

that document in the Philippines, just as George III tried to do in the old American colonies. It was regarded as insurrectionary. But if the Filipinos could not be trusted to read the American Declaration of Independence, is it quite safe to thrust it upon the attention of American school children? Is there no danger of hypnotizing them with its "glittering generalities"?

In the reasons which Gen. Bell, of Colorado, gives for his resignation may be seen the image of a general condition which the public generally have been slow, altogether too slow, to recognize. The criminality of labor mobs could be seen by merely looking, but the criminality of employers' conspiracies could not be seen. The difference has been that labor mobs have committed their own crimes, whereas employers' conspiracies have utilized government agencies to commit their crimes for them. The Colorado case is an example. The employers' conspiracy in that State—really a land owners' conspiracy, for the power of the employers rests upon their ownership of the rich mining lands of Colorado—secured control of the Governor, and the Governor turned the militia into a mob acting under military orders, to suppress a strike. The militia has been used as lawlessly as any labor mob could be, and far more dangerously to law and order; but its conduct has had the surface appearance of enforcing the law, and so the people were deceived. Gen. Bell has undeceived them, as to that case, whether he intended to or not; but that case is typical of most cases in which the military arm of the government is used to intimidate strikers at the call of the big corporations against which they strike.

Reasons for believing that Grover Cleveland (p. 97) is really the Presidential candidate of the "remorganizers" and that the Olneys, the Walls, and the other "favorite sons," even Parker, are only stalking horses for him, are accumulat-

ing. His own Western organ, Mr. Walsh's Chicago Chronicle, nominated him on the 21st in a long editorial. And what nomination could be better than Cleveland's, if the "remorganizers" are to regain control at all? Cleveland's name would draw the line, better than any other, between the democratic and the plutocratic currents in the Democratic party. Some democratic Democrats would be swept along with him in some eddy or other, and some plutocratic Democrats would be swept away from him in other eddies; but on the whole he would be very distinctive in his representation of Democratic plutocracy. And then what a beautiful and spectacularly instructive disaster his defeat at the election would be! Better for the democracy of the Democratic party, if it must court disaster, to encounter it before the election than after the inauguration; and all the better, in that case, if the disaster be spectacular.

A significant bit of legislation is reported from Massachusetts, through the regular news channels. The report tells of the passage of a bill providing that—

whoever gives, offers or promises to an agent, employe or servant any gift or gratuity whatever with intent to influence his action in relation to his principal's, employer's or master's business, or any agent, employe or servant who receives or accepts a gift or gratuity or promise, under an agreement or with the understanding that he shall act in any particular manner in relation to his employer's business, shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$10 nor more than \$500, or imprisonment for not longer than one year.

This bill, reported to be awaiting the signature of the Governor, is also reported to be loaded only for small game. It reads:

The act is designed to prevent the payment of commissions on purchases of supplies or payment for the use of employes' influence. It probably covers the cases of butlers and other domestic servants who have understandings with the butcher, the grocer and other tradesmen from whom employers purchase household supplies.

Whether or not the Massachusetts bill is intended to affect only

domestic servants, it would apply as well to modern business methods, and upon a very extensive scale. At any rate, the bribery of employes who control their employers' purchases is far from being an evil peculiar to domestic service. It is universally practiced. And the bribed employes are not underlings alone. This species of "graft" extends all the way up to business managers and even to boards of directors and presidents of companies.

One of the well recognized arts of the modern salesman is to know how to "sweeten" a proposal so as to make it palatable to purchasing agents or officials; and the business house which refuses to keep a "slush" fund for bribery purposes of this kind must be content not only not to augment its trade, but to lose much of what it already has. For the practice is misnamed when called bribery. It is really blackmail. That is to say, its universality is attributable less by far to salesmen who tempt with bribes than to buyers who intimidate with hold-ups.

This species of business "graft," this blackmailing of supply houses by purchasing agents, is not nearly so new as it is general and demoralizing. It probably had its beginnings in the operations of public purchasing agents. Whether or not they were bribed by strenuous salesmen representing unscrupulous houses, the custom early developed into blackmail and was charged to "political corruption," the "failure of democracy," etc. Similarly with sales of school books by publishing houses to school boards. But the evil broke out in non-political places when railroad directors began to make contracts with express companies with a view more to their own personal profit than the benefit of their companies; and it had the business world by the throat, morally speaking, when the organization of side-companies by directors in corporations, for the purpose of making contracts with the corporations, came to be recognized as legitimate. Since then