GENERAL LIBRARY
AUG 1905

The Public

A Journal of Fundamental Democracy and
A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making

Eighth Year | CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 12, 1905 | Number 384

LOUIS F. POST
EDITOR

Entered at the Chicago, Illinois, Postoffice as Second Class Matter

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION

Yearly	$2.00
Half Yearly	1.00
Quarterly	.50
Single Copy	.05

Extra Copies, $3.00 per 100, in lots of 50 and upward; if addressed to individuals, $4.00 per 100

For Advertising Rates and Other Particulars of Publication, See Cartoon Page

The Receipt of a Sample or Marked Copy by a Non-Subscriber is an Invitation to Subscribe

FOR TABLE OF CONTENTS SEE FIRST INSIDE PAGE

Our Catalogue of Books

We have just issued a descriptive catalogue of the books published and sold by this company. These books include the works of Henry George, Henry George, Jr., Ernest Crosby, Bolton Hall, Louis F. Post, Henry Demarest Lloyd, John P. Altgeld, Clarence S. Darrow, Edwin Markham, Lawson Purdy, Thomas E. Watson, Oliver R. Trowbridge, William Jennings Bryan, and others, including Tolstoy and Walt Whitman. There are, in this notable list of books, novels and romances, biographies, histories, poems, essays, sketches, addresses, treatises, and other kinds of books. Every book listed is one of great interest and real importance. The catalogue will be sent to anyone on request.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY
First National Bank Building, - - - - CHICAGO

THE POWER OF AN IDEAL

Booklet Sent Free

THE MOODY CORPORATION
35 Nassau St., New York
CHICAGO BRANCH: 535 The Rookery

Debtors know how interest consumes them. Wise men know how interest works for them. One of the best illustrations of the latter is an investment policy in the

Penn Mutual Life
Philad'a

Please mention THE PUBLIC when you write to advertisers.

Digitized by Google

AN EXCEPTIONAL OPPORTUNITY

The New Library Edition of the Complete

Works of Henry George

Including the

LIFE OF HENRY GEORGE

By HENRY GEORGE, Jr.

Just Published, in ten volumes, 12mo., handsomely bound in buckram, with gilt tops, untrimmed edges, etc. It contains a full set of portraits, and is in all respects equal to the well known MEMORIAL EDITION, issued in 1898, which is now out of print, and which sold for $25.00 per set.

What Tom L. Johnson Says of This New Enterprise

"Gentlemen:—

"I wish to congratulate you on bringing out a new library edition of the Works of Henry George. The day is not far distant when the professional or business man who does not understand the philosophy of Henry George will stand discredited in any intelligent community.

"A knowledge of this philosophy will broaden and strengthen any man, morally and intellectually; will make him a more public spirited citizen, and better equip him for the activities of business and professional life. It will give him a clearer comprehension of his duties to his fellow man, to the State and to the Great Ruler of the Universe; lifting him immeasurably above the plane of vanity, sordidness and selfishness which now seems to be the chief end of man.

"I hope and believe that your enterprise will be a success beyond your most sanguine expectations."

"Very truly yours,

TOM L. JOHNSON.

LIST OF THE VOLUMES:

Volume I. **Progress and Poverty.**

Volume II. **Social Problems.**

Volume III. **The Land Question.**

This volume contains three short works: (1) A brochure of seventeen short chapters and entitled "The Land Question;" (2) "Property in Land," a passage-at-arms with the Duke of Argyle; (3) "The Condition of Labor," an open letter to Pope Leo XIII., in reply to the Pope's encyclical letter on "the condition of labor."

Volume IV. **Protection or Free Trade.**

Volume V. **A Perplexed Philosopher.**

Volumes VI. and VII. **The Science of Political Economy.**

Volume VIII. **Our Land and Land Policy.**

This volume contains, besides selected speeches, lectures and miscellaneous writings, the pamphlet which, first published in 1871, was the forerunner of "Progress and Poverty" eight years later.

Volumes IX. and X. **The Life of Henry George.**

TERMS OF PURCHASE

This handsome set of books, of uniform size and boxed, will be delivered free of all further cost to any address in the United States (with customs duties added to Canada and Mexico, and to other foreign countries at the extra expense of foreign expressage and customs), for $15.00, CASH WITH ORDER, or for $17.50 IN INSTALLMENTS, payments to be made $2.00 on delivery and $2.00 thereafter monthly until the set is paid for.

AGENTS WANTED

In every locality for the sale of these and other important books. Descriptive circulars on application.

The Public Publishing Co.,

First National Bank Building, Chicago, Ill.

The Book for the Hour!

The Cost of Something for Nothing

By JOHN P. ALTGELD

"Reveals a strong man at his mental best."
—*Chicago Tribune.*

Dealing fearlessly with recent social, business and political developments, the late Governor of Illinois warns those who enter into the spirit of modern business speculation and political corruption that there is a moral law which will exact swift and fearful retribution from those who transgress it.

At this time, when multitudes are intent on getting something for nothing, these words of a statesman and a philosopher should not pass unheeded.

12mo., cloth, gilt top. Price, $1.00 postpaid.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY

First National Bank Building, CHICAGO, ILL.

Books by Ernest Crosby

Plain Talk in Psalm and Parable

A Collection of Chants in the Cause of Justice and Brotherhood.

12mo, cloth, 188 pages, $1.50; by mail, $1.62.
Paper, 40 cents; by mail, 44 cents.

"Do not fail to get and read 'Plain Talk in Psalm and Parable.' It is a fine, true, high, noble, unselfish work. It will do you good, no matter what you believe. There is a profit in its reading you cannot afford to miss."—New York Journal.

Tolstoy as a Schoolmaster

An Essay on Education and Punishment, with Tolstoy's Curious Experiments in Teaching as a Text.

16mo, cloth, 94 pages, 50 cents; by mail, 53 cents.

"This little book is written in Mr. Crosby's best vein. It is illuminated with his own fine comments on that about which he writes, and we laid it down wishing there had been as much again of it.....We commend 'Tolstoy as a Schoolmaster' to the young and progressive teachers of the nation."—Advocate of Peace, Boston.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY

FIRST NATIONAL BANK BLDG., CHICAGO

Please mention THE PUBLIC when you write to advertisers.

Digitized by Google

The Public

LOUIS F. POST, Editor

Volume VIII Number 384

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 12, 1905.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:
Tom Watson and Negro inferiority...289
Snobbishness of the anti-labor attitude ...289
Larceny by law...289
Municipal traction ownership in Chicago ...289
Effects of the single tax in New Zealand ...290
Our Advancing Postal Censorship....290

NEWS NARRATIVE:
A Russian national assembly...295
The Russian-Japanese war...295
Russian-Japanese peace negotiations in the United States...295
Yellow fever in New Orleans...296
American politics ...296
The referendum in politics...296
The Chicago traction question...296
The Newfoundland land grab...297
News Notes ...297
Press Opinions ...297

MISCELLANY:
In the Garden (verse)...298
Tolstoy on Land Ownership...298
Public Ownership of Public Utilities..299

BOOKS:
Readable Essays that are Worth Reading ...303
The Standard Oil crowd...303
Books Received...303
Periodicals ...303

CARTOON—Back to the Land (Bengough) ...304
[Copyright,1905, by Marion G. Scheitlin.]

For terms and other particulars of publication see cartoon page

EDITORIAL

Tom Watson and Negro inferiority.

In the June number of Tom Watson's Magazine, Mr. Watson undertook to demonstrate the inherent inferiority of the Negro race. His article has drawn an answer from Kelly Miller, a member of that race, which appears in the August number of The Voice of the Negro, an ably edited magazine of the race published at Atlanta, in Mr. Watson's own State. As the interesting controversy now stands, Mr. Miller has clearly the better of it, both in temper and argument. But it would be unfair to Mr. Watson to make a final comparison until the discussion closes. It is to be hoped that his reply will be in better temper and with more gracious feeling, even if with no better argument, than his opening attack. A full, fair, well tempered yet candid, discussion of this question, between so distinguished and brilliant a champion of the doctrine of inherent inferiority of the Negro as Mr. Watson, and so generous and able a representative of the Negro race as Mr. Miller, whose racial purity by the way is so manifest that his superior qualities cannot be attributed to an infusion of white blood, ought certainly to produce good results.

Snobbishness of the anti-labor attitude..

"Every little while," said Samuel Gompers at the teamsters' convention in Philadelphia, "it has been the misfortune of the labor movement to have hurled at the heads of its leaders charges of alleged misconduct, such as would receive no attention were they directed at persons in other walks of life." This is something which needed to be said, and Mr. Gompers has said it with excellent emphasis. An exasperating class snobbishness characterizes most of the criticisms of labor organizations and leaders, and Mr. Gompers's retort at Philadelphia was both within the facts and richly deserved.

Larceny by law.

Bolton Hall, aready famous as a writer, is making himself famous as a real estate promoter. And, being Bolton Hall, he is candid,—which is something like saying of Washington that being Washington he could not tell a lie. But Mr. Hall's candor has to do with more important things than cherry trees and little hatchets. "We have a big lot of land at Berkely Heights," runs his circular, which significantly offers "something for nothing," and bears unmistakable signs of the Hall mark; "and we have the money to improve it, but it cannot become valuable without people to live on it; so we know it will pay us to make all the inducements we can in price, improvements and accommodations to get good residents there—we want no others. To buy cheap land that will be made valuable by the efforts of others is just like finding money—or stealing it, except that it is done under the protection of the law."

Municipal traction ownership in Chicago.

Persons who really fear that Mayor Dunne's "contract plan" for securing municipal ownership (p. 279), is in effect a backdown on his part (a notion which the traction interests are industriously propagating), may be glad to know that this plan is directly in line with the recommendation of the Chicago Federation of Labor made through a committee of which Addison Blakely was chairman, in the latter part of the year 1900. That committee advised that if it becomes necessary—

> a company can purchase these or other properties in trust for the city, to be paid for in stipulated installments covering the purchase price and interest, to be turned over to the city upon payment of the principal, or at such time as the city shall be authorized to take the same, in such manner as hereafter may be provided by law—as by issuance of bonds or otherwise.

This suggestion was made before the city of Chicago had legal authority from the legislature to own and operate its own traction service, and for the purpose of providing a method whereby the municipal ownership policy could immediately begin in effect, pending the enactment of laws enabling the city to adopt it in form. The same method is now proposed for the purpose of immediately beginning municipal ownership and operation in effect, and pending the perfection of the details legally necessary as preliminaries to that policy in form. Just as the Federation of Labor plan of a trustee company contemplated the prosecution of all necessary formalities for securing direct city ownership and operation, so does Mayor Dunne's "contract plan" contemplate the prosecution of all necessary formalities for municipalizing the traction service under the Mueller law. Mayor

Digitized by Google

Dunne's plan neither delays nor impairs any of the city's rights under the Mueller law. On the contrary, it is designed to promote them. It contemplates the prosecution of every means for securing complete and direct municipal ownership and operation, without delay, side by side and day by day with the acquisition and operation of traction plants by the city's auxiliary company for which the plan provides.

—

All of this plainly appears in the Mayor's message, as when, for example, that document declares of the "contract plan" that—

> It provides for this system of street car service [municipal ownership under the Mueller law] under the management of a board of directors in its preliminary steps, and without the intervention of such board as soon as the city raises the necessary capital and complies with the statutory requirements.

The newspapers and press dispatches that describe this plan as an abandonment by Dunne of his immediate municipal ownership policy fully deserve his characterization of them as mendacious.

Effects of the single tax in New Zealand.

