

for New York ground rent are as truly a drain upon the country, increasing its "favorable" balance, as is the food that Irishmen export to pay for Irish land. Nothing comes back in exchange for what goes out. Is it so certain, then, that we are not a fool people?

Some disappointment is expressed by the Chicago Tribune (republican) over the alacrity with which its party leaders at Washington are pushing through the ship subsidy bill. "It was not understood," says the Tribune, "when the spellbinders were urging the people of the northwest to vote in favor of the reelection of President McKinley, that one of the first items on the senatorial programme when congress met would be the passage of a shipping 'subsidy' bill which contemplates the expenditure of \$9,000,000 a year for 30 years for the special benefit of a number of rich men residing in eastern cities." But why was not this understood? If the idea was not grasped by the Tribune and its followers, they must belong to that class to which Lincoln referred when he said: "You can fool some of the people all of the time." This subsidy measure, which the Tribune now denounces, was before congress last winter, and the republicans, with few exceptions, rallied to its support. In principle it was openly advocated by Hanna both in congress and during the campaign, was favored with McKinleyistic prudence of expression by President McKinley, was made the subject of an approving plank in the republican platform, and was advocated by Mr. McKinley in his letter of acceptance. If anything at all was stamped with public approval by the election, ship subsidies were. It is too late for the Tribune to object as a party organ. The matter is now a party measure. But the Tribune's objections are none the less valuable. One of them is especially so, since it sufficiently

concedes the validity of Bryan's complaint that the republican party stands for the classes and against the masses. In its issue of the 9th it says editorially of the ship subsidy bill that "the attempt being made now to favor the classes at the expense of the masses will give color and point to future appeals like those Mr. Bryan made this year."

But the shipping subsidy ring is not making the headway its members had looked for. Though the bill has the benefit of the president's influence, together with the active support of Senator Hanna, and is, besides, one of the favors for millionaires to which the party managers are pledged in return for campaign contributions, there is reason to hope that it may be defeated, or at least headed off. Many of its plundering provisions have been patched over with amendments. But an examination of these shows it to be as vicious as ever. The amendments are only masks. Ex-Congressman John DeWitt Warner analyzes some of them in a letter to the New York Evening Post. He shows, for instance, that under the amendments the subsidy of an ordinary freight steamer carrying 7,500 tons of freight would be but \$4,740 for a voyage for which the passenger steamer the St. Louis, carrying only 3,575 tons of freight, receives a subsidy of \$25,000. That is, "in proportion to American exports carried the passenger steamer receives more than 11 times the subsidy that does the freighter." The subsidy bill would, therefore, appear to be for the encouragement of passenger service, rather than freight traffic. Another point to which Mr. Warner calls attention is the Frye amendment requiring subsidized vessels to use in their construction fittings and machinery of American manufacture. It is thus proposed, says Mr. Warner, "first, to give a subsidy to American ship builders on the ground that their materials cost them more than do those of foreigners; and, second, by

another provision of the same bill, to make these same Americanship builders pay still for more their materials." Well may Mr. Warner denounce this either as "tomfoolery," or as "successful blackmail levied by manufacturers upon the subsidy beggars, as a condition of not yelling 'stop thief' till they get safely away with their treasury loot."

Mr. Warner deals with numerous other points of the subsidy bill, showing that it has been so framed and amended as to distribute subsidies to favored corporations. This alone is enough to condemn the bill. But there are deeper reasons. No matter how fairly subsidies might be distributed among ship builders and ship owners, they would still constitute a robbery of private tax payers for the benefit of private tax eaters. Every man who buys a cigar, or a glass of beer, who wears foreign goods in his clothing, who in any way consumes anything upon which the federal government levies a tax, either through the custom house or the internal revenue office—every such man contributes to the federal treasury: The government lays the heavy hand of its taxing power upon him, and he must pay the tax or refrain from consuming the taxed goods. Now, the government has no moral right to force money out of the pockets of the general public and turn it over to individuals in subsidies. When it does so it commits a robbery, which is none the less stealing because the government is not amenable to punishment. Subsidizing is a synonym for larceny, and the man who advocates it or votes for it commits robbery in his heart. This is the fundamental reason why the shipping subsidy bill should be defeated. It is the reason why it ought to be defeated even if it provided for a fair distribution of the plunder.

