

The New Northwest.

FREE SPEECH, FREE PRESS, FREE PEOPLE.

VOLUME X.—NO. 35.

PORTLAND, OREGON, THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1881.

PER YEAR—\$3 00.

MONOPOLY

IN THE LIGHT OF PHILANTHROPY AND SOCIOLOGY.

ADDRESS BY ELVIN A. THOMP BEFORE THE WOMAN SUFFRAGE CLUB OF INDEPENDENCE.

I love to linger upon the strong but kind benevolence of a man now dead, who came to New York before the railroad was known, and while that city was scarcely more than a good-sized town. This man's whole financial capital was summed up in the traditional shilling. Employed as clerk, which in those days meant porter too, he labored morning, noon and night. By dint of honesty, economy and industry, he worked his way from employe to master; from poverty to wealth. This man was Palmer. And how can we fail to admire the shrewdness, sturdy pluck and tireless perseverance of such a character, which, amid the fierce struggles of trade, enable a man, as in this instance, to distance his competitors and wrest success from the very jaws of opposition?

This is the picture of individual enterprise upon its better side; and it is this same individual enterprise that has done more than ought else to build up our national commerce and raise our country to its present height of renown, and which, extending and strengthening itself by corporate combinations, has given us those wonderful developments we see daily in the departments of banking, insurance, telegraphy and transportation, not to mention many other mammoth and similar outgrowths of trade.

"But now the question comes," says Palmer, "how far may this individual enterprise be legitimately carried? How far may the few go on appropriating to their own behoof the great powers of steam and electricity, the soil, and all the other great facilities for production and exchange which nature and human justice declares should be free to all? For, brought to its extreme ultimate, this process could only mean that a few great financial potentates or incorporated companies would own the whole of our great planet, while all the rest of earth's citizens would be their moneyed slaves."

A speaker, referring to the State of California, remarks as follows: "There monopoly is king. There a few men control steam transportation. They have annihilated competition. There is not a farmer, not a producer, between the mountains and the Pacific, who does not pay them heavier tribute than conquered people ever paid to their conquerors. They fix the value of the farm, the mine, the mill, and the forest. They decide year by year whether the producer shall make a profit or a loss; whether his children shall travel toward the academy or the poor-house. They name Senators and Judges. They have their candidates for the Presidency. They have bound the prosperity of California in fetters of iron as fatal as death and as unyielding as the grave." But all this evil is from the corrupt control of legislatures, public officers, etc., and should be remedied by proper legislation. A just government would regulate rates for the interest of the whole people.

Statutes may be ordained restrictive of those men who recognize no responsibility but that of their stockholders, and no principle of action but personal and corporate aggrandizement. To this most worthy aim I say amen, for great would be the good accomplished by such reform. As long as gigantic public enterprises like our railroad and telegraphic systems are privately controlled, there must be warfare between the private interests of the stockholders and the public interests of the people. And even under the best of regulation laws, when best administered, we should still see the few swollen plutocrats amassing their fortunes from the unjust tax they levy on the public, since, ever so restricted, their powers become too great to admit of opposition, and all competition is handicapped against them.

What is the necessity of this Woman Suffrage move? Is it for the purpose of gaining legal power to organize working women's societies, so that when they die their husbands can draw \$2,000, the same as now does the Workman's wife? If the Workman's society would offer me membership free of tax, I would not join them. Why not? For the simple reason that I would have to work for the interest of that society, which would, in my opinion, turn the bars on individual interest, and in the future drive the working masses to homes of poverty, and their widows would have to pick the gleanings of organized societies and sleep at the feet of the rich, as the Bible says Ruth was compelled to sleep at the feet of Boaz. I wish to work for the interest of universal human justice and natural rights; that would enable woman to carry on business just the same after the death of her husband as before, and give all of earth's children a home instead of \$2,000.

I am not afraid of woman. By giving her equal rights, there is no danger that she will send the

nation to destruction, as some men think. Nature has endowed her with shrewdness, sturdy pluck and tireless perseverance of such a character as would equalize monopoly, stop the license of crime, and make this earth a better dwelling-place for her sons and daughters. She would establish commerce and the ballot-box as rulers instead of the sword and the money power. Right here I can do no better than to quote from an address delivered before the Anti-Monopoly League. In setting forth the purposes of the League, the speaker thus announces two of its fundamental principles: "We advocate and will support and defend the rights of the many as against the privileges of the few; and corporations, the creations of the state, shall be controlled by the state." To make the first of these statements consistent with the second, it seems to me the latter should be amended thus: "Corporations, the creations of the state, shall be controlled by the State; and when inflated to such magnitude that they become co-extensive with the government domain itself, then they shall be bought and owned and managed by the state or government." Otherwise, in my opinion, the rights of the many will never be maintained against the privileges of the few. This is the only real solution of the question that I can see, and is at once confirmed by a comparison of our people's post office and the Western Union telegraph consolidation, the first of which sends a letter from New York to San Francisco for three cents, and the second a telegram of ten words for two dollars.