A single tax experiment in New Zealand has been in operation long enough to afford some actual indications of its probable effect. We refer to the experiment in local taxation (vol. iv, pp. 617, 618; vol. v, pp. 62, 298; vol. vi, pp. 10, 524), which began in 1896 with the granting by the Colonial parliament of authority to all taxing districts, upon local referendum, to exempt real estate improvements from local taxation, personal property having been exempted throughout the Colony by act of parliament in 1891. More than sixty taxing districts—towns, cities, counties, etc.—have availed themselves of the local option privilege granted by the act of 1896. A comparison of 12 of these towns, ranging in population from 500 to 45,419, and aggregating 92,215, has been made by the Sydney (New South Wales) Single Tax League, with twelve other New Zealand towns, ranging in population from 590 to 37,022 and aggregating 89,917, for the purpose of contrasting gain or loss of population in the single tax towns with gain or loss of population in towns that have not adopted the single tax. The selection of towns seems to have been fairly made, as the subjoined tables indicate. The comparison is for the years from 1897, when the single tax was adopted by North Palmerston, to 1903, two years after the latest of the twelve single tax towns had adopted the reform. We append the result in tabular form.

—

The first column states the year when the indicated town adopted the single tax, the second the names of the towns, the third their populations in 1897, the fourth their populations in 1903, and the fifth the increase in populations:

SINGLE TAX TOWNS.

1901	Wellington	40,000	45,419	5,419
1901	Sydenham	10,312	12,679	2,367
1897	Palmerston N.	5,910	7,828	1,918
1900	Davenport	3,060	5,000	1,940
1898	Greymouth	3,200	4,300	1,100
1901	Hasterton	3,600	4,000	400
1898	Melrose	2,044	4,295	2,251
1901	Lower Hutt	1,530	2,230	700
1901	Fielding	2,100	2,000	400
1901	Gore	2,200	2,000	400
1901	Sumner	596	864	268
1901	Winton	398	500	102
	Totals	74,950	92,215	17,265

It will be observed that in the twelve single tax towns population has invariably increased, with a total increase of 17,265, or 23 per cent. On the other hand, in the non-single tax towns for the same period—1897 to 1903—several have actually lost, while the rest have increased but slightly, and the total increase is only 1,575, or less than 2 per cent. Following is the table, each of the decreases being indicated by a star:

NON-SINGLE-TAX TOWNS.

Auckland	37,320	37,022	298*
Napier	9,231	9,015	216*
Nelson	6,659	7,513	854
Wanganui	6,200	7,386	1,186
Oamaru	5,300	5,000	300*
Parnell	4,250	4,850	600
New Plymouth	4,000	4,500	500
Thames	5,500	4,200	1,291*
Lyttleton	3,808	4,026	128
Onehimga	2,913	3,015	102
Gisborne	2,500	2,800	300
Richland	580	590	10
Totals	68,351	89,917	1,575

Palmerston North, which had the local single tax for six years, gained 33 per cent.; Greymouth and Melrose, with five years of the same policy, gained 34 and 100 per cent. respectively; Davenport, which had it for four years, gained 63 per cent., while the gains of the other eight towns, which had had the reform but two years, ranged from 11 to 46 per cent. Of the twelve towns which retain the antiquated method of taxation, four lost from 1 to 25 per cent. of their population, while the other eight gained only from 2 to 19 per cent. The gain of all these twelve towns for the six years was less than 2 per cent., as against 23 per cent. for the twelve towns with partial single tax.

OUR ADVANCING POSTAL CENSORSHIP.

I

Since long before the foundation of the Federal government, American public sentiment has cherished freedom of the press above every other condition of popular liberty except trial by jury. With the press untrammeled our fathers believed that no menace to liberty could really gain a foothold, if an innovation, or long endure, if already established; whereas, if the press were subject to censorship, they felt that autocracy would flourish as in their day it did throughout Europe and as in ours it still does in Russia.

They did not mean that the press should have license to attack personal reputations or offend public morals with impunity. They conceded that publishers should be held to account for libelous and indecent publications. But they insisted that guilt should be determined by juries, after the act, and upon a full hearing of both sides; and not by bureau officials in advance of the act and ex parte.

Much has been said against this view on the ground that it would permit the accomplishment of wrongs which once done cannot be undone; and it must be confessed that the objection is not without plausibility when particular grievances are considered irrespective of general effects. But our fathers realized that the greater danger lies in empowering officials to impose upon publishers a decree of silence. A person outraged by libel would be vindicated by the

Digitized by Google

verdict that condemned his libeler; common standards of public morals would be strengthened by the verdicts of juries if the standards were true, and weakened by assault only in case they were false. But under a censorship, private outrages upon public rights might go unrevealed and unscathed; true standards of public morals might be perverted and false ones perpetuated; and with a pretense of protecting personal reputation and public morals, bureaucrats might insidiously undermine popular liberty.

Our fathers therefore made it a part of their political religion that every one should be free to print and publish whatever he would, subject to being held accountable therefor by a jury of his fellow citizens. So wedded were they to this thory of a free press accountable only to a jury of the people, that the result of a lawsuit in the old Colony of New York was acclaimed throughout the Colonies and helped kindle the fires of the Revolution, because the jury had found that an alleged libel against the Colonial authorities was justified and the publisher not guilty, notwithstanding that the Colonial judge before whom the case was tried had ordered the jury to convict.

So vital did this sentiment remain after the Revolution, that the Federal party went down in political wreck and ruin because it became responsible for the "sedition act," which evaded the principle of a free but accountable press by making libels against the President and other Federal officials triable before judges of the President's own appointment and juries selected by his own appointees.

So vital did that sentiment continue down the troublous century just ended, that even in the heat of the anti-slavery agitation a pro-slavery Senate revolted at a suggestion that anti-slavery newspapers be made unmailable.

We believe that this wholesome sentiment of liberty survives in the American mind. Though a great influx of foreigners in recent years—foreigners seeking not greater liberty as in earlier times, but only better wages—may have had the effect of making American landmarks of liberty fade in the public opinion of today, yet the autocratic conditions of which we get reports from Russia are abhorrent enough to stir even the dullest mind to some sense of the dangers which go with a bureaucratic censorship of the press. It is an innovation which we believe American public opinion would not consciously tolerate. Were any direct attempt made to subject to the control of a government bureau the right to print and publish freely, subject only to accountability to juries, it would surely overwhelm the political party responsible for it, as the Federal party of a hundred years ago was overwhelmed, with the condemnation of an indignant people.

But what could not be done directly because the people would resent it, might be done indirectly and surreptitiously because the people would not realize that it was being done.

And it is a fact, that by indirect and surreptitious methods a censorship is gradually being established over printing and publishing in the United States. It has advanced so far that a Federal bureau at Washington already possesses powers of press censorship sufficient to enable it to suppress any periodical whatever, in the discretion of the officials who control the bureau.

We do not intend to say that every possible attempt at such suppression would succeed. What we do intend to say is that the censorial power which already exists in this Federal bureau is unlimited in its possibilities and threatening in its character. To a consideration of this fact we beg most earnestly to call serious public attention.

II

Let us consider first how a situation so serious might come about.

If an autocratic coterie, acute, skillful and patient, were deliberately set upon the purpose of creating a press censorship like that of Russia, in a republic like ours, where the traditions and the laws guaranteed freedom of the press subject to accountability only to juries, and where public opinion clung tenaciously to the spirit of those traditions, how would that coterie begin?

Not by trying to repeal the laws nor by violently overriding them. Either would be a hopeless undertaking in those circumstances. Such a coterie would begin by trying to invest with censorial power that bureau of the government, if there were such a bureau, which managed the distribution among the people of written and printed matter.

In doing this the coterie would at first carefully limit the censorship to such written and printed matter as was most intensely offensive to public morals; for that would be along the line of least resistance. A vast majority of the people, their thought centered upon offenses against morality and drawn away from offenses against liberty, would cordially approve the innovation.

Later a similar censorship would be extended by this coterie of liberty destroyers, to written and printed matter somewhat less offensive to public morals; and thus on and on by easy stages to such as was less and less offensive.

And the same acute discretion would be observed in the execution of these powers of censorship. The bureau so invested with censorial authority would at first execute its powers only against violators of the most sacred tenets of public morality. As its censorial powers were thereby commended to public approval, they would be applied to less repulsive offenders or those who occupied debatable ground, some of whom might bring the subject into the courts.

But the courts, keen to see that a decision in favor of minor or dubious offenders would make a precedent favorable to the repulsive class, would prefer making a precedent against liberty to making one against public morals. A few such precedents against liberty, in the guise of precedents for morality, and the hardest work of the censor-seeking coterie would be nearly done.

The bureau could then begin, on pretense of suppressing immorality, to discriminate against the publication of legitimate opinions. Over this there would be a struggle in the courts. But when the courts had decided that the bureau was engaged in executive work, and that its interference

Digitized by Google

therein with private rights, even to the extent of seizing and confiscating private property upon evidence satisfactory to the bureaucrat, must not be prevented, the censor-seeking work of the coterie would be complete.

After that, there would be nothing to limit the scope of the censorship.

An object of sufficient importance to the coterie, and a confederate of sufficient nerve at the head of the bureau, would make a censorship which the crude censors of Russia might envy.

By deciding as to any periodical whatever, and however falsely, upon evidence satisfactory to himself, that its contents were offensive to public morals, the head of this bureau could effectually suppress that publication. And the mere fact that he could do this, would have a powerful effect in influencing all periodicals to support or oppose public policies as the persons or parties controlling the censorizing bureau might direct.

It is by insidious steps, such as are here suggested as possible, that the public opinion of free peoples has always been suppressed, and that their other liberties have been wrested from them in the consequent silence.

III

Now, in this country there is just such a bureau as we have imagined above. It is known as the Post Office Department. That department controls the delivery and receipt of almost all the written and printed matter of the country. Nearly all private correspondence, nearly all books, nearly all periodicals, are circulated by its machinery. It has gone so extensively into the business of distributing letters and periodicals for the people that all business is dependent upon it, and any periodical against which it might discriminate could not long continue publication.

To invest this department with power to grant or refuse its distributing service to periodicals, with reference to its own judgment of the legitimacy of their printed contents, would be to place at its mercy every periodical which the department might wish to destroy.

But not only have we such a bureau in this country, in the Post Office Department, but that department has been gradually invested, in very much the manner indicated above, with the censorial powers outlined above as possible. And it has exercised those powers with similarly aggressive discretion. We do not mean that there has been a conscious and definite purpose of creating a dangerous censorship, as in the imagined case; but that there has been similar progress in a direction in which similar results are the inevitable ultimate.

The investiture of the Post Office Department with arbitrary censorship over the press, began (as we have indicated in our suppositions that such a censorship probably would begin), with legislation against such postal matter as was most intensely offensive to public morals. Obscene letters and papers were declared to be unmailable and the act of mailing them a crime. To this innovation objection was difficult. No appeal to the principle of freedom of the press could be made which would not seem like an attempt at shielding vile offenses, with appeals to political traditions and abstractions—like opposing "mere generalizations" or theories of government to actual immoralities. Under cover of the silence which decency thus imposed, the postal censorship gained a foothold.

Then further steps were taken. The ban of unmailability was extended to mail matter in furtherance of frauds. Decency did not impose silence here, but what could be said against laws for the suppression of fraud? Nothing that would not make the objector seem to be an apologist for actual crime on pretense of devotion to a mere "theory of liberty."

Nor was much difficulty encountered in extending the postal censorship against obscene and fraudulent mail matter to mail matter in connection with lotteries. Public opinion had become ripe for excluding that business from its old place in the category of the legitimate, and objections to this extension of the censorship were rebuked as sympathetic with lotteries, instead of being accorded a fair hearing in the interest of freedom of the press.

While censorial statutes were accumulating, criminal prosecutions which never got before the highest court were building up a mass of precedents, and rules and rulings of the Postal Department were establishing censorial lines of administrative procedure which have crystalized with time. And so it has come about that the postal department has acquired and is actually exercising the ominous censorial power to which we invite attention.

Upon decrees sent out from a bureau at Washington, all their correspondence is withheld from individuals, on the charge, established before no judicial tribunal, that at some time in the past they have solicited correspondence through the mails for purposes of fraud; and legitimate periodicals are suppressed, on pretense that they contain obscene language or sentiments. In none of these cases is the alleged offender given a jury trial, in none does his case come before a judicial tribunal, in all his nearest approach to a trial is before attaches of the censoring bureau which makes the charge, and in some the specific accusations are withheld from him.

