

protest indicates progress, as it most surely does, then the time is likely to come when those who grow rich by immoral methods will be denied the prestige which some now secure by ostentatious liberality.

Greed for gain has raged like a fever, but there are signs of abatement. The standard of measurement has too often been wealth—no matter how secured—but there is evidence of a return to higher ideals. Many have been "hoodwinked into believing" that what Carlyle calls "loyalty to the money-bag" is a noble loyalty, but he speaks the verdict of history when he says:

"Mammon, cries the generous heart out of all ages and countries, is the basest of known gods, even of known devils. In him what glory is there, that ye should worship him? No glory discernible; not even terror; at best detestability, ill-matched with despicability!"

And in the days to come—may they draw near!—we shall learn anew that "thought is stronger than artillery parks," and that "the beginning of all thought worthy of the name is Love."

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS

Walter Williams, writing with the force and clearness characteristic of his utterances, has the following to say in the Columbia (Mo.) Herald on the railroad question:

The conservative who hesitates at having the government take decided steps toward regulation of railways may well ponder what refusal to take such steps would bring about. There are three possible results of the present railroad situation. The railroads may own the government, the government may own the railroads or the government may regulate the railroads. It may be assumed that the first possibility, while it may be claimed by the pessimist as most likely to occur, will not be satisfactory. It may, therefore, be dismissed from consideration. Only two possible results remain: Government ownership or government control. The timid individual who shrinks from a struggle for governmental control will learn that government ownership is the only alternative. If he prefers to have the government own and operate the railways, well and good. He must not be frightened away from government control because it is too radical and not realize that it is the less radical than the only alternative remaining.

The time has gone by, if it ever was, when public service corporations, created by the state and dependent upon the general public for existence, can conduct their own business independently of the interests of the public or without regard for public law. The creation of a public service corporation is that it may serve the public. The public which created it and endowed it with certain privileges for certain ends has moral and legal right to put such safeguards and regulations upon the business of the corporation as will make it best serve the end for which it was created. It might have been true in the elder Vanderbilt's day that the public could be damned but it is not true now. In all that relates to the public interests the public service corporation, particularly the railroad which is the largest and most important, is a proper subject of public control.

Between government regulation and government ownership is a question of policy. Which is better from the standpoint of the public? The government may properly do either. If it can own and operate a postal system which carries small packages it can own and operate an express system which carries large packages. If it can own and care for dirt roads and gravel roads and turnpikes because the interest of the public is thus best subserved it can own and operate steam and electric roads for the same sound, economic reason. As to whether the interest of the public may be promoted by ownership better than by control is a matter for debate. As to whether the people, acting in their organized capacity as state or nation, can either own or control as they prefer is not a question for debate.

THE QUEERNESS OF REPUBLICAN LOGIC

During reconstruction days in the south, when northern carpet-baggers descended in hordes upon the seceding states like the locusts upon stricken Egypt, immense bond-issues were made by the hungry officials. The proceeds of these bonds, issued ostensibly for public improve-

ments, found their way into the pockets of the venal carpetbag officials, and the taxpayers never received a penny's benefit therefrom. When the south escaped as by a miracle from carpetbag rule, the bonds were repudiated, and the southerners proceeded to pay taxes into the treasury for the purpose of building up their shattered communities.

Recently the owner of a block of the repudiated bonds gave the bonds to the state of South Dakota for educational purposes. Suit was brought to collect, and the supreme court decided that the bonds, under the circumstances, must be paid. Now an association has been formed in New York City and is advertising for similar bonds, the purpose being to threaten the states issuing them that unless they step forward and make a compromise the bonds will be given to state educational institutions and payment of principle and interest in full compelled by legal mandate. Referring to this peculiar state of affairs, the Lincoln (Neb.) Journal, a republican organ, says:

If the men of the south could have foreseen the consequences, they might not have rushed headlong into rebellion as they did in 1861. But they did not see what they were doing, and brought upon themselves the war and all its horrors, the reconstruction era with all its atrocities, and now their children must carry the burden of millions of bonds issued by irresponsible state governments in the decade following the close of the war. The north carries few wounds from the war compared with the dreadful marks still shown by the south.

This is a characteristically partisan and sectional view to take of the case. Because they "rushed headlong into rebellion," as the Lincoln Journal puts it, the men of the south should make no objections to paying for the rottenness and corruption forced upon them by the selfish and dishonest carpetbaggers who robbed them without compunction and were upheld in their nefarious work instead of being promptly incarcerated like other common robbers and malefactors.

The men of the north and south who met and fought upon many a field have long since clasped hands across the bloody chasm. The memory of the war still lives, it is true, but its animosities are all but forgotten. But the crimes committed against a conquered and a ruined people by the carpetbag regime foisted upon them by designing politicians who followed in the wake of the conquering armies are not so easily erased from memory.

