

explained. Mr. Morton is in the cabinet as secretary of the navy not so much for naval purposes as for the purpose of establishing a cordial understanding between the President and the railway magnates.

But Mr. Morton's official life is still enveloped in mystery. Although his change of party was cynically explained by his appointment to office, and his naval rank somewhat incongruously by his abilities as manager of railway traffic, there is as yet no explanation of his personal sacrifice in the matter. For Mr. Morton has given up a railway salary of \$25,000 to take a government salary of \$8,000. Is this difference the price of gratifying an unwonted political ambition? Or is the sacrifice an act of patriotic devotion, analogous in the walks of peace to the sacrifices of battlefield heroes? If Mr. Morton is too modest to confess such extraordinary devotion, some of his admirers should do a little virtuous boasting for him. But what if this relinquishment of the difference between a large salary and a small one is neither a patriotic sacrifice nor the price of a political bauble? What if the financial loss is in some way financially covered? Should that be so, who is to be reimbursed and how? Mr. Morton possesses the confidence of the railroad magnates; have they thought it well to have such a representative near the wielder of the big stick—that unswerving wielder who sometimes swerves? These are only questions, to be sure. But as the facts suggest such questions, the people will do well to watch, with a very great watchfulness, Mr. Roosevelt's overtures to the railroads for regulating railroad traffic and authorizing pools.

Almost frantic in their efforts to throw upon democratic Democrats the burden of responsibility for the overwhelming defeat of the Democratic party under plutocratic control and with plutocratic candidates for President

and Vice-President, plutocratic Democrats are attributing this defeat in part to what the New York World describes as a "mass of clotted nonsense" in the platform, the clotted nonsense being the platform declaration that "protection is robbery." On that point the World fairly represented the whole brood of Democratic protectionists, when it said, in its issue of the 1st, that the majority of Democrats do not believe it and never believed it, and that in its opinion no Democratic Congress would pass a strictly free trade revenue measure. As the tariff question—involving as it does the essential principle of freedom of contract, untrammelled commerce, unobstructed manufacturing, unmonopolized transportation, unrestricted employment, and business freedom generally,—is the really vital question in our national politics, this attitude of plutocratic Democrats is an important consideration with reference to the Democratic party's future.

The assumption that no earnest purpose stood behind those brave words in the St. Louis platform doubtless accounts for the refusal of many free traders to vote for Judge Parker. If no principles were involved and the difference between the parties was only one of percentages, no wonder that apathy chilled the Presidential canvass. On a question of right and wrong, human pulses may be stirred; but whether a man shall be privileged by government to take a smaller or a larger part of the people's earnings from them in the form of a tariff tax, is an issue which affords little scope for enthusiasm. Under the circumstances, therefore, it was not strange that the nation preferred a candidate with definite avowals, to the estimable but indefinite Judge who was warmed into life only at the campaign's end.

If protection is not robbery, to what species of appropriation does it belong? If it is wrong for tariff to shelter a monopoly or trust, as tariff tinkers concede,

why is it right for tariff to shelter single individuals, engaged in occupations which enforce tribute from their fellow citizens? Is morality a question of numbers? If not, why is it immoral for the trust to pillage helpless consumers? If the kind of democracy which is cherished by those who condemn the candid anti-protection declaration of the St. Louis platform is the kind that was represented by the Democratic party in the recent campaign, then the overwhelming defeat of the party was richly merited. It was in that case a plutocratic combination with an alias,—its most urgent need the grave-digger.

True democrats who are enrolled in the Democratic party, the democratic Democrats, will decline to accept the dictum of those for whom the World speaks in this matter. They will rather subscribe to the vigorous statement of Henry Watterson, that "next after the institution of African slavery, for which the South was no more responsible than the North, the protective tariff is the most monstrous instrument of classism and greed, of legalized robbery, jobbery and corruption, which the rapacity of man and the malice of Satan have ever devised to degrade and torture humankind." The assumption that no Democratic Congress would pass a strictly free trade revenue measure is a matter upon which men may reasonably differ. Popular opinion determines what a Congress in power will do, and free trade popular opinion is fast making. Such editorials as that in the World are reminiscent of the Tory editorials of England when Cobden and Bright sought to emancipate their countrymen from protection robbery. Yet a Tory prime minister eventually executed the commands of the unpopular "fanatics." So in this country popular feeling is beginning to revolt at protection, and to demand the total extermination of this scheme of spoliation which wears the mask of a benevolent name.