IV

With the details of one of these cases of newspaper suppression we have been at the pains to make ourselves acquainted. It is the case of "Lucifer" (p. 242), a Chicago publication, issues of which have but recently been suppressed by the postal department. Our information relates to a previous suppression for the same alleged cause, and not to the recent one. Whether the latter would prove to be similar to the former we do not know, nor do we regard it as important to the point under consideration, which is not the propriety or impropriety of suppression in a particular case, but the dangers of suppression in this manner in any case. As the instance to which our information relates illustrates the tendency toward a censorship of the press, it is sufficient for the purpose in hand.

Our inquiry into the matter began with the following letter of January 27, 1904, to the postmaster at Chicago:

I am informed that the Chicago of-

Digitized by Google

fice stopped the transportation as second-class matter of a Chicago weekly called "Lucifer," the issue of December 17; that the reason given was violation of section 497 of Postal Laws and Regulations; that nothing in apparent violation of that section appeared in the issue in question; and that your office refuses definite information. Will you kindly inform me, for public use, what the specific offense of the issue in question was?

In his reply of January 29, the Chicago postmaster courteously stated that the Chicago office had not originated the act of suppression, but had merely obeyed orders from Washington. He wrote:

The issue of "Lucifer the Light Bearer" dated Dec. 17, '03, was refused admittance to the mails by direction of the Department at Washington, which ruled that matter in that edition was in violation of section 497 of the post office laws and regulations. Under date of Dec. 19, '03, the publisher was advised to this effect.

It will be observed that the Chicago postmaster did not deny that specific information of his offense had been withheld from the accused publisher, and that he did not give the information asked for in the letter to which his was in reply, namely—the specific offense. In this reticence he was doubtless, as events subsequently indicated, obeying orders from Washington. It is also to be observed that the publisher was not notified of the suppression until two days after his date of publication.

Having learned from the Chicago postmaster that he had acted under orders from Washington, and been tactfully though courteously refused information as to the specific offense of "Lucifer," we extended our inquiry to the Postmaster General in a letter of February 13, 1904. In replying by letter of March 3, 1904, the First Assistant Postmaster General wrote:

I have received your letter of February 13, addresssed to the Postmaster General, in reference to the exclusion from the mails of a publication entitled "Lucifer, the Light Bearer." The issue of December 19 contained matter which is unmailable under section 497, Postal Laws and Regulations, and therefore the Postmaster at Chicago was instructed to treat copies of that issue in his office in the same manner as other unmailable matter is treated.

Still we had failed to get information of the specific charge against "Lucifer," sufficient to enable us by examining the paper to form a judgment as to the official good faith of its suppression; and from an examination of the whole paper we had been unable to discover anything apparently justifying the charge of violating the postal section referred to. Accordingly we asked of the Postmaster General, by letter of March 14, 1904, that he do us the favor of indicating—

the particular article or articles, by their title or otherwise, which are regarded by the Department as unmailable under section 497? If you could indicate the particular paragraphs of the articles that are regarded as unmailable I should be obliged.

In answer to that inquiry the Acting First Assistant Postmaster General, in a letter of March 29, wrote:

You ask that the particular article to which exception was taken by the Post Office Department be pointed out to you. If you will kindly call upon our Inspector in charge at Chicago, who has the copy of the paper to which you refer, that officer will be able to comply with your request.

An effort to act upon this suggestion, and the result, are described in a letter of June 13, 1904, to the Postmaster General, in which, after a recital of previous correspondence, we wrote:

There seems to be some misunderstanding, possibly on my own part, though I do not see how I am at fault. In reference to your Acting First Assistant's letter, I have called on the inspector in charge at Chicago and shown him your Acting First Assistant's letter. After reading it he told me that he could not supply me with the information because his assistant, Mr. McAfee, in whose charge the matter had been, was then out of the city, but that upon the return of Mr. McAfee he, the Chief Inspector, would notify me and supply me with the information. Accordingly, a few days later a messenger called at my office, and, I being out, left word for me to call up Mr. McAfee by telephone. When I did so, Mr. McAfee was out of his office. When I did so again, the next day, he had gone out of the city. But on the latter occasion the chief clerk in the Inspector's office, learning my identity and knowing my object, informed me that the Chicago office cannot furnish me with the requested information. He explained that the suppression of "Lucifer" under section 497 had not taken place under the initiative of the Chicago office, but had been ordered by the First Assistant Postmaster General, and that the Chicago office does not know what the objectionable matter was. In answer to my further inquiry he assured me, but with entire courtesy, that I might regard this reply as official and treat it accordingly. I am therefore under the necessity of again troubling your office in this matter. Will you kindly arrange in some proper and convenient way to supply me, for legitimate newspaper use, with the information I am seeking, namely, what are the particular articles, designating them if possible by their titles, on account of which the Post Office Department suppressed the issue of December 17, 1903, of "Lucifer the Light Bearer," of Chicago, as unmailable under section 497 of the Postal Laws and Regulations, and what are the particular paragraphs of such articles in which the objectionable matter is to be found.

No attention having been paid to this inquiry, after the lapse of more than a month, we addressed the Postmaster General, by letter of July 23, 1904, offering to forward a copy of our letter of the 13th of June if the original had failed to reach the Department. Still without reply, on the 19th of August, 1904, we wrote again to the Postmaster General, referring to our two previous letters and asking:

Will you kindly give me the information requested in those letters, or advise me of the time when you can probably do so, if delay is necessary.

This request brought a reply from the Acting First Assistant Postmaster General, dated August 25, 1904, as follows:

I have received your letter of the 19th instant calling attention to the fact that yours of June 13 had not been answered. Replying specifically to your inquiry I have to state that the article on page* . . . . . and the article on page* . . . . are, in the opinion of this Department, offensive under the Act of Congress approved September 26, 1888.

The reply gives no indication of the paragraph or paragraphs of the articles mentioned as containing the matter which in the opinion of the postal censor is unmailable, although this information was distinctly requested. We are obliged,

*We omit the page numbers and the titles of the two articles which the Acting First Assistant Postmaster General gave in his letter. Our reason for the omission is that such a publication here might subject this issue of The Public to suppression by order of the postal censor bureau. The same Act of Congress by authority of which "Lucifer" was censored for publishing those articles, provides also that "notice of any kind giving information, directly or indirectly, where or how, or of whom or by what means an "obscene . . . publication of an indecent character" "may be ob-

Digitized by Google

therefore, if we would examine into the good faith of the censor, to consider the articles as a whole, word by word, thought by thought, from first word to last. This necessity is in itself significant of the arbitrary and secretive methods of the Department in passing upon questions involving freedom of publication.

Upon examination of the articles we failed to find anything, either in the thought alone or the phrase alone, which could be condemned by the ordinary standards of decency. While it is true that the colloquial phrasing is so ill-adapted to the sociological subject discussed as to offend good taste, taste is not yet subject to postal censorship. And while neither the subject nor the phrasing would be appropriate at a young people's party, this is no test of postal propriety.

The subject matter, considered by itself, is a legitimate one for public discussion among adults; and, expressed in philosophical phrasing, it could not possibly be objected to as salacious.

The phrasing, considered by itself, is not out of the common in the current literature of fiction. If any well-known novelist had put these two articles, thought by thought and word by word, into the mouths of characters in a problem novel, it is almost inconceivable that any publishing house, other than the American Tract Society, would have suppressed them; and if the postal censors had condemned them as obscene by excluding the novel from the mails, a cry of derision would have echoed from one end of the country to the other.

The inference seems to us unavoidable, that the issue of "Lucifer" of December 17, 1903, was excluded from the mails, not because of any violation of the postal statute, but because it advocated doctrines of social life at variance with those to which the postal censors are professedly devoted. In other words, it was suppressed, not for decency's sake, but for opinion's sake.

With the opinions intended to be censored by the suppression of "Lucifer," we are entirely out of sympathy. Were they up for discussion under circumstances demanding our participation, we should emphatically condemn them—not because they are unconventional, but because we believe them to be unsound. But the question here is not whether they are unsound. It is whether their discussion shall be forbidden.

On that issue we yield to no one in demanding the fullest freedom of discussion for every debatable question. Nothing but error can suffer from honest debate. And while we recognize the propriety as to taste, and the decency as to morals, of limiting discussions of some subjects, not only conventionally but by law if necessary, to appropriate occasions, we do not regard the use of the mails for the distribution of any discussion whatever, for adult readers, and in good faith, as a violation of the proprieties of discussion. We do regard the denial of their use for such purposes as a menace to one of the most important safeguards of liberty, and an obstruction to the most important promoter of progress.

V.

Yet we hesitate to denounce the postal censor for suppressing a paper for its opinions. To denounce him for that might be quite unjust. He only suppressed disagreeable opinions, and that is what most men would do who have the power. It is what the censors of the Czar do, when they forbid publication of the proceedings of a national congress. It is what our own censors in the Philippines did, when they forbade the publication of the Declaration of Independence. It is what we ourselves might be tempted to do if we were at the head of the postal censor bureau,—since the opinions as to marriage which "Lucifer" advocates are repugnant to our views. If we had the power as censor to read "offensive to the statute" into "Lucifer's" opinions, or into those of any other periodical whose opinions on social philosophy, religion or politics we reject, we might give way to the temptation to which the postal censor appears to have succumbed in "Lucifer's" case.

But all this is one of the very reasons why powers of censorship, even for the best of purposes, and though reposed in persons of liberal disposition, are dangerous powers.

Power fattens upon what it feeds on. Little by little, from suppressing evil reading to suppressing that which is doubtful, it advances to the suppression of unpopular opinions, and then to those that are popular; and it makes its advances so insidiously that all freedom of opinion is throttled by censors before the people realize it has been assailed.

That the point of suppressing unpopular opinions in one branch of social philosophy has already been reached, is evident from the circumstances of the "Lucifer" case which we describe above.

Here is a publication depending for existence, as all others do, upon regularity of mail circulation. Without notice, accusation, specification, trial or hearing of any sort, a regular issue, the full edition, is confiscated by a local postmaster upon orders from the censor at Washington. After this suppression, the publisher is notified of it, but information as to the specific fact upon which the arbitrary action was based is withheld. He is told he has violated a particular postal law, but he is not told how he has done it. Nor does he get a hearing even on the vague general charge of which he is advised. The action is as arbitrary as such actions are in Russia. In Russia, indeed, the censor is more considerate. He lampblacks objectionable articles and circulates the rest of the paper; but our censor suppresses the whole edition, the "good" along with the "bad." And after the edition has been suppressed, another paper, interested in sounding an alarm if freedom of the press has been bureaucratically assailed, is trifled with by the censors for months, in its efforts to discover the specific offense for

---

tained," is itself "non-mailable matter." Since the censors have already decided that the articles in question are obscene and indecent, they might decide that the naming of them by title and page in connection with the name of the publication in which they appeared, is a notice making the paper publishing it also guilty under the statute and therefore subject to suppression. Were they to so decide, they could suppress this issue of The Public, and we should be without protection or redress or any power to get a judicial trial. Inasmuch, therefore as that part of the Acting First Assistant Postmaster General's letter which we have excised in quoting it above, is not absolutely necessary for the information of our readers, we prefer to avoid an unnecessary risk of censorship, by omitting it.

Digitized by Google

which the suppressed paper was suppressed, only to learn finally that it was for publishing two articles, only the titles of which are given, and in which, however offensive they may be to good taste, even a prude could hardly find material for specifications on a charge of immorality.

A censorship which can maintain this attitude toward freedom of the press respecting one subject of discussion, will have little difficulty in speedily advancing its meddlesome jurisdiction to other subjects.

VI.

The real issue here, let us repeat—and it will bear repetition again and again—is not the legal offensiveness of the particular articles noted above. That issue is important only for its bearing upon the point of the good faith of the censor. The real issue is the wisdom of allowing any official to deny mailing facilities to anything whatever which is otherwise mailable, merely upon his own judgment, as a censor, of the morality of the intelligence it conveys or the opinions it expresses.

