

port that he confessed his crime. That may be true or not, but this makes no difference. Confessions under such terrifying circumstances are valueless. Even if the confession were true and the black boy a criminal, that does not exonerate the white men. Nevertheless, in imitation of their Missouri exemplars, this Illinois mob followed up their murder of one Negro victim by making a murderous attack upon all the Negroes of the region, none of whom were parties to the boy's crime, if he committed a crime. It remains now to be seen whether the Republican governor of Illinois will be any more efficient in bringing white men to justice for murdering "niggers" than the Democratic governor of Missouri is likely to be.

The "nigger" of Russia is the Jew. All the vicious race animosity, prejudice and injustice which in this country brutal white men feel at liberty to indulge in their relations with Negroes as a race, the Russian barbarian cultivates towards Jews. At Kishineff, the capital of Bessarabia, the Jewish inhabitants were attacked on the 20th by a Russian mob, and 25 of these harmless people were murdered while 275 were wounded. Doubtless the Russians could give reasons as absurd and cruel for their war upon the Jew as Americans give for theirs upon the Negro, and doubtless their reasons seem to them as logical and humane. What makes the whole thing topsy-turvy is that the murderous brute in each case imagines himself superior to his unresisting victim.

Whether the Supreme Court of Illinois was right in holding invalid the entire statute establishing free employment agencies because of the unconstitutional provisions of one section, it was certainly right in holding that section itself invalid. The act in question provides for State bureaus through which persons seeking employment and employers seeking help may be accommodated

without expense. This in itself may be open to criticism as paternalistic, though it can be excused on poor-house principles; but for the section to which the court has objected and held to be fatal there is no excuse either in law or in the principles of democratic government. It declares that any employer whose employes are on strike or have been locked out, shall be allowed none of the facilities of the employment bureaus. The evident object of the section was to make the law palatable to labor unions. But it was clearly invalid. When the State sets up establishments of any kind for the benefit of the public, it has no right to make arbitrary discriminations. If workmen are discriminated against in some respects that is no reason for discriminating in their favor in others. The proper remedy for existing discriminations is to abolish them, not to make more.

We were not wrong in guessing that the Republican and brevet-Republican papers would foam at the mouth indignantly at Mr. Bryan's Kansas City speech on Grover Cleveland. The echoes are numerous, but the Boston Herald and the Providence Journal are especially rabid. Their evident anxiety to have both political parties nominate Republican candidates next year, and their anger at Bryan for being "mischievously determined to destroy" that possibility, afford gratifying evidence that Mr. Bryan's speech has hit the mark in the center.

An impressive commentary upon our "abounding prosperity" was unconsciously made last week by the Board of Arbitration and Conciliation of Massachusetts. After investigating the textile strike in Lowell, the Board reported to the Governor that only one corporation could afford to pay the ten per cent. increase in wages demanded by the strikers. To soften this conclusion the Board presented figures to show that the operatives were not so badly off after all. They had already shared in

"prosperity" to the extent of 16 per cent. rise in wages since 1897, and been mulcted for it to the extent of only 15.37 per cent. A weekly wage, therefore, of \$10 in 1897 would now be \$11.60; and if the family had then been spending nine dollars for living expenses and saving one dollar, they would now spend \$10.38 and save \$1.22. Who says that this is not a clear gain of 22 cents a week on a \$10 operative's income? And isn't that prosperity—for those "inferior" people?

At last the city of Detroit is anxious to secure municipal ownership of the street car system. She had an excellent opportunity to do this less than five years ago, when Tom L. Johnson and Gov. Pingree worked together for it. Had their plans not been balked, partly by men who are now favoring municipal ownership, all the street car systems of Detroit would long since have been municipal property and on far better terms as to purchase price than is possible now.

EQUALITY.

I.

In "The Virginian," by Owen Wister (pp. 143-144) occurs the following passage. The cowboy from Virginia and the Vermont school mistress are taking a horseback ride.

"All men are born equal," he now remarked, slowly.

"Yes," she answered, with a combative flash. "Well?"

"Maybe that don't include women?" he suggested.

"I think it does."

"Do you tell the kids so?"

"Of course I teach them what I believe."

He pondered. "I used to have to learn about the Declaration of Independence. I hated books and struck when I was a kid."

"But you don't any more?"

"No. I certainly don't. But I used to get kep' in at recess for bein' so dumb. I was most always at the tail end of the class. My brother, he'd be head sometimes."

"Little George Taylor is my prize scholar," said Molly.

"Knows his task, does he?"

"Always. And Henry Dow comes next."

"Who's last?"

"Poor Bob Carmody. I spend more time on him than on all the rest put together."

"My!" said the Virginian. "Ain't that strange!"

She looked at him, puzzled by his tone. "It is not strange when you know Bob," she said.

"It's very strange," drawled the Virginian. "Knowin' Bob don't help it any."

"I don't think I understand you," said Molly, stiffly.

"Well, it is mighty confusin'. George Taylor, he's your best scholar, and poor Bob, he's your worst, and there's a lot in the middle—and you tell me we're all born equal."

Molly could only sit giggling in this trap he had so ingeniously laid for her.

"I'll tell you what," pursued the cow puncher, with slow and growing intensity, "equality is a great big bluff. It's easy called. . . ."

"I know a man that mostly wins at cards. I know a man that mostly loses. He says it's his luck. All right. I know a man that works hard and is gettin' rich, and I know another that works hard and is gettin' poor. He says it's his luck. All right. Call it luck. I look around and see folks movin' up or movin' down, winners or losers everywhere. All luck, of course, but since folks can be born so different in their luck, where is your equality? No, seh! Call your failure luck, or call it laziness, wander around the words, prospect all yu' mind to, and yu'll come out the same old trail of inequality."

Thus, in the lighter literature, under the guise of a sparkling banter between a young man and a maiden, are we taught the deepest truths of political science.

The touch of nature is one of the truest in that excellent book, and one wonders if the sentiment is really that of the author, or if it is only his puppet who makes this assault upon the Declaration of Independence. The same argument is so often made and is so effective that it may be considered the standby of a certain political school. The specious assumptions of the premises, the garish cheapness of the reasoning, and the adroit non sequitur of the conclusions are of the kind to bring conviction to minds which are unable to distinguish between counterfeit and genuine logic. In pretty much the same way the theory of the Declaration of Independence has been exploded so often, everywhere, in morning lead-

ers, in the ponderous essays of the quarterlies, and in attractive dialogues like the above, that many people, educated and uneducated, are convinced by it. The logical faculty does not seem to be always strengthened by education as we have it.

Some men are possessed of keener penetration and sounder judgment than others, therefore all men are not created equal. Some men achieve fortune and distinction where other men, under the same conditions, remain in obscurity and poverty; therefore, in the pursuit of happiness there is no equality. Some men are more worthy of trust, more capable of shouldering responsibility, and therefore better fitted to hold office than others; therefore the Declaration of Independence was a mistake.

This argument is usually made with extreme circumspection—to avoid wounding the sensibilities of those who still fondly cling to the old notion of equality, of course, and not to save the argument itself from becoming absurd. Yet, it is capable, with a little indulgence, of running itself into the ground. It might, for instance, be thus stated: Some men are taller than others, some have blue eyes and some have brown, some have good digestion and some are hopelessly dyspeptic, therefore the revolt of the American colonies against the British government on the theory of equality in the matter of taxation and representation was uncalled for and a stupid blunder at best.

II.

What could those brave and earnest signers have meant by such nonsense? Imagine Benjamin Franklin, that embodiment of practical sagacity, subscribing to the sentiment that all men have equal capacity to earn a living! Think of John Adams, the ceremonious stickler for forms, setting his name to the statement that all men are equal in courtesy! Think of Robert Morris, Edward Rutledge, and the rest, agreeing to the whole mess of absurdities which we are told are properly deducible from the famous Declaration.

They could not have done it with sincerity, and Mr. Jerome, of New

York, becomes so impatient with them that he does not hesitate to call them "those old fakirs," while Mr. Lodge, of Massachusetts, more than hints that some of them were demagogues. Mr. Jerome passes for a Democrat, and Mr. Lodge is a Republican in good standing, so that the enlightenment and progress of our day is not confined by party lines.

The iconoclasts might be persuaded to take the more charitable view that the whole thing was a joke, since Franklin, Jefferson and some of the others are known to have possessed a sense of humor. If it was a joke, it was a most successful one, and it was perpetrated not only upon the British whom they were seeking to outwit, but also upon their fellow rebels and upon the generations of their posterity which have followed. How they must have poked each other in the ribs and chuckled their delight in the intervals between their deliberations! What a rich joke, to be sure! Everybody at the time swallowed it, and 85 years later, Abraham Lincoln, himself a joker, took it down without suspicion, quoting freely and with approval from the Declaration and from Jefferson's expositions of the doctrine of equality.

III.

There is a possible explanation of arguments like that quoted from "The Virginian," an explanation not often advanced, and suggested here with extreme hesitation and yet with some confidence. It is that people who argue thus, Mr. Jerome, for instance, never read the Declaration of Independence. The document is printed in a good many places, but I will venture to insert here again the passage which gives rise to all this discussion:

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments were instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organiz-

ing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

Could those iconoclasts have read that, really?

If the Declaration had stopped with the first two lines quoted, it would be evident enough that the words "created equal," taking into consideration the times and the conditions under which the instrument was penned, were intended merely as a denial of the divine right of kings. It is an assertion that the distinctions which make some men kings, lords and masters, and other men subjects, vassals and slaves are not natural but artificial distinctions. Men were not created that way, but were made so by institutions of men.

But, instead of stopping there, if one takes the context—not only the rest of the passage quoted, but the entire instrument—the meaning is so clear, so impossible to misunderstand, that the theory that Jerome and people like the Virginian never read it, seems the only possible explanation of their attitude.

Men have certain inalienable rights. That is to say, there are certain principles of natural justice which affect all men equally. So far as the government affects men, it should preserve this equality. What is law for one man should be law for another. No restrictions should be placed upon the pursuit of happiness for one man from which another is exempt. It cannot properly be made a crime for one man to steal and a virtue for another man to embezzle. What one man earns should not be taxed into another man's pocket. Opportunities, so far as the government and the laws affect them, should be made equal, so that the natural abilities of men may have an equal chance to achieve their best.

That is the argument. Then, as if to leave no room for doubt or quibble as to what the Declaration meant, there follows a long list of grievances showing how the particular government against which they were rebelling had operated unequally, so that another government which would preserve that equality became necessary.

Yet we have arguments like that by the Virginian in fiction and similar ones by those like him in real life, starting with the premise that the signers of the Declaration were "fakers" and "demagogues," who intended to say that all men are created equal in ability and deserts and therefore should be equal in condition, equal in honors and in creature comforts. Could they have read it, really?

IV.

Of course, since that day, the social structure has become a much more complex thing than it was then. The preservation of the equal opportunities seems much more difficult. The problem has been, to a degree transferred, it is said, from the province of politics proper to that of politico-economic questions have thrust themselves into politics and demand the consideration of the government. Nevertheless it cannot be presumed that that is a reason for waiving aside the principles of the Declaration. Such questions should first be tried by those principles. It can be easily shown, though there is not space for it here, that the true solution of the vexing questions of the hour turns upon the solution of the fundamental problem, how to secure and maintain, politically and economically, equal opportunities, how equally to "give every man a chance."

V.

Whether or not some, who use arguments like that in the quotation with which this article begins, have failed to read the Declaration of Independence, there are those with whom it would make no sort of difference to understand perfectly the scope and intent of that document, those who resent the notion of equality in any sense as a sort of personal affront. They make the argument in the utmost good faith. Complacent in their secure and comfortable positions in life they calmly assume an inferiority in the less fortunately placed, forgetting that their own superiority is one of position merely and not of personal excellence.

There is really very little reasoning in it, but when there is it assumes

about this form: Men, they discover, are not equal in ability, nor in deserts. At the same time it is seen that some men have easy access to fortune, while others are born under conditions from which nothing can lift them even to ease and comfort. It becomes easy, then, to mix the two and make the able identical with the fortunate. Starting with the premise that some by reason of ability and character, are more worthy of political power and economic advantage than others, they reason that therefore they should be invested with them. Opportunities, instead of being equal, should be granted the worthy and withheld from the unworthy. Then it is but a step to the conclusion that some are in the enjoyment of superior privileges because of their superior worthiness. They have achieved advantages by reason of their ability. The same reasoning applies to nations as well as individuals.

In those two conclusions, first, that the more worthy should have greater privileges, and, second, that those who now enjoy superior advantages have achieved them by superior merit, is enough to prove all that such people require. The first justifies government aids to prosperity in the way of subsidies, protection, monopolies and special privileges of all sorts whereby some men may reap where other men have sown. In the second is embraced the argument by which all the oppression, tyranny, conquest and exploitation of all the ages has been justified. It is the argument which protects franchise grabbers, railroad wreckers and corrupters of legislatures in the fruits of their crimes.

It is usually those interested in maintaining the status quo, who thus divide the world into the worthy and unworthy, and they never classify themselves with the unworthy. They never assign to themselves the inferior opportunities, nor to their nation the role of the have-to-be-governed-by-a-superior-people. It is always the other fellow who is the inferior, unworthy, heretic, barbarian, foreign devil, etc.

The term "demagogue" is often used without justification in applica-

tion to men who make, honest arguments and appeal to reason and justice, but it has a definite significance, meaning one who appeals to the passion and prejudice of the so-called "lower classes." But what opprobrious word fits the case of the pettefogger, sometimes in a professor's gown, who appeals to the pride and the cupidity of the rich and powerful class by telling them that they are enjoying the rewards of superior virtues? This sort of appeal is on a moral level with the virtuous solicitude of the protected baron who, securely entrenched in his law-created privileges, exhorts the common people to be self-reliant, independent, and to scorn government aids to prosperity.

