

industrial factor, the lack of which is to be lamented.

The writer then proceeds to show the evils that followed in the wake of the civil war: "government by power, with all its undemocratic accompaniments", "full-fledged paternalism", and "so-called protection". Speaking of the governmental interference with the natural relations of trade, he shows how the system reacts:

This false dependence of industry upon the government has begotten a vicious dependence of government upon industrial capital. The industries look to the government for special privileges conferred at the cost of the tax-paying public and for the restraint of competition; the governing classes in turn draw on the purse of industry for personal bribes to legislators and for contributions to election funds to perpetuate party dominance. Such has been the course of our nation building for nearly half a century.

Then follows a very clear exposition of the purpose and effect of trusts, and of their corresponding accompaniment, the great trades unions. Both movements the writer holds to be manifestations of the "current monopolistic invasion," retrogressive in tendency and hostile to American ideals of liberty and right. All in all, no saner, calmer, and at the same time more earnest warnings have been uttered in recent times than are to be found in that editorial. Its appearance goes far to strengthen the belief that there are substantial, legitimate, business interests which are prepared to welcome a "change of government." Will these same interests be willing to curb monopolies by adopting genuine measures for maintaining "equal access to the virgin resources of our vast domain"? That is the question.

It may border upon the impious to object to so strenuous and warlike a game as football; yet a protest springs to the pen-point, as it were, when one reads such accounts of football games as the following news

report of a game at Danville, Ill., on the 19th:

The Central University football team returned home to-day from Nashville, where they played Vanderbilt yesterday. The team was so badly crippled by the game that it was compelled to cancel the game with Sewanee, which was to have been played Monday, and lay up for repairs. Cheek, halfback, has a broken ankle; Hugely, halfback, has a broken collar bone; Wilson, fullback, was hit on the head and rendered unconscious by the blow; Tarkington, end, sustained a fractured bone in the hand; while other members were more or less seriously battered up.

If this sort of thing is to become characteristic of our universities, what place can they be regarded as holding in the education of youth? Has our civilization fallen so completely under the dominion of the devilish spirit of "success" and the evolution of the "strenuous life," that humane ideals are being supplanted in our universities by such savage games as that described above? We boast of our progressive civilization, but can that be a progressive civilization in which success in brutal sports rather than intellectual and moral culture distinguishes our university life?

The latest autocratic interference by the post office department at Washington with private mail matter, is in the case of the "League of Educators" of Chicago. This concern does a business which we believe to rest upon unsound business principles. Probably most men would come to the same conclusion upon examining into it. But it is not fraudulent. There is no trick or deception about it. There are no secret springs in it. What it does is open even to the most casual examination. Nothing is concealed. On the contrary all facts are exploited. Should it turn out in the end to have been ill-advised, the losers will have lost through their own judgment and not through the trick and device of swindlers. There is, therefore, no excuse whatever for interference with this business by the law in any of its branches or in any manner, ex-

cept the plea that government ought to paternally protect investors against the results of their own mistaken judgment. But if this plea is allowable, every kind of investment should be subject to government censorship, and that is absurd. Yet a bureau in the post office department at Washington reaches out with its long and strong arm and forbids the delivery of mail matter addressed to this business concern. In other words, it stops its business. To do such a thing on no better basis than that the avowed business principle of the concern is unsound would be bad enough under any circumstances. It is infinitely worse when, as in this case, the interference is made arbitrarily and peremptorily, without court or jury, without any opportunity to the house to be heard, but upon the mere ipse dixit of a department clerk. If such things can be done in one case they can be done in others, and every new business may easily come to depend upon the will of the department clerk unless Congress or some court intervenes and takes away from his department the extraordinary power it now exercises so freely of stopping men's letters and depriving them of remittances without due process of law.

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON.

The life of this noble woman, which has just come to an end, is part of the most enduring history of her country, and indeed of modern civilization. Not only did she live during the period when the equality of womanhood with manhood came into recognition, but she as much or more than any other one person brought about the change.

In Mrs. Stanton's younger days, even while she was in middle life, married women had no individual standing before the law on its civil side. Their property belonged to the husband and their individuality was altogether merged in his. Though his right to flog his wife had become obsolete, his governing authority remained intact. As the social idea of woman was as a vine clinging tenderly to her stalwart

oak of a husband, so the legal idea of her was as an absolute nonentity. That condition has not been wholly altered, but it has been altered in great degree.

Married women now own and control their own property, if they want to. In the law, the relationship that subsists between them is more analogous to partnership and less to serfdom than in former days; while in some States women are even invested with the ballot, as they are destined yet to be in all.