Granted that some publications ought to be excluded, the power of discrimination cannot safely be entrusted to an administrative official. A bureau of administration with authority to exclude matter from the mails with reference to the intelligence or the opinions it conveys, will inevitably grow into a bureau of dangerous censorship.

For offenses against the purity of the mails the only safe remedy is the one that is applied to purity in every other connection—to the legitimate method which has been sanctioned and approved by long usage in English-speaking countries; and this is to punish offenders after they, having had an opportunity to be heard upon specific charges, have been convicted by a jury of their fellow citizens.

If opinions in this country are to stand or fall upon reason and free discussion, the present postal censorship must be abolished. So long as publication through the mails can be denied arbitrarily by an administrative bureau of the government, the discussion of conflicting opinions is hampered.

Even the sentiment of fair play, entirely apart from all considerations of a free press, demands the abolition of this censorship. So long as an administrative officer can withdraw mailing rights from a publication for any offense whatever, without an opportunity for the publisher to be heard in his own defense before an impartial tribunal, fair play is impossible. Though we deny mailing rights to indecent publications, fair play demands that the person accused of the offense, and whose personal and property rights are involved in the accusation, shall have the opportunity he is guaranteed in all other cases to convince his fellow citizens that his publication is not indecent. It is his right to be judicially heard in his own defense.

Instances like that of the suppression of "Lucifer" by postal censorship point so directly and unmistakably to great injustice and public danger that any fair-minded man may see it and every patriotic man ought to resent it. No matter what one's opinion of any paper and its teachings may be, there should be but one opinion of a postal organization which permits in any case what was done in that case, and this should be an opinion of unqualified condemnation.

The confiscation by postal clerks, of any publication, for any cause, without specific charges, without opportunity to the publisher to be heard, without the verdict of a jury, without appeal, without any of the ordinary safeguards of personal rights and private property, and consequently without any assurance of guilt, is an ominous fact. No matter how objectionable or even dangerous a paper's teachings may seem to the censors, no matter how offensive its language in their estimation, so palpable an invasion of the commonest rights of citizenship is a direct menace to the independent press of the country. Any law that authorizes it should be swept from the statute books.

The only difference between such a power and that of Russian censorship is a difference neither in kind nor degree. It is a difference only in scope of execution. And scope of execution widens with use.

The issue before us turns not upon the propriety of excluding indecent publications from the mails, but upon the wisdom and justice of allowing administrative officers to hamper freedom of the press and confiscate property rights, upon their own opinion of what constitutes indecency, and without an opportunity for the alleged offender to be heard in his defense. Under the postal censorship publications are denied mailing rights, not because they are offensive to decency, but because the censor, from whom there is no appeal, chooses to think them so. Here is the seed of a mighty tree of absolutism.

NEWS NARRATIVE

Week ending Thursday, Aug. 10.

A Russian national assembly.

It was reported from St. Petersburg on the 8th that the final session of the special commission which has been considering the project for a national assembly which had been drafted by Mr. Bouligin, minister of the interior, and elaborated by the council of ministers (p. 276), had been held at Peterhof on that day. Its verdict upon the project as a whole was said to be favorable, and at the conclusion of the session, before the assembled grand dukes, ministers, senators and other members of the commission, the Czar formally approved it. The assembly is to be proclaimed, it is understood, on the 12th.

The Russian-Japanese war.

All that remained of the Russian garrison of Sakhalin Island (p. 232) surrendered to the Japanese on the 31st, according to dispatches of the 4th from Tokio, and Japan is now in full possession of the island.

Russian-Japanese peace negotiations in the United States.

The Russian and Japanese peace envoys (p. 280) were formally introduced by President Roosevelt on the 5th on board the Mayflower at Oyster Bay, L. I. At the luncheon which immediately followed, President Roosevelt proposed the following toast:

Gentlemen: I propose a toast to which there will be no answer and to

Digitized by Google

which I ask you to drink in silence standing. I drink to the welfare and prosperity of the sovereigns and peoples of the two great nations whose representatives have met one another on this ship. It is my most earnest hope and prayer in the interest of not only these two great Powers but of all mankind that a just and lasting peace may speedily be concluded between them.

—

All the envoys had arrived at Portsmouth, N. H., on the 8th, when the city gave them a formal welcome. They were received by Rear Admiral Mead, at the navy yard, and a body of State militia escorted them from the navy yard to their hotel. On the way they stopped at the Rockingham county courthouse, where Gov. McLane delivered the address of welcome.

—

The envoys met in joint session for the first time on the 9th. The meeting lasted about an hour. Nothing was done but to verify credentials and agree upon a programme for future meetings.

Yellow fever in New Orleans.

At a meeting of representatives of all the commercial bodies of New Orleans, at which the Mayor, the president of the Orleans Parish Medical Association and the State health authorities were present, a resolution was adopted which asked the United States government to take control of the yellow fever situation in New Orleans, and requested the Governor of the State and the Mayor of the city to take steps to carry the proposition into effect. It also pledged the hearty cooperation with the Federal government of the State and city governments, the State and city health boards, the parish medical societies, and the merchants and people generally. Gov. Blanchard immediately transmitted the resolution to President Roosevelt with a request in accordance with its terms; and on the 4th President Roosevelt issued the following order to Surgeon General Wyman, of the public health and marine hospital service:

Please take every step in your power to meet the situation at New Orleans, and comply with the request of the Governor and the other authorities and notify me what further action is advisable and possible for the Federal authorities to take. Would like full report from you as to what should be done. Please confer with the surgeons general of the army and navy if in your judgment this is wise.

On the 8th the scourge had spread more than on any previous day. Business had then come practically to a standstill, as a result of quarantine regulations, and great suffering was reported in many parts of the State from lack of mail service, ice, coal, and other necessaries. One of the effects of hysterical quarantine restrictions was a state of disorder bordering on rioting, for the suppression of which the State health board requested the Governor to call out the State troops. Statistical reports of the 9th, published on the 10th, were as follows:

Deaths to date.....131
Cases to date.....688

Among those who died of the fever on the 9th was Mgr. Placide Chapelle, Roman Catholic archbishop of Louisiana.

American Politics.

At the Prohibition convention for Ohio, held at Columbus on the 2d, an attempt was made to endorse for governor the Democratic candidate, John M. Pattison (p. 200), who is regarded as an anti-saloon candidate; but the proposition, though urged by the Prohibition gubernatorial candidate of two years ago, was defeated. The nominee for governor is Aaron S. Watkins.

—

The Prohibitionists of Nebraska, in convention at Lincoln on the 8th, nominated as head of the ticket F. B. Beall for associate justice of the Supreme Court.

The Referendum in Politics.

While on his vacation (p. 279) at Atlantic City, N. J., Mayor Dunne, of Chicago, was interviewed regarding "graft," and his interview was reported on the 7th as follows:

The people of the States and municipalities of this Republic have grown thoroughly tired of seeing the public possessions plundered and exploited in the interest of private capitalists. The people's disgust with such conditions is undoubtedly very widespread. It is plainly manifested in the political revolt and governmental upheaval that has taken place in Philadelphia; it is shown in Folk's progress in Missouri; in La Follette's achievements in Wisconsin; in the acclaim with which the people have greeted Lawson's disillusionments in the world of finance. It is made plain in the recent political developments in Chicago, as well as in a score of other places. It is a case of the people coming, after a long time, to claim possession of their own. After the civil war, by which the graft system was first introduced into our government, the people were too busy with money making and other affairs of immediate importance to pay much attention to the germ of corruption with which their governments had been inoculated, and the way of the grafter was comparatively easy. But now the people are beginning to rise in revolt against a condition they too long tolerated, and the effect of their rising is being felt in every part of the country. Furthermore, I am convinced that the uplift consequent upon this sweep of reform sentiment will be permanent. While there may be lapses here and there, the general effect will be a permanent betterment in all the features of our various governmental systems. It will inevitably be the establishment of the initiative and referendum for the management of legislation in our larger cities. The seat of corruption, graft and boodle, as they are known in America to-day, lies in the membership of city councils and State legislatures. Corporations are unscrupulous, and they long ago discovered that the easiest way to procure the use of public property without compensating the people was to buy a majority of the people's representatives to vote to them, without charge, the rights they sought. But whenever our form of government is so changed that ten per cent of the people may propose legislation which shall require a majority vote of all the people before it becomes a law, conditions will change.

The Chicago traction question.

Preliminary to the meeting of the local transportation committee of the City Council of Chicago, to be held on the 14th, to consider the local traction question with reference to Mayor Dunne's traction policy and plan (p. 279), meetings of financial magnates interested in Chicago traction are on the carpet at New York, at the instance of J. Pierpont Morgan. As reported by the Chicago Tribune of the 8th—

no less a person than J. Pierpont Morgan himself is going to settle the traction question. Heretofore Mr. Morgan's connection with the paramount issue in Chicago has been a purely financial one. It was he who arranged the syndicate which took over the Chicago City railway, and he and his friends have interests in Union Trac-

Digitized by Google

tion, but such minor matters as franchise rights, municipal ownership and settlements with the city he has not had a hand in. In fact, he has been in Europe nearly all the time since the sale of the south side road was made. Now, however, Mr. Morgan has awakened to the fact that buying a Chicago street car line with no franchise, or only a partial franchise, was one thing, and maintaining the value of its stock at a price which makes the purchase a good bargain is another, and he has determined to take a hand in the game himself. So a meeting has been called at his office in New York for this morning. John A. Spoor, John J. Mitchell, and Vice President Mitten of the Chicago City railway have been invited to be present, and it is reported that R. R. Govin, who is better acquainted with the Chicago situation than any of the easterners connected with the Union Traction company, has also been asked. It is possible that W. W. Gurley, who is now in the East, may be there also.

The New Foundland grab.

No cable reports of the progress of the attempt of the Harmsworths, of London, to reestablish feudalism in Newfoundland (p. 277) are available; but the last number of "Land Values," of Glasgow, reports that—

on Thursday, June 22, the question was brought under the notice of the House of Commons by the following series of questions: Mr. Whitley asked the Colonial Secretary whether, in view of the fact that the contract "contains provisions which are in contravention of the provisions of the Crown Lands Act of 1903," he will advise His Majesty to withhold his consent to the bill until full inquiry has been made into the circumstances under which the contract was entered into. Mr. Trevelyan asked if His Majesty will be advised to withhold assent till an opportunity has been afforded to the electors of Newfoundland to express their opinion upon it at a general election. Mr. Levy, in calling attention to the fact that the lease is for 99 years, and conveys a right of continuous renewal over 3,000 square miles of land, made the suggestion that "the paid agent of the said company spoke and voted in the Legislative Council on the bill for approving and confirming the said contract," and asked what steps will be taken in the matter. Mr. Herbert Samuel, "in view of the unusual provisions of the contract," asked that a copy of it, and the bill to confirm it, be printed for the information of the House. Sir John Brunner asked in a further question that His Majesty be advised to withhold his consent to the bill "until clauses shall have been inserted in the indenture for the more effectual safeguarding of the rights of the Crown and of the citizens of the Colony in the lands affected." Mr. Lyttleton said that until he received the act as finally passed by the Newfoundland legislature, he was not in a position to decide what action he should take in the matter, but in the meantime he referred members to Mr. Chamberlain's dispatch of 5th December, 1898, to the governor of Newfoundland, as laying down the general principles which had guided his predecessors in considering the question of advising His Majesty in regard to the disallowance of the acts af colonies possessing responsible government. Mr. Whitley put a long supplementary question as to the irritation caused by the hurried manner in which the bill was passed through the legislature by the suspension of standing orders, but the Speaker ruled that notice must be given of it.

NEWS NOTES

—The extraordinary session of the Swedish Riksdag (p. 276) closed on the 3d.

—The third annual convention of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters met at Philadelphia on the 7th.

—Secretary Taft and his party (p. 280) arrived at Manila on the 5th. There was a parade of 10,000, including soldiers, in his honor on the 7th.

