

country who live abroad. Its perfect analogy may be found in Irish rent payments to absentee landlords.

A revelation, not at all surprising for what was revealed but very surprising for the sources from which it came, was made on the 7th before the Interstate Commerce Commission, sitting at Chicago. It was nothing less than the fact, now revealed beyond possibility of denial, that trusts are favored by railroads in the matter of transportation rates. The same old trick that originally enabled the Standard Oil trust to ruin competitors is in vogue, despite federal legislation and a federal supervisory commission. Paul Morton, vice president of the Atchison, Topeka & San Francisco railroad, testified bluntly to a cut rate "understanding." He admitted that it was unlawful, but tried to excuse himself. C. D. Whitney, president of the Toledo, St. Louis & Western railroad, gave similar testimony. So did D. C. McCabe, freight traffic manager of the Pennsylvania lines west of Pittsburg, who naively explained that the memoranda of settlements were destroyed soon after settlements were made, because the railroads feared that the commission might investigate them. Other witnesses to the same general effect were Edward F. Cost, freight manager of the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis; A. C. Bird, freight traffic manager of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul; J. M. Johnson, second vice president of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific; and the general freight agent of the Burlington. These disclosures furnish two or three valuable morals. They show that federal regulation of railroads has not prevented secret preferential contracts. They show also that trusts are traceable in some degree to highway monopoly. They show, furthermore, that indifference to law is not a characteristic of "anarchists" alone. And they suggest that the success of our successful business men may be due in some measure at least to excellence in other things than piety and industry—that excellence in law-

breaking may also cut a figure now and then in making fortunes.

It was a great pro-Boer meeting, that at Cleveland last Sunday, at which ex-Congressman Lentz was the speaker and in which Mr. Bryan and Mayor Johnson personally participated; and it took definite and wise action. Among other things it formally called upon President Roosevelt to prevent the continuous and notorious shipment of mules from New Orleans to the seat of war in South Africa. Commenting upon that feature of the resolutions, the New York Tribune insists that these shipments conflict with no established principles of neutrality. The Tribune's error lies in its assumption that the shipments are commercial. In fact they are not commercial; they are military. That is, the mules are not shipped as commodities in regular course of trade by dealers in this country to dealers in Great Britain or South Africa or elsewhere. If they were, the Tribune would be right. And it would make no difference whether they were mules or guns. But the truth is, as we are reliably informed, that these mules are bought in New Orleans by agents of the British army, and are shipped at New Orleans by those agents of the British army, upon British transports, directly to other agents of the British army at the seat of war in South Africa, where they are used to subjugate the Boer republics. Now, one of the imperative duties of a neutral nation is to forbid the use of its territory as a base of operations by a belligerent nation. But is it not clear, in these circumstances, that we are allowing our territory to be used by the British government as a base for operations against the Boers? Mules so purchased and so shipped for such uses are as truly munitions of war as guns and cartridges would be; and guns and cartridges so bought and so shipped, with our permission, would be evidence of breach of neutrality. It is the imperative duty of Mr. Roosevelt, therefore, as the president of a neutral nation, upon finding the facts to be as

above indicated, to stop these shipments. The courts have refused to do so because the question is not judicial, but executive. This indisputably casts the burden of deciding upon the president. The responsibility is his and his alone.

The political situation in Ohio could not be better than it is now, for the advance in that state, and by force of example in other states also, of the principles of genuine democracy. In the fierce fight between the Hanna and the Foraker factions of the Republican party, Senator Hanna did not win. All he was able to do was to keep Foraker from winning. He made it a draw game by taking his nominees from a small third faction, which held the balance of power in the House caucus. This enabled him to win in the House. But he was defeated in the Senate, where he strenuously sought to name a henchman of his own as clerk for the purpose of balking Mayor Johnson's measures during the session. A draw game so fiercely played cannot be followed by sweet friendship and unquestioning confidence. It is spoils, not principles, that both Hanna and Foraker are seeking, and the struggle will go bitterly on. That makes an excellent opportunity for genuine democracy; and under such skillful and aggressive Democratic leadership as Mayor Johnson's, good things may be looked for in Ohio. Already the monopolistic railroad interests are fortifying themselves. They, at any rate, believe in Johnson's sincerity. They believe in it with all their might. They believe, too, that the solid Democratic delegation which Johnson wrested from the Republican county of Cuyahoga means to keep its pledges. Accordingly they have opened their legislative campaign with petty bribery—railroad passes over every road in the state. The Cuyahoga delegation came down pledged, among other things, to take no passes, and it is making that pledge good. Every member buys thousand-mile mileage. This object lesson, of which the state will doubtless learn before the ses-

sion is over, is "opening number two" for the Johnson legislative campaign for equitable taxation, as the Hanna-Foraker fight is "opening number one." "Opening number three" was made by the Republican governor, who in his message advocated home rule in taxation, one of the fiscal reforms to which Johnson has been long devoted. Incidentally, however, the governor proposed such an adjustment of this reform as may let some of the great landed monopolies escape taxation with only a trifling state tax. This slip is not unlikely to offer Johnson a fourth opening, better even than all the others.

