

interview in the Milwaukee Sentinel of the 26th he says:

With a division of the colored vote in the north, a large portion of it going to the democratic party, there would be an instant change in the political conditions of the south, as it would make the democratic party equally responsible for the political association of the colored race in both the north and the south; and the whites of the south, a large majority of whom are firm believers in the doctrines of protection and expansion, would then feel free to act with the republican party and work for its success.

Mr. Payne grasps the situation. His party has made a complete 'bout face since the days of Lincoln. It stands to-day where the bourbon democracy stood in the sixties; and the bourbon democrats of the south are ready to jump into its band wagon as soon as they realize that the negro is no longer under its protection. But Mr. Payne may find himself mistaken about the political effect of this revolution in the south. Not all white southerners are bourbons. When the issue of bourbonism is clearly drawn there, we may find that they lack the majority which Mr. Payne expects.

Many of our readers will recall the fine German translation of Markham's "Man with the Hoe," which we published in No. 93 under the title of "Der Mann mit der Hacke." Its author was Dr. Ernst Schmidt, to whom a sympathetic tribute was paid in the same number by George A. Schilling. Dr. Schmidt was at that time supposed to be at the point of death. He survived, however, until last week, dying on the 26th. For 40 years he had been a well-known physician of Chicago. Born in Bavaria in 1830, Dr. Schmidt participated as a youth in the republican movement of Germany, in which Sigel and Schurz figured so conspicuously; and in 1856 he came to this country. As an American citizen he made common cause with Schurz and Heinzen and Hecker and Hasereck and Louis Prang in their support of the movement for the abolition of slavery. The same human sympathy that made him a German revolution-

ist in the forties, and an American abolitionist in the fifties and sixties, drew him to socialism in his later years. He was the socialist candidate for mayor of Chicago in 1879, polling 12,000 votes out of 50,000; and he braved local prejudice in 1886-87 by acting as chairman of the "anarchist" defense committee when August Spies and his associates were on trial for murder in connection with the Haymarket affair. Dr. Schmidt was a man of magnificent physique, of fine mind, of excellent education, of sturdy convictions, and of splendid courage. He was universally respected in Chicago both as a physician and as a man. His was one of those lives that go to prove that courageous fidelity to conviction in unpopular causes is not always a bar to public respect.

To get a clear idea of what world power imperialism means, one must listen to its advocates abroad, where there is no fear of offending democratic sensibilities. An opportunity for Americans to do this is afforded by the Literary Digest of the 11th, which summarizes from the Chronik, of Leipsic, a discussion of the subject in the Evangelical Social congress at Carlsruh. This conference, the Digest explains, is a representative body of 300 of the most progressive religious thinkers in Germany. Several phases of the discussion are presented in the Digest's summary. To begin with, it assumes that in "the development of new world powers, Germany, too, is called upon to take its part in the spread of its commercial, moral and spiritual powers." Then it urges that "Germany must become a world power, not only in the interests of its economic independence, but especially because it has the duty of contributing toward the civilizing and developing of peoples that have hitherto not done their duty toward mankind." For, "in general, to base a colonial policy only on the benefit that the mother country may derive is unjustifiable." Then follows a vindication of "the duty and the right

of a Christian nation to become a world power," because of the "abundance of national strength and vitality which enable it to make others the recipients of its nobler qualities," and because it is "the general duty of mankind to master the earth and to make it serviceable to the purposes for which it was created."

All that is familiar to the American reader. Precisely such appeals are put forward here to induce the United States to go into the "world power" business of which Mr. McKinley has given us a foretaste. Almost to the letter the German reasons are duplicated by Outlook editorials and militant sermons and strenuous harangues. But what follows in the discussion, from which we have quoted, and what must follow in inevitable order, is not so freely expressed by our own imperial philanthropists as by their German brethren. Referring to their declaration that it is the duty of superior peoples to master the earth and make it serviceable, these German apologists for Christian land grabbing go on to declare that—

this neither the negro tribes nor the states under Islam nor the South American republics can do; this can be done only by European powers, as is seen by the example of Japan, Tunis, etc. That this cannot be done without the application of force lies in the very nature of the case; but conquest of such inferior people is only to be the preliminary step toward their salvation, education, and civilization in accordance with Christian principles.

There you have a glimpse into the imperialism which these professional Christians of Germany describe as a "call," and toward which the same imperial spirit is driving our own aforetime republican nation. Even the South American republics are not to be spared. They, too, are to be Christianized under martial law. And toward all mankind, except the European powers (including the United States in grace of its power), there is to be "an application of force" with a view to conquest. But one suggestion remains to complete this picture of the bloody reign of the

Prince of Peace. The power necessary to conquer "inferior" peoples in South America and Asia, will be available to subdue "inferior" citizens and subjects at home, and for that purpose it will assuredly be used. If you would forecast the further history of this Christian crusade, read the story of Rome.

