

induced the rank and file of the party to discipline for corruption and treachery, are working like nailers, with Republican campaign funds, to defeat the Democratic party at its own convention. When Johnson said, after two years' experience at fighting plutocracy in politics, that no one need expect the plutocrats to "lie down" until they are "whipped to a finish," he said something worth remembering. The war upon plutocracy is neither child's play nor fool's play.

While the working people are wondering where all that prosperity is which they are gravely assured that they are enjoying, but of which they see but little except in the prosperity-boasting newspapers, the Cincinnati Evening Post comes forward to prove with figures that they are prosperous with at least a figurable prosperity. It gets its figures from the report of the comptroller of the treasury upon the condition of savings banks. According to this report, says the jubilant Evening Post—

There are in the United States 6,666,672 individual depositors, with an aggregate accumulation of \$2,750,177,000 on deposit. Taking the year 1896 as a point of comparison, it appears that since that time there has been an increase in the number of depositors of 1,601,672, and an increase in the total deposits of \$843,177,000. This exhibit shows the remarkable increase in seven years of 30 per cent. in depositors and 40 per cent. in total deposits. There is no dream about all these cold millions in the banks, mostly placed there by and belonging to the working people. The total deposits in all the banks amount to about \$5,000,000,000, of which the savings funds, the money of the common people, make \$2,750,000,000—more than half. Clearly, not all the money in the country is owned by the great financiers. This showing of money saved by the working people of the country becomes all the more remarkable when we take into consideration the prevailing high prices. Wages have not gone up in proportion to the universal increase in prices. With only a little more money to buy with, labor pays far more for all the comforts of life. Yet the savings report shows that their share in the benefits of prosperity is no small one.

There is something suspicious about that last observation. It seems like a suggestion that read-

ers must beware of placing too much confidence in what has preceded. Well may the writer have wondered, well may workingmen wonder, well may we all wonder, how laborers could have only a little more to buy with, could pay much more for the comforts of life, and yet could largely increase their savings.

Only one of two explanations of that riddle is possible. Either laborers have lowered their scale of living or they have not increased their savings. Both explanations are probably true to some extent. At any rate the savings banks reports, with their averages of depositors and deposits, prove nothing. Workingmen should be as cautious of "averages" as Sam Weller was advised to be of "vidders." The story is told of a traveler who, coming to a stream he desired to cross, but not knowing its depth, asked a wise man, who informed him that the average depth was three feet, whereupon the traveler started to wade across and was drowned. Savings bank averages are as dangerous in another way. If 200 people had savings bank deposits amounting to \$2,000, the report would show for them an average deposit of \$10 apiece; although 199 of them might have a deposit of less than \$6 while one had over \$1,000. This trick of savings bank averages becomes very deceptive when the well-to-do and even the rich use savings banks for their uninvested surpluses. One person, being allowed only \$1,000 in each bank, might deposit that much in each of several banks. Suppose he distributed \$5,000 among six banks. Then he would count for six individuals in the averaging process. If for example, he were one of 200 with \$6,000 amongst them, the reports would show 205 depositors with an average deposit of nearly \$30 each. Yet in fact there would be only 200 depositors, one of whom would have deposits amounting to \$5,000, while the other 199 would have an average of less than \$5.03.

That savings bank averages are distorted in this way, so as falsely to show a great increase of the average wealth of working men, is an actual fact. It has been several times exposed. The Massachusetts statistics have exposed it, and so, more recently, have those of Connecticut. Upon the Connecticut exposure, the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post of December 31, 1901, had this to say:

The savings banks reports are deceptive in that they are being used for investment purposes by rich people, rather than by the wageworkers. The Connecticut savings banks increased their deposits the past year by \$9,500,000, bringing the total up to \$193,000,000 in round numbers. But of this sum only \$76,000,000 belongs to depositors who have less than \$1,000 each to their credit. One bank reports an individual account of \$60,000, to which was added \$4,850 during the year, although the law forbids any bank receiving more than \$1,000 from any depositor during the year.

