

provided for dismissal. It is true, not alone in Chicago, but in every other city. Policemen who would not testify falsely in private affairs do so glibly in police affairs. They are like the newspaper man who writes what he is ordered to. They obey orders and when there are no orders they obey the orders they know would come if the superior dared issue them. This is the life the policeman is trained to live.

* * *

The Thirst for Blood.

Gen. Frederick Dent Grant appears to have a craving for human blood, if he is to be taken at his own estimate. Likewise he is not good at keeping a secret. When the teamsters' strike (vol. ix, page 1138) was on in Chicago in 1905, it was a more or less open secret that the business-man conspirators who imported thugs and armed them to turn a peaceable strike into a riot, had arranged to secure a call of State troops by a trick, and that this was to be the first move in a scheme for turning the city over to Federal troops. From what Grant said a few nights ago at a club banquet in Chicago, the arrangements had really been made. He was stationed in Chicago, he said—

when the teamsters threatened to precipitate a wide-spread riot, and I was given authority to suppress any general disorder. My plans were ready for execution in the event of any riotous demonstrations which would involve the destruction of life and property. The troops were ready for duty, but fortunately the crisis was passed without any serious trouble. If there had been a riot, there never would have been another one in Chicago.

It is not so easy to believe that Gen. Grant did in fact regard the peaceable climax as fortunate, when his next words are considered: "If there had been a riot, there never would have been another one in Chicago." There is a suggestion of bloodthirstiness about that remark which smacks of disappointment at missing the opportunity which the business-man's combine tried to furnish him, of earning for himself the title of "Butcher" Grant. Incidentally, however, who gave Gen. Grant authority to suppress local disorder in Chicago? Was it another instance of "What's the Constitution among friends?"

* * *

Improvement in Journalism.

It has remained for the Christian Scientists to furnish an example of what daily journalism should be. In the Christian Science Monitor, the

publication of which has but recently begun in Boston, there is much more than a bare suggestion of high journalistic standards. It publishes in a serious manner the serious news of the day with an evident sense of responsibility for informing instead of merely entertaining its readers. Whether this is the kind of newspaper work which the people are willing to support is yet to be seen. Such daily papers as the Springfield Republican, the Johnstown Democrat, the New York Evening Post, the Sacramento Bee, the Milwaukee Daily News, the Dubuque Telegraph, the Oregon Journal, and some others, do thrive fairly well as honest purveyors of the news; but all surface indications are to the effect that the great mass of newspaper readers care less for straightforward news reports than they do for sensational trimmings.

* * *

The Secret of Poverty.

Dr. Woods Hutchinson of New York unlocked the secret of general poverty in an address at the American Museum of Natural History in New York early this month when he said: "What is killing the people of this city may be stated as overwork, underfeeding, and overcrowding; and two of these may be included under the one word 'underpaid.' The message of the church and of medicine today to the community is not 'Give to the poor,' but 'Don't take so much away from them.'"

* * *

ARE WE ALL GAMBLERS?

When one of the big "financiers" declared that "Life is a gamble—business is a gamble," I instinctively repelled the assumption as the crafty attempt of a guilty man to justify his own methods by characterizing them as identical in kind with the necessary processes of business in general. But I dismissed the matter from my mind, as too thin for acceptance by guiltless minds. I was mistaken, however; the idea has been accepted in many quarters, sometimes by writers of great influence, who, I think, should have reflected more profoundly before expressing themselves on the subject.

The absurdity of the assumption should appear to anyone who reflects that business consists of production and exchange, while gambling consists of hazarding something in possession, on the chance of winning something in another's possession, without imparting anything in lieu thereof.

Normal business is to produce economically and to exchange equitably—whereby all parties are benefited.

In gambling there is no pretense of produc-

tion, but only the capture of a pool by superior dexterity at the game.

In business, all participants are presumably benefited in proportion to their several equities. That is, each receives, theoretically, the equivalent of what he has produced and added to the sum total to be distributed.

In gambling, the element of production is absent, while one merely expropriates from another by outwitting him.

The one process is wholly beneficent; the other totally baneful. The two processes are morally antithetical.

The fact that the element of chance enters into both does not make them identical, any more than that the element of carbon in iron makes it identical with charcoal. Chance is a minor element in normal business, and its entire extinction is the desideratum; while in pure gambling it is the chief element.

The fact that gamblers are also largely engaged in business, and that they have studiously degraded a large portion of the world's business to the low plane of chance—have made of it the play of the gamester—is not denied. On the contrary, it is a generally recognized fact that society is agonizing under the demoralizing influences of the gambler in business—the gambler, who craftily injects his vicious methods into the realm of business, and then, like the fakir that he is, blatantly proclaims the resultant as the inevitable condition of co-operative society!

Free the business world from the deliberate, cold-blooded machinations of the gambling spirit, and millions of suffering men, women and children will be lifted from the depths of poverty and despair to the uplands of ever-increasing affluence and intensifying joy in existence.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

* * *

WHAT OF THE UNDER DOG?

Always there has been the under dog. Always there has been the hewer of wood and carrier of water. These things have been a part of the intellectual development of mankind. In this, the old world is fixed by hundreds of years of toil and struggle, of pitting brain against brawn; to the end that after these many hundred years of unremitting labor, an aristocracy of title and wealth and culture has been so fixed upon the peoples of the old world that nothing short of a social revolution of many years' duration could unsettle the minds and conditions of the people, if such a thing could be started.

In justice, it has never been morally right for

one man to ride his brother, without that brother's consent; but the doctrine that might makes right, has so long held the minds of men, that it is considered right to take advantage of your fellow man, within certain bounds. What the restrictions are, is a matter of debate between thinking men, both honest and dishonest, and has been for thousands of years.

+

In the older nations, where the under dog is placed within bounds from which there is practically no escape, there are the rights of the classes over the masses; rights to compel obedience and service, because of superior mentality that can summon the requisite force if need be. These rights of custom and training are recognized by all, save on the part of little groups of the discontented under dogs, when unusual oppression seems unbearable.

It is a fact, that the highest development of man, mentally, has been built upon the shoulders of others. The highest education in book lore and experience has been gained while subsisting on the wealth that others have produced. One gains leisure to cultivate the mind and manners, on the fruits of others' toil. Each one's early education and training comes from the accumulation of others' labors. This is the history of mankind. Each one, in the endeavor to outstrip his neighbor, must take advantage of his weaker brother, if progress be made. Such has been the theory to which the world has adhered for many thousand years.

The under dog of Europe is the peasant of France and Germany; the serf of Russia; the coolie of Asia. The under dog is marked and classified; he has his station and place in the society of the old world, fixed and immutable. For such a length of time has the riding of the weaker brother been in vogue in Europe and Asia, that nothing short of phenomenal ability can raise him from a lower stratum to the next higher, and no amount of development can change his station.

Out of this imposition of the stronger on the weaker brother, an aristocracy of classes, of two and three divisions, has been marked and enclosed against intrusion; living in most part on the impetus of past performances of ancestors, here and there ebbing to such low condition that only the name and station can save from the position of the under dog, here and there a new flow of aristocratic blood that develops the strength to wrest the weakened branch from the shoals, and place it once more in the ranks to which hundreds of years of mental success entitles it.