The very principle that the Anti-Monopoly League enunciates brings us face to face with the hard problem of individual versus social rights; of the old political economy based on self-interest versus the new political economy founded on a higher view of man as a social being, and vested with social rights and duties. In truth, the undeniable fact is that labor, acting upon the free gifts and forces of nature, is the source of all wealth; and it is equally true that labor does not reap its equitable share of rewards. Through the squeezing-out process of competition, the stronger are yearly working toward the top, the weaker toward the bottom; the rich are growing richer, the poor poorer; and, instead of a just distribution of earth's products, we find the meanest of all mean power concentrating itself in the hands of the few—the power of irresponsible wealth. Our banking, insurance, telegraph and railroad companies, our great dry goods, grocery and other business houses, and even the control of the real estate, are now becoming thus monopolized, and such a thing as free competition practically exists no more. Against these overpowering agglomerations, any poor man starts out so weighted down that victory is next to impossible. For a few years many such tyros may struggle on till one of our decennial money panics flings up its turbid waves and engulfs them, while their cargoes are landed on the decks of their more powerful rivals, who, by their superior strength, are enabled not only to outstride the storm, but gather in the spoils the feeble ones have lost.

Of Herbert Spencer's little work on sociology, I can only give here the barest reference to its argument. He says: "Society is not a mere aggregate of separate individuals, which, like an audience in a theater, disperses when the play is over and exists no longer, but rather is a living organism, analogous in many respects to the human body itself. For instance, the human body grows; so does a society. Again, one body, taking its conception as its date of birth, undergoes great changes of structure and function; so, too, does a society in the course of its evolution, as witness how, in early stages of culture, man was his own farmer, tool-maker, merchant, etc., but how, as time goes on, vast divisions of labor and occupation occur, by means of which commerce, manufactures, the arts, education, and all the functions and departments of life, become assigned to their respective workers." Spencer's second reason is: "As in the human body, so in the social body, there exists mutuality of dependence between the parts and the whole, and thus the more humanity develops the more interdependent and unified its many classes become, until, as Carlyle says, 'an Indian cannot quarrel with his squaw on the lakes of Maine without producing a rise in the price of furs in London.' To harmonize as well as may be such vast relationships, it is that governments arise. Their purpose is to act as the balance wheel to the general clockwork, and make it all harmonize and keep time."

Now, all this solidarity of interest has always been more or less clearly perceived, and was even shadowed forth in the old Roman fable of the bells and the members. St. Paul said, "No man liveth to himself, and we are all members one of another;" and we ourselves are accustomed to speak of society as the body politic, and to refer to the life of a nation in pretty much the same terms as we do the life of a man. Bradlaugh says: "Society should be one brotherly circle, in which

men should be linked together by a consciousness that they are only happy so linked—conscious that when the chain is broken then society and her peace is destroyed."

It is just and right that when private enterprise so overleaps itself as to trench on what should be public enterprise, then the public or state should step in on fair terms, put the individuals out, and put themselves in. I cannot see why a nation which conducts its post office and custom house cannot also manage a national railroad and telegraph system, and also (which is even more needed, in my estimation) a national, really national, banking system.

I am satisfied that just so long as woman can have no voice in the body politic with man, just so long will that heathenish, oppressive, monarchical spirit be more or less ingrained in man. From remote antiquity comes the custom, and from the conditions in the struggles of life, the strong arm of man has said that the masses of womankind should go no further socially with man than to the church, home, penitentiary or gallows; but in this age of railroading and telegraphing there are a few thinking women who dare come out and plead for the free rights of the masses of their sex, and, in accordance with the fundamental principle of our government, to go up with man into the financial, political and social struggles of life, and soon take a seat with him in the state-house as well as the church. With me, the very thought shows a bright future of a higher protection and the elevation of our race.

I close with a few lines of attempted poetry:

BACK BONE.

When you see a fellow-mortal
Without fixed and fearless views,
Hanging on the skirts of others,
Walking in their cast-off shoes,
Bowing low to wealth or favor,
With abject, uncovered head,
Ready to retract or waver,
Willing to be drove or led;
When you see a politician
Crawling through contracted holes,
Beggaring for some fat position
In the ring or at the polls,
With no sterling manhood in him,
Nothing stable; broad or sound,
Destitute of pluck or ballast,
Double-sided all around;
When you see a fellow-mortal
Hugging close to custom's creed,
Fearing to reject or question
Politics his fellows read,
Holding back all noble feeling,
Choking down each manly view,
Caring more for forms and symbols
Than to know the good and true,
Walk yourself with firmer bearing,
Throw your moral shoulders back,
Show your spine has nerve and marrow—
Just the things which he must lack.

GREAT FEAT IN REPORTING.

[From the New York Star.]

