

be determined by their character, not by their value. The railroads also object to the bill that it would make the commission sole arbiter of matters "now safely regulated by that great corrective, competition." If railroads were regulated now by competition, this objection would be good; but they are not. Healthy competition is unknown in the railroad business, for the simple reason that the basis of that business as now conducted is monopoly, which is the antithesis of competition. The real reason why the Cullom bill is a bad one is that it establishes over railroading a power akin to that which some of our municipal regulations give to policemen over vice. As the police often wink at vice when they are bribed, and sternly repress it when they are not, so would the Interstate Commerce Commission come, under the operation of the Cullom law, to govern railroads according to the bribes which in some form or other were offered. The bill embodies all the evils of socialism, with none of its benefits. If the government intends to manage railroads at all, let it own the railroads it manages. Ownership and management cannot be safely separated. If the government undertakes to manage railroads while they remain private property, as the Cullom bill contemplates, it will find itself, through its Commission, in a corrupt partnership with the very worst elements of railway monopoly. The true method of dealing with this question is to eliminate the monopoly features of railroading by putting them wholly under public control, and then to leave the business to the regulation of competition.

Three years ago Joseph Edwards, of Wallasey, near Liverpool, England, issued the first number of his "Labour Annual," and the publication has been continued regularly since, the fourth number, that for 1898, being now available. It may be had of Mr. Edwards himself; of the Clarion Co., 72 Fleet street, E. C., London; or of the "Labour Press," Miller street,

Manchester; or, as the title page somewhat severely says, "of Decent Booksellers Everywhere." The price of the "Labour Annual" is one shilling net, which to the American purchaser would be 25 cents, plus postage—probably 35 cents in all. It is a useful reference book for persons interested in any kind of subject related to the labor question. Along with much other information, the number for 1898 contains the names and post office addresses of the leading labor reformers of the world, and of the leading reform papers; a chronology of those events in the world's history which indicate social and political progress; a list of public reports and reference books bearing upon labor questions; a description of English labor legislation for the preceding year; a list of recent books on social reform, and the official reports of the principal reform and labor organizations of England. Many contributions to labor literature are also embraced in this number, including the last newspaper article by Henry George—that which appeared on Labor day, 1897, entitled "The Great Battle of Labor." From this article we quote Mr. George's fable for illustrating the merits of violent labor strikes. The fable is well worth preserving as an answer to those self-satisfied men who think that workingmen are wholly blameable for disturbances and violence in connection with labor disputes. To all who understand the importance to labor of the land, of mother earth, which is indeed the mother, as labor is the father, of all genuine wealth, the fable points its own moral with startling clearness. It is as follows:

Before the Cadi of an eastern city there came from the desert two torn and bruised travelers.

"There were five of us," they said, "on our way hither with merchandise. A day's journey hence we halted and made our camp, when following us there came a crowd of ill-conditioned fellows, who demanded entrance to our camp, and who, on our refusing it, used to us violent and threatening words, and, when we answered not their threats, set upon us with force. Three of us were slain, and we two barely escaped with our lives to ask for justice."

"Justice you shall have," answered the Cadi. "If what you say be true, they who assaulted you when you had not assaulted them shall die. If what you say be not true, your own lives shall pay the penalty of falsehood."

When the assailants of the merchants arrived they were brought at once before the Cadi.

"Is the merchants' story true?" he asked.

"It is, but—"

"I will hear no more!" cried the Cadi. "You admit having reviled men who had not reproached you, and having assaulted men who had not assaulted you. In this you have deserved death."

But as they were being carried off to execution the prisoners still tried to explain.

"Hear them, Cadi," said an old man, "lest you commit injustice."

"But they have admitted the merchants' words are true."

"Yes, but their words may not be all the truth."

So the Cadi heard them, and they said that when they came up to the merchants' halting place they found that the merchants had pitched their camp around the only well in that part of the desert, and refused to let them enter and drink. They first remonstrated, then threatened, and then, rather than die of thirst, rushed upon the merchants' camp, and in the melee three of the merchants were slain.

"Is this also true?" asked the Cadi of the merchants.

The merchants were forced to admit that it was.

"Then," said the Cadi, "you told me truth that, being only part of the truth, was really a falsehood. You were the aggressors by taking for yourselves alone the only well from which these men could drink. Now the death I have decreed is for you."

#### AN ENGLISH ALLIANCE.

Our war with Spain has not only bridged the "bloody chasm" between the North and the South; it has filled it up, so that the chasm no longer exists. The American Union, for the first time, is truly reconstructed. Nor is that all. The Spanish war has wiped out the animosities engendered by the war of the revolution and that of 1812, which were perpetuated by "patriotic" school books and Anglophobic newspapers and stump orators; so that, besides a perfect union of the American states, we may reasonably look forward to a perpetual communion of the English-speaking peoples.

