

the progressives in this country the chief cause of their interest in the situation, disappointment can hardly be reasonably anticipated. The Lords, whether their privileges are or are not curtailed, have shot their bolt. They claimed only that the country must be appealed to. It has been appealed to, and they have lost. To further oppose the financial legislation enacted by the Commons would be too dangerous even for them to attempt. The House of Commons will certainly re-pass the bill. Their mandate to that effect is undeniable, for Nationalists and Laborites equally with Liberals were elected with the understanding that they would do so. The land taxation clauses in the Budget—the crux and gist of the whole contest—were besides always enthusiastically supported by both Nationalist and Labor members. Landlordism in Great Britain, may we hope, has seen the beginning of the end!

+ +

The Appeal to Justice.

It was commonly told in New York a generation ago, of Fernando Wood, Congressman and Mayor in the 40's, 50's and 60's when politics were more visibly corrupt than now, that he had said he was convinced that the politicians did not "sufficiently pander to the moral sense of the community." And Canon S. A. Barnett, in a letter addressed to a Liberal meeting held at Queen's hall in London on December 31st, speaking from a standpoint morally antithetical to that of the old New York Mayor, urged a like appeal. "It is not indeed fitting," he said, "that one in my position should appeal to party passions or to class selfishness, but I should have liked to appeal to the quality of justice which is always present in the British mind. It would, I believe, be more active if politicians trusted it more and appealed to it more frequently. 'I hate the Budget,' said to me a city magistrate, 'it is a beastly Budget, but it is just.'"

+ +

Monopoly's Vulnerable Spots.

Thoroughly alarmed by the agitation over the increased cost of meats, the Administration is planning, we are told, a new coup against the packers by criminal prosecutions under the Sherman Act. At the same time we are told that the Government intends to show, by way of proof, that there is an illegal combination or conspiracy in restraint of trade. It presents an interesting question to a layman. Smith, Brown and Jones, we will say, are respectively directors of competing corporations 1, 2 and 3, engaged in meat pack-

ing. Corporation No. 4 is formed for the apparent purpose of further competing in the same business. Smith, Brown and Jones all buy stock in it and get themselves elected directors of it. Corporation No. 4 has a directors' meeting, and legitimately decides what it will pay for live animals and for what it will sell their flesh after they are slaughtered. When corporations 1, 2 and 3 have their directors' meetings respectively, Smith, Brown or Jones, as the case may be, without informing any one else of any especial reason therefor or revealing what Corporation 4 has resolved on, suggests purchasing and selling prices for that corporation which happen to be the identical prices which Corporation 4 has set. But they are adopted apparently only because of the fellow directors' confidence in his business judgment. Has a crime been committed, for which men can be sent to jail? If so, is it a crime to be a director in each of two corporations which are ostensibly competing? Perhaps to make it so will be considered the next necessary step. But we wish that instead of insisting on this kind of legislation, so continuously proposed and when enacted so continually evaded and made futile, our legislators would turn their attention to the effects in aiding monopoly, of unwise tariffs and patent and land laws, establishing and fortifying privilege and plutocracy!

+ +

Corrupt State—Corrupt Nation.

There is an amusing side to the controversy raging between the proponents of State control of water rights and of water rights of way, and the opponents of that policy. Representative Smith of California demands State control and ownership, and that the rights be leased to private corporations; but the San Francisco Call, a Republican paper, opposes that policy on the ground that the State government can't be trusted! Well, it is true that the State government of California is merely an agent of the Southern Pacific Railroad and allied interests, but then it is also true that the Government at Washington is in large part a combination of all the railroads and their allied interests. The illogical may make the deduction that unless the profits of monopoly are taxed into the public treasuries, it will make no difference to the people whether the private monopoly be licensed by the Nation or a State government.

+ +

Bryanism Still Lives.

