

have in one way and another given expression to the essential controversy of equal rights against special privileges, of democracy against aristocracy or plutocracy; and to that controversy, whatever the special issue and whether he has been mistaken or not in his particular apprehensions, William J. Bryan has been consistent throughout. When the issue was over the tariff, his voice sounded the democratic note of free trade; when it was over the money question, he resisted the plutocratic interests; when it was imperialism, he stood for democracy. To say of him that he veers like a weather-cock with every turn of the wind, is to confess to an utter lack of apprehension of the difference between constant political principle and the ephemeral policies through which political principle, from time to time and in changing form according to varying circumstances, finds concrete expression. It is as if his critic were astride the weather-cock, and judging Bryan's attitude from his own shifting viewpoint.

+ +

Good Times Ahead.

This year's silly season in journalism began last Sunday. For lack of exciting news, the Sunday editors clipped from their files their last season's prophecies of "good times at hand," and worked them over for this season's use. These prosperity prophecies have almost driven sea-serpent tales and Port Jervis anecdotes out of the silly season manuscript market.

+ +

Death of H. H. Rogers.

Henry H. Rogers was in no sense an ordinary man. He was a great man by the standards of his time. Had he lived in an era of military conquest, his name might have come bounding down the centuries and into modern school books as a conquering hero, the head of a line of despots. Had he lived in a golden age that despised all conquest but such as brotherly justice achieves, he might have been loved by all his contemporaries, and for untold generations, with the intensity that he seems to have been loved by a narrow circle of personal friends. Living as he did in an era of industrial exploitation, his great qualities placed him in the front rank of industrial exploiters. Let him be judged charitably. No man is to be lightly condemned for excelling in a career in which nearly all his able contemporaries strive to excel; and especially true is this when his career is at an end and criticism can only fall ineffectively. The tendency is nevertheless natural to wish at

least that the greatness of such men might serve better purposes than typifying the more or less savage characteristics of their own time. Who can tell what the great qualities which Mr. Rogers devoted to conquest in industrial warfare, might not have accomplished for the good of mankind had they been devoted to the establishment of industrial peace on the basis of social justice?

+ +

The Money Value of Personal Reputation.

The telegraph wires buzzed last week with reports of a shocking judicial discrimination. A Negro porter of a Pullman car had been arrested at the instance of a passenger upon a false charge of stealing a pocketbook. Being released he brought suit, and a jury awarded him \$2,500 damages. But the trial judge set the verdict aside as excessive. The reasons the judge gave were that the Negro's loss of income from the arrest was only two or three dollars; and as to humiliation and mental anxiety, that a Negro could not suffer the shame a white man would. Having been sustained by the appellate court, this decision is circulated as an instance of judicial discrimination against Negroes. But it is not quite that. Courts have been long accustomed in cases of damage for personal wrongs, to discriminating in favor of the rich and against the poor. Damages for personal injuries which would stand in favor of a man of large income, would be set aside as excessive if in favor of a man of small income. And this seems reasonable enough provided the element of suffering endured and the penalty imposed by means of damages, be given equal weight regardless of the wealth or poverty of the person injured. But in the New York case a step has been taken toward class discriminations as to suffering. Incidentally, the case happened to turn upon class differences between Negro and white man; but the principle is broader. It embraces analogous class differences between "lower" class and "upper" regardless of race, color or previous condition of servitude.

+ +

Emma Goldman.

What the mystery is that lurks behind the persistent efforts of police officials to suppress Emma Goldman's meetings, can only be guessed at. That their conduct is flagrantly lawless every one now knows. They themselves are no longer ignorant of it. Yet reports come, now from one city and again from another, of the dispersal of her meetings under circumstances calculated to excite the resistance that would furnish apparent excuse for

“putting down a riot.” Whatever the motive, this police lawlessness is evidently concerted. The Chicago police have engaged in it; so have those of San Francisco; a few days ago it was the police of New Haven, and now it is those of New York. Yet Emma Goldman has spoken in Cleveland, in Portland, and in many other cities, without leaving behind her the slightest evidence of unlawful utterance. Although she was arrested in San Francisco, she was acquitted upon jury trial; and in New York the District Attorney has warned the police that the utterances they have accused her of are quite within her rights. No pretense of unlawful speech is set up for dispersing her New York meeting. The police despotically dispersed it. If they are permitted to disperse her meetings with impunity they can disperse any others at their own will. Whether they are acting for some astute press agent to enhance Miss Goldman’s audience-drawing power in the early future, which is hardly conceivable, or are hounding her down in Russian style, they play a dangerous game—dangerous to all the people, whose rights of speech and assembly are menaced by this tendency to subject public meetings to police censorship. The practice should be peremptorily stopped. The right of free speech and free meeting is an American principle and not a police privilege.

+ +

Why Women Should Not Vote.

All the stock objections to woman suffrage have been ably condensed into one, by an English adversary no less distinguished than Lord Cromer. In an address to the L. O. W. S. (League to Oppose Woman Suffrage) in London on the 18th, Lord Cromer is reported to have said that the whole argument against enfranchising women could be summed up by saying “they are unfitted to vote because they are not men.” This is candor indeed. For it is quite true that all the arguments ever made in opposition to woman suffrage are part and parcel of this one; and could any argument be more catholic in possibilities of application, more strictly historical in connotations, or more frivolous in substance? See how comprehensive it is. Commoners are unfitted to vote because they are not lords, the poor are unfitted to vote because they are not rich, the illiterate are unfitted to vote because they are not academy bred. What a delightful specimen of begging the question Lord Cromer’s accurate summing up of the arguments against woman suffrage is, to be sure. And note how useful the principle might be made in other fields of controversy, as that black men are unfitted for freedom because they are

not white, or that workingmen are unfitted for wealth because they are not wealthy. Read it again. Women are “unfitted to vote because they are not men”! Might it not have been as well said in the days of Tom Jones that women were unfitted to read because they were not men? Or at this day, and conversely, that men are not fitted to cook because they are not women?

+ +

Bernard Shaw’s Censored Play.

The official suppression of Bernard Shaw’s new play because it makes effective dramatic use of a vital force which conquers the will of the human brutes who call it God and despise as sentimental weakness any expressions of respect for it, is not strange. Acknowledgments of the living God have always offended the worshipful servants of dead ones.

+ + +

LAND VALUES TAXATION IN GREAT BRITAIN.

There seems now to be little doubt that the Lloyd-George budget (pp. 481, 487, 494, 510) is destined to insert the “thin end of the wedge” which, when driven home, will split British land monopoly wide open.

Whereas the Conservatives have all along been jeeringly calling upon the Liberal ministry to resign and bring on a general election immediately, they are now looking contentedly three years forward for the earliest probable general election date. This indicates that they are disposed to agree to the Lloyd-George budget, rather than meet its issue before the people; for in three years its basic principles will have been fixed in British policy. Their prudence does not desert them, bitter though their anger is and deep and loud their curses.

+

While the curses of the Conservatives are distributed with judicious impartiality over the entire budget, their anger really centers upon the land value items; and with much less intensity upon the trifling tax of a half penny in the pound on the capital value of vacant urban and suburban land, or upon the more stinging one of 20 per cent on future increments of value, or upon the moderate one on the value of unmined minerals, than upon the plans which these taxes necessitate for an Imperial valuation of all land—urban, suburban, agricultural and the rest. For it is only by such a valuation that the budgetary discriminations can be made. As this valua-