

was hostile to republican ideals not only in the mere fact of his kingship but in his record as well? It is true that friendly relations have long existed between the people of the United States and the people of Germany. It is to be earnestly hoped that they will continue unbroken and undisturbed while time lasts. It is to be hoped moreover that they will knit closer as time goes by. Of the propriety of fitly symbolizing this friendship there should be no question. But have the Germans nothing more fit to offer us than a statue of Frederick the Great? Were there no German members of the world's republic of literature to choose from? Were there no German leaders in science who have helped reveal the democracies of nature? Was there no German statesman whose statue in one of our public places would not hourly challenge our republican ideals and seem to signalize their decay? If there were none such, and this gift was designed as a genuine expression of the esteem of one people for another, then why was Baron Steuben overlooked?—Baron Steuben, the military pupil of Frederick the Great, who came over to our struggling colonies, though not at the command of his royal master but of his own will, and gave his military aid to Washington and his fortune to our hungry and ragged troops? The German people do not lack illustrious countrymen whose statues as a present to us would symbolize our mutual friendship without seeming to rebuke our principles of government? Why then does their emperor offer us a statue which symbolizes kingship in a form most repugnant to republican ideals? It is not to be inferred that he intended offense. He is self-centered and impulsive, to be sure, but his familiarity with affairs of state would have restrained him from offering a present of that character to a friendly nation without first ascertaining its acceptability. The offer must have been the result of a diplomatic understanding between Berlin and Wash-

ington. But this inference would only enlarge the scope of the question. It would not answer it. If it be true that American sentiment recoils from the forms of monarchy, this larger question arises, why has the government at Berlin offered and the government at Washington encouraged and accepted this gift?

There is but one reasonable answer. It must be because the gift is peculiarly symbolic of our recent tendencies toward imperialism. As no gift could be more incongruous with our republican ideals than a statue of Frederick the Great, so none could be quite so appropriate to our recent imperial policies. It must have seemed, both to the German emperor and the American president, to symbolize with perfection the new departure of the American republic. For Frederick the Great was notable as an exponent of the very kind of imperialism to which the party in power in our republic has committed us. Though it has been said in his behalf that he granted extraordinary liberties of speech to the Prussian people over whom he reigned, the true character of those liberties may be best understood by his own commentary when he said: "My people and I have come to an agreement; they are to say what they please, and I am to do what I please." This principle of government has been in vogue at the White House for four years. Senator Hanna invented it in its application to the United States, President McKinley dutifully adopted it, and President Roosevelt has inherited it. He applies it even to the question of accepting the statue. Though he cabled William that he would refer the matter to Congress, he has since decided that this is not necessary. Congress and the people may say what they please, but he will do what he pleases. The symbolism of the royal Frederick's statue at the American capital would be still more striking in another respect. Frederick's conquest of Silesia and his participation in the annihilation of Poland and

the parcelling out of her territory are by no means unlike the American assault upon the Filipino republic and her bloody conquest of the Philippine islands. Even in the detail of treachery to an ally, the comparison holds good; for of Frederick's conquest of Silesia it is said, we quote from Ma-caulay, that "without pretext, without a provocation, in defiance of the most sacred engagements, he had attacked the helpless ally whom he was bound to defend." Nothing but a change of names is necessary to make this quotation fit as closely to the imperialism to which President Roosevelt is committed as that which the great Frederick practiced. In this view of the matter we are obliged to acknowledge the entire appropriateness of the German emperor's gift and the consistency of the President's hasty and unauthorized acceptance. In any other view, we should hardly expect that the statue would be allowed to stand on public ground at the American capital longer than might be necessary for the American people to realize its significance as a royal symbol.

What a comic commentary on the theory of monarchical government, which finds so many advocates among persons who distrust popular government, is the coronation of the king of Spain. Here is a mere lad who talks about "my" people, who is assured of the good wishes even of republics for "his" people, and whose personal insignificance is enveloped in imposing robes and a glittering crown. He would not be trusted to teach a district school in Illinois, yet full-bearded men make themselves believe that he governs them and that if they were not so governed anarchy would reign. Of course he does not govern. He is a fiction. His royal crown and robes do all the governing that is attributed to him. They would do it as well if he stuffed them with straw and went to a bull fight.