A remarkable achievement in stenography was that of the lady to whose kindness the Boston Herald is indebted for the accurate and almost verbatim report of Carl Schurz's fine speech in German at the reception by his Boston countrymen. The speech was translated off-hand into English short-hand notes as it was taken, instead of being taken in German and afterward put into English, as is generally the case on such occasions. Mr. Thomas Allen Reed of London is regarded as the greatest short-hand writer in England, and his facility at taking both French and English equally well is considered a marvel. But when he takes a French speech, his notes are in French. In the Canadian Parliament there are two sets of short-hand reporters, one to take the speeches delivered in English, and the other those delivered in French. But the mental processes necessary to such a work as that of the Boston lady will be seen to be remarkably complicated. First, there is the following of the speech in German, which must have been with the strictest attention. Then there is the instantaneous translation of the German words into their English equivalents. And thirdly, there is the rendering of the English into short-hand characters, while the ear is alert to catch the German. The quickness of wit demanded by such a performance is wonderful, and, as far as we know, it is unprecedented in the recording of public speaking. The lady gained her skill in this way by practice in taking notes at the lectures in German universities.

From the San Francisco Examiner: "Women have won a victory even in old-fogy, bigoted Spain. After a long and earnest discussion, the conclusion was recently reached that women should be permitted to attend the lectures, and if found competent, to take the degrees conferred by the Spanish universities. In view of the obstacles formerly placed in the way of women's acquiring information, it would almost appear as if men were afraid of the women excelling them in science, art, or literature, and so denied them a fair opportunity of developing their mental powers."

RESOLUTIONS OF WASCO SUFFRAGISTS.

[From The Dalles Mountaineer.]

Resolved, That we are in favor of the enfranchisement of women.—First, because it is right. Second, because there are certain invidious distinctions made by the laws of Oregon in reference to the descent of real and personal property which we fear will not be changed unless woman is given the ballot; among these invidious distinctions is the law governing curtesy and dower. Third, that no governments are so successful as those whose laws and authorities of government are based on the nearest approach to equal rights of all.

Resolved, That we heartily commend the action of the Legislature of 1880 in passing the resolution for so amending the State Constitution that the women of Oregon may be secured in the possession of their right to the elective franchise.

Resolved, That we will use all honorable means to induce the Wasco county members of the legislative session of 1882 to further legalize the action of 1880 by ratifying the Woman Suffrage resolution.

Resolved, That no government is republican in form or democratic in principle which refuses to guarantee to every citizen the equal protection of the laws.

Resolved, That women are now denied the equal protection of the laws, because they are taxed without representation and governed without consent.

Resolved, That this movement for enfranchisement for our wives, mothers, sisters and daughters is a movement in strict accord with the fundamental principles of equality and justice upon which this Government is professedly founded.

Resolved, That women are seeking for the ballot as much for men's good as their own; they are courteously and earnestly demanding rights—not asking for privileges; nor would they, if they could, usurp authority over men.

Resolved, That it is the duty of women to understand the functions of the government which they are taxed to maintain, and to whose laws they are held to be amenable.

A WORD FOR THE GIRLS.

[From the Methodist Recorder.]

A great deal has been said and written concerning the rights of farmers' boys, but nothing about the girls. It is a common thing for farmers to pay their sons fair wages for their work; yet their daughters do not receive a dollar from month to month. Why should this difference exist between the farmer's girl and the boy? The former is quite as much entitled to a reward for services as the latter. In truth, the farmer's girl is frequently the more valuable of the two. She is expected in many cases to rise very early, get breakfast, clean up the house, and prepare the other meals required through the day, or, if not, to at least largely aid in all these household duties. In addition, she is looked upon by father, mother and brother to entertain company—to act the hostess, at least, as a creditable second to the mother; and she may be the pride of the family, and regarded as a sort of privileged character, yet much is expected from her in ten thousand smaller features of home life. Why, then, should she not be encouraged—with at least as much pay as the boy? In addition to that, the farm-house should be made as attractive as possible—with a piano, plenty of books, newspapers and pictures; cultivate a taste in the girls for flowers, etc. These features, with a moderate amount of work, should produce a happy and contented home farm life.

[From the Port Orford Post.]

PROBABLY WILLFUL.

A package of NEW NORTHWESTS was addressed to Independence, Polk county, to regular subscribers, and then returned from there to the office of publication through Wells, Fargo & Co. As an explanation of his conduct, the postmaster at Independence avers that the package was addressed to an individual instead of to the office simply, and that he delivered the package to the husband of the lady whose name the wrapper bore, and then by him it was returned through the mails. And now comes the mailing clerk of the paper and makes affidavit that the self same package had been addressed in the usual way to the Independence office, simply, and that it was received back through Wells, Fargo & Co. in the original wrapper as first addressed. Here, now, is raised a question of veracity between the postmaster and the mailing clerk, and thus far the P. M. is manifestly the sufferer in this behalf. Abuses such as this cannot be too sternly rebuked by the press in common. All have suffered more or less through the ignorance, inattention or petty malice of some postmaster, who, not being capable of distinguishing between duty and spiced, has entailed embarrassment and loss upon the publisher.