

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.

William J. Bryan have often been compared as men of the same type. This is usually done by people who dislike them both. To a partisan of Roosevelt's, it would be in the highest degree offensive to liken him to Bryan; to a partisan of Bryan's, it would be no less offensive to liken him to Roosevelt. Each is a disagreeable character to the partisans of the other. Yet there is good reason for the comparison. They certainly present to the public eye a striking resemblance.

"We suspect, however, that their resemblance is less a resemblance of each to the other, than of Roosevelt as he actually is to Bryan as he has been pictured.

"Bryan is habitually described by the Republican and the pluto-Democratic press, including the professional funny papers, all of which are bitterly partisan against him, as a self-seeking man.

"In his Chicago speech, which rang round the world, this press could see nothing but a bid for the presidential nomination to gratify personal ambition. In his extraordinary round of campaign speeches in behalf of silver coinage, it could detect nothing but overweening ambition supported by a superabundance of animal energy. His courteous telegram to the successful candidate after election, a telegram which at least sounded like a generous expression of patriotic good feeling, was treated as another bid for popular notice, and the reply of scant courtesy as a merited rebuke. When he offered his services to the country without reservation, in any military capacity in which the President thought he might be useful, he was again pictured as a notoriety hunter; and the President, who was at the time appointing callow sons and nephews of political and social favorites to positions in which they have proved more dangerous to our troops than the enemy, was commended for the insulting manner in which he ignored Bryan's offer.

"Then, when Bryan enlisted among the volunteers of his state as a private, he was sneeringly described as a man with an itch to get into the muss somehow, for the sake of attracting attention to himself; and

when he was chosen by his comrades to be their colonel, the sneers were renewed in aggravated form. At last, when the war was virtually over, when nothing remained to do, except garrison duty in conquered countries which we had no right to subjugate and the subjugation of which was never contemplated as an object or result of the war; when, in other words, the intention of all patriotic enlistments had been accomplished—when this time had come, and Col. Bryan applied for the release of his regiment, or rather, when it was reported, truly or falsely, that he had made such application, a new variety of sneer broke out. He was now a soldier who wished to lay down the sword of war in order to resume the jaw of politics.

"An ambitious, self-seeking politician, without political principle, and restless for notoriety; such is the picture that Bryan's plutocratic enemies have drawn of him. Whether it is a true picture of the man, we shall not now stop to inquire. We have for the present a different purpose in view. What we wish especially to call attention to is the fact that the picture of Bryan as his enemies paint it, is a perfect picture of Roosevelt as he paints it himself.

"Consider Roosevelt's career. To become a member of the legislature, he pretended for a term to change his residence. His own counsel tells it, by Col. Roosevelt's authorization. And in support of what political principle did he do this? None. There was nothing in the episode to indicate a better motive than personal ambition.

"Then he became a reformer in politics. Here was an indication of his possession of political principle in some sort; but, when the reformers were defeated in national convention by the boss, he abandoned his reform associates. His reward came two years later, in the form of a boss's nomination for mayor of New York. This he accepted at a time when, according to the present authorized statement of his lawyer, he was not a resident of New York. What could have been his motive but personal ambition?

"Next we find him again pretend-

ing to remove to New York so as to accept an appointment as police commissioner, returning to his old residence upon vacating the office. And he vacated it, not because his term had expired, nor because there was not as good work to do there as anywhere, but because he had successfully solicited an office at Washington which, while offering him no greater opportunities for usefulness, did offer opportunities for a more ambitious career. At a critical moment he abandoned that office too, in order to take the field in the spectacular role of the most sensational officer of a spectacular cavalry regiment. Here he made a dashing record. It was just such a record as an ambitious and reckless man overflowing with animal spirits might have been expected to make—just such a record as a magazine article which he had published two or three years before, indicated his ambitious desire to make.

"Largely on account of this record, the independent Republicans, regarding him as one of themselves despite his former desertion, hopefully looked to Roosevelt as the man to overthrow boss-ship in the Republican party of New York, by running as an independent Republican candidate for governor. But that would have savored of fidelity to political principle, and Col. Roosevelt ignored his independent friends to dicker with the boss of New York himself, whereby he became the accredited candidate of the machine. Thus, at the present climax of his career he again subordinates political principle to personal ambition.

"Col. Roosevelt has not only never given the slightest indication of any ambition for aught but his own selfish advancement, but he has distinctly shown by his conduct, and though guardedly yet not ambiguously, has at times shown in words, that his own glory is his chief concern in life. Even what he would call his political principles—frequent war to foster the military spirit, expansion of territory to make the nation great, and an enormous navy to make it mighty—are but a magnification of his own personal ambition. He thinks of the nation as his greater self.

"All that Bryan is by his meanest

political enemies described to be, that is Roosevelt proved to be by Roosevelt himself. His whole career testifies, directly and positively, without reference to the judgment of his enemies, without reference to any motives which he has not himself frankly revealed, that, utterly oblivious of political principle, he is dominated by an intensely personal and selfish ambition."

II.