—Louis F. Post will speak at All Souls' Church (Oakwood boulevard and Langley avenue, Chicago, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, minister), on the 13th, at 11 a. m. Subect: "A Non-ecclesiastical Confession of Religious Faith."

—Alexander Melville Bell, inventor of "visible speech," died at Washington on the 7th at the age of 86. His father was Alexander Bell, who invented a method of obviating impediments of speech, and his son is the distinguished Alexander Graham Bell.

—A fire on the 8th, early in the morning, swept away the main depot at Hoboken, N. J., opposite New York city, of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western railroad, with 600 feet of train sheds, the ferry house, and an adjacent hotel. The loss is put at $2,000,000, and no lives are reported as lost.

—The United States and Nicarauga company is the name of concern, exploited by Standard Oil interests and capitalized at $20,000,000, which was reported from New York on the 5th as having acquired great interests in Nicaragua. It holds the exclusive right to dig mines and the use of waters and timbers within the States of Cape Gracias, Jinotega and Segovia, including the State of Esteli, now merged and forming part of the State of Jinotega and Segovia. This territory extends almost the whole width of Nicaragua, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Its area is nearly 10,000,000 acres.

—A demurrer to an indictment of three Christian Scientists for manslaughter, consequent upon the death of a child of two of the defendants (the third being a Christian Science healer) from diphtheria, for which the defendants had not called a physician, was sustained on the 7th by the county judge of Westchester Co., New York. This judge decides that the parents of children have a right to determine, within reasonable bounds, what mode of treatment their children shall have; and that the child of a Christian Scientist, placed in the hands of a reader or healer, has, in legal contemplation, the same safety in life and limb as the child who is given into the hands of a licensed physician.

PRESS OPINIONS

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP GRAFTING.

(Chicago) Examiner (Dem.), Aug. 8.—The men indicted for grafting in Milwaukee are strong opponents of municipal ownership. Private ownership of street car lines, lighting plants and garbage plants is responsible for the graft that is now in the city departments of that otherwise beautiful city. . . . The Milwaukee Rendering company (a private concern, whose chief business was hauling away dead dogs, dead cats and dead horses) wanted a monopoly of all the ill smelling business of Milwaukee. It got a contract through the council. This company turned over $32,000 to Pfister "to expend as Gross directed." Gross is the president of the rendering company. That transaction of beating the municipal garbage idea got Pfister into trouble. Others got graft for putting the deal through. Again, the people of Milwaukee voted for a lighting plant. Pfister's paper —"it is a safe, sane and conservative" paper—then began to print elaborate articles on the evils of municipal ownership. The plan was denounced as "socialistic." The Council finally concluded to have no city lighting plant. Graft, it is charged, killed the verdict of the people. The grafters and the graft takers were strong against municipal ownership. Again, there was a fight in Milwaukee over a street car franchise. It was finally secured by a private company. The people of Milwaukee know the extent of the grafting that was done to get this deal through. All the rascals who bribed and all the rascals who took bribes in this street car deal sneer at municipal ownership advocates as addle pated visionaries. Get at the bottom of all the graft in Milwaukee, and you will find that private ownership is responsible for it.

SECRETARY TAFT ON DISFRANCHISEMENT.

The (New York) Worker (Soc.), Aug. 5.—There is really nothing surprising in the recent declaration of Secretary of War Taft in favor of the disfranchising "all ignorant voters, whites as well as blacks." It is quite in keeping with the undemocratic trend of thought which now rules at Washington and which is being most industriously cultivated by the various spokesmen of great capitalism, in press, pulpit and college chair. It is not surprising, but it is well worth noting. From a purely partisan point of view, we Socialists could have no objection to any moderate educational qualification honestly applied. The average of intelligence and of education among our voters is much high-

Digitized by Google

er than among those of either of the old parties; comparatively few illiterates vote the Socialist ticket, and if a reading-and-writing test were enforced in good faith the Republican and Democratic parties would lose ten times as many votes proportionately to their present strength as we would. But in the first place, we do not wish to see even our opponents disfranchised; and, what is still more to the point, we know that such qualifications are never honestly applied. It is notorious that in those Southern States where the law requires that the voter shall be able to "read and explain" the Constitution of the United States, the most ignorant man can register and vote if he is known to be a safe supporter of the dominant party, while the poor man who is suspected of intending to vote the opposition ticket is called upon to "explain" some constitutional point that the Supreme Court of the United States has never been able to agree on and is convicted of ignorance, no matter how he expounds it. All this talk about the dangers of the ignorant vote is nothing more or less than a screen to conceal the intentions of the dominant school of capitalist politicians, gradually take the ballot away from the working class lest the workers use their lawful power to abolish capitalist exploitation.

THE NECESSARY BASIS OF CAPITALISTIC EXPLOITATION.

(Glasgow) Land Values (s. t.), August.—Newspapers come and newspapers go; business organizations flourish and business organizations decay; the latest means, methods and machinery of production and distribution have to yield pride of place to still further improved means, methods, and machinery—but the land endureth for ever. It is, therefore, the ownership of land that alone can give a perpetual means of exploiting, a perpetual ownership of the men who have to live and work on it, a perpetual command of the fruits of their labor, individual and collective. Some such thoughts must have been influencing Messrs. Harmsworth's minds when negotiating their . . deal . . in . . the fortunate or unfortunate Colony of Newfoundland. . . . Let it once be enforced upon the governments of all constitutionally governed countries that the land belongs in usufruct to the living; that it is the inalienable inheritance of this and all future generations; that its use only can be granted to individuals, and this solely on the condition that they contribute toward the necessary public revenues in proportion to its annual unimproved rental value; and the main cause and necessary basis of what is erroneously termed the capitalistic exploitation of the many by the few will be swept away, and the path will be cleared for the advance of the race to a nobler and more equitable civilization, to a higher plane of individual and social life. Justice, or association in equality, is the law of social progress, is the law of social life. Such association is manifestly impossible so long as the land, the element which gives control of all the natural bounties, sources, forces and opportunities, is made the property and heirloom of a privileged few. This is the fundamental social wrong of which "Capitalists" are ever eager to avail themselves to insure their own agrandizement. This is the fundamental social wrong which in all countries to-day forms the basis of the exploitations and enslavement of the many by the few. And this is the fundamental social wrong, the death-knell of which was sounded with the publication of "Progress and Poverty." To-day its power is at its height. To-morrow it will have passed away, and be regarded as we to-day regard the institution of slavery. For "the mills of the gods grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small."

MISCELLANY

IN THE GARDEN.

I spied beside the garden bed
A tiny lass of ours,
Who stopped and bent her sunny head
Above the red June flowers.

Pushing the leaves and thorns apart
She singled out a rose,
And in its inmost crimson heart,
Enraptured, plunged her nose.

"O dear, dear rose, come, tell me true—
Come, tell me true," said she,
"If I smell just as sweet to you
As you smell sweet to me!"

—Ernest Crosby.

TOLSTOY ON LAND OWNERSHIP.

Copyright, 1905, The Evening Bulletin, of Philadelphia. Reprinted in The Public by courteous permission from The Bulletin.

A number of suggestions have been made as to how to divide, in the most just manner, all land among the workers, but of all these only the one made by the late Henry George appears to me to be practicable.

The property right, Henry George wrote in his book about the single tax, is founded not on human laws, but on the laws of God. It is undeniable and absolute, and every one who violates it, be it an individual or a nation, commits a theft.

A man who catches a fish, who plants a tree, builds a house, constructs a machine, sews a dress or paints a picture, thereby becomes the owner of the results of his own efforts—he has the right to give them away, to sell them or to leave them to his heirs. As the land has not been created by us, and only serves as the temporary residence of changing generations of human beings, it is clear that nobody can own the exclusive right to possess land, and that the rights of all men to it are equal and inalienable.

The right to own land is limited by the equal rights of all others, and this imposes upon the temporary possessor of land the duty to remunerate society for the valuable privilege given him to use the land in his possession.

When we impose a tax upon houses, crops, or money in any form, we take from members of society something which by right belongs to them, we violate the property right and commit a theft in the name of the law; while when we impose a tax upon land we take from members of society something which does not belong to them, but to society, and which cannot be given to them except at a detriment to others. We thus violate the laws of justice when we place a tax on labor or the results of labor, and we also violate them if we do not levy a tax on land.

Let us, therefore, decide to stop levying all taxes except the tax on the value of land, regardless of the buildings erected or the improvements made on it, but only on the value which natural or social conditions give to it.

If we place this single tax on land the results will be these:

1. The tax will relieve us of the whole army of officials necessary to collect the present taxes, which will diminish the cost of government, while at the same time making it more honest. It will rid us of all the taxes which lead to lying, to perjury, to frauds of all kinds. All land is visible, and cannot be hidden, and its value is fixed easier than that of any other property, and the single tax can be determined at less expense and less danger to public morals.

2. It will to a great extent increase the production of wealth, doing away with the discouraging tax upon labor and thrift, and it will make the land more accessible to those who want to work or improve, as the proprietors, who do not work themselves, but speculate in its increasing value, will find it difficult to keep such expensive property. The tax on labor, on the other hand, leads to the accumulation of immense fortunes in a few hands, and the increasing poverty of the masses. This unjust division of wealth on one side leads to the creation of one class of people who are idle and corrupt, because they are too rich, and the creation of another class of people who are too poor, and thus doubly delays the production of wealth. This unjust division of wealth creates on one side terrible millionaires, and on the other side vagrants, beggars, thieves, gamblers and social parasites of various kinds, and necessitates an enormous expense for officials to watch these—policemen, judges, prisons and other means which society uses in self-defense.

The single tax is a remedy for all these evils.

I do not mean to say that this tax will transform human nature, for that is not within the power of man, but it will create conditions under which human nature will grow better instead of worse, as under the present conditions. It will make possible an increase of wealth, of which it is hardly possible to form an idea. It will make undeserved poverty impossible. It will do away with the demoralizing struggle for a living. It will make it possible for men to be honest, just,

Digitized by Google

reasonable and noble, if they desire to be so. It will prepare the soil for the coming of the epoch of justice, abundance, peace and happiness, which Christ told His disciples of.

Let us suppose that in a certain place all land belongs to two owners—one very rich, who lives far away, and another, not rich, living and working at home—and to a hundred of small peasants owning a few acres each. Besides these there live in that place some scores of people who own no land—mechanics, merchants, and officials.

Now let us suppose that the people of that community, having arrived at the conclusion that the land is common property, decide to dispose of the land according to their new conviction.

What would they do? Take all the land away from those who own it, and give everybody the right to take the land he desires? That could not be done, because there would be several people who would want the same ground, and this would lead to endless quarrels. To form one society and work all things in common would be difficult, because some have carts, wagons, horses and cattle, while others have none, and, besides, some people do not know how to till the soil, or are not strong enough.

To divide all the land in equal parts, according to its value, and allow one part to each is very difficult, and this would, besides, be impracticable, because the lazy and poor would lease their property to the rich for money, and these would soon again be in possession of it all.

The inhabitants of the community, therefore, decide to leave the land in the possession of those who owned it, and to order each owner to pay into the common treasury money representing the revenue which had been decided on after appraising the value of the land, not according to the work or the improvements made on it, but to its quality and situation, and this money was to be divided equally among all.

But as it was difficult first to take this money from all those who held the land, and then divide it equally among all the members of the community, and as these members, besides, paid money toward the public needs—schools, fire departments, roads, etc.—and as this money was always needed, they decided to use all the money derived from those who had the use of land, for public needs.

Having made this arrangement, the members of the community levied the tax for the use of land on the two large owners, and also from the small peasants, but no tax at all was imposed on those who held no land.

This caused the one landowner who lived far away, and who derived little income from his property, to realize that it did not pay to hold on to land thus taxed, and he gave it up. The other large owner gave up part of his land, and kept only that part which produced more than the amount of the tax.

Those of the peasants who held small properties, and who had plenty of men, and not enough land, as well as some of those who held no land at all, but who desired to make a living by working the land, took up the land surrendered by its former owners.

