business in which to earn a livelihood, or a profession in which to excel, but as a weapon. They hire editors as they hire coachmen. While they want the newspaper to support itself, that is a secondary consideration, their main purpose in owning and controlling it being to enable them to manipulate other interests out of which they can not only make good the paper's losses, but secure a profit besides which no legitimate newspaper could win for them.

Chicago again furnishes the most striking example. With only two inconsequential exceptions, the news-