

trains had been furnished free of charge to his predecessors, not in their personal capacity, but as Presidents of the United States. The President is aware that special trains are emphatically not furnished to Theodore Roosevelt as Theodore Roosevelt, but to the personage who happens at the present time to occupy the position of President of the United States. President Roosevelt was informed at the time of his original inquiry that the various railroads vied with one another in furnishing such special trains, not only by reason of the publicity accruing to the carrying company, but because such company had found that, because special trains carrying a President of the United States attracted potential and actual passengers to the trains' various destinations and points of call, their free purveyance constituted a sound business investment. Moreover, President Roosevelt considers that in his recent western trips he was merely completing or doubling the circuit broken perforce by his predecessor at San Francisco on account of Mrs. McKinley's illness. Apart from this, President Roosevelt also realizes that in such a trip, for instance, as that recently completed, a President could scarcely be expected to defray the cost of a special train out of his own private purse.

After that boyishly ingenuous explanation, who can blame the Boston young lady for complaining—

The President says it's a rule that he can't accept presents. But I read that he takes other things. A paper last night said he took railroad passes and champagne. Why not, then, my flag? Is it because people who gave him the other things were rich and he did not wish to honor a poor girl who only wanted to show her patriotism?

Who can blame Senator Beveridge, either, for filling his pockets with railroad passes—not for Beveridge, but for a "personage who happens at the present time to occupy" a seat in the United States Senate, where the railroads need favors? And who can possibly sympathize with Congressman Baker for rejecting passes offered him—not as Baker, but as a "personage who happens at the present time to occupy" a seat in the lower House of Congress, where also the railroads need favors?

"Shall I oppose the bill, then?" said the lobbyist.

"Well," said the magnate, "I leave it to you. Use your own judgment whether to oppose it or put something in it to make it unconstitutional."—Fuck.

"WE HAVE CHANGED ALL THAT"

In a certain document once held in much esteem among us are these sentences: "We hold these truths to be self-evident," that "all men are created equal," that "they are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights," that among these are "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," that "to secure these rights governments are instituted," "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." And those were once thy gods, oh America! Those the ideals toward the realization of which our republic was struggling, and which made us in the highest sense a world power. But, as in Moliere's play, when Sganarelle is attempting to diagnose a case, with an assumption of great learning, and someone says to him, "But I thought the heart was on the left side and the liver on the right," the quack doctor answered, "Yes, that used to be so, but we have changed all that;" so, to-day, if we speak of this old document, and our old reverence for those sentences, our political quacks tell us, "Yes, that used to be so, but we have changed all that."

These sentences, they say, "are aphorisms that run trippingly on the tongue;" they are "rot," and their author, whose name has stood high among those we held in most respect, we are told "was a timid, shifty doctrinaire—constitutionally unable to put a proper value on truthfulness." We are told that the events of the last five years have made us a great world power, and the cry is for more ships, more arms, more men in training for war. Not, as we are assured, that we expect or desire war, but that we may be prepared for any emergency. It is an appeal to the national vanity, enormously strengthened as that has been in these same five years. And so far it has been effective; the old ideals seem lost, indeed.

But such changes in a nation's ideals are not brought about in five years or in ten. They are the result of many influences, and these influences can be mainly and directly traced to three events: The prostitution of the civil service, the passing of a land

grant in 1861, and the protective tariff.

It is not necessary to dwell on the political corruption which has followed the making party spoils of the offices in our civil service. It is a subject of humiliation to ourselves and a marvel to foreigners. But the evils following this special land grant are little understood. The effects are seen but the cause is seldom recognized.

Grants of the public lands were no new thing in our national history. They were given to the soldiers in the Revolutionary war, to those of the war of 1812, and of that with Mexico. Large grants were made to the new Territories and States, as well as the special grants for the support of education. There were the homestead grants, grants for wagon roads, for canals—for very many purposes.

Over the question of grants to railroads there was always much controversy, and although by 1856 "the Senate had accepted the theory that when a railroad was to be built through public lands, it was, as matter of course, entitled to a large amount of these lands, to aid in its construction," the House came more slowly into line; and though the arguments for railroad grants were plausible and carried honest conviction to many minds, both in and out of Congress, the opposition to them continued.

Partly, this was because it was recognized that large corporate interests were behind the claims for them, and charges of legislative corruption were made. There seems no doubt that this had played its part in many of these grants, as well as in the passing of the bill, in 1861, by which Congress gave to the Northern Pacific R. R. Co. a grant of 12,800 acres per mile within the States of Wisconsin, Oregon and Minnesota, and 25,000 acres per mile within the territories of Dakota, Montana, Idaho and Washington, to aid in the construction of the road.

By the completion of its main line in 1869, the company secured 43,000,000 acres, and the completion of the other two divisions

*Poore's Manual.

brought this up to 60,000,000 acres.