In criticism of our approving comment, on page 260, upon a New York court's decision in a labor case, we are in receipt of the following protest from William J. Strong, the eminent Chicago lawyer, who has for the past five or six years been waging a relentless legal fight against the "black listing" of workmen:

I desire to challenge the pernicious doctrine laid down by the court in the case of the National Steamfitters vs. Enterprise Steamfitters and approved by you in an editorial on page 260 of *The Public* of August 4, 1900, wherein you assert that "That which all men have a right to do individually, all, or any number less than all, have a right to do together." This doctrine is pernicious because it fails to take note of the fact that there are many acts which can be done individually and not work an injury to others, but which when done in combination with others become oppressive. In other words, there is a power for oppression residing in numbers, when acting in concert, that does not exist in individuals when acting alone. No two men are likely to act in the same manner when acting as individuals; hence the evils which may arise from concert of action are not likely to happen. For instance, I have a right acting as an individual to deny a man employment, from whim or caprice, because, for instance, I do not like the color of his hair; but I have no right to combine with others for the malicious purpose of preventing that man from getting work at his trade. The reason is that as an individual I could not work him an injury. I might deny him work, and he might get work elsewhere; but if every employer in his trade combined to keep him out of work, then an injury could be inflicted. The public is interested in having men work at their trades, and when men cannot find work at their trades they become either paupers or criminals, and a charge on the community, and the public is injured as well as the individual; and as it is one of the highest duties of the state to protect the weakest of its members from oppression, those combinations which are oppressive to the individual are treat-

ed as misdemeanors and are punishable as such, as well as giving a right of action for civil damages to the individual who has been deprived of a legal right. The boycott, for instance, has always been held to be unlawful. On the same principle the blacklist also is illegal.

Neither do these injuries, in my judgment, arise from monopoly, as you seem to think. Take the packers who have blacklisted girls who struck because Libby, McNeil & Libby cut their wages — girls who were able to earn \$16 a week as expert labelers, and who solely by reason of the combination between the packers, are unable to find work at their trade, and are compelled to go to the department stores and work for four and five dollars a week. It cannot be because these packers have any "legal monopoly" that they are able to perpetrate this wrong. Neither is it because their packing establishments are located on the railroad terminals (which are monopolies), that they are enabled to do it. They could combine and do the same thing if all their business were done by wagons on the public highways.

It cannot be that the monopoly in land is the cause, for under the single tax they could rent the ground, unless it be that the single tax would prevent men from engaging in the packing business.

Even if we had an ideal state where there were no monopolies, and the demand for labor exceeded the supply, they could still do it if the employers in any trade took it into their heads to impoverish a man by keeping him from working at his trade. They might have work for him, and still for the malicious purpose of injuring him they might combine and keep him from getting work. The question of whether they would be likely to do it if monopolies were established is not the question. But could they do it? And if so, what is it that enables them to work the injury? Is it the power of combination, or the fact of monopoly. These illustrations are made to show that there are many evils which may be accomplished by the power of combination and by concert of action, that could not be done by individuals acting as individuals. Hence it is not true as a matter of morals or law, that what a man may do alone he always has the right to do in combination with others, as there are many things which are made wrong solely by reason of the power of oppression which resides in the concert of action of numbers.

I will not refer to the many adjudicated cases which sustain my contention, as you may say that the judges who rendered these decisions were "striving to serve one class by interfering with the rights of another."

The decision you refer to is not, in my judgment, good law, nor is it founded on justice or the rights of man. And

if taken to the higher courts it will be reversed.

The blacklist is an issue in the coming campaign, and I cannot believe that *The Public* will justify the iniquitous practice of the railroads and other corporations who are attempting to terrorize their employes and make them slaves by means of the blacklist, by using the argument they use, viz.: that whatever a man has a right to do individually, he has in all instances a right to combine with others in doing. If a combination has the justification of competition it may be lawful; but combinations which have only the purpose of injuring others, cannot be held to be just or legal.

We assure Mr. Strong that *The Public* does not justify the railroad "blacklisting," which he, as a lawyer and citizen, is fighting so valiantly. But we dissent from his view that "blacklisting" can be accomplished by mere combination. No combination of competitive establishments can make it effective. What makes it effective with railroads is the fact that railroads are not in any true sense competitive. Railroad combinations are combinations of monopolists. Nor is it an answer to speculate upon what might happen even in competitive conditions if all competitors in a given branch of trade combined in a "blacklist." That is an impossible hypothesis. In conditions truly competitive all employers could not combine in a blacklist. They could no more do that than an engineer could build a dam that would prevent the waters of the Hudson from finding their way to the sea. Competition is a force which nothing but legalized monopoly can resist. And when instances are cited, like that of the packers, to show that competitors actually do combine, they prove nothing; they are not instances of competitive conditions. In the first place the packers are lessees of monopolized terminal privileges, whereby they strangle competition; and in the next place, the monopolization of land in general has so far lessened opportunity for self-employment as to have completely killed off that most natural of all competition, which consists in employers bidding against each other for help. It is