

sented, and not as the democratic citizen he is justly reputed to be.

While it is true that the oath of office of a councilman is his primary obligation, it is not true that it exonerates him from pre-election pledges. He ought to take no pledge that would require him to violate his oath of office; but any public pledge not in plain contravention of that oath is as sacred as the oath itself. It is an interpretation of the oath which his constituents have already demanded of him as a condition of his election, and which he has solemnly adopted in order to be elected. To thrust pre-election pledges aside in the easy way that Judge Moran appears to have advised, would be utterly destructive to popular government. Spoilsmen have indeed treated platforms as something to stand on until election and to kick over after election; but Judge Moran is not a spoilsman, and his approval of this undemocratic view of platform obligations, even as a lawyer in a case, is surprising.

The ease with which the pen of the ready writer may unintentionally misrepresent, was recently exhibited in a Wall street article by Sereno S. Pratt, an associate editor of the Wall Street Journal, the late Henry George being the victim of the misrepresentation. Mr. Pratt wrote:

I once escorted Henry George through the subtreasury, and the noted philosopher of the single tax, pointing to the piles of bags of silver stored in the great vault, remarked: "What a waste! Why take the trouble to dig that silver out of the mines, to store it here? Why not issue certificates against the silver as it lies in the mine?" There was a certain plausibility about that suggestion, but a moment's thought shows that it was without practical value. Gold and silver in the mines is of unknown quantity and quality. It must be taken out, assayed and weighed, in order to obtain market value.

The quotation from George is so nearly an expression of his views as to guarantee Mr. Pratt's good faith. Yet it so far distorts Mr. George's meaning as to show that Mr. Pratt wholly misunderstood him. He ev-

idently supposed that George favored the issuance of silver certificates based upon silver in the mines, whereas George did not believe at all in paper money redeemable in either of the precious metals. He believed in government paper deriving its purchasing power not from the value of the material of which it is made, nor from the value of any particular material in which it is by law redeemable, but upon the confidence of the seller that he can buy with it, of commodities he desires, as much in value as he has given for it.

"The fact," writes George in his "Science of Political Economy," at page 491, "is that neither the fiat of government nor the action of individuals, nor the character or intrinsic value of the material used, nor anything else, can make or mar money, raise or lessen its circulating value, except as it affects the disposition to receive it as a medium of exchange;" the essential quality of money being (as he states at page 493) "not in its form or substance, but in its use," which is "not that of being consumed," or redeemed, "but of being continually exchanged." And "this use comes," he adds, "from a common or usual consent or disposition to take it in exchange, not as representing or promising anything else, but as completing the exchange." Hence his conclusion at page 494 that "whatever in any time and place is used as the common medium of exchange is money in that time and place," whether it be gold or silver coins, greenbacks, postage stamps, or tokens. The man who held these views could never have advocated money redeemable in unmined silver any more than in mined and hoarded silver. The idea he evidently intended to convey was that the free circulation of silver certificates as money was due not to the fact that they were redeemable out of a hoard of silver, but to the confidence of those who accepted them that they could pass them again; a confidence which would be

just as perfect and general if they were guaranteed by the silver producing possibilities of the country, or by any other confidence inspiring fact, as if they were redeemable out of a hoard of silver which had been taken from a hole in Montana and dumped into a hole in New York.

Prof. Laughlin's "Principles of Money," the first volume of a proposed series of six, is not likely to be acceptable to either the bimetalist or the paper money schools of financial thought. But it should be welcome to all schools as probably the best expression of the gold standard theory. Without attempting to consider the volume as a whole, but with reference merely to the quotations from it that appear among the reviews, we are able to express hearty satisfaction with some of its leading principles. For one thing, we are gratified with the emphasis Prof. Laughlin places on the important difference between the money standard and the currency. His view of the quantity theory also seems from the review quotations to be well considered and sound. The most gratifying fact, however, about all these quotations from Prof. Laughlin's book, is their indication that Prof. Laughlin has not been drawn into the "value" maelstrom of the university cult of economists. He appears to hold to the sane old doctrine that substantial wealth is the basic idea of political economy and that value is only an unsubstantial phenomenon of exchange.

Gov. Durbin, of Indiana, is one of the few governors who has proved equal to the emergency of an outbreak of race fury against a Negro charged with crime. Not only has he protected the prisoner from lynching, but he stands like a rock against the demands of the mob for a speedy trial under circumstances that would make conviction sure regardless of guilt. Gov. Durbin's words are worthy of the most solemn consideration in these times of white lawlessness and Negro helplessness.