We talk of New York as the empire State. We compare its size with that of the British Isles. Yet it contains only 31,500,000 acres, and to a railway company was given, of the people's land, nearly double that number of acres!

The prostitution of the civil service opened the floodgates of political corruption, and this special land grant of 1861, more than any other, opened them to a wholesale robbery of the people. No grants to railroads have been made since 1880, but before that date these grants from State and Federal governments reached a total of 300,000,000 acres, and of this, 124,120,977 acres were a direct gift from the government, of the land which it held in trust for the whole people.

To-day, by the absorption of other roads, the great railway systems, and these are controlled by a few men, own a territory almost ten times the size of New York.

Nor does the robbery of the people stop here. The corporate industries, which played so large a part in bringing about these grants, stand behind the railroads still. "Mr. Morgan and his associates control 55,555 miles of road," and they also control corporations which Moody's Manual cleverly characterizes as "Morganized," and which need coal and iron; and by possession of these railroad lands, and by purchase, they already own many of the richest mines, and are fast gaining possession of others. That is, the coal and iron, which we cannot doubt the Almighty placed in the land for the benefit of the whole people, are exploited for the benefit of these corporations.

And by their control of the railroads, the steamship lines, the mines, the great steel plants, they control our industries, our commerce—it is hardly too much to say our civilization, for it is to-day based on steel.

That they control the government, which went into partnership with them through the protective tariff, "the mother of trusts," as Mr. Havemeyer frankly acknowledges it to be, every election, every session of Congress gives fresh proof, to our national

disgrace. Through the special advantages secured by the tariff they can defy all competition, and still further rob the people.

But it cannot be too often emphasized, too often insisted upon that primarily all the enormous wealth, all the power of the great corporations, whether railroads, the Steel Trust, the Sugar Trust, the lumber companies, the Standard Oil—any you will—rest on the possession of the land. Mr. Schwab's schedules of the properties of the Steel Trust give convincing proof of this. Here are the figures:

Iron and Bessemer ore properties	\$700,000,000
Mills, fixtures, machinery, equipments, tools and real estate...	300,000,000
Coal and coke fields, 37,569 acres.	100,000,000
Transportation properties, railroads, terminals, docks, ships, equipments	80,000,000
Blast furnaces (76 plants).....	48,000,000
Natural gas fields (number of acres not given).....	20,000,000
Limestone properties.....	4,000,000
Cash in Bank.....	65,000,000
Material and products on hand..	82,291,000
Total	\$1,400,291,000

Now, let us see what proportion of this vast sum they owe to their possession of the land:

Iron and Bessemer ore properties.....	\$700,000,000
Coal and coke fields.....	100,000,000
Natural gas fields.....	20,000,000
Limestone properties.....	4,000,000
Total	\$824,000,000

This does not include the unimproved values of real estate, which have been estimated at \$100,000,000. Yet, as it stands, it is more than half the value, almost two-thirds the value, of what Mr. Schwab specifies as the properties of the Steel Trust. That is, almost two-thirds in value is in the land, and the riches God has placed therein for the benefit of the whole people.

Nor is this robbery of the people's bank the whole wrong, nor do the special advantages of the Steel Trust stop here; "for while* farmers and householders pay on the average \$20 in taxes on every \$1,000 worth of property, the United States Steel Corporation pays less than \$1 in taxes on every \$1,000 worth of property."

"We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." So says the Declaration of Independ-

*Hon. T. L. Johnson, mayor of Cleveland.

ence. But the words seem to have faded from men's minds as they are fading from the precious paper whereon they were first written.

Fifty years ago and less they were still held to be "eternal verities," and it was recognized that the right to life, liberty and happiness rested on a right to the land—that a right to this meant individual independence, and every man of industry and thrift had the opportunity to acquire what he might reasonably need.

But we have changed all that!

In Europe little is left of the old feudal over-lordship, but here in America we have established an over-lordship of money, and the nation finds its ideals in enormous fortunes, in vast undertakings, in military power, and so far have we gone toward the centralization of power and the strengthening of the military spirit our fathers dreaded for the nation, that there is open advocacy of a "strong man" in the presidency, who shall hold his position for 20 years. We have the founding of a war college, resentment of criticism of the army, and the strengthening of class feeling, in the setting apart of a large body of men who, as the repeated experience of other countries shows, look down upon the citizens who support them.

Already our President exercises more despotic power than any ruler of Europe, and as a careful student of men and the times* tells us, "is impatient with whatever restraints the law imposes upon the Executive power."

Those behind this centralization know well that their power rests on the monopoly of the land—the people's land. Syndicates buy up vast areas at the West, and we have established among us a system of absentee landlordism with all its inevitable evils. The number of tenant farms, as is shown by the census, is steadily increasing, and more and more "the land is becoming not owned by the men who use it, and not used by the men who own it."**

Nearly 30,000 of our farmers

*Letter from Henry Loomis Nelson in the Boston Herald.

