

is to do so at St. Louis. Perhaps they will succeed. In Illinois John R. Walsh, the Chicago banker, through Hopkins for his Democratic lieutenant, literally owns the State machinery of the party. The delegation is under instructions to vote for Hearst while he is a candidate; but that was the cheap price Walsh and Hopkins paid Hearst to keep his papers quiet about the rough-riding tactics whereby they exacted all they needed from a convention in which they were in a hopeless minority. One purpose of this forcible reversal of the primaries by methods which included the unseating by the gavel of whole delegations whose seats were not contested, was to deliver Illinois to Cleveland, who is Walsh's choice. But back of that there lay a local purpose. Walsh is scheming for corporation legislation, to be secured through a Democratic-Republican ring—for Walsh is bipartisan when he chases the merry dollar. Fortunately his Republican lieutenant failed him, though not intentionally, and an anti-ring candidate for governor was nominated in the person of Deneen. Scores of thousands of Illinois Democrats, who have learned through the bold action of the ring at the Illinois convention that Hopkins's leadership means corporation control, will vote for Deneen. Their double object will be to rebuke their own convention boss, and to make sure of a veto for any corrupt corporation bill which the Walsh-Hopkins-Lorimer ring may work through the legislature.

In all this, Hearst exhibits a pitiful figure. So intent was he on getting an "instruction" for the Presidential nomination, so fearful it might slip through his fingers, and so ready to swap everything for this compliment, that he lost such an opportunity as seldom comes to any man for proving his right to leadership by leading. A large majority of that convention would have followed him against the Hopkins dictatorship as well as the Harrison machine,

and he could have had, not only "instructions," but a friendly delegation, a friendly State ticket, a friendly State organization with only a ludicrous rump convention to protest, and the prestige of having redeemed Illinois Democracy from corporate dictation. That opportunity Hearst swapped for a chromo for himself and a place on the delegation at large for one of his office boys. What would such a weakling do in a national crisis?

When Professor Sumner, of Yale, announced over twenty years ago, that incorporated capital was becoming more and more indispensable, John S. Crosby, now of New York, marveling at the optimistic complacency with which Sumner and others seemed to regard those excrescences upon the body politic known as private corporations, took occasion to write in substance that they were indeed indispensable to the rapid accumulation of the enormous fortunes then beginning to pile up. He added the prophecy that the time was not distant when every industry would be controlled by its corporate magnate as railroads, telegraphs and petroleum already were, and when the price of labor would be adjusted by dominant and pooling corporations. That prophecy has come true. The condition it foretold obtains now except in so far as the counter but unincorporated organization of wage earners has withstood the corporate assaults upon the price of skilled labor. Every industry and all the products of industry are virtually controlled by the trusts, or great corporations. The question heard on every hand now is, How shall we control these "indispensable" accessories to modern industrial progress? For few even now venture to criticise their conduct without first gingerly disavowing any and all such heresy as is involved in questioning their assumed necessity and supposedly benign mission. Instead of taking so much for granted, is it not time for some one to point out why private corporations are indispen-

sable, wherein they are beneficial to the public, and by virtue of what legitimate function government presumes to grant corporate privilege? Can natural competition ever obtain among unnatural or artificial persons?

How thoroughly plutocratic the Philippine conquest was is "given away" by that ultra-veracious newspaper correspondent, William E. Curtis, in a recent letter from Manila. Mr. Curtis explains, with graphophonic fidelity no doubt, why American capital has been so much slower in making investments in Philippine monopolies than was expected. American capitalists fear that the Filipinos will not be as docile as we Americans, under plutocratic dominion. That is rather uncomplimentary to American public spirit, to be sure, but Mr. Curtis writes:

There is not the slightest doubt that plenty of capital will be offered, and all the transportation facilities needed will be promptly undertaken in the Philippine islands whenever an assurance can be given that authority will not be turned over to the natives and investors placed at their mercy. . . . Of course no one can anticipate the action of Congress, but there is not the slightest probability that the Philippine islands will ever be declared independent or that the natives will be given sufficient control of affairs to endanger any investments that may be made here.

So the truth about the Philippines is leaking out by degrees, often through such unexpected apertures as Curtis's letters, and fools who read as they run may become aware thereof. The object of subjugating the Filipinos by the military power has been to turn the monopolies of their country over to the plutocratic wizards of Wall street. A great hullabaloo was raised over the friars' lands question. Yet the friars got those lands through the voluntary concessions of their converts to Christianity. But now railroad franchises and lands are to be turned over to the Standard Oil "crowd" and their confreres; and to perpetuate this iniquity vested rights guarantees are de-

manded, not only against independence but even against an autonomy that might endanger titles to American monopolies in the islands.