Writing to the judge at Evansville on the 8th Gov. Durbin said:

I decline to sanction an arrangement whereby the Negro Lee is to be immediately tried at Evansville under the military forces of the State. My information obtained from medical officers of the State reformatory is that the prisoner is suffering severe and possibly fatal gunshot wounds. However heinous the crime, or seemingly clear the guilt, he is entitled, under the most sacred tenets of our jurisprudence, to a hearing, which he cannot have in the very nature of things until he has sufficiently recovered to make a defense, if he has one to offer. No grounds should be given for the suspicion that even a guilty man has been railroaded to the gallows to satisfy public sentiment or that the civil authorities have been influenced to the determination of their course by the demonstration of the lawless. I do not wish, by consenting to the programme suggested, to confess to the world that in the second city of Indiana the law has not been enforced in an orderly manner without the presence of troops being necessary for the protection of those charged with the duty, nor do I desire to yield an inch to compromise for a moment with the mob spirit. Let this man be tried as speedily as his condition will permit, under the safeguards prescribed by law. If guilty, he will pay the penalty of murder with his life. If at any stage of the procedure it shall appear there are still those in your city who desire to oppose the State in its efforts to exercise the function conferred upon it by the people, then the State will be ready to give further demonstration of its disposition and its ability to do with rioters as they deserve.

When there is so much popular insanity and official pusillanimity in connection with race lynchings by "the better classess," such sane sentiments and determined purpose as Gov. Durbin has exhibited are refreshing.

ONE ASPECT OF MOB FURY.

The good nature of an American crowd is proverbial. It has, perhaps, its best exemplification in the great cities where inadequate transit facilities lead daily to shameful overcrowding in the cars and to the massing of thousands of individuals on platforms built for hundreds only. Often the crowding becomes in highest degree perilous, and a few riotous or panic-stricken persons could precipitate a terrible catastrophe; but almost all remain cool, officials keep

control, and though individuals often suffer the catastrophe is time after time averted.

The same national good nature is largely responsible for the shortcomings of our governments. Inefficient and corrupt public servants rely on the tolerance, the laziness and the short memory of the public, and their reliance generally proves a safe one. Disregard of promises, extravagance, favoritism are condoned again and again by an easygoing electorate which, in slavish allegiance to party, takes repeated betrayals with seeming indifference.

Similarly the great exploiters of the nation, who fence in nature's reservoirs and monopolize labor's opportunities, are regarded in the main with an amazing amiability, rising often to admiration. During the great strike of last year the coal barons traveled unprotected back and forth between the mines which they kept idle and the cities which clamored for fuel, and not a hand was raised to threaten them. Railroad officials whose economies born of greed, lead to horrible wrecks go unwhipped of justice save as the companies may be mulcted for damages in the civil courts. Anarchical assassination and violence outside the law are universally and rightly reprobated.

But to this there is a glaring exception, becoming even more ominous. One class of crimes when committed by one race have been singled out for mob vengeance. Lynching of Negroes has spread from South to North. Burnings, unheard of a few years ago save in darkest Texas and Arkansas, have taken place in Colorado, in Kansas, in Illinois, in Delaware. Shall we hear of one next in New York or Massachusetts? It is not even necessary now for the victim's crime to have the diabolical character it took in Delaware. An ordinary murder, even an attempt at murder, may suffice.

As a mob will do deeds from which the individuals who comprise it would shrink, so a community will justify public crimes that committed privately its citizens would abhor. There seems no reason to doubt that the majority of the inhabitants of

the places where these horrors have occurred excuse if they do not applaud the action of the mob. The fact, however deplorable, is established that in some circumstances Americans, despite their native good nature, can be, like other peoples, collectively ruthless in cruelty.

If any further proof of this be needed it can be found in the records of the Philippine conquest. Not all the doughty denials of Roosevelt and Root can explain away that carnival of slaughter and torture. And here there were no crimes against women and children to incite to reprisals, but only the ordinary incidents of the resistance of a feeble people to a strong one.

There is one question suggested by this lamentable fact that is seldom asked. Is the spirit of race contempt a necessary ingredient in American cruelty, or may circumstances arise in which white men will treat with equal ferocity members of their own race? Is it not conceivable that some day the mob fury that now breaks on the head of depraved Negroes may break over public robbers and forestallers and their legislative tools? It may seem utterly impossible that the scenes of the French Revolution will ever be repeated in the United States. Fifteen years ago it would have seemed equally impossible that a human being should be burned to death in the United States amid the plaudits of a community and while the officers of the law stood supinely by.

Nothing has been more thoroughly exploded than the old notion that the leaders of the French at the time of the Terror were naturally monsters of cruelty and vice. Marat was a physician of ability and standing; Danton and Desmoulins were patriotic young lawyers and devoted husbands and fathers; Robespierre once resigned a judicial office rather than pronounce the death sentence.

Nor was the mob which mastered them exceptionally ferocious or hardhearted when the revolution began. On the contrary, it was filled with sentiments of universal fraternity and benevolence. The first victims of its fury were public criminals and oppressors. Its love for