Throughout this whole movement Elizabeth Cady Stanton was conspicuous and influential. It was natural, perhaps, fighting as she was for the withheld rights of one sex, that the struggle should have assumed the appearance to her of a sex conflict, just as the anti-slavery struggle seemed to so many of its leaders a race conflict. But Mrs. Stanton lived long enough to see her cause rise to the higher plane of a conflict not of sex against sex but of men and women who believe in equal human rights against men and women who do not.

Her own daughter, Mrs. Blatch, truly characterized this conflict when in a speech at Cooper Union a few years ago she recited all the objections ever made to woman suffrage, both those that have been abandoned and those that are still urged, and declared that every one was essentially neither more nor less than an objection to democracy.

Probably the most perfect characterization of Mrs. Stanton is that of her coadjutor for so many years—Susan B. Anthony. Miss Anthony has called her “the statesman of the woman suffrage movement,” and that was really her relation to it. From her speech before the legislature of New York in 1848 in support of the married woman’s property bill to the latter days of her life, she did the kind of work for the movement that falls to statesmen to do, and she did it with singular ability. She was a statesman of the first order.

Of course, Mrs. Stanton suffered the jibes and jeers of thoughtless and vicious adversaries. That is something which no one can escape who enlists in the service of his kind. Of course, also, these jibes and jeers came from the upper mob even more

freely than from the lower. It is the upper mob, always sensitive to such weapons when turned against themselves, that uses them with greatest freedom against others. But the day has passed when the jeers of the thoughtless or the slanders of the vicious can have any influence upon the cause to which Mrs. Stanton devoted her long life. She lived to see it successful in many particulars and its success assured in all. And as to herself, she has left a name that will be honored as long as the story of woman’s emancipation shall be told.

THE TRUE ISSUE IN THE COAL STRIKE.

He must be a confiding soul who believes that the Presidential arbitration can settle the anthracite coal strike.

The arbitration commission does serve an excellent purpose in allaying excitement and making opportunity for calm reflection. It will doubtless make an adjustment of terms of employment which may keep the peace for a little while. It may recommend palliatives to Congress and State legislatures. In a flight of optimistic imagination, one might almost prophesy its securing better treatment for the miners, as a similar commission might possibly have secured 50 years ago better treatment for Negro slaves in the District of Columbia.

But the true issue will go unnoticed by the arbitration board. The relation of mining serf to feudal lord will remain undisturbed and unmenaced. The essential right and wrong of the matter will be passed over. The irrepressible conflict will be minimized. Like the issue of chattel slavery, which was allowed to gather momentum until it plunged our nation into the throes of a bloody civil war, this issue of economic slavery will, so far as the President’s arbitration board affects it, be left to develop its own kind of cataclysm.

The comparison of that issue with the slavery issue of our fathers is something more than an analogy. The two issues are but different expressions of the same thing. Under chattel slavery, the master drove his slave to work and appropriated the

proceeds of his labor. Under economic slavery, the coal baron appropriates mining opportunities and thereby forces the disinherited miner to work upon his grinding terms or starve in idleness. In both forms of slavery the worker must work for a master. Whether he cringes under a lash and to save his body from bruises consents to work, or cringes under fear of starvation and to save his life begs for work, makes no difference. So long as his will in that respect is controlled by another, so long as his earnings over and above his bare “keep” are appropriated by another, he is a slave—even though he have a vote.

One need only to know the surroundings of the anthracite coal mines to realize that the miners are slaves. Even the well paid ones average hardly a dollar a day in wages. This is not because they cannot or will not earn more, but because they are not allowed to earn more.

Says Henry George, Jr., who is familiar with the region and the subject:

It may be truthfully said that eight railroads, to all intents and purposes, own all the hard coal lands in the United States, for Pennsylvania contains the only anthracite deposits in this country, and commercially, in the world. The Reading railroad, the Erie railroad and the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western railroad own considerably more than half of the hard coal lands, and their policy dominates. . . . They aim to make an artificial scarcity of coal. The scarcity they effect in two ways. First, they do not work the equipped mines as long and as fully as they might be worked. They are deliberately closed down for periods that are not needed to make repairs. Next, they do not attempt to open all the available coal land, but on the contrary keep as much as possible out of use, and deliberately and continually buy and lease workable coal land to prevent it from being worked. By its published annual report current during the coal strike of 1900, the Lehigh Valley railroad was paying a quarter of a million dollars a year in minimum royalties on coal land from which it was not taking a pound of the mineral, but was purposely holding out of use.

In the light of that information it is easy to see not only that the coal barons do reduce the miners to bare subsistence wages, but how they do it. They do it by reducing opportunities for mining to a minimum as