In the instance mentioned the limitation law of Connecticut seems to have been violated openly. That such laws are extensively and systematically evaded is evident from the following extract from a circular letter from the City Trust Co., of 36 Wall street, New York, seeking to draw away from savings banks some of the patronage of their rich clients:

Savings banks' depositors will find this company's facilities in many ways of greater advantage than the savings bank. This is especially true of those who are now using savings banks as a species of investment, and who are compelled to arrange their deposits so that the lawful maximum amount which is permitted to an individual account shall not be exceeded, and to accomplish which it is necessary to use different titles and patronize different banks.

A little intelligent reflection upon this aspect of the matter may explain to the jubilant though somewhat mystified editor of the Cincinnati Evening Post, why workingmen whose living expenses are much increased without a corresponding increase in their wages, nevertheless appear to have "salted away" a much larger "average" of savings bank deposits than ever before.

When the Tory government of Great Britain was prosecuting its

war of conquest against the Boers, a very large proportion of Americans who were indignant at this British aggression saw nothing wrong about the American conquest in the Philippines. "That was different." So, on the other hand, with British jingoes who condemned our "benevolent assimilation" of the Filipinos. They saw nothing wrong about their "benevolent assimilation" of the Boers. "That was different." Similar self-centered distinctions are made in a multitude of relationships. What I do may be beneficent, though if you do the same thing it may be malevolent. "There is a difference." With many employers, for instance, it is right for employers to combine against some workingmen and blacklist them, but wrong for workingmen to combine against some employers and boycott them. "There is a difference." With many workingmen, on the other hand, it is right for workingmen to boycott employers, but wrong for employers to blacklist workingmen. "There is a difference." The only real difference in all these self-centered distinctions is that on the one side my ox is gored while on the other side it is yours. It is a different ox, that's all. The most recent and one of the most sorrowful of the manifestations of this combination of jealousy for our own rights with indifference to the corresponding rights of others, has to do with the persecution of Negroes and of Jews, of which some spectacular instances have occurred within the year.

Both these peoples are persecuted peoples. The Jews became slaves. They escaped from bondage. The nation they set up was conquered by pagans and they were subjugated and despised by their conquerors. With the Christian dispensation, the element of religion came in to intensify the persecution of which they have been victims as a race for centuries. In some places and at some times they have suffered

more than at others. They have risen up and they have been crushed down. They have found freedom and equality of rights and have been divested of them again. Even where legal rights are accorded them, the race, as a race, is irrationally despised by the dominant race; not so generally nor so relentlessly as is the Negro race, but despised nevertheless. Where legal rights are withheld, or have been taken away from them, they are terrorized by mob violence and are now and again the victims of wholesale massacre. From a homogeneous people with their sorrowful history, who have found in this country a safe asylum for their rights at least, it is only reasonable to expect sympathy for another race with a history not dissimilar on its sorrowful side, whose rights still are withheld and whose persons are at the mercy of infuriated mobs when the cry of a nameless crime is raised against them. But "that is different." Some American Jews do speak out for the rights of the Negro—not many, but some. More are silently sympathetic—not a great many, perhaps, but not a few. Yet there is no indication of any race sympathy. When the Polish Jews were massacred at Kishineff the American Jews spoke out with one voice—Jews of high degree and those of low, leaders and followers—in behalf of their persecuted fellow racemen and co-religionists of Russia. But as a race they have looked upon the persecution of the American Negro in America with composure. Many of them are found even "hounding it" on. If a single voice among the American Jews has been raised in behalf of the American Negro, by way of expressing the sympathy of one persecuted race for another, its echoes have not reached us. It is natural, of course, that the sufferings of their own race should thrill them most, and that for these sufferings their expressions of sympathy should be more general and pronounced. But have the leaders and the newspapers of the persecuted

Jewish race no word of sympathy for the persecuted Negro race?