True words were those of a New Jersey vice chancellor in a speech at the State Bar association at Atlantic City on the 17th. "The world is living," he said, "in a state of international lynch law, where might makes right and where the biggest army and the biggest guns rule." International law has gone out of fashion and national hold-ups have taken its place. Chancellor Stevenson honors the thing too much when he calls it lynch law; for lynch law is a crude method of doing justice, whereas this thing is undisguised freebooting.

But this lynch-law state, as Chancellor Stevenson stigmatizes it, is not international alone. It is rapidly becoming domestic. When our plutocracy threw democratic principles to the winds in order to play at empire in the Philippines, they opened the way to playing at empire in Colorado, and the game there is going merrily on. The owners of the Colorado mines own the State (p. 163), and free speech, free press, private property and personal liberty are no longer secure without a certificate from the mine-owners' union. Even Denver papers have had warnings. Under the influence and coercion of the mine-owners' organization, Senator Patterson's papers, the Times and the News, are facing an advertisers' boycott for having opposed gubernatorial and military lynch law. Fortunately, Patterson is not disposed to yield the freedom of the press, and a fight is being waged by him in his papers which may prove to be a tocsin of revolt against government by and for monopoly corporations.

If it be true that bloodhounds, when put on the trail of the miscreant who caused the dynamite explosion in Cripple Creek, Colo., by which a dozen non-union miners

lost their lives, followed the trail to the houses of watchmen for the mine-owners, then W. J. Ghent ought to change the title of his Independent article from: "The Next Step: A Benevolent Feudalism," to: "The Present Step: A Benevolent Assimilation, a la Filipino," and alter the text accordingly.

**"WORTHY OF SOME CONSIDERATION."**

The following editorial observations of the Iron Trade Review of May 26, 1904, are peculiarly worthy of consideration at this time:

The advisability of protecting prices in all possible advances would be more easily defended were it the fact that such high prices are maintainable over long periods, so that the consumptive trade could be adjusted to the conditions. This is not the case. Every great upward or downward swing in iron and steel prices leaves many manufacturing consumers with enormous losses because they have been unable to keep their purchases and sales in parallel grooves. Finished iron and steel products are in general but the raw material of other manufacturing processes, and those who are engaged in such later manufacturing operations have some grounds for the complaints they sometimes diffidently make, that protection to the producers of rolled iron and steel and less finished products actually works out, in periods of price inflation, as an absolute and artificially produced injury to themselves. That the trades which consume such iron and steel products are worthy of some consideration can be seen by comparing the value of goods containing iron and steel in the form in which it finally wears out with the value of such iron and steel in the form in which it leaves the iron industry proper.

It may be noticed that the writer of the foregoing quotation draws the line of economic class division between those who own the sources of raw materials and those who use them in making finished goods. That he does not consider the interests of those who "wear out" the goods is manifest, for he says that: "The advisability of protecting prices in all possible advances would be more easily defended were it the fact that such high prices are maintainable over long periods, so that the consump-

tive trade could be adjusted to the conditions." No objection whatever to the monopolist of raw material—the natural source of supply—being "protected in all possible advances" of price, if by any means "such high prices" could be "maintained over long periods," so as to enable the "manufacturing consumers" to adjust their "purchases and sales to parallel grooves." But there's a screw loose somewhere with the deplorable result that many manufacturing consumers are subjected to "enormous losses," both going and coming.

Surprising, isn't it?

But let us have patience; The "historical school" of economists will possibly hazard a surmise as to the (under some imaginable circumstances) hypothetical cause of the phenomenon some time within the next few thousand years. It is never wise, you know, to "jump to conclusions."

True, a casual observer might imagine that the "iron industry proper," i. e., that branch of industry that mines, smelts and shapes raw materials for the manufacturing consumers, enjoys an enormous advantage in the monopoly of the sources of supply. A man unacquainted with Comte might speculate somewhat after this fashion:

A few men own all the available mines and all manufacturing consumers must buy of them or quit business. They might buy of Europe but for the fact that the monopolists of the American mines are protected by a tariff as follows:

Pig iron.....	\$4.00
Billets .....	6.72
Rails .....	7.84
Structural .....	11.20
Sheets, gauges 21-25.....	17.92
Sheets, gauges 26-32.....	24.64
Tin plate.....	33.60
Wire, gauges 14-16.....	33.60
Wire rope.....	50.40
Wire nails.....	11.20
Cut nails.....	13.44
Scrap iron and steel.....	4.00

Trade activity, on the upward swing of the industrial pendulum, is so great that the manufacturing consumer does, in spite of this tremendous tariff handicap, buy large quantities from abroad. But the manufacturing consumer has no monopoly. He pays a monopoly price for his raw materials,