**See Prof. Elder's pamphlet, "The School Land of Oklahoma."

left the West last year for Canada, where a farm can be bought for little more than must be paid here in yearly rent. The price of land is steadily increasing, while the amount of public lands, suitable for settlers and which once seemed so inexhaustible, has decreased at a rate few realize. American land companies, however, fully understand it and are endeavoring to secure large tracts, not only in the Dakotas, but in Canada, evidently believing that emigration from the United States will continue. Even of the lands given by Congress to the Territories and States for the support of schools, much has passed and is passing into the possession of "rings." *

With all the enormous wealth in the country, with fortunes greater than any in the world, with all our boasted excess of exports over imports, with all our prosperity, living expenses have greatly increased, a fact plainly recognized in the proposal to increase the salary of the President, a fact recognized by railroad corporations in raising the pay of their employes. But, as the superintendent of the Chicago Bureau of Charity expresses it, "Prosperity raises prices, but does not raise the wages of wash-women, scrub-women and day laborers." What of them, and of the thousands of men and women with small salaries or incomes, which are not increased, yet who must meet the increased expenses of living?

The handwriting is on the wall! It is for us to read it aright.

It has been said that a people never move until only one course of action is open to them. If this is true, as history seems to prove, we have not yet arrived at that point, for three ways lie before us.

There are those among thoughtful men who, watching the signs of the times, predict revolution. This is a possibility not to be ignored.

"For though to-day the world has fixed its seat

On pillars of society and hills
Of custom, founded on the forceful
wills

Of master men, in many a toil bent
form

* See same pamphlet.

And low-browed visage on the crowded street,
Quiet but for a moment sleeps the storm."

Another, broad, easy, the downward way, is to drift, as we are doing; to "stand pat," as Senator Hanna advises; to let the net wind itself more and more closely about us—and, sooner or later, the republic is dead! Its forms may remain, but the life—the spirit of them—will be gone; and we shall have either the "strong man," indeed, or an oligarchy of the worst kind—that of money.

The third, the upward way, is steep and straight, and strewn with boulders of the largest size; for it means waking from what President Lincoln, of the Boston Board of Trade, lately called "our appalling apathy" as to our duties as citizens. It means putting aside our national vice of toleration. It means freeing ourselves from the rule of convention and bosses, taking our civil service once for all out of politics and insisting that our representatives in city, State and nation shall be men of character and ability. It means being great enough to acknowledge our national sin, and making what amends we can to the Filipinos. It means taking the railroads under government control. It means the restoration of the land to the people.

We can fight. The world needs no further proof that there are no braver men than ours in battle. But that which is before us now needs a different and a higher kind of courage, for it means the conquest of ourselves. Whether we possess the faith, the steadfast purpose and courage, the true patriotism needed for such a struggle, we have yet to prove.

If we have this noble courage and stand fast for the liberty wherewith our fathers made us free, the republic will once more rest on the broad and eternal foundations of eternal principles which they laid for it. We shall once more take up the work God gave this nation to do; and in the days to come, our people, looking back to the problems that now perplex, the dangers that now menace, can say, "Yes, these things used to be so, but we have changed all that."

LOUISE W. RICE.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Sept. 17.

The reports from Beirut, Syria, (p. 361), agree that the Turkish government has restored order there, and these reports are confirmed by Rear Admiral Cotton, who reported on the 12th to the American navy department that— he had exchanged very satisfactory visits with the governor general. The governor general has personal charge of the vice consul case. The late chief of police has been deposed. Twenty-eight persons, including the principals in the disturbances of last Sunday, have been arrested. Beirut quiet. Administration of new governor general inspires confidence. The former governor general left on the 12th inst. for Constantinople.

Admiral Cotton's mention of the new governor general is an allusion to the fact that on the 10th the Turkish government formally appointed Nazim Pasha as vali (governor) of Beirut, in the place of Reshid Pasha, who was removed for incompetency. Nazim Pasha was vali of Damascus at the time of his appointment to Beirut.

In Macedonia the terrible conditions are unchanged (p. 361), except that the circumstances are more than ever prophetic of war between Turkey and Bulgaria. For such an outbreak both countries are evidently preparing. Turkey is said to have 300,000 soldiers in the field, and Bulgaria has ordered out reserves. On the 14th the Bulgarian ministry, through a diplomatic note warned the European governments that unless they intervene for the protection of Bulgarian Christians in Macedonia, and restrain Turkey from advancing upon Bulgaria, Bulgaria herself will be obliged to act. The note in question refers to a previous note (p. 312), and declares that what was therein predicted has been more than verified. It charges the Turkish government with systematically annihilating the Bulgarian people, and complains that the mobilization and concentration of great forces in European Turkey under the pretext of suppressing the revolution, give Bulgaria reason to suppose that at an opportune