It is urged that there is a difference between Negroes and Jews. But we recognize no difference as to rights. When any Jew argues a difference, in justification of his participation in or approval of Negro lynching, while protesting against Jewish massacres, we know him for what he is. When, however, a difference is argued, not for the purpose of justifying Negro persecution, but for the purpose of minimizing the efforts of Russian persecutors to excuse themselves with the cry of "You're another," there is, indeed, a difference. Such is the spirit of the following letter from Dr. Solomon Solis Cohen, a prominent physician of Philadelphia. Dr. Cohen is a democrat in the true sense of that word. His democracy knows no difference of race, color, religion or condition, when human rights are involved. It is not, therefore, as an enemy of the Negro race that he writes, nor as a man indifferent to the wrongs which that race suffers. He says:

God forbid I should excuse or condone any wrong against any man. I have not kept silent when my white countrymen have robbed or murdered my countrymen of red or black skin, at home, or my fellowmen of yellow or brown skin abroad. Nor do I wish to set up degrees in crime; it is as fiendish to torture or kill Negroes because of their color as it is to torture or kill Jews because of their faith.

Nevertheless I must protest against the attempt to set up an analogy between the lynching of Negroes guilty or accused of rape or murder, in the United States, and the massacre of Jews in Russia, the more so, as the attempt to compare the incomparable is part of the effort of Russian emissaries and literary bureaus here and abroad, to mislead public opinion, and to break the force of American condemnation of Russian official barbarity. The unspeakable crime committed by many Negroes, which is undoubtedly the moving cause as well as the pretext for the mob violence unjustifiably wrought upon convicted and unconvicted wretches, and probably at times upon innocent victims, must be considered as an element in the psychologic problem of the return of ostensibly civilized communities to savagery.

In Russian violence against Jews this crime is committed not by the people murdered, but by the murderous mob.

Here, at least, is one great difference. If Russian soldiers were to shoot all moujiks of the district in which anti-Jewish riots had occurred, not in defense of the Jews, but afterwards in revenge, without separating innocent from guilty, there might be some ground of comparison between this supposititious action of Russian soldiers, and that of the American mobs—but there is not such ground of comparison between the actual deeds of Russian mobs and American mobs.

Further, the incitation to violence against Russian Jews comes from the government, and is the fruit of exceptional laws against the Jews; restricting the latter in their place of residence, in their education, in their choice of vocation, burdening them with innumerable special taxes, and making them exceptionally liable to official blackmail. From all these restrictions and burdens they can escape by becoming members of the orthodox Russian church. In the United States no such discrimination against Negroes exists. The evasion of constitutional amendments as to suffrage and of civil rights laws, tolerated by communities or courts, only emphasizes the distinction here pointed out.

Another great difference that is somewhat related to this subject may, however, be alluded to. The Negroes are a recently enslaved race coming up to freedom; thus the evils from which they suffer are in a measure survivals of a worse state now bettered. The Jews of Russia on the contrary have been comparatively recently reduced from the position of relative freedom enjoyed under the kings of Poland to that of absolute deprivation of civil rights under the czars of Russia. It is the partition of Poland, whither Jews from Germany and elsewhere had been attracted in the Middle Ages because there they could dwell in peace and safety, that has brought about existing conditions in the so-called Jewish Pole of Russian Poland. Massacre is thus part of a process intended to deprive the Jews of liberty previously enjoyed.

It is not unfair in this connection either to contrast the advanced stage of intellectual and moral development of the Jews in general with the limited progress that the masses of Negroes in Africa and in America have as yet had the time and opportunity to achieve—not to excuse crime against the ignorant or undeveloped, but to emphasize the variance of the sociologic factors in the respective questions.

To sum up, the outrages against Jews in Russia are directed against the members of a certain church and are the result of priestly and official instigation in a country where church and state are united in pursuance of a deliberate policy approved by the heads of state and church, and are facilitated, if not encouraged, by exceptional re-

strictive legislation; that policy and that legislation tending to deprive a whole people of prescriptive rights previously enjoyed in the country of their birth, a land wherein their fathers had dwelled for generations. The outrages committed against Negroes in the United States—with rare exceptions—originate in crimes committed by individual Negroes, are directed, at least primarily and ostensibly, against the criminal; are always theoretically and often practically resisted by the officers of the law; and are in contravention of the declared purpose of the law to restore freedom to those previously enslaved and to their children, and to establish equal civil and religious rights for all men.

Whatever condemnation may therefore justly be visited upon the members of American lynching mobs, upon individual faithless officials, and upon communities tolerant of injustice, no such verdict can be rendered against the government or the laws of the United States or of the several States, or against the American people at large. Americans not guilty of lynching can, therefore, individually, and certainly the President and Congress can officially protest against the Kishineff massacre and the incidents leading to it without exposing themselves to the tu quoque of M. Rochefort. As I said before, the attempt to institute comparison between Russian official murder and barbarity and American mob criminality is simply part of the attempt to break the force of worldwide public opinion against Russia.

There is no disposition on our part to lessen in the slightest degree the force of Dr. Cohen's argument in so far as it serves as a protest against the Russian persecution of Jews. Quite the contrary. But inasmuch as it may be, and is likely to be used in palliation of the persecution of Negroes, the distinction he makes between the persecution of Negroes because of their race and of Jews because of their religion, ought not to pass without comment. Even if his distinction were accurate our analogy would hold. Not only is it "as fiendish to torture or kill Negroes because of their color as it is to torture or kill Jews because of their faith," as Dr. Cohen agrees, but it is essentially much the same thing. In this case, however, the distinction Dr. Cohen makes is clearly one without any difference. The religion of the Jews is a race religion. The line that

separates the Jews from the rest of the world as the Jewish race, and the line that separates them as Jewish religionists, coincides so nearly that the gentile world does not distinguish the two. To gentiles the Jew is a Jew, precisely as to white men the Negro is a Negro. Let the difference between the Jew and the Negro be all that Dr. Cohen suggests; let the difference in motive between the Russian persecutors of the one and the American persecutors of the other be all that he insists upon—concede all this, and yet the identifying facts in the parallel remain. In Russia Jews are massacred because they are Jews, and in the United States Negroes are burned at the stake because they are Negroes. Even the cry with which the bloody passions of the race-hating populace are excited is much the same—that the Negro ravishes white women, that the Jew immolates Christian children. This cry against the Jew is, of course, without any foundation in fact; while the one against the Negro is true of some Negroes—reported by the Springfield Republican as less in 1902 than 1 in every 250,000 of the Negro population. But that makes no difference. The former cry is as false with reference to the innocent Negroes who have been lynched and tortured as is the latter with reference to every Jew. And after all, it is not the truth of the cry that counts in either case. It is the fact that, be it true or false, the persecutors take advantage of it to relieve their race animosity in a carousal of torture and death.

Apropos of our passing reference to a dispute over a recent statement that Moses had married a Negro (p. 289), based upon the passage in Numbers which tells of his having married an Ethiopian, Dr. Cohen writes us further as follows:

The word "Ethiopian" in Biblical English does not mean Negro. It is the translation of the Hebrew word "Cushi," meaning a Cushite or Hamite. The Hamite tribes of the Bible, i. e. the Egyptians, Canaanites, Babylonians,

Midianites, etc. (see Genesis, Chapter X.), were not Negroes. Moses, as stated in Exodus 2:21, married Zipporah, the daughter of Jethro, the priest of Midian, a descendant—according to the ethnologic views of the writer of the story of the revolt of Aaron and Miriam—of Cush; hence a Cushite; or, as the King James translators Englished it, an Ethiopian—but not a Negro.

The good that can be done by one Democratic paper in a community, if edited in the interest of democratic-Democracy instead of lending its influence to the schemes of bi-partisan plutocrats, is shown by the experience of the Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat. When Warren Worth Bailey came into the control of that paper, about ten years ago, it was of the ordinary spoils-hunting type of party paper. For democratic principles it did not care one jot, and there was no way of distinguishing it from the Republican paper except by its party label and its smaller share of spoil. Bailey changed all that. He made the paper thoroughly and radically democratic in principle and purpose as well as in name. It was a brave thing to do, for genuine democracy comprehends free trade, and Johnstown is in the heart of a protection-besotted region. In propagating the principles of genuine democracy Bailey not only endured the gibes of Republicans; he also encountered the hostility of his own party. But he persevered, and with the usual result where perseverance is allied with common sense in a crusade for what is right. His paper has long since risen from the humiliating position of a mere dependent upon the bounty of politicians and the corruption funds of monopolists, to a place among the profitable newspaper properties of the country which depend for support solely upon the confidence of the people and exercise a powerful influence in consequence.