Indiana is the last state to contest with Georgia and Colorado for the honors of lynching negroes. In Indiana, however, the mob did no burn-

ing at the stake. It contented itself with commonplace hanging, thereby earning the commendation, we presume, of those good preachers who found nothing to condemn in the Colorado lynching but the fact that the mob burned their victim instead of murdering him humanely. There were three victims in the Indiana case. All of them were negroes. One of them confessed to having committed the murder the mob had set out to avenge. But he confessed under duress and in terror. The law books agree that confessions made under such circumstances are worthless. But the Indiana mobbers were not particular about the value of confessions. They wanted "the nigger," and his confession was good enough for all practical purposes. So they hanged him. And as this negro had in his confession implicated another of his race, the mob hanged him, too. The confessor had also implicated a third negro, who was yet at liberty. But the sheriff put him in jail and held him there securely until the mob came again. Without encountering the least resistance from any official, it dragged the new prisoner out and hanged him also. This was all done in the most orderly and genteel manner imaginable by a mob of all classes, some of the most respectable men of the locality participating, and no masks were worn. When the Colorado lynching occurred its apologists explained it on the theory that the abolition of capital punishment in Colorado has made it necessary for mobs to administer the extreme penalty in aggravated cases. But as capital punishment has not been abolished in Indiana the Colorado excuse will not serve there. The simple explanation of all these lynchings, north and south, is the unreasonable and unreasoning, not to say unchristian, contempt for negroes which prevails among white people. Negroes are lynched not because of their crimes, but because a crime by a negro is felt to be more heinous than the same crime by a white man. So strong is this feeling that even the safeguards

which the law adopts to shield the innocent are regarded as superfluities when invoked in behalf of a negro. In the Indiana lynching case, for instance, the mob hanged three men upon the uncorroborated confession of one, the other two protesting their innocence. Even if lynching could be justified under any circumstances, lynching upon no better evidence of guilt than that would condemn the lynchers for criminal lack of intelligence.

Representative Crumpacker, a republican of Indiana, has again introduced a bill reducing congressional representation to the basis of voting population. It is in this way that he proposes to punish states that disfranchise the negro. And it is the only way in which the federal government can punish them. Yet President McKinley opposes Crumpacker's bill. When that gentleman proposed it last year it was pigeon-holed. And such will doubtless be its fate again this year unless Mr. McKinley can be persuaded to favor its adoption. Here is an opportunity for northern negroes who object to the disfranchisement of their race in the southern states. Let them bring their influence to bear in support of the Crumpacker bill. If they neglect to do so, if they allow that bill to be again pigeon-holed without a protest from their leaders or their press, without so much as a petition in its favor, they must not be surprised if the public come to suspect them of having a deeper interest in the plums of republican machine politics than in the maintenance of their constitutional rights as a race.

On the occasion of the public announcement this week of a gift of \$1,500,000 to the University of Chicago from John D. Rockefeller, the president of the university, Mr. Harper, took advantage of the opportunity to express his opinion about freedom of speech and its abuse by uni-

versity professors. The allusion was obvious, of course. Hard upon the heels of the dismissal of Prof. Ross, of Leland Stanford, Jr., university, for giving expression to views on street car monopolies and coolie labor at variance with those entertained by Mrs. Stanford, the "angel" of the institution, Mr. Harper could not with very good grace have boasted of so munificent a donation of \$1,500,000 from the most notoriously absorptive parasite of our monopoly era, without offering assurances that the gift was really and truly a gift and not a bribe.

This assurance Mr. Harper offered specifically. "Mr. Rockefeller has never," he said, "by a single word or act, indicated his dissatisfaction with the instruction given to the students in the university or with the public expression of opinion made by an officer of the university." One could have wished the assurance to be more specific. But Mr. Harper doubtless meant to assert that Mr. Rockefeller's donations have no influence upon sociological instruction at the institution, and in the absence of counter testimony it may be assumed that this is so. When, however, the evils of the system with which Mr. Rockefeller has identified himself and through which he manages to absorb millions of wealth that other men earn, are more clearly recognized and freely exposed at the University of Chicago, there will be less difficulty in believing that there is not some vague and unconscious connection between the policy of the school and the magnitude of Rockefeller's donations.

Of Mr. Harper's abstract views on free speech by professors in their class rooms, it is possible to speak strongly and favorably. Headvoted freedom of expression, even though it be abused. "For the abuse of such liberty," he said, "is not so great an evil as its restriction." That is unqualifiedly true. And in defining abuse of free speech by professors Mr.