After that all the members of the community could live on the land and make a living from it, and all land passed into the hands of or remained with those who loved to work it, and who made it produce the most. The public institutions flourished and the wealth of the community increased, for there was more money than before for public needs; and the most important fact was that this change in the ownership of land took place without any discussions, quarrels or discord, by the voluntary surrender of the land by those who did not derive any profit from it.

This is the project of Henry George, which, if tried here, would make Russia wealthy and happy, and which is practicable all over the world.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF PUBLIC UTILITIES.

Substance of a lecture delivered by John Z. White, of Chicago, before the Los Angeles (Cal.) Real Estate Board, June 15, 1905, and the Puyallup (Wash.) Board of Trade, August 12, 1905.

Controversy over the question of public ownership of public utilities is becoming more and more heated. Those who oppose public ownership insist that it is nothing more nor less than a decided step toward socialism—in fact, that public ownership is socialism. Those who favor public ownership argue that this is the only measure whereby individualism can be maintained; that private ownership of these utilities is steadily crushing independent industries. Where opinion is so widely separated it is probably needless to say that there is plenty of room for argument. Argument, however, is not common in dealing with public questions. Declamation is easier.

It is claimed by advocates of public ownership that the railroad is a public function. This claim is scouted by others as only the expression of a theory and a demand is made for something practical. Barely stopping to note that a theory is but an explanation, the other side retorts that, outside of the United States, about two-thirds of all the railroads in the world are publicly owned. But this fact has little effect on the average practical American. He is confident that our way is the best way. He is as sure of this as a voodooist is of the efficacy of charms.

Besides all the railway experts so declare, and they know. Of course they know. When we wish to learn about groceries, we ask grocers; when we wish to learn about stocks, we ask brokers. And so, if we want to know about railroads, we should of course ask railroaders. Looks reasonable, doesn't it? What is wrong with this idea?

Simply this: The question is not of railroads, but of government. Work it out. As I have suggested, the railroad is a public function. Now, apply the rule to that idea. When we would learn about government, we seek governors; and who may these be? There is an old-fashioned, maybe obsolete, notion to the effect that the people rule—that they are in very truth governors. And what say the people? Why, the people are not of one mind—are divided. Hence the arguments. And these are made to the people. For the people, not any particular set of experts, nor all sets, but the whole people, are to deal with and settle this question.

One thing is beyond dispute. If private ownership is the better plan, we are now getting its full benefit—the best possible. Strange as it may seem, however, not only Populists and Democrats, but prominent Republicans—even the President—are insisting that something must be done. Imagine! Something must be done to relieve the best possible condition! Curious, isn't it?

Yes, something must be done. The question of public ownership of public utilities is up, and full and fair discussion will sooner or later compel an equitable settlement.

What fundamental principle supports the claim that railroads are public utilities? Simply this, that each individual has a natural right of highway. That is to say, in order to live we must produce food, clothing and shelter. We desire, and have a right

Digitized by Google

to produce these in the most economical way known. The basic law in economics is that "man seeks to gratify his desires with the least exertion," which is but a recognition in human nature of the physical fact that all forces flow along the line of least resistance. This desire to produce in the most economical way leads to subdivision of labor. That is, one man or a group of men produces one form of wealth, while another man or another group produces another form. Then they trade portions of their products. This process of trading gives rise to a certain physical necessity—namely, a path or highway.

Men produce wheat in Dakota. Other men produce cotton in Mississippi. They wish to trade; they have a natural right to trade. To trade they must cross the land. Other men wish to produce corn and other varieties of wealth in localities between Dakota and Mississippi. These also have a desire and a right to trade. Is it not perfectly clear that the establishment of the necessary paths, or highways, will lead to conflict if left to individuals? Will not one man wish to make a path where another will wish to grow corn?

Right here a distinction should be noted: Each individual has a right to cross the land—a right of highway. So, also, each has a right to the use of air. In the latter case, however, each can use the air without interfering with his neighbor, but in the case of the highway this is physically impossible. It is this physical condition that compels a community to act as a unit in establishing highways. And when a community acts as a unit the majority must rule. It not only can rule, but it must—either positively or negatively. If the minority rule, is it not because the majority refrains from exercising its power?

This physical necessity distinguishes the public function. Therefore has the right of highway always been a matter of public law. The community—the public—must act. Even our present railroad systems rest on this communal or public action. The right-of-way is the public thing—the common right. It is therefore asserted by advocates of public ownership that when any public body grants a right-of-way to a group of individuals it thereby gives to this group a power that properly inheres in the whole people. Further, that the power of the whole people is sovereign, and that therefore such a grant is a partial abdication of sovereignty.

An argument so simple, and seemingly so conclusive, would undoubtedly result in public administration of public utilities, were it not for the fact that a wrong disposition of social forces, while injurious to the community as a whole, is financially beneficial to a few who control by virtue of mistaken law. A generation or two ago wolves were numerous in northern Illinois. Some localities began to give bounties for their destruction, and almost immediately some of the farmers began breeding wolves. It paid better than breeding hogs. Many things can be done through legislative stimulus; even wolf culture is thereby possible—graft culture as well.

Because of this private profit we find all manner of reasons advanced against the policy of public ownership of public utilities. First it is claimed that public operation is wasteful; that private profit is the only incentive that will insure careful and economical management. There is just truth in this contention. Private management does tend toward economy in management. But who gets the resulting profit?

If a given service can be produced under private management at a cost of 10, while under public management the cost is 12, but is rendered to the people at cost by public producers, and at a profit of 50 per cent. by private producers, or an expense to buyers of 15, which is the greater economy? Or, if public producers make the same charge, namely, 15, will not the profit of 3 inure to the people instead of being a private gain? It would seem that all that can be fairly claimed on behalf of the economy of private management of public utilities may be freely granted without loss to the argument for public ownership.

But the practical man is never content with argument. He wants facts. Well, facts can be furnished to him in great abundance. For instance, Hugh H. Lusk of Australia tells us this: In proportion to population that country has nearly six times as many miles of telegraph lines as any other country in the world, excepting New Zealand. It has one telegraph station for every 1,300 people. We have one for every 3,000. Australia sends two and one-half messages per year per inhabitant. We send one. Our rates are from two to three times higher than those of Australia. The Australian lines make three per cent. above cost of operation and maintenance. This rate of profit would hardly satisfy Mr. Gould. The post office and telegraph is administered by the public as one system, and in small places the postmaster and operator is the same person. Of 6,000 post offices, 3,000 are telegraph stations. And with it all the population of Australia is only about one-twentieth of that of the United States.

United States Consul Charles N. Daniels reported on public ownership of the water system at Sheffield, England: Charges had been reduced 25 per cent. All expenses were met, including sinking fund, and a good profit secured. Profit in 1887 was $29,058; in 1904, $361,231. Improvements in plant and reduction in cost to consumers had been made by the city, and yet gross and net revenues had increased under the despised public ownership system. In 1904 the city began furnishing water for free public baths, and for other purposes, by which the expenses of the health department were reduced $13,140.

United States Consul Hamm, Hull, Eng., reports that the private telephone company charged nearly $50 per year for telephone service to a private family. The public establishment renders like service for a little less than $25, thereby forcing the private company to do likewise. A curious fact is that the private company is under contract to render as cheap service in all cities, as in any, for unlimited service. If our public officers knew how to bargain as well as the British we might fare better—or if we were a little more careful in selecting public officers. Gas is also under public management in Hull; also water; also electric lighting; also street cars. In each department a profit is shown, with the following low prices to consumers: Street car fare, two cents; exclusive telephone service in private house less than $25 per year; in business office, $30 per year; gas, 48 cents per thousand feet. Consul Hamm says the object is not to make profit, but to furnish citizens with the service. That policy may have its advantages.

In Glasgow, street cars were placed in possession of the public in July, 1894. Fares have been reduced 30 to 40 per cent. Drivers and conductors were required to work 12 and 14 hours per day. Under public management they work ten hours. Meanwhile the concern is making money for the city, after meeting all obligations.

Dr. Hugo R. Meyer, lecturer on political economy at Harvard, tries to counteract the influence of the facts of public ownership in Glasgow, and to this end makes comparisons between conditions in the United States and Britain. That is not a fair comparison. The true method is to compare Glasgow under private management with Glasgow under public management. He makes much of the fact that some car fares in Glasgow are six cents, but fails to tell us that 18 per cent. of total re-

Digitized by Google

ceipts is from one cent fares, and 67 per cent. of total receipts is from two cent fares. He tells us the average length of ride in Boston is estimated to be between three and four miles. But how the estimate is arrived at he leaves us to guess. It seems to be assumed merely from the fact that in some of our cities street car lines are longer than in Glasgow. Railroad lines in the United States are also longer than in Great Britain, yet Prof. Emory R. Johnson quotes Dr. Weyl, of the University of Pennsylvania, to show among other things that the Briton travels 244 miles to the American's 209. He takes three and a half trips to the American's single one.

Dr. Meyer tells us that it is as easy to earn two cents in the United States as to earn one in Glasgow, as if the ease or difficulty with which we earn should determine to what extent we shall be robbed.

Gas in Glasgow was $1.14 per thousand before public ownership. It is 54 cents now. Water was 14 pence per thousand gallons; now it is six pence. We are told that in Manchester for a morning or evening street car ride workmen are charged two cents without regard to distance; that Huddersfield has public ownership of water, gas and electric plants, and street cars, while rates are much lower than any in this country; that a Belgian workman living 42 miles from his place of employment can buy a ticket good to go and come six times a week, for 57 cents; that in Berlin like tickets on suburban lines, some of them running ten miles into the country, are sold for 17 cents a week; that in the same city a yearly ticket, good for an average ride of five miles in and out as often as you please, on any train, is sold for $4.50; that as far back as 1894 Russia reduced passenger rates to three-fourths of a cent per mile for distances under 106 miles, and for 2,000 miles the fare was $6; that this paid so well a farther reduction was made; that in Victoria publicly owned railroads earned enough revenue to pay all the Federal taxes. In 1903 the Municipal Year Book of Great Britain showed that 56 cities give a profit of over $5,000,000 on municipal lighting, which under our management would have gone into private pockets, with undoubtedly as much if not twice as much more: The average fare on railroads in Switzerland is 1.55 cents, in France 1.21 cents, in Germany 1.1 cents, in Austria-Hungary 1 cent, in Belgium 0.88 cent, in the United States 2 cents. It would be more here but for deadheads.

Such figures as we are permitted to examine by the kindly owners of the United States reveal a worse condition than that of Europe. Ex-Gov. Larrabee of Iowa places the average cost of railroad construction at $25.000 per mile, and the water in the capitalization at $38,000 per mile. C. Wood Davis says many lines have been built for $8.000 to $15.000 per mile; that the Kansas Midland cost $10.200 and was capitalized at $53,024 per mile; that the superintendent of the St. Louis & Iron Mountain Railroad swore before the Arkansas state board of assessors that he could duplicate that road for $11.000 per mile, but it was capitalized at five times that sum. Poor gives the railroad capitalization for 1890 at $63,600 per mile, and says it was 50 per cent. water. This leaves cost a trifle over $30,000 per mile; but the estimate evidently was not intended to be exact, and besides we all know Poor.

Floyd W. Mundy says the New York, Ontario & Western has 480 miles of track, while the Chesapeake & Ohio has 1.500 miles. The earnings for 1901 were about $10,000 per mile on each road, but the capital stock on each road was about the same in spite of the difference in length.

The railway capitalization for 1903 is given by the Inter State Commerce Commission at $63,186 per mile. The chairman of the Inter State Commerce Commission, speaking to the Senate committee, said:

> It costs about one-fourth of what the wheat sells for to get it to the sea board market. The freight on a train of 40 cars, with 20 tons to the car, making 1,200 tons, from Chicago to New York, at 20 cents a hundred, would be $4,800, yet the bare cost of hauling that train is not much over 50 cents a mile. That is, a train which earns nearly $5,000 is moved at an expense of about $500.

The large capitalization is primarily for the purpose of concealing as far as possibly the unreasonably large profits, although it often serves other ends, especially in stock jobbing schemes, and indirectly aids in the advance of rates.