Since that article was written additional information has transpired about Roosevelt's apostasy to the reformers in his own party in 1884. The story appears more completely, in the following paragraph editorial which appeared in *The Public* a few weeks ago (p. 165):

The following interesting bit of political history is going the rounds:

In one of his essays the late Edwin L. Godkin threw a very neat little harpoon into Henry Cabot Lodge in the following style: "In 1884 I learned of the prospect of Blaine's nomination from Henry Cabot Lodge, who called at the Evening Post office. He told me, with the proper expression of countenance, that there was a serious cloud hanging over the Republican party; that there was danger of Blaine's nomination and that he was on his way to Washington then to see some of the leading men with a view of preventing it if possible. I heartily approved of all that the good young man told me he had in mind and cheered him on his shining way. But I was chastened by seeing him on the stump for the said Blaine by the mouth of July."

It is a pity that in this connection Mr. Godkin could not have lifted the curtain upon a certain dinner party of three ambitious but baffled young reformers, gathered in conference immediately after Blaine's disappointing nomination and before that chastening appearance of Mr. Lodge upon the stump. He might have shown how two of them, Mr. Lodge and Mr. Roosevelt, decided, for personal reasons somewhat cynically disclosed, to abandon their dinner comrade to his awkward scruples.

The same self-seeking disposition has characterized Roosevelt's career since the close of the war in which he gained his military notoriety.

He put himself into the hands of "Boss" Platt to become governor of New York. After his election he played fast and loose with the "boss"—fast enough to accomplish nothing for the public, yet loose enough to irritate the politicians. They consequently tried to balk his unconcealed

ambition for the presidency by relegating him against his will to the vice president's perch, where they believed and he feared that, barring accidents, his career would end.

But an accident came and Roosevelt tumbled into the presidential chair. In the administration of that office his self-seeking qualities have been so unrestrained that one may say they are almost displayed. The story of the shameful atrocities of brutal army officers in the Philippines, and the efforts to minimize and suppress the terrible facts, is a story in which plans for the presidential succession furnish the whole ground work for the plot. Roosevelt and Lodge, with Root in the political firm in place of the too scrupulous third partner of the 80's, are still playing the strenuous game of "get there."

Even the descent down into the dominions of corrupt and corrupting "bossism" has progressed. In 1898 Roosevelt's ambition plunged him into the arms of "Boss" Platt; it has now led him to affiliate closely with the malodorous Quay. If Bryan may be fairly criticized for having once ridden for a few minutes in a carriage with "Boss" Croker, when a political guest of his political party in a city where Croker happened to be its official chief, and therefore under circumstances which made it impossible for him to reject Croker's attentions, what extreme of criticism could do justice to Roosevelt for pushing his way into Quay's political band wagon?

III.

Roosevelt has recently been criticized upon another phase of his character by Bryan himself, with a directness and justness that should command especial attention. While selfishness, though always reprehensible, is too common to be peculiarly objectionable even in a President solicitous for a further term, there is something still deeper in Mr. Roosevelt's character, which he has deliberately adopted and made his own and which marks him as an inferior man. It is to this that Mr. Bryan refers:

President Roosevelt in his recent extemporaneous speech at West Point gave expression to a sentiment which suggests an inherent

barbarism that will have to be taken into account in weighing his purposes and predicting his future course. His address on strenuous life delivered some three years ago showed that he gave to virtue the ancient rather than the modern definition, and placed physical courage above mental greatness and moral worth. But when in his West Point speech he laid aside all restraint and in a fit of animal enthusiasm said:

A good soldier must not only be willing to fight; he must be anxious to fight. I do not want to have anything to do with him if he is not—

he turned a light upon his inner self and revealed a moral deformity which must shock such of his friends as are not wholly carried away with the blood-and-brutal gospel of imperialism. If a good soldier must be anxious to fight, then it naturally follows that an administration which desires to develop good soldiers should surround cadets with influences calculated to infuse into them a fighting spirit, an eagerness for blood letting. If the President really means what he says we may expect that his second term, if he has one, will be made forever illustrious by the inauguration of a new regime at the military academy and in the army. The ten commandments and the Sermon on the Mount will be discarded and the yellow-back novel substituted for them; for "thou shall not kill," and "blessed are the peacemakers" could have no proper place in a school designed to train men to be anxious to fight.

In that paragraph is distinctly though unconsciously displayed the essential difference between these two men. It indicates the opposite paths they try to tread, the opposite impulses to which they respond, the opposite ideals toward which their faces are turned, the hostile forces in the irrepressible conflict which for the time they respectively personify.

Such an interpretation of this paragraph Mr. Bryan would doubtless disclaim. Notwithstanding the funny papers and his malevolent enemies, he is far from being an immodest man. To think of him as one while there is a Roosevelt at large is a wanton waste of imaginative energy. What Mr. Bryan means by his paragraph is not to provoke a contrast but to condemn a brutal instinct. Yet the contrast is there.

On the one hand, you behold unconsciously revealed a man to whom brute force is the lowest of all the human energies; while, on the other,

you see most justly censured one to whom it is the noblest.

This difference might be traced by the speculative back to the boyhood of the men, and if it were much might be found in the way of excuse for him of the brutal instincts.