The hopelessness of the anthracite coal strike is unintentionally foreshadowed by the final report of the industrial commission in its sum-

mary and digest of the evidence it has collected. This discloses clearly the fact that the monopoly of the anthracite coal lands and of railroad rights of way and terminals is so far shielded from competition that no combination of laborers, subject to the competition of other laborers, can reasonably expect to cope with it by means of a strike. On this point the commission declares:—

Effective control by unity of stock ownership is given to a large proportion of the entire output of the field. It appears that the trend toward consolidation by actual purchase, not only of one railroad by another, but of independent coal holdings by the railroads, together with the extension of the community of ownership idea, is unmistakable. It cannot be long before the anthracite coal business of the United States in all its enormous extent and commercial value will be entirely monopolized by a few powerful financial interests. The only safeguard for the public against exorbitant prices must be found either in the competition of other fuels, in enlightened self-interest on the part of the railroads, or the immediate application of governmental regulation. Competition between either the producers of anthracite coal or the railroads which transport their product can no longer be regarded as of the slightest effect. Competition cannot be perpetuated. It has disappeared apparently once and for all.

To ordinary observers all that has long been evident. The curious thing about it is that so many observers, as well as this commission, do not distinguish the key to the monopoly. They see it and describe it, but they confuse it so hopelessly with non-essentials that they fail to recognize it as the key. What really makes it possible to monopolize the anthracite coal business is not any consolidation of the business of digging coal or of carrying coal. It is not the consolidation of ownership of mining machinery, for that can be reproduced at will; nor is it the consolidations of ownership of railway rolling stock, for that also can be reproduced at will. It is in part the consolidation of the ownership of the anthracite beds; these cannot be reproduced. It is in other part the consolidation of terminal sites of railroads, where coal is shipped and where it is delivered; neither can

these be reproduced. They are all in the category of land, while the rolling stock and mining machinery are in the category of reproducible capital. Why be so shortsighted, then, as to suppose that this monopoly can be destroyed only by government regulation or ownership of the coal business? All that is necessary is to terminate private control of coal land and railroad land. Competition in producing and transporting coal would then set in more briskly than ever. If all the reproducible capital in the world were consolidated in a trust, competition would soon break up that trust; but if all the land in the world were so consolidated there would be no competition except the competition of landless men for a chance to work.

When the legislature of Ohio adjourned last week it had passed but two of the "ripper" bills with which the Republican majority threatened Cleveland. Both were designed to cripple Mayor Johnson in his work of giving to Cleveland a good non-partisan, but fundamentally democratic government. One was brazenly in the interest of the local monopolies, and each was cynically defiant of local public sentiment.

The park board "ripper" takes the management of the city parks out of the control of the city authorities and turns them over to a county board to be appointed by a Republican official, whom the law designates by the title of his office but whom it might with equal propriety and no greater impudence have designated by name. This "ripping" was done on the theory, distinctly announced by a Republican leader in the legislature, that the Cleveland parks ought to be managed by the rich and not by the public at large. A proposition to submit the measure to a vote of the people of Cleveland was therefore voted down by the Republican majority in the legislature.

The other "ripper" relates to taxation. Mayor Johnson's administra-

tion having sought to tax the local franchises on the basis of 60 per cent. of their value, the same as other property (vol. iv, p. 741), those interests combined and under the dictation of Senator Hanna secured from the Republican majority in the legislature a measure empowering the county auditor of any county to apply in his discretion to the state officials—dominated by railroad interests—for the appointment by them of a local board in which all power over taxation shall be vested. The significance of this measure will be understood when it is explained that the county auditor of the Cleveland county, Craig, is a friend of the corporations, one of the beneficiaries of railroad pass privileges (vol. iv, p. 115), who became so brazen in serving them that at last fall's election he was defeated for reelection in his strong Republican county. But his term of office does not expire until next fall. Consequently this Hanna law enables him to perpetuate the power of serving local monopolies, which the voters took away from him, by authorizing him to secure the appointment of a tax board to his own liking. He has applied for the appointment of such a board, and Mayor Johnson declares his intention of resisting the Hanna law under which the application is made as unconstitutional.

Among the other acts of the Ohio legislature just adjourned were tax measures calculated to protect railroad companies from equal taxation while heavily taxing competitive business corporations. The earnest efforts of Mayor Johnson and his friends to secure laws making taxation equitable, and putting a stop to the tax dodging of railroad, street car and other monopoly corporations were frustrated by the Republican majority.

But two or three hopeful measures did slip through this boss-led and monopoly-ridden Ohio legislature. One was a bill establishing a uniform system of accounting in the public offices throughout the state. Even this bill,