Passenger rates vary from two to four cents per mile. In Europe first-class fare is three cents, and is paid by the aristocracy, the fools and the Americans. Second-class is one and one-half to two cents, and is used by the well-to-do middle class people. Third class varies from one-half to one cent a mile, and accommodates more than two-thirds of the passenger traffic. In the United States the rich pay little or nothing; ordinary people who travel much, pay two cents—the "mileage" rate; the poor and others who travel but little (the third class in Europe, which travels at one cent or less), pay three cents or more. This result of course flows from the fact that we have no classes in our democratic republic where every man is the perfect equal of his fellow before the law!

An oil refiner writes under date of October 4, 1899, that he "manufactures 35,000 barrels of oil per month. Seventy per cent. is marketed in Europe, and 90 per cent. of that in countries where the railroads are controlled by the governments. We have no difficulty in competing with the Standard Oil company in those countries." He further says that he is a "believer in government ownership of the transportation lines of this country." Now can we help inclining to agree with his view, when we remember that all honest men have always been opposed to interference with the highway—even by Dick Turpin.

Those who oppose public ownership of public utilities seem to be animated by the same idea of business relations that controlled a book agent who on dropping into town learned that it was the day of Smith's wedding anniversary. He called on Smith and suggested that he present his wife with a bible, and offered a handsome $15 article for five dollars. Smith bit. The agent at once proceeded to Smith's home and suggested to Mrs. Smith that she should make Mr. Smith a present of a handsome $15 bible which he would sell for five dollars. Mrs. Smith bit. Smith came home. The bibles were presented. Tableau. Smith called on the 'phone for his friend Brown to hurry down to the train and catch a book agent, and hold him till Smith arrived. Very important. Brown complied, found the agent, and said: "Smith must see you—says it's important." "Sorry," said the agent, "it's impossible. Got to leave on this train, but I know what he wants. He was to let me know if he wanted one of my $15 bibles at five dollars. If you care to take it to him?" Brown bit.

The railroad situation has its humorous phases, but it is a humor that has cost thousands of men and women years of heartache. It has destroyed, and is destroying, thousands of lives every year. Worse, it is corrupting the moral nature of an increasing proportion of our people. It is destroying popular government.

But it is objected that public ownership would so increase the number of public employes that the political supremacy of the party in power would be perpetuated. Is there anyone so innocent as not to know that these corporations are in politics now, are in fact the dominating influence in both par-

Digitized by Google

ties—both before and after elections, and that their influence is exerted secretly? If railroads are great forces, and therefore to be feared, shall we not be safer if they appear in the political arena openly? Will it not be much safer to have a government manager who can be called to account, than an irresponsible one who might carelessly remark: "The people be damned"? We had to indulge in strong language to get rid of Secretary Morton, but we did get rid of him; but Manager Morton violated our laws, and told us so, and for that it seems we are without remedy. We have trouble with the post office, but Machen didn't tell us to be damned. Mrs. Wilmans had to fight, but she won; while Armour appears secure. The "system" is doubtless annoyed by Lawson; but none of its votaries seems to expect a striped suit. When railroads go into liquidation, is it not our practice to place them in the hands of receivers, and has not such management been found to be as honest and efficient as that of the men appointed by the railroad corporations?

Grant all that may be claimed as to the dangers of public ownership of public utilities, and private ownership is many fold more dangerous.

"It is socialism, anyway," cry monopoly beneficiaries. No, it is not. Socialism is public ownership of private utilities.

Private utilities are those utilities that are naturally open to free competition. Lines of business that rest on a right of way do not fall within this definition. As I have already mentioned, the right of way is the common right. It is controlled by law, necessarily. We have developed a practice of abdicating this power, and thereby have placed in private hands what amounts to a power to tax. There is yet to be shown a group of men long in power who have not used such authority to enrich themselves by oppressing others.

At present the railroads can destroy or stimulate any industry in any particular locality. If the public owned the roads, how would the iced car trick of the beef trust work? Where would be the leverage of the oil monopoly? Who would get passes? Should we not save the whole cost of railroad solicitors, which C. Wood Davis places at $20,000,000 per year? By using shortest routes we could save $25,000,000; by consolidating depots and staffs, $20,000,000; by refusing passes, $30,000,000; by dispensing with useless officers, $33,000,000, etc.

By earning instead of appropriating the money of the people, we could avoid killing one passenger in every 2,267,000 carried, while Germany kills one in 10,000,000; we could avoid injuring one in 170,141, while Germany injures one in 1,700,000. In ten years we killed over 66,000. As to employes, we injure one in every 28, and kill one in 447.

There is, however, a method by which the anxiety of those who fear socialism may be allayed, provided the so-called conservatives will undertake a vigorous corrective policy. This method involves genuine public regulation. Since the beginning of the agitation for the Interstate Commerce Commission we have had nothing but failure from any and all attempts a regulation, and it is now frequently said that the roads are stronger than the government. In a sense this statement is true, as our good President is likely to discover. But why is it true? The vulgar notion is that the monopoly companies corruptly influence elections and both legislative and judicial bodies. There is a large amount of truth in this same vulgar notion. But a much more potent cause for the failure of regulative measures, and one which influential advocates of regulation studiously ignore, is the doctrine laid down in the Dartmouth college case, by no less an individual than the celebrated tory, John Marshall, while chief justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. As was entirely fitting, the other political gymnast, Daniel Webster, appeared as counsel. In that case, without right or authority, but by usurpation (always agreeable to tories) Marshall held a corporation franchise to be a contract, and, therefore, under the protection of the clause in the Constitution regarding the inviolability of contractual obligations. This is the doctrine which makes regulation so difficult. It is contrary to all precedent. Contrary to all reason. It was, and is, pure usurpation. If you want regulation, instead of public ownership, you must get rid of that doctrine.

In a recent article in Tom Watson's Magazine, by Fontaine T. Fox, which might well be read by every intelligent citizen, other performances by this same tory are related. He decided that Congress has power to create a bank (and presumably other corporations), although Madison proposed in the Constitutional Convention to give to Congress power "to grant charters of incorporation where the interests of the United States require, and the legislative provisions of individual States may be incompetent," and the proposal was defeated. Thus Marshall said Congress could do just what the Convention refused to permit. Fortunately, there was a man named Jackson.

Marshfield then decided that a corporation is a person. Next, that a citizen can sue his own State before the Supreme Court of the United States, although before the Convention of Virginia, called to adopt the Constitution, he had said that such course would be incredibly absurd. James Wilson, one of the members of the first Supreme Court bench, in his lectures in defense of the Constitution, held that all government is the result of contract. This seems to have been Marshall's view. But is it so? No State adopted the Constitution unanimously. How many Congressmen or other officers of the government have since been unanimously elected? Where, then, is your contract? The truth is that government is dominion expressing the will of the majority.

If those who oppose public ownership on the ground that it is socialism, should substitute public regulation they would first be obliged to abrogate the John Marshall doctrines. Unless this can be done we must all be swept forward in the rising tide of public ownership sentiment. The condition of trade and labor calls for redress. The advantage of modern productive power is secured to those holding legal privileges. Industry—both capital and labor—is despoiled.

But the essential remedy is simple. Restore liberty to all men. We seek not property, but freedom to earn, and to keep what we earn. The spoliation of industry is increasing with even greater ratio than the power to produce. All available land is owned. Therefore the normal safety valve of our industrial population is closed. So long as there be available lands open for settlement, so long is abject poverty impossible. But with this avenue of escape shut off, beware.

Finally, hope not too much from the public ownership of public utilities. If railroads are placed in the hands of the public the farmer will be able to ship his produce more cheaply. The same is true of the manufacturer, and of all other producers. What then? As the farmer makes more profit, the value of his land will rise. As the manufacturer increases his profits, his site for business becomes more desirable and therefore more valuable. The same is true of all kinds of producers. It follows, then, that as we find relief from monopoly

Digitized by Google

charges by public utility corporations, we shall be met by increasing monopoly charges by land owners. What we save from the clutches of railroads we shall lose to the rapacity of earth owners.

Shall we therefore vote public ownership hopeless? By no means. We will declare that land owners are no more entitled to unearned wealth than are railroad companies. Tax no industry. Tax the value of land alone. We demand freedom from all monopoly.

The history of all countries where public ownership has been tried, without curtailing the landlord's power, shows no relief to the industrial masses. In Glasgow we find an increasingly emphatic demand that the British parliament give to the city permission to tax land values. We find the demand indorsed by scores of other municipalities in Scotland and England. Public ownership makes the truth very clear.

If we add all the earnings of public utility corporations together, we have a sum not much over one-half of the amount we pay in taxes, although the governments do not get all that we pay. Some one does. The total values of the country are probably not less than $100,000,000,000. Subtract from this amount all public utility values and commodity and building values, and look carefully at the remainder—and name it.

Private taxation is the cause of all industrial troubles. Public taxation of private monopoly is the remedy.

Judge Grosscup, of the United States District Court at Chicago, says we must recast and regenerate the country's corporation policy. He thinks the general government should undertake this task. Has the general government's course thus far been such as to inspire confidence? It looks very much as though that same general government, as it appears in the guise of the Supreme Court, might be the cause of our difficulties. Still, the Judge makes a splendid presentation of the cause of private property, giving as his text: "In the beginning the Creator so conditioned mankind, that always underneath him would be the earth, always about him the air, always above him the sky. On this, as a dowry, he started us." But the Judge did not enlighten us as to who has taken possession of the dowry. Nor did he explain how it may be recovered.

Yet this is the question that all must face. Here is the task for "big hearts and big brains," and it is a task that big brains have heretofore been much more agile in dodging than courageous in meeting. What shall it profit us if we gain all public utilities and lose the whole world?

BOOKS

READABLE ESSAYS THAT ARE WORTH READING.

Most essays are not easy to read, and those that are easy are usually not worth reading. But Henry M. Simmons has given us a volume of essays (New Tables of Stone and Other Essays. Boston: James H. West company) which are well worth reading and so easy to read that they seem to read themselves into you as you turn the pages.

A truly religious book is this one, although it shatters many a religious idol. But for every idol it shatters it sets up a living God.

"The New Tables of Stone" gives a new and deeper meaning to the story of the tables of stone "written by the finger of God" and received by Moses on Sinai. The physical laws of geology are seen to typify moral law, and the correspondence is beautifully pictured. In foliage the author finds "New Leaves of Scripture;" and "The Cosmic Roots of Love" he traces down even to chemical affinity, which he describes as "at least prophetic of that which unites us in societies and families." The "Divinity of Man" and "The Book of Jonah" are especially interesting, though less so than "The Breath of Life;" while "The Sin of a Census," and "The Rise and Fall of Satan," are enlightening as well as pleasing. With these go such subjects as "The Water of Life," "The Enlarging Thought of God," "Various Meanings of Easter." "Christianity Then and Since," and "The New Year of Religion."

The distinguishing characteristic of the volume is a rational idealism poetically expressed in limpid prose.

THE STANDARD OIL CROWD.

In these days of exposure of Standard Oil iniquities, Gilbert Holland Montague's "The Rise and Progress of the Standard Oil Company" (New York: Harper and Brothers) is suggestive of a voice crying out in the wilderness. It is a defense of the Standard Oil "crowd," which that crowd has recognized as such by distributing copies extensively, with the publishing house's compliments, especially among clergymen.

The work was begun by the author while "Ricardo Scholar in Economics" at Harvard, and is brought down to 1903. It is evidently the conscientious work of a student who honestly thinks it quite unnecessary to put his social ethics to any higher test, for business purposes, than business habits, customs, and efficiency. When he finds or thinks he finds that the Standard Oil people have won their way by superior ability and capital, he assumes that their plea of "not guilty" is sustained, no matter how their superior ability and capital may have been got or used.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—Municipal Ownership and Operation of Public Utilities in New York City. By Samuel Seabury, one of the Justices of the City Court of the City of New York: Municipal Ownership Publishing Co., 201 Duane St., New York City. Price, 25 cents. To be reviewed.