Physically, he was a puny boy. This defect was the one great burden upon his mind, and to remove the defect became his laudable but too absorbing ambition. He removed it, but in doing so acquired the brutal tastes of the prize-fighter, the adventurous spirit of the buccaneer, the bellicose passions of a Napoleon, and the ideals of a catapult.

Bryan, on the other hand, was blessed with such physical perfection that he had no call to surrender his mental and moral faculties to its improvement. He was able to begin where Roosevelt left off—with a strong body, needing no adventurous sports to build it up. This left him free to develop those higher qualities which so sharply distinguish him from the man whose low ideals he has criticised. No one, not even imperialistic clergymen, can compare Bryan's criticism of President Roosevelt's West Point speech with the speech itself, without being forced to admit the superiority of Bryan's moral ideals thus contrasted. But that admitted, all is admitted so far as moral ideals are concerned. Roosevelt's West Point speech and Bryan's criticism are respectively typical of the men.

Nor is Mr. Roosevelt's character helped out by the ex post facto explanations of what his bellicose language might have meant but didn't. Some apologists think it might have meant that a good soldier should be anxious to fight when the time comes. Even that isn't true. Such soldiers are least to be depended upon. Napoleon had the true conception of a brave soldier in battle when he described him as a man who realized and feared his danger, but nevertheless faced it unflinchingly. But Mr. Roosevelt's language is not open to the interpretation of his apologists. Not only in its terms, but in the light of his whole career, it could have meant nothing but that a soldier should love a fight.

NEWS

The Democratic convention of Ohio closed its session at Sandusky on the 3d, after completely and by an overwhelming majority committing the party in that state to the policies of Mayor Johnson of Cleveland.

This extraordinary victory was won, not at the convention by the manipulation of delegates, but at the primaries by an appeal to the rank and file of the party. Three elections had made the Johnson policies secure in his own county of Cuyahoga. Mr. Johnson's election 18 months ago as mayor of the Republican city of Cleveland; the election a year ago, under his leadership, of the entire legislative delegation from the Republican county of Cuyahoga, the first time in twenty years that this county had elected a single Democratic legislator; and the election last Spring, also under his leadership, of the director of public schools,—all this, coupled with his record of fidelity as mayor to his declared principles of "home rule and just taxation" and to the merit system in the public service, made the task of defeating Mr. Johnson at the party primaries in his own county a hopeless one. Yet it was attempted. Opposition tickets were filed for use at the primaries, but most of these were discredited by the discovery that they had been filed and the filing fee paid by a Republican holding the place of confidential clerk in the Cleveland post office. Not one opposing delegate was elected; and in the mayor's own ward, where it had been confidently predicted that he himself would be defeated, he was elected by 349 to 14. Though his leadership in the party had been fully assured so far as his home county was concerned, Mayor Johnson was not supposed to be in favor in the Cincinnati county—Hamilton. This county had long been under the control of John R. McLean, proprietor of the Cincinnati Enquirer, whose chief lieutenant is Lewis G. Bernard. Mayor Johnson had refused from the beginning to make terms with the McLean faction, taking the ground that it acts regularly in collusion with Mr. Cox, the Republican "boss" in Cincinnati, and cannot be trusted by the Democratic party of the state. At his suggestion, therefore, the Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of the Vine street Congregational church, of Cincinnati, organized an opposition. Here-

tofore, the Democratic committee of Hamilton county had been self-perpetuating, each committee naming its successor. Delegates to state conventions, also, were named by the county committee and not at primaries. But under Johnson's influence, the state committee this year decided that no delegates to the state convention should be admitted who were not chosen either at primaries or at delegate conventions elected at primaries. Since this requirement brought Bigelow's contest in Hamilton county directly before the people, the McLean faction was defeated. Meanwhile, at nearly all the contested primaries in other parts of the state Johnson's followers were successful.

The delegates so elected to the state convention met at Sandusky on the 2d. Under the rules of the party in Ohio, they immediately came together in groups, one from each congressional district, prior to the meeting of the convention in a body, and selected members of the various committees, which forthwith organized to prepare the work for the convention. The committee on resolutions adopted Johnson's suggestions as to platform by a vote of 16 to 5, and the state central committee named Johnson men exclusively on the executive committee. In the state committee itself, 14 out of the 21 members are supporters of Johnson.

When the convention assembled in a body on the 3d, Mr. Johnson was elected temporary chairman by acclamation. His speech upon taking the chair is printed in full in the Miscellany department of this issue, under the title of "The Ohio Key-note." The temporary officers were made permanent, and the following state ticket was nominated:

Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of Cincinnati, for secretary of state, without opposition.

Judge Michael Donnelly, of Napoleon, for supreme court judge.

Philip H. Bruck, of Columbus, for food and dairy commissioner.

Joseph J. Pater, of Hamilton, for member of the board of public works.

The platform adopted by this Ohio convention is of national interest and importance, and we give it in full:

In state convention assembled, we, the Democrats of Ohio, hereby acknowledge and declare our continued allegiance to the Democratic party of the nation, and on national issues reaffirm and endorse the principles laid