Since our comments upon bureaucratic interferences with the second-class postal rights of the Challenge (p. 596), the Ladies' Home Journal, the Unique Monthly, and Discontent (p. 610), we have come into possession of evidence relating to the Appeal to Reason, to which reference is made at page 597. This paper is published at Girard, Kan., by J. A. Wayland. Its last serial number is 318, which indicates that it is 318 weeks old. Like the Challenge, it is obviously and professedly devoted to the propagation of socialist doctrines. As these words are written, it, too, is threatened by the bureau of the third assistant postmaster general with denial of second-class rights in the mails.

The manner in which the postal bureau's attention was called to the Appeal to Reason has been given in the words of the third assistant postmaster general himself, in an approving article, dated at Washington, December 20, and published in the Topeka (Kan.) Capital, as follows:

My attention was first called to this paper's violation of the postal regulations by postmasters from many points reporting to me that large numbers of the Appeal to Reason were being refused by persons to whom it was sent. I immediately sent out a circular letter to all the subscribers for the paper, asking them if they were paid-up subscribers. About two-thirds answered, and

fully one-half of these stated that they had never subscribed for the paper.

In consequence of this discovery the third assistant postmaster general appears to have notified Mr. Wayland to explain why he should not be deprived of second-class mail facilities on the ground that the paper was to a great extent circulated gratuitously. In response to that notice, Mr. Wayland forwarded a cargo of postal cards which he had received from his subscribers, upon his request through the columns of the paper, certifying that they were subscribers bona fide. Here the matter seemed to rest until the 5th of December, when the third assistant postmaster general wrote a long letter to the postmaster at Girard in which he said:

The department does not question that there are many legitimate subscribers to the publication, but there is indisputable evidence on file that copies of Appeal to Reason are being sent to persons claimed by the publisher as subscribers, but who have informed the department that they are not subscribers and do not want the paper. The illegitimate subscriptions vitiate the whole list. Unless they are eliminated by December 20 next, the certificate of entry will be canceled.

What was here meant by illegitimate subscribers was explained in the same letter. In outlining an affidavit for the publisher to submit, the department required him to state, among other things—

how many legitimate subscribers he has to the next issue; that is, persons who have paid their own money for it?

It appears, then, that the department's objection to the Appeal to Reason is that the subscriptions of some proportion of its subscribers are paid for by others. But that this is not a general rule is quite evident from a reply of the third assistant postmaster general to a request by W. A. Ross, of Columbus, Ga., for information regarding another publication. In that reply, dated November 23, the third assistant postmaster general wrote:

I have to advise you that a subscription to "Success," of New York,

N. Y., paid for by you as a Christmas gift to your friend, in the manner indicated, is held to be legitimate, and the copies of the publication may be sent to your friend at the pound rate of postage, under such subscription.

It would seem that if only those "persons who have paid their own money" for the Appeal to Reason are "legitimate subscribers" to that periodical, only such persons could, without invidious discrimination, be "legitimate subscribers" to the periodical known as Success.

But it is in fairness due to the third assistant postmaster general to note the distinctions he makes. In an explanatory letter to Senator Burton, of Kansas, dated December 7, he puts his objection upon this ground:

The mailing of a large per cent. of his editions being to names furnished and paid for by others without the volition of the addressee, is conceded by the publisher, as had already been ascertained by the department, as well as the fact that a large percentage of papers so sent are being refused by the addressees.

Taking this in connection with the letter regarding Success, it would appear that the question of the legitimacy of subscriptions paid for by others than the nominal subscribers depends, partly upon how large a percentage of such subscriptions a paper carries, and partly upon the reasonable consideration of whether such subscribers accept or reject the paper. But in a letter of subsequent date, December 14, to Mr. Wayland, the publisher of the Appeal to Reason, he makes an additional condition. It is now not merely the percentage of such subscriptions, but also the motive with which they are made, that determines the question of legitimacy. We quote:

There is no objection to a reasonable number of subscriptions by one person for another, when not for an ulterior purpose. But when such subscriptions amount to a considerable part of the claimed list of subscribers, and they are paid for by persons manifestly interested in the circulation of the publication because of the doctrines it advocates, or because of the goods it advertises, they have uniformly been held to be not "legitimate" within the spirit and purpose of