—The Quest of John Chapman. The Story of a Forgotten Hero. By Newell Dwight Hillis. New York: The Macmillan Company. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. The historical hero of this story is "Johnny Appleseed," whose true name was John Chapman. To be reviewed.

—Moody's Manual of Railroads and Corporation Securities. Sixth annual number. 1905. Moody Publishing Co., 35 Nassau St., New York; The Rookery, Chicago; Broad Exchange building, Boston, and 238 Fourth Ave., Pittsburg; also Wade Chance, Threadneedle House, 28 Bishopsgate St., London, Eng.; J. H. De Bussy, Rokin 60, Amsterdam, Holland. Pages 2,640. Price, $10. To be reviewed.

—"Glimpses of Universal Evolution," by J. J. Jewett (Los Angeles, Cal.: Baumgardt Publishing Co., 116 North Broadway. Price 20 cents.) An ingenious versification of the ingenious scientific theory that matter and motion create mind and morals. It is prophetic, however, of a perception of a moral state when "men will have their equal rights obtained, and wonder how they were so long enchained."

PERIODICALS

The Springfield Republican is wrong in saying that Clarence S. Darrow's forthcoming book entitled "An Eye for an Eye," is his second. Two at least of his books have been widely sold and discussed, "Farmington" and "Resist Not Evil." Of the forthcoming work, which is to be published by Fox, Duffield & Co., the Republican says, "it tells the story of a murder and the murderer's expiation of his

I AM INTERESTED IN "THE PUBLIC"
AREN'T YOU?

I Am Desirous of Increasing Its Circulation
ARE YOU?

If you are you can get something of value for nothing, and no string to it.

Having come into possession of a number of authenticated maps of the United States (including all its possessions) mounted, measuring 7x5 feet, valued at four dollars each, I will send one to each of the first fifty who will send in five (5) yearly or ten (10) half-yearly subscriptions to THE PUBLIC, as per its offer of furnishing these at the yearly rate of $1.20. These maps are especially valuable to schools, clubs, hotels, offices, etc., as also in homes. **Who Will Win First One?** Single Taxers can bulk their subscriptions and so get one for their club rooms.

DANIEL KIEFER, 530 Walnut St., Cincinnati, O

Digitized by Google

THE "HOST" WHO IS TO BE RECKONED WITH.

Landlordism—He talks about relieving the pressure in the cities and towns by getting the people "back to the land"—but not a word about paying one, the owner, all they can make above a bare living in the form of Rent! Ignores the Rights of Property altogether—there's cheek, if you like!!

crime, the narrative taking the form of a talk between the murderer and a friend who visits him in prison the night before the hanging."—J. H. D.

John Z. White, in the San Francisco Star of July 15, replies very fully and conclusively to the Call newspaper, which had criticised one of his addresses. Speaking of "water" in railroads, Mr. White very aptly says: "If capitalization were just equal to worth of improvements present income would show so enormous a rate of profit on investment as to cause something possibly more distressing than public ownership."—J. H. D.

A critical paper by M. O. Lorenz on methods of measuring the concentration of wealth is an important contribution to the June number of the quarterly publication of the American Statistical Association (491 Boylston St., Boston). One of the minor articles, "Economic Conditions of the Jews in Russia," by G. A. Goldenweiser, based upon a St. Petersburg publication of the Jewish Colonization Society, seems to be a careful condensation.

The Public

is a weekly review which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of radical democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

TERMS:—Annual Subscription, $2.00; Semi-Annual Subscription, $1.00; Quarterly Subscription, 50 cents; Trial Subscription (4 weeks), 10 cents; Single Copies, 5 cents. Free of postage in United States, Canada, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO. Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

Published weekly by The Public Publishing Company, First National Bank Building, Chicago, Ill. Post office address, THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING

Per agate line,	each insertion,	$0.05
Per inch, (14 lines),	" "	.70
Per column (133 lines),	" "	6.65
One-quarter page (100 lines),	" "	5.00
One-half page (200 lines),	" "	10.00
One page (400 lines),	" "	20.00
Front cover page,	" "	25.00
Front cover half-page,	" "	15.00
Last cover page,	" "	25.00
Last cover half-page,	" "	12.50
Last cover quarter-page,	" "	6.25

Advertising Forms Close on the Tuesday Preceding the Saturday of Publication.

THE PERFECT LIFE

A PEARL OF LITERATURE

By mail postpaid, 12 cents per copy; 12 copies for $1.00.

A. C. HINGST,

119 E. 15th St., New York City

GLIMPSES OF UNIVERSAL EVOLUTION

After Haeckel, Huxley, etc. Pamphlet. By mail, 20 cents. Address Author: "J. J. JEWETT, 116 N. Broadway, Los Angeles, Cal."

5000 TELEGRAPHERS NEEDED

Annually, to fill the new positions created by Railroad and Telegraph Companies. We want YOUNG MEN and LADIES of good habits, to

LEARN TELEGRAPHY AND R. R. ACCOUNTING.

We furnish 75 per cent. of the Operators and Station Agents in America. Our six schools are the largest exclusive Telegraph Schools in the world. Established 20 years and endorsed by all leading Railway Officials.

We execute a $250 Bond to every student to furnish him or her a position paying from $40 to $80 a month in States east of the Rocky Mountains, or from $75 to $100 a month in States west of the Rockies, immediately upon graduation.

Students can enter at any time. No vacations. For full particulars regarding any of our Schools write direct to our executive office at Cincinnati, O. Catalogue free.

The Morse School of Telegraphy

Cincinnati, Ohio. Buffalo, N. Y.
Atlanta, Ga. La Crosse, Wis.
Texarkana, Tex. San Francisco, Cal.

Every Reader of THE PUBLIC

Can easily be a valuable factor in enlarging its usefulness and influence, without any expense to him or her.

Send for circular which tells how.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.
First National Bank Building, - CHICAGO

ON EVERY NEWS STAND THE PUBLIC

Can be placed, with a little co-operation from those who wish to see its influence grow.

WE WILL TELL HOW.

The Public Publishing Company
First National Bank Building, - CHICAGO

JOSEPH McDONOUGH
"Ye Olde Booke Man"
OLD AND NEW BOOKSELLER and IMPORTER
39 and 41 Columbia St., Albany, N. Y.
Monthly Catalog Free. Books Not in Stock Hunted for and Reported Free of Charge.

Digitized by Google

"WILCUT"

The Knife That Holds Its Edge

These knives, being made from the best steel in the world for the purpose, are absolutely perfect in their temper and are guaranteed to stay sharp longer than any others. A long, flexible knife with a sharp, keen, lasting edge, for thin or accurate slicing of ham, beef, etc., is a prime necessity in the kitchen of every efficient housekeeper. Such a one is our

12-in. Slicing Knife sent prepaid for $1.50

All live dealers sell Wilcuts, or we will send prepaid, for 40c., a 6-inch, or for 65c., an 8-inch butcher knife. Our Special

$5.00 Kitchen Assortment of Knives

includes 6-inch butcher knife, 10-inch steak knife, 6-inch boning knife, 12-inch ham slicer, 6-inch French Cook's knife, 4½-inch kitchen knife, 8-inch bread knife, 4-inch fruit knife and 4-inch paring knife. This forms a complete assortment of "sharp edged" knives for the kitchen. No equal sum spent otherwise will yield one-half the usefulness, pleasure and convenience to housekeeper or cook. Your money back if not perfectly satisfied. Send for catalog 7.

Wilkinson Shear & Cutlery Company Reading, Pa.

Hours: 10 a. m. to 4 p. m. Tel. Harrison 1027.

CHARLES L. LOGAN, D. O.

OSTEOPATHIC PHYSICIAN

Office: 45 Auditorium Bldg.

HOTEL WARNER—EVENINGS. CHICAGO

EDWARD POLAK

4030 Third Ave., NEW YORK CITY

Real Estate Auctioneer and Broker

Investments carefully made in New York real estate for out of town clients. BEST OF REFERENCES

ATTORNEYS

B. C. STICKNEY

Attorney and Counsellor at Law

Patents and Trade Marks

Expert in Patent Causes

132 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK

WILLIAM H. HOLLY

LAWYER

1506 Tribune Building, CHICAGO

Telephones { Central 2056 / Automatic 4065

CONTRACTORS

GEORGE H. ATKINSON, CONTRACTOR.

Telephone, Electric Light, Trolley and Municipal Work. Trolley Roads built complete and financed.

Lincoln Trust Building, Jersey City, N. J.

"To Those Who Are Poor and Wish to Become Rich, or Who Are Rich and Wish to Become Richer"

FREE AMERICA

By BOLTON HALL

is dedicated. The book shows, in an interesting and amusing way, the evils from which we suffer as individuals and as a society, the causes of them and their cure—which is liberty. The illustrations are by Dan Beard.

Two Hundred and Fifteen Pages, 18mo. Price, postpaid: Paper, 25 Cents; Cloth, 75 Cents.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

Works by Clarence S. Darrow

Resist Not Evil

Fourteen chapters on the subject of non-resistance.

"It is a startling arraignment of the doctrines of force and punishment."—St. Paul Pioneer Press.

12mo., Cloth, 75c, postpaid.

A Persian Pearl

A volume of essays and literary interpretations.

CONTENTS:—A Persian Pearl (The Rubaiyat), Walt Whitman, Robert Burns, Realism in Literature and Art, The Skeleton in the Closet.

12mo., Cloth, $1.50 net, postpaid.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY

First National Bank Building, CHICAGO, ILL.

Captain Jinks Hero

By ERNEST CROSBY

A keen satire on our recent wars, in which the parallel between savagery and soldiery is unerringly drawn.

PROFUSELY ILLUSTRATED BY DAN BEARD

There is not a dull page in the book.—*South African News, Capetown.*

The author has added to our literature a notable work of satire, which, whether right or wrong, must appeal to all endowed with the national sense of humor.—*New York Mail and Express.*

12mo., cloth, 400 pages, $1.50 postpaid

The Public Publishing Company

First National Bank Building, - CHICAGO

DO YOU WANT TO KNOW

how best to take advantage of existing conditions to advance your own interests, and to keep others from advancing their interests at your expense? Then read

BISOCIALISM

The Reign of the Man at the Margin

By OLIVER R. TROWBRIDGE

It will point out to you the five possible avenues for money getting under the established order, and thus enable you to start right if you are young, to get right before it is too late if you are of middle age, and to see just where you have missed it if you are old.

The value of this book cannot always remain unknown. It will not be easy, or even possible, to set forth in any satisfactory way its various points of merit. Yet from the housetops it ought to be proclaimed, "Here is a book unusually worth everybody's attention."—*City and State,* Philadelphia.

Handsomely bound in cloth, 12mo., 400 pages. Price $1.50 net. Add 10 Cents for Postage.

The Public Publishing Co.

BOX 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

Natural Taxation

An Inquiry into the Practicability, Justice, and Effects of a Scientific and Natural Method of Taxation.

By THOMAS G. SHEARMAN.

12mo, 268 pages, cloth, $1.00; by mail, $1.08

Paper 50 cents; by mail, 55 cents.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.

First National Bank Building, - CHICAGO

The Art of Living Long

By LOUIS CORNARO

Cornaro wrote his guide to a long and healthy life in four parts at the ages of 83, 86, 91 and 95, and died at 103.

"I have for forty years carried out the idea of Cornaro."—THOMAS A. EDISON.

Octavo volume, illustrated, bound in full cloth, gilt top—a handsome edition. Price $1.50 net; sent postpaid to any address.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.

Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

Please mention THE PUBLIC when you write to advertisers.

Digitized by Google

DON'T FAIL TO READ

The Arena

FOR

AUGUST

Some of the Features:

Hon. J. Henniker Heaton, M. P., of London, England, who is one of the recognized postal experts in Great Britain, contributes an important paper on "The European Parcels-Post" in which he shows that many European countries, notably Germany and England, are incomparably ahead of America in this department of their postal service. Rudolph Blankenburg's contribution, which closes the historical survