

Some idea of the indignation Mr. Hanna and his ring are awakening may be got from the following editorial extract from the Cleveland Press, an independent daily, having the largest circulation of any paper in northern Ohio, and being one of the Scripps' league of papers:

The corporation pirates of Ohio, led by that battle-scarred veteran of many a piratical cruise—Marcus A. Hanna—have raised their black flag of loot to the peak of their slippery decked craft, and, with guns shotted, are bearing down on the ship Ohio. "Perpetual street railway franchises" is the yell that floats across the waters from the pirate craft, as the bloodthirsty crew and captain brandish their knives and prepare for their devil's work. For years and years this ship, with its crew of corporation pirates, under the same captain, has cruised about, sinking a small craft here and looting another there, dividing the booty among its outlaw band. The craft has not always been recognizable. Sometimes it has been painted one color, sometimes another. Never before has it raised its black flag. Usually the stars and stripes have been prostituted for the purpose of deceiving the victim. But success after success has emboldened the pirates to a point of reckless disregard. No more deception! No more sailing under a false flag! No more stealing up on the doomed quarry under the cover of darkness. The big prize has been sighted by the lookout. Capt. Hanna takes his stand on the bridge. He orders the crew to man the guns. The black flag rises to the peak. "Full speed ahead!" jingles in the engine room. "Take that ship Ohio, loot her of all her treasure and give no quarter!" is the command that is carried from mouth to mouth along the deck. God help the ship Ohio and her crew and passengers unless they have listened to the many warnings and have prepared for this fight to the death.

As Mr. Roosevelt goes on, his sympathies with the trust magnates and monopoly interests generally becomes more obvious. Judging from his Fitchburg speech, ignorance of the subject is not improbably the mother of his sympathy; but whether from ignorance or design he certainly does not intend doing or suggesting anything that would interfere with these parasites. When he urged that it is "better that some people (the trusts)

should prosper too much than that no one should prosper enough," he swapped good sense for a poor epigram. If the trusts do not prosper at other people's expense, it is nobody's business how much they prosper. The more the better. In that case, why is Mr. Roosevelt meddling with them at all? But if they do prosper at other people's expense it is absurd to say that it is better that they should prosper too much than that no one should prosper enough. Would Mr. Roosevelt say it is better for common thieves to prosper too much than that no one should prosper enough? We do him the justice of presuming he would not—not even if common thieves held the balance of power in his party. What Mr. Roosevelt ignores, thereby exposing his ignorance of the subject, is the point that the trust issue turns wholly upon the question of how the trusts get their wealth and not upon how much they get. If they get it without impoverishing other people, they should be encouraged. If they get it at the expense of other people, they should be condemned. Mr. Roosevelt's policy of trying to condemn them just enough to satisfy public feeling, but not enough to expose or weaken their plundering power, may be discreet but it isn't strenuous.

Sir Edmund Barton, the prime minister of the Commonwealth of Australia, who was in Washington last week, spoke freely of the coal strike and the trusts. To President Roosevelt, his words could not have been particularly grateful; for he said that the President could, if he would, end the coal strike and crush the trusts. Nor did this statesman from the antipodes have autocratic measures in mind, as might be suspected. On the contrary, he declared himself as opposed even to sending the military into the strike regions. This policy he regarded as pernicious, because it tends to lessen respect for civil authority. No more democratic view than that could be asked. It is his opinion that the English common law, as in force in

the United States, affords every needed opportunity for checking the aggressions of the coal trust, and that if the coal trust were checked the strike would end. But Sir Edmund Barton overlooks a point or two. In the first place, our Federal courts have no common law jurisdiction, except such as they have usurped to enable them to put down labor strikes; and in the second, President Roosevelt's attorney general and Candidate Roosevelt's friends in Wall street, upon whom he depends for campaign funds two years hence, don't want to crush the trusts. Mr. Roosevelt himself is as tender toward them as a schoolboy toward a nest of turtle's eggs which may possibly hatch out snakes.

The "Public Ownership Party" of Chicago, has wisely changed its name to the "Public Ownership League." As the organization is not a political party, and was never intended to be, its name was misleading, and the change became a necessity. This league is naming candidates for the Illinois legislature wherever there seems to be any hope of breaking the bi-partisan arrangement of the monopoly corporations. It is also endorsing party nominees who are opposed to these monopolies. One of the candidates whom it has so endorsed is Western Starr, the Democratic candidate for the state senate against John Humphrey, a corporation tool whom the Republicans have nominated in the Seventh Illinois district. Another is Frank E. Herdman, an independent Republican, who is running for the lower house against the corporation candidate in the same district. The leading candidate of the league distinctively is Clarence S. Darrow, whom it has nominated by petition for the lower house. With its change of name, which prevents misconception of its non-partisan but anti-monopoly character, the Public Ownership League should place in the next legislature of Illinois a group of men who may be depended upon to expose and fight and possibly thwart the monop-

oly schemers of the non-partisan corporations and their bi-partisan tools in politics.

At last the much mooted and carefully guarded report of Carroll D. Wright to the President on the anthracite coal strike has been released for publication. Mr. Roosevelt was quite justified in neglecting to publish it sooner. There is nothing in it to have made its publication worth while.

"No friends, no money, no work; better to die," were the despairing words which a Chicago suicide left behind him last week. This is one of the few cases of misery that come to light out of the many that exist in these piping times of plutocratic prosperity. Since this man had no money, of course he had no friends. That is the way the world wags on. He thought he had no money because he could get no work. It was a false analysis. Had he been able to get work he might, it is true, have had some money; and then he would have had some friends. The unfortunate man erred in supposing that the way to get much money is to get work. Had he laid his plans to get workers, instead of work, to get control of jobs for others instead of doing jobs himself, he could have had plenty of money and plenty of friends. Only in that case some one else would have died saying: "No money, no work, no friends."

Lord Milner has just imposed a head tax of \$10 on the natives of the Transvaal. This is twice as much as the head tax imposed by the Boers, but that is not the important consideration. What is important is the fact that the tax is imposed for the purpose of compelling the natives to seek employment of the whites and thereby glutting the labor market. If they needed no ready money, they could make a comfortable living among themselves without selling their labor. But when, as under this Milner decree, which went into effect on the 1st, every adult native male and every married native wom-

an must pay a tax in money of \$10 each annually, the exploiters of labor are assured a superabundant supply of labor from the native tribes for several months in the year. This is part of the process of Christianizing the heathen. Incidentally it fattens the dividends of the Christianizers.

The Rev. Thomas B. Gregory contributes many an interesting and stimulating signed editorial to the Chicago American; and not least among these in interest is one of the past week on the subject of child labor in factories. It rests upon the fact that the Illinois factory law, which prohibits the employment of children under 14 years of age, is in operation a farce. Mr. Gregory quotes in explanation the statement of the chief factory inspector of the state to the effect that "the main obstacle to the better enforcement of the factory law is the habit, on the part of parents, of signing false affidavits." It is discouraging to find that as keen and sympathetic an observer of social conditions as Mr. Gregory can be so far taken in by that explanation as to confine his comment to a futile appeal to parents to make true affidavits and to pastors to admonish parents of the sin of perjury. It is not signing of false affidavits by parents that makes the law inoperative. That is not the cause. It is only an effect of a deeper cause. When industrial opportunities are so restricted by monopoly that parents earn but a scant living when they work, that work is so scarce as to be a boon and the giving of it something like charity, and that the miserable wages of a child are necessary to eke out the poorest kind of a poor living—when these are the circumstances under which hosts of honest people have to live, it seems almost heartless to censure them for lying to employers about the ages of their children. Let us demand the right thing, not the wrong or foolish one. Let us demand that opportunities for productive work be multiplied by abolishing monopoly, and

the parental instinct will be enough to keep tender children out of factories. When society ceases to sin against parents by depriving them of natural opportunities to make a living for their families, parents will cease to sin against society by committing perjury to evade factory laws.

#### ROOSEVELT AND BRYAN.

These two men are preeminent in the United States to-day as personifications of the two great opposing tides that are deeply agitating the political seas. This does not mean, necessarily, that either is the leader of thought on the side with which his name is so conspicuously identified. It does not imply that his views control or that his leadership is acceptable. It does not ignore the fact that one of the two has attained his exalted conspicuity chiefly by official accident. Nor is it intended to be prophetic of the future. It merely states an incontrovertible fact of the moment.

Everyone feels it to be a fact, even those who are never so anxious to have it otherwise. The rush and push of a strenuous national life along the grewsome highways of colonial imperialism abroad and plutocratic evolution at home, inevitably bring up in the popular imagination the name of Theodore Roosevelt. Even Senator Hanna has sunk into a lower than secondary place. On the other hand, whenever and wherever the democratic impulse is felt, the name of William J. Bryan comes uppermost. Nothing could be more spontaneous than the tendency of his enemies in both parties, as well as his friends, to identify all unrelenting opposition to the "going thing" as "Bryanism."

It may not be uninteresting, therefore, to compare the two men.

#### I.

A comparison was made editorially in these columns four years ago (vol. i, No. 23, p. 5), which we reproduce now, both because it is appropriate and because it is out of print. What we then said, when each had just come out of the Spanish-American war with a military title, still holds good:

"Col. Theodore Roosevelt and Col.