VI.

It is charged, as an objection to the Declaration, that it was an echo of Rousseau, that its defenders were doctrinaires, and their expositions were imitations of the "cheap pseudo classicisms of the French revolution."

It is true that Rousseau did say some things very like those afterwards taught by the Revolutionary fathers. It is also true that the "social compact" theory, upon which Rousseau built his system, has long ago been exploded by political philosophers. Yet Rousseau perceived and expressed some truths in which the French revolutionists and the American revolutionists alike found their inspiration. None of those, however, was the first to give them voice. They all got them second hand from the greatest of all teachers of equality, the Author of the Sermon on the Mount. Before that expounder of natural equality, how flimsy and contemptible become all the conventional artifices by which men claim superiority to each other! How unsubstantial the superior "rights" and higher "obligations" and "duties", under cover of which they plunder and oppress each other!

The ideal of human relations which He set before mankind was taken up by our fathers and translated—imperfectly, it may be—into the language of politics, and thus aroused our people to power and achievement as none on earth was ever aroused before. The ideal, even as apprehended by the fathers, has never been re-

alized, nor anything near it. It has only been at a long distance approached. But the ideal has done the work, and it will be a sad day for us when we return to the old and outgrown notions of inequality and dependence which it displaced.

However, every generation has its quibblers, its pseudo thinkers, who formulate their little objections to the laws of God, their points of agreement in their vacuous principles, and call their conclusions "the trend of thought."

JOHN TURNER WHITE.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

New Orleans, April 25.—Striking as the contrast was in many respects, there was one point of likeness between the two large national conventions that have recently met in New Orleans. However much subsidiary talk there may have been in each, each was dominated by one thought. The convention of women was not more distinctly concerned with the one question of suffrage than was the convention of manufacturers with the one question of union labor. Mr. Parry set the keynote in his vigorous presidential address, and the convention could not get away from it. It was in the air.

President Parry's address had been printed and circulated among the members some time before the convention met, and this fact had the effect of concentrating the attention of delegates upon the question. It is evident that he intended that it should do so. Any reader of his address can see that he is one who faces issues and leaves compromises to others. Nor was there much spirit of compromise in the convention. It is true that the resolutions were directed against what was termed the vicious elements in unionism, but it was not hard to read between the lines that pretty near anything was vicious except an innocuous organization for mutual improvement and education. Emphasis was laid on the part of Mr. Carroll D. Wright's address in which he said that some of the methods of unionism were "damnable," and great interest was shown in the reported formation of a union of non-unionists to protect themselves from the "damnable" oppression of union labor.

If there was much opposition to the prevailing spirit of the convention, it did not make itself manifest. It is not unlikely that there was more than

appeared, and there were doubtless some who would have advised more conciliatory measures, if they had not felt that their opposition would be useless. The only notable effort was that of Mayor Jones, and this had no effect upon the convention. In fact the convention refused to listen to him. He was so constantly interrupted by motions and calls of question, that he said but little, and soon good-humoredly took his seat. As one looks back upon the episode, it seems that perhaps Mayor Jones began unfortunately. Had he started by speaking directly of the un wisdom of the proposed resolution as a declaration of war between capital and labor, and of the probable injury of such a resolution to the association itself, perhaps he might at the last have got a hearing for the noble words of peace, good-will and the golden rule with which he sought to begin. It is true that from his point of view these thoughts were pertinent, and to an interrupter who demanded that he speak to the question, he quickly retorted that the question was one of humanity, yet it was evident that the convention would not listen.

Tense as the situation was, with President Parry on his feet, Mayor Jones attempting to speak, and two or three members making motions, I could not keep from being amused at a man who sat near me on the outskirts of the seats. He was laughing to split his sides, not aloud of course, but to himself, and in the midst of his laughter he kept slapping his knee and saying: "Jones wants to tell 'em the golden rule, and they don't want to hear anything about the golden rule. They—don't—want—to—hear—the golden—rule." He could hardly get the words out for laughing. A veritable modern Democritus, he seemed to be talking to no one in particular, and was enjoying the fun all to himself.

But this laughing philosopher could not banish thoughts of awful seriousness. During an hour or two of that morning session there must have been more than one who felt, perhaps more intensely than ever before, the presence of an irrepressible conflict—a conflict having its origin in injustice and leading to evils on both sides.

Irrepressible as it seems at times, may not the conflict yet be averted? Has not civilization, through its turmoils and past conflicts, advanced far enough to make a peaceful forward movement in the evolution of social conditions? Can we not look deep enough below the surface to see that the spirit of special privilege and mo-