A man of straw which took the shape of an unauthorized announcement of Mr. Bryan's candidacy for the Presidency in 1912, was banded

about the country last week, calling forth ribald comment from Democrats of the non-democratic type. With jeers for his "kind word," and for his solitary state, the Cincinnati Times-Star quotes Daniel Kiefer as thus sturdily standing for Bryanism, as against Cleveland-Parker-Harmon Democracy:

I do not believe the statement said to have been authoritatively made by Mr. Metcalf, editor of the Commoner, that Mr. Bryan is to be a candidate in 1912. Mr. Bryan is en route to South America, and it is altogether unlikely that any one may speak for him in his absence on any such matter. Mr. Bryan's willingness to be a candidate in 1908 was, as it was in 1900, and for the same reason that he made the fight against Parker's nomination in 1904, that in the ranks of real Democrats there seemed to be no one else to satisfy the call for a representative of true Democracy. Fair-weather and imaginary Democrats of the Cleveland-Parker stripe, personally estimable though they be, were admittedly better satisfied with their party distinctions when, previous to Bryan's first nomination, the party was a competitor of the Republican party for the favor and support of plutocracy. While Mr. Bryan does not stand for all that is democratic that I could wish he did, so long as the talk of candidates for the Presidency on the Democratic ticket is of men whose like characteristics to those of Taft are that they will be the pliant and subservient tools to monopolies and trusts, I hope that Mr. Bryan will consent to be a candidate for the balance of his life, and the people of the United States demonstrate, as they have three times by their more than six million votes (a greater vote each time than was cast for Cleveland), that it is far better to deserve to win and lose, than win without deserving it.

To Democrats, to whom Democracy is more than a tradition and a name, the fight for Bryanism will continue, and until an equally able exponent of it comes forward, and one considered more available, true Democrats will find it necessary to keep Mr. Bryan at the helm. Personally, I should rather make a fight for La Follette Republicanism than for Cleveland-Parker-Harmon Democracy.

+ +

A Vindication of the Dunne School Board.

Many good people of Chicago, misled by newspaper reports and comments which were intentional and malignant misrepresentations, believed that the appointees of Mayor Dunne to the School Board were not safe guardians of the interests of the schools and school children of Chicago. In-genuous and simple-minded clergymen and "Alameda citizens" joined with smug Pecksniffian representatives of "big business" in wagging their heads and declaring that apart from the traction questions involved in the last mayoralty election, the great educational interests of Chicago demanded that "visionary theorists and faddists who had no proper idea of business methods" should give

place to "sane, safe, reasonable business men"; and that to that end Busse should be elected over Dunne. They got the desired change. Mayor Dunne's School Board gave place to Mayor Busse's. How do the good people like the results? Probably they know little about them. The newspapers on which they pinned their faith are not exploiting the doings of the Board of Education in these days. To those who may see this paragraph, we should like to make a suggestion. Let them procure a copy of the Chicago Inter Ocean of January 22, and learn from facts of which there can be no denial, the difference between the dealings of the Dunne School Board under the leadership of its President, Emil Ritter, and the dealings of the Busse School Board, with the "coal ring." Perhaps their eyes may be so far opened as to induce hereafter in similar matters a more deliberate judgment.

+ + +

WAGE WORKERS AS NATION BUILDERS.

The average American is extremely proud of his "national front-yard." He points with pride to the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation, Washington, Lincoln, and almost invariably to the free school system as the great bulwark of free American institutions.

If asked as to the origin of the public school system, he will speak of Horace Mann, Henry Barnard and the New England ministers as the sole architects of our important educational edifice. Throughout the length and breadth of the nation, men pay tribute to these great reformers as the founders of the American public school system. But recent investigations, while recognizing the importance of the work of these pioneer educators, has found another and more potent force which has long lain concealed from view. This underlying force proceeded from the wage earners, dominated by a bread-and-butter argument.

+

Free schools had existed in New England and New York in Colonial times; but the Revolution and the long period of adjustment subsequent to the war, together with the growing heterogeneity of the population, led to the practical abandonment of the system.

The modern free tax-supported school originated in the eventful period, 1820 to 1850. The famous embargo act of Jefferson's administration and the war of 1812 artificially forced the rapid development of American manufacture. At the