Some of the exposures in Lawson's January installment of "Frenzied Finance," corroborated as they are by several of the implicated persons, may well lead one to ask whether government has not gone clear beyond its legitimate limitations, in undertaking to adjust private quarrels and to farm out its own functions through franchises. Would it not be far better if it confined its activities to the maintenance of public order, the regulation of land tenures, inclusive of highways, and the collection of the common revenues? This would cut out corporate charters, private monopolies, and public debt-collecting. It would leave individuals, where they should be left, to deal with one another on the basis of personal integrity. And why not? Why utilize public functions for the furtherance of rascally private schemes? Why not leave the rascals, little and big, to swindle one another to their hearts' content, until each comes to distrust the rest and swindling ceases to pay?

Not often are land speculators as candid in their operations as is a New York investment company of which Senator Depew is a director. In its advertisements it invites the investment of hundreds now in vacant lots which "will become thousands within the next few years," and then naively urges: "If you are open-minded and want to get ahead, let us tell you what the expenditure of over \$350,000,000 is doing for those who have intelligence and foresight, and"—mind this, now—"plant where others will till and you reap." Planting is euphemistic, of course; it doesn't mean seed-planting in the ground either literally or metaphorically, but money-planting in the promoters' office. The tilling and reaping, however, are in a way quite literal. And that is the trouble with industrial affairs. There is too much reaping by some where others till, and consequently too little reaping by the tillers themselves. Senator Depew's company has truly found the explana-

tion. There is only one way, fundamentally, of reaping where others till, and that is by owning the natural tillage place.

Some newspaper comments on the recent promotion of an active gentleman from the management of the harvester trust to the management of one of the subsidiary steel trusts, are not of a kind to stimulate moral progress. This man is described as successful, and his success is ascribed to his having been always busy. What he was busy at seems to cut no figure; his example is commended to the youth of the land absolutely without reference to the object or character of his incessant activity. Take, for instance, this reflection upon the matter by the Chicago Tribune:

The degree of a man's success, whether in money getting, or writing, or scanning the heavens for new stars, or running for office, usually depends a good deal more upon the assiduity with which he plies his trade than upon his opportunities or natural talents. . . . The successful man is usually busy, and the busy man is usually successful.

Every word of that would apply as well to a burglar, a forger, a sneak thief, or a political grafter, as to an honest worker. With a change of the personal pronoun to the feminine form, it would have applied as well three months ago to Mrs. Chadwick as it does to-day to the man whose success inspired the reflection. This does not imply that the activity of that active gentleman has not been well directed. He is possibly as useful as he is busy. Nevertheless, it is to be observed that big salaried heads of trusts, such as he, are usually selected less for their productive than for their appropriative skill.

With the death of Clinton Furbish, which occurred in New York on Christmas, there passed away a remarkable man. Mr. Furbish was intensely political in his tastes and associations, and, although never a candidate for elective office and but once an office-

holder, was widely intimate with public men. His participation in political movements dated back to the Free Soil convention at Pittsburg in 1852. He was an active Republican until the Greenback party, with Peter Cooper at its head, came into politics in 1876. For this party Mr. Furbish was one of the most effective stump speakers; and he never abandoned its doctrines, although he subsequently supplemented them with the land-tenure doctrines of Henry George, of whom he was a personal friend, and in whose campaign for mayor of Greater New York in 1897 he was a worker and adviser. With Mr. George he had become a supporter of Cleveland in 1888; and in 1892, having meantime engaged in journalism in Chicago, he was Ben T. Cable's chief assistant in managing the Western branch of Cleveland's third campaign. It was as a result of effective political work in this connection that Mr. Furbish became chief of the Bureau of American Republics at Washington, an office which he vacated soon after the close of Cleveland's administration. Although thus closely associated officially with the administration of President Cleveland when the influence of that administration was exerted against the election of Bryan, Mr. Furbish made speeches in the campaign of 1896 both in support of Bryan and of the bimetallic theory of money for which Bryan stood. To Mr. Furbish, however, bimetallicism was less attractive in itself than as a step toward the greenback doctrines which he had never relinquished. By occupation he was a patent expert, and after his retirement from office he pursued this vocation until his death. As a newspaper man, Mr. Furbish's principal work was done on the Chicago News and the Chicago Times, as editorial writer, and for the Chicago Leader, a weekly political review of which he was editor in the early 90's. A man of tireless industry, of inexhaustible resource, and of singular devotion to his convictions, Mr. Furbish was also a man of notable loyalty to his friendships.