How great an influence the Johnstown Democrat has come to exercise within its sphere of publication may be seen from the refreshingly genuine platforms that the Democrats of its county, Cam-

bria, are now in the habit of adopting. Take the latest county platform, for instance, which was adopted a few days ago, and read these crisp enunciations of democratic principle:

The Democrats of Cambria county remain loyal to the declared principles of the party as promulgated in its national platforms.

They declare against all favoritism in taxation and against the devotion of public rights and property to private uses.

They insist that wherever the burden of taxation can be lifted from industry and placed upon privilege, common interest and common morality demand that it should be done.

They believe in local self-government. They believe that the people immediately concerned are the best judges of their own interests. They believe that the principle of the initiative and referendum is essentially democratic.

The Democrats of Cambria county join with the Democrats of the State in denouncing the crowning infamy of Republican bossism embodied in the Salus-Grady law, which is directed against the freedom of the press and which is designed to terrorize the organs of public opinion into silence in the presence of jobbery, corruption and crime on the part of public servants and their allies among the political banditti led by unscrupulous bosses. The Democrats of this county denounce the three alleged Democrats who voted for this monstrous measure and they also denounce the senator and the representative from Cambria who aided in its passage.

We believe in a free press, in free speech, in free government and in freedom of the people from tribute-paying in whatever guise.

We are therefore opposed to the trusts and to the monstrous tariff which has bred them and which is now their shelter and defense.

We are opposed to government by force and to government by injunction.

If only a moderate proportion of the Democrat newspapers of the country would throw off their allegiance to their plutocratic masters and bravely follow the example of the Johnstown Democrat, they would soon give us a Democratic party to be proud of, and incidentally would flourish in business upon their earnings instead of festering with spoils and bribes.

Gov. Yates, of Illinois, is solemnly advised by his leading party paper, the Chicago Tribune, to make no effort for a renomination.

Here is the cheerful picture it urges him to look upon:

By giving up his aspirations he will get surcease of toil and trouble. He will be able to take his ease in the Executive mansion for a year and a quarter. He will not have to plot and scheme to get delegates. He can look on with amused unconcern, while eager candidates are struggling in the 102 counties in the State. It will not be necessary for him to traverse the State, show himself to the people, and make explanations and promises. There will be nothing to interfere with his strict attention to executive business.

If that is good advice to Gov. Yates of Illinois, why not to President Roosevelt, of the United States? It fits snugly enough.

THE ISTHMIAN CANAL.

The Colombian senate's rejection of the Panama canal treaty (vol. v, p. 792) gives importance once more to the question of the Panama route versus the Nicaragua route for an Isthmian canal.

One of the American commissioners who opposed the Panama route, but finally agreed to it against his own judgment, was Lewis M. Haupt, an engineer of long experience and approved and acknowledged ability. Mr. Haupt agreed rather than bear the odium of preventing the construction of any canal at all. For President Roosevelt had intimated to the commission that unless it made a unanimous report there would be no canal legislation.

After ceasing to be a member of the commission Mr. Haupt published his views, briefly, in the North American Review for July, 1902. In this article he said:

The factors which should have greatest weight in the choice of routes are those most intimately connected with the economics of transportation—such as the volume and destination of the traffic, which is in turn a function of the distribution of population; the strategic position of the waterway; the physical and engineering advantages for all classes of vessels; the possibilities of local development, regulation, control, sanitation and police, and the relative freedom from seismic influences.

In all these particulars he declared he had found that—
The Nicaragua route has the advantage; for the northern hemisphere con-