It is with no idea of apologizing for the war that we note these beneficent results, nor at all in the spirit of com-

mending evil for the good that may come out of it. It would give us much greater satisfaction to be able to attribute this rehabilitation of the Union, and this communion of all the English, to something else than a war, breeding animosities in other directions. But the fact remains that after a generation of bitterness, more or less suppressed, between the North and the South, and more than a century of hatred toward England, we suddenly find, as a result of our war for the liberation of Cuba, that a spirit of amity is hovering over the English-speaking countries.

This spirit of amity is to be cordially welcomed. God grant that the time may at last have come when a war between the United States and any other English nation will be forever impossible. The communal character and the lofty aspirations of Canada, of the Australasian colonies, and of England herself, are so like our own that no temporary irritation should be allowed again to estrange us from them or them from us.

We are really one people, notwithstanding the hypercritics who remind us of the various races which contribute to the American population. Nationality springs less from race origin than from identity of language, of laws, of institutions, of history, and above all of political ideals. And the language, the laws, the institutions, the history and the political ideals of Americans—whatever their race origin—are English. Even what historically is distinctly American has come to be English in essence. Our revolutionary war, for example, in which we fought England, produced a revolution in government the benefits of which we have shared with the people of England, of Canada, and of Australasia. Their liberty is due to the contest we waged. So true is this that Englishmen often rank the revolt of the American colonies with the rebellion of Cromwell and the revolution of William and Mary, as a stage in the progress of English freedom. Race cuts a small figure in nationality in comparison with other considerations. Gov. Altgeld was right, though thoughtless people laughed at him as if he had perpetrated an Irish bull, when he, a German by birth, referred to the founders of this government as

“our forefathers.” In the political sense they were his forefathers as truly as if he had boasted a long line of American ancestry. And by the same token, the fathers of English freedom also were his forefathers. English history, English institutions, and that love of liberty which is distinctively the English ideal, make one people of all English-speaking peoples, however conglomerate their race origin.

It does not follow, however, that we should welcome a formal alliance with England. Entangling alliances with no nation is a rule that still holds good. If a combination of nations hostile to England were made, having the destruction of England for its object, it would be short sighted in this country to stand by and see that object accomplished. Were England crushed by hostile powers, the democratic movement in the world would be set back by centuries; and our own national independence would be imperilled. As we value the advances in political freedom that have been made, regarding them as necessary prerequisites to the acquisition of economic freedom, we must be jealous to preserve them, not only within our own borders, but to the greatest possible extent within the borders of every other nation that has secured them. In an emergency, then, involving her existence, England should have the support of the United States. But to unite with England in an emergency, for the preservation of English liberty, is a very different thing from uniting with her in a general alliance, not only for the preservation of English liberty, but also for the promotion of tory aggressions. We want no such alliance.

What we do want, and what we should lose no opportunity in securing, is a treaty with England that will secure all the English-speaking peoples against the possibility in future of war among themselves. No dispute can come up between this country and England which might not be appropriately submitted to arbitration. Questions involving denials of the right to liberty are not at all likely to arise. All English countries are too much at one on that subject to give opportunity for deadly dispute. If it were otherwise, a general treaty

of arbitration should not be made. Questions between free and autocratic nations, which involve the right to liberty, cannot be submitted to arbitration. Regarding these questions there is but one appeal, and that is to arms. But other questions—the only kind of question likely to arise between this country and England or any of her colonies—may be properly arbitrated; and advantage should be taken of the new era of good feeling between England and the United States to enter into a standing treaty for the determination of all disputes between those countries in that manner.

Beyond this, no treaty looking to an alliance ought to be made. We doubt if any closer alliance would be tolerated by the American people or deemed advisable by the English. In neither country is the best sentiment inclined toward an aggressive combination.

#### MILITARY SNOBBERY.

The war calls attention to a condition in the American army which should make every American with democratic blood in his veins blush with shame for the hypocrisy of his country. We refer to the status of the private soldier. This is well described by a correspondent of an eastern paper—the New York Post—who writes from Tampa. He says:

Socially the regular private soldier is nowhere at all. If he enters the big hotel where the headquarters of the army are, and which is constantly full of officers, he enters it only as a messenger for an officer, and must enter it hat in hand, and go by an inconspicuous way around to the desk and present his message, and when he has had his answer, he must go out in the same way. The private soldier or non-commissioned officer cannot eat at the same public table with officers, nor drink at the same bar. This social distinction is not founded, it should be said, on the assertion of any difference of class, but on the necessity of discipline.

It is untrue that this social difference is founded not upon caste, but upon the necessity of discipline. It is founded distinctly and knowingly upon caste. Discipline requires no social distinctions.

Between the lieutenant, for instance, and his superior officers there is social equality, in so far as there is congeniality; yet the lieutenant