

experiencing no trouble. The building managers' union professed to regard these demands as outrageous enough to justify them in breaking their contracts with tenants and putting thousands of people — with whose rights and comforts they, and not the elevator men, were charged by contract—to the extreme of inconvenience and to serious risks of financial loss.

In those circumstances the merits of the conflict were of minor importance. It could make no difference to tenants of the buildings whether the elevator men were forcing extravagant demands or not. They do not appear to have done so, but that is beside the question. The important consideration is that building managers who had agreed to furnish their tenants with elevator service, arbitrarily refused to furnish it. This was not because they could not get the service; it was because they couldn't get it on their own terms. And they pride themselves upon being "business" men!

Serious as this indefensible breach of contract by the building managers' union was to the victimized tenants, it had its ridiculous aspects. One of them is the fact that many of the suffering tenants put the blame upon the union that represents labor interests, giving their sympathies to the union that represents financial interests. Could class prejudice go much further without becoming positively comical? Another of these ridiculous aspects of the situation was produced by the air of outraged innocence with which the walking delegates of the building managers' union condemned the exactions of the strikers; for a more exacting and arbitrary union could not be found in a year's journey than that of the building managers. The one-sided leases they require testify eloquently to the power of their union and the audacity of their walking delegates. They adapt to their peculiar requirements the same coercive methods to bring building managers into their union that the less

"financial" labor unions do, and they exert against tenants the same kind of combination to shut off competition. When a tenant deals with a building manager in Chicago, he finds himself in most cases "up against" the compactest kind of trade union. Yet this association of house renters turns cry baby when it faces a few slight exactions of an elevator men's union. In the vocabulary of expressive slang, "wouldn't that jar you?"

Congressman John S. Williams, of Mississippi, who will probably be the Democratic leader in the next House, a distinction he has richly earned and a place he would ably fill, pierced the trust question to the core in his speech on the trust publicity bill. A full report of his speech will be found at page 1924 of the Congressional Record of February 7. We call especial attention to this extract:

I do not suppose there is a man in this House that would deny the right to any individual in America to do all the business that is done in America in a given line provided he did it in free competition with the world, in an open and fair field, and with equal opportunity to all other men. Everybody knows that neither individual nor corporation can monopolize any business in that way. I defy the wisest Republican on the other side to give one single solitary instance of the successful operation of a monopolistic combination or a trust which has not rested upon special privileges granted either by law or by a corporation permitted by law to grant them. There is not one.

Whole volumes could not more clearly and truly diagnose the trust disease. In those few words all the complexities of the trust question, so baffling to the shacklers of cunning because they want to remedy the evil without disturbing its cause, are unraveled. Whoever reflects upon Mr. Williams's words with an open mind will conclude that there is nothing complex about the trust question except the financial interests of men who think it patriotic to earn their bread in the sweat of other men's faces.

We are not prepared to point out the cunning African in the wood pile

of the Livingston-Elkins-Nelson anti-trust legislation now before Congress, but we are sure that a particularly cunning one is working there. John D. Rockefeller's alleged demand upon the Senate to head off anti-trust legislation is proof positive. Mr. Rockefeller is reported to have sent this message to several senators:

We are opposed to any anti-trust legislation. Our counsel, Mr. —, will see you. It must be stopped.—John D. Rockefeller.

If Mr. Rockefeller did not send that message it is evident that some one wants it to appear that he did. Whoever that some one may have been he had one of two motives: anxiety to promote anti-trust legislation by making Congress believe that Rockefeller, the potentate of trustdom, is panic-struck; or anxiety to complicate and nullify anti-trust legislation by throwing Congressmen into a panic in which they will improvidently pass bad measures. The former motive is highly improbable. If Rockefeller had regarded the message as hostile he would have disclaimed it. The second motive is probable. Rockefeller may be willing to wink at the use of his name without authority, hoping that it will produce a panic. If he himself sent the message, as seems now to be generally believed, it is inconceivable that he did so with a view to preventing anti-trust legislation. Unless he has wholly lost his head he knows that nothing would be more likely to precipitate such legislation than impudent orders against it from him. His purpose, if he did send the message while clothed in his right (though not necessarily righteous) mind, could have been nothing else than to help rush through what looks like anti-trust legislation upon its face, but is within full of bad men's schemes and trust corruption. John D. Rockefeller is too "devilish sly" to make such a blunder as the trust organs accuse him of in connection with this most extraordinary message. The document smells rank of his dark and tricky ways, as Miss Tarbell de-

scribes them, in the earlier periods of his predatory career.

One of the possible virtues of the pending trust legislation, from the point of view of trust magnates, was pointed out by Congressman Sulzer on the floor of the House on the 6th. Mr. Littlefield, the President's chosen shackler of cunning, had introduced a bill which looked very much like a real shackle. But when he brought his bill out of committee it had been curiously worked over, apparently by unseen hands. Referring to this, Mr. Sulzer said:

The gentleman from Maine (Mr. Littlefield) seems to me to be in an embarrassing position. He changed the title to his bill—he gave up his original bill—and substituted for it a weak, apologetic makeshift that will accomplish nothing or do great harm. Now, I want the members of this House to see how cleverly the trust lawyers amended the title of the original bill. If you will take the title of the original bill introduced by my friend from Maine, you will find it required "all" corporations to make "true" returns, and the trust lawyers some way or other induced the great trust buster from Maine to amend his bill so that it leaves out entirely "all" corporations and "true" returns. The entire bill—I mean the new trust bill—now before us is a hollow sham.

Whatever Senator Hanna's motives may have been in fathering a bill for pensioning the liberated slaves, his bill offers an impressive lesson on the subject of compensation in connection with the abolition of institutional wrongs. It reminds one of the subterfuge of the hero of "No. 5 John Street." He designed to live in the slums—to actually live there and become a companion of their denizens instead of an inquisitive and benevolent overseer. But he dared not let his friends know his purpose. They would have laughed at him. So he accounted for his absence from his aristocratic haunts by letting it leak out that he had gone to the Caspian sea to hunt ducks. There was nothing comical to his set about his traversing the continent of Europe and penetrating far into Asia to kill

ducks; but it would have seemed inexpressibly comical to them if they had known he had gone a mile away from upper tendom to make companions of poor people. This incident in Whiteing's interesting novel has its parallel in connection with Senator Hanna's slave-pension bill. Everybody is laughing at Hanna's bill to compensate the slaves for the years of unrequited servitude which the government imposed upon them, while nobody would laugh at a bill to compensate the owners for refusing any longer to impose that servitude upon the slaves. How we do laugh about serious things and grow serious about comical ones! If anyone were to be compensated it should be the slave and not the master, for it was the slave whom the government wronged by standing between him and freedom. The master was not wronged by the government's refusal to continue wronging the slave.

But neither master nor slave should be compensated now. Let bygones be bygones, and look out for the future. We still have wrongs akin to slavery to remedy, without turning back to the wickedness of other generations. If existing institutional wrongs were righted, the old slave masters would not want compensation and the old slaves would not need it. Each would earn enough for himself and keep his earnings. Did Mr. Hanna really wish to serve the Negro, for whose vote in the next Republican convention he is now so undisguisedly angling, he would get into harness with Tom L. Johnson and devote the rest of his life and his fortune to abolishing the tariffs that rob American workers, black and white, and the monopoly land tenures that disinherit them.

It must be somewhat startling to our imperial patriots who have assumed that peace prevails in the Philippines, to read this week of a battle within seven miles of Manila. A force of 200 "insurgents"—Filipino patriots as history will call them

—engaged the foreign (American) constabulary and was defeated only after what the dispatches call a severe engagement. It now leaks out that the Filipino force was part of a little patriot army under Gen. San Miguel, who has refused to abandon his country to its alien conquerors. This event makes two things pretty clear: first, that the American reports of pacification have been deceptive; and, second, that there are Filipinos who, like ourselves, have a hatred of foreign dominion even unto death.

#### A BOUNTY-FED REPUBLIC.

Two of America's industrial monarchs—men who have waded to the thrones they occupy through the slaughter of their fellow men's opportunities—are just now scoring what our dramatic critics would call "a huge success" in the character of philanthropists. That lively competition which they have abolished in the industries they controlled, they have carried into the domain of charity, and according to the latest bulletin it is by no means clear whether the ex-iron despot who has turned book-buyer to the world at large has not been outrun in munificence by the man to whom so many collegestudents owe their midnight "oil," and so many college professors their ethical doctrines. So that it seems there is use for our arch-monopolists after all; under cover of all their elaborate schemes for the destruction of our liberties, they are really hatching deep-laid plans for our benefit, reminding us of Pope's lines:

But still the great have kindness in reserve,  
They helped to bury whom they helped to starve.

Whether the same people whose rights have perished in the upbuilding of the over-swollen wealth of Carnegie and Rockefeller are likely, through the overflow pipe of charity, to come by their own again—whether the gift of a library here and a college there is an adequate recompense for the hundreds of thousands of independent livelihoods that have been taken away, is not the question which now concerns us; the aspect of the case which overshadows every other is the fact that the richest Be