

chances are distinctly declining. The alternative that confronts everyone in business life is great mastership or dependent servitude. Those who do not achieve the one are in imminent and increasing danger of falling into the other. And the difficulties in the way of achieving great business successes are becoming constantly greater. Business may be likened to a race. The prizes for winners are richer than ever; but more and more are the winners those contestants who have phenomenal powers. And just as the prizes for success become more tempting do the penalties of mediocrity become more general and dreadful. There is indeed room at the top; but everywhere else business is crushingly crowded, and he who would climb to the top must be intellectually able and morally willing to make mounting blocks of his brethren.

Ohio, a state that Hanna rules, has a law upon its statute books which makes it a crime, punishable with imprisonment from one to three years, for any man who refuses work to beg outside of his home county. This law has just been sustained as valid by the supreme court. It should be noted that the law is almost identical with the labor laws of England which followed the plagues, and which history has branded as infamous. What is meant by refusing to work? It means refusing to work for the starvation wages that prevail. And this is a crime in Ohio if followed by begging outside of the home county of the beggar. If, for example, a workman, refusing to work for Mr. Hanna in Cleveland upon Mr. Hanna's terms, should hunt for work upon better terms in another county, and failing to find it should beg a meal of victuals to help him on his way, he would be guilty of a crime for which he could be imprisoned for not more than three years nor less than one. Such were the provisions of the infamous labor statutes of England. Their purpose was to force laborers to work at starvation wages.

The effect of this Ohio statute is the same.

It is a significant fact that the same judges who upheld that labor statute at Columbus this week, rendered a decision at the same time in favor of the tobacco trust upon a question of corporation privileges within the state. We make no reflection upon the integrity of the judges. Possibly they were obliged to decide both cases as they did. The serious significance of the juxtaposition is not what it may imply with reference to the Ohio judiciary, but the threatening suggestion it embodies of a social development under which power and privilege are strengthened under laws that build up trusts by first making beggars of men and then making criminals of beggars.

Ex-Attorney General Frank S. Monnett, of Ohio, is a welcome addition to the new democracy which is developing under the magnificent leadership of Bryan. Mr. Monnett might have been worth \$400,000 and be an honored office holder under the Hanna party had he been willing to accept a Standard Oil bribe. As attorney general of Ohio he was prosecuting the Standard Oil trust for a plain violation of a state law. To head him off he was first offered this rich bribe. Had he accepted that and left the trust alone Hanna would have renominated him. The trust would in that case have been safer under his administration than under that of a new man. But as he refused the bribe and continued his fight against the trust, it became necessary to Standard Oil interests to displace him. Accordingly, Senator Hanna, who controlled the republican convention of Ohio, named another candidate, and the Standard Oil trust has been molested in Ohio no further.

In commenting, on page 337, upon Gov. Roosevelt's Labor day speech at Chicago, in which he urged the improvement of life conditions so that "as nearly as possible each

man shall receive the share to which he is honestly entitled and no more," we heartily commended the sentiment, but said:

But Mr. Roosevelt has given no earnest of his own belief in this exalted and exalting sentiment. He is himself a beneficiary of life conditions that give him annually a much larger share of the world's annual earnings than he is honestly entitled to, in consequence of which others have less than they are honestly entitled to. No blame attaches to him for that. But what does he propose by way of changing these conditions? Nothing. How, then, do we know that he believes in the sentiment he phrases?

An objection is raised by the Fairhope (Ala.) Courier to so much of this comment as absolves Roosevelt from blame for being a beneficiary of unjust conditions. The Courier's objection is a common one among social reformers, and one which seems to us to be as thoughtless as it is common. Believing it to be thoughtless, we do not argue it, but content ourselves with asking the Courier or any other objecting paper or person to explain, thoughtfully and with a consciousness of responsibility, what Mr. Roosevelt could or ought to do to divest himself of his unjust share of the world's earnings. Mind, we do not ask what he could or ought to do as a citizen. We have already explained that a citizen ought to try to get his fellow citizens to join him in abolishing the social institution—landlordism—which makes unjust wealth distribution not only possible but unavoidable. What we wish to know is, What can he do simply as a landlord, as a beneficiary of "unearned increment"—what can he do that would amount to anything more than a transfer of his unjust share from himself to others whose right to it would be no better than his own? The question is not how he can be charitable, but how he can be just.

In Hawaii the republican party of Hanna and McKinley is excellently well represented by the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, published at Honolulu. The issue of September 25, 1900, lies before us. It is so rich in