

lan's decision are worth remembering. In a newspaper interview immediately after the decision he said:

The great thing is that it has been established in the person of this weak and uninfluential milk boy that there is no place under our system of government for the autocrat. This is a government of laws, not of men. No official, however high, is above the law. He has no right or lawful power to do anything except what the law permits him to do, and then only in the manner and way the law limits and prescribes to him. That is free government.

Judge Gaynor was credited with saying at the same interview that he "can name at least five police rulers who have gone out of their offices millionaires in the last fifteen or twenty years." This tends somewhat to account for the growing police despotism, of which the case before Mayor McClellan was a minor example. Despotism and graft are seldom far apart.

* *

The Race Struggle for Work.

"First-class white people, North or South, have ever been friendly towards our people, but God deliver us from the lower grades of whites—the trash." This is the opinion of a Negro, writing from Georgia to the Gazette, of Cleveland, a loyal paper of his own race. The quotation is preceded by a description of a brutal attack by a white mob upon a Negro locomotive fireman during the recent railroad strike in Georgia (p. 589), from which a white woman of what the writer calls the "first-class" had protected the Negro.

*

It is doubtless true that the brutally cruel treatment of the Negro by some whites at the South comes from what the writer we quote calls "trash." The aristocratic element are, as a rule, kind to individual Negroes, whatever their views may be of the proper status of the Negro as a class; and equally, as a rule, the poor white working class are apt to be brutally cruel. An instance in point is furnished by this Georgia strike. The white firemen struck to compel the railroad to stop giving Negro firemen better firing work on the basis of greater length of service; and its ultimate object was very likely to exclude Negroes from that kind of service altogether. The sympathy of the working whites of Georgia was with the strikers in this controversy, while that of the aristocratic whites was with the Negroes. This fact alone is strong confirmation of the contention we have frequently made (p. 529), that the race question at the South, while influenced by tradition, is at bottom a labor question. If jobs were not scarce in

Georgia, the white locomotive firemen would have no incentive to exclude Negroes from that kind of work. But when jobs are scarce, individual fights individual for what jobs there are, and class fights class; and if class lines coincide with race lines, then race fights race. It would be so at the North. It would be so anywhere. It would be the same if the class line were religious, and even if it were a sex line instead of a class line.

*

We might add that precisely as the race question at the South is a labor question, so the labor question there is a land question. If the unused and poorly used land of Georgia were held upon a tenure that made its owners keen to put it to its best use, jobs in Georgia wouldn't be scarce. And isn't it quite natural—human naturely natural—that when the owners of land have no incentive to use it to its best, they shall hold it out of its best use in large measure? And when they hold it out of its best use, don't they restrict the demand for work? And when the demand for work is restricted, aren't jobs scarce? And when jobs are scarce don't men who live by work, scramble for employment? And when there are two distinct races, divided by social lines, among the workers, isn't the scramble certain to generate a race war? And in this race war isn't it also quite human naturely natural—Anglo-Saxonly natural at any rate—that they who are in the midst of the life and death struggle for employment shall be brutal toward those of the "inferior" race, while the leisure class, personally unaffected by the bitterness of the fight whichever way it may go, are kind? We condemn nobody for this. We excuse nobody. We merely state a broad fact of human experience, and suggest a responsibility which no one of either race can safely evade.

* * *

WHY WE ARE A NATION OF GAMBLERS.*

I.

Whoever has read Andrew Carnegie's recent essays on "Problems of Today" must have been impressed with the author's naive preachments against the folly and dangers of speculation in stocks.

Mr. Carnegie emphasizes the importance of avoiding the gambling instinct if one seeks financial or material success, and gives examples of in-

*Problems of To-day: Wealth, Labor, Socialism. By Andrew Carnegie. Published by Doubleday, Page & Co., New York. 1908.