Doubtless in something less than forty years from now republican organs will be taunting the Filipinos and telling them that if they had not had the temerity to cherish the idea of liberty they might not be called upon to pay the enormous debts saddled upon them by carpetbag politicians and political adventurers. If it comes to pass it will not be the first time, by any means, that history has repeated itself.

A "TAINTED MONEY" PRECEDENT

Some of the ministers who defend the acceptance of the money from Rockefeller insist that the church cannot inquire into the methods employed in obtaining the money or refuse the giver the right to contribute to Christian work. While there are few precedents which can be accepted as authoritative, there is one scriptural incident upon which the anti-Rockefeller ministers can rely, for it proves conclusively that the church can inquire into the source from which the money comes, and can refuse to use tainted money for the advancement of church work. The precedent will be found in the twenty-seventh chapter of Matthew, verses three to eight. It reads as follows:

"Then Judas, which had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, saying, I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood. And they said, What is that to us? See thou to that. And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself. And the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, It is not lawful for to put them into the treasury, because it is the price of blood. And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's field to bury strangers in. Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood unto this day."

It will be seen from the above that "the chief priests and elders" not only exercised the right to close the treasury to such money, but cited a law saying, "It is not lawful for to put them

(the silver pieces received by Judas) into the treasury because it is the price of blood." They refused to accept the money for the treasury, even though Judas came repentant saying, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood."

But Mr. Rockefeller might find some consolation in the fact that, while the chief priests and elders would not accept the money for the treasury they did agree, after he had left it with them, to put it to some good use. They took counsel and used the money to buy a potter's field to bury strangers in. Now the potter's field is the place where the poor are buried—those who leave so little that the family cannot buy a lot in the cemetery. Mr. Robert Hunter in his book on "Poverty" presents statistics to show that sometimes as many as 10 per cent of those who die in the city of New York are buried in the potter's field.

This is the best precedent that has been found for dealing with the Rockefeller contribution, although in the Rockefeller case the element of repentance is lacking. But possibly the religious boards might overlook the absence of repentance and agree to use for the purchase of potter's fields whatever money Mr. Rockefeller desires to give to the church. Having aided in making a great many people poor, it might be some consolation to him to furnish them a last resting place. And if the term "potter's field" seems harsh, why not call the fields bought with his money "Rosebeds," for did not his son compare the methods of the trust with the plucking of the weaker rosebuds, that the remaining rosebuds might enjoy the strength that nature intended for all of them?

Until some one finds a more authoritative precedent let tainted money be used for the purchase of potter's fields, or rosebeds.

A TRUST'S VIEW OF TRUSTS

The Shareholder, published in New York, has an interesting comment upon the last session of congress. The editor of the Shareholder is afraid that the president "listens too much to popular clamor in his efforts to curb the trusts," although it seems to think that he is not going to be able to injure the trusts much. In fact, the editor ventures to say that "the people know less about the way to handle trusts than they did six months ago," and that the remedy for the trusts is actually farther off than it has been for sometime. He declares that "the movement to curb the trust evil, to use a homely phrase, has been flabbergasted."

The editor of the Shareholder then goes on to explain that nothing has been done because "our moneyed men are opposed to any change in existing conditions. The very moment any measure is proposed they set all the machinery at their command against it, and at once that particular measure is doomed. This thing has so frequently happened that close observers of affairs almost despair of ever accomplishing anything in the way of curbing trust evils."

The editor of the Shareholder thinks that the best policy is to favor the trusts and to ask no concession from them unless it can be shown that it is positively to their advantage to grant it. The position of our great corporations is to be made better rather than worse. This is the remedy of the Shareholder. It presents the views of those who are defending the trusts; but the work of education goes on, and the day of redemption from trust rule draws nearer.

A LAWYER'S CONSCIENCE

When the people of Philadelphia wanted a lawyer to fight the gas company they found all the leading attorneys of the city retained by the company. This raises a question: To what extent is the lawyer justified in accepting a fee from the corrupt corporations which dominate city politics? Has a lawyer's conscience anything to do with his professional conduct? or can the word "lawyer" be used like charity and cover "a multitude of sins?" A lawyer can not conscientiously help another to do what he could not conscientiously do himself. There can be no double standard of morality, one for the man in his personal relations and the other controlling him in his capacity as an attorney. If the respectable lawyers would refuse to assist in jobbery, the corporations would soon have to give up their corrupt practices, but as long as lawyers of standing accept retainers from the franchise holding corporations it will be difficult for the people to protect themselves. Whenever the lawyer's conscience becomes stronger than his desire for a fee he will find no difficulty in drawing the line accurately between the lawyer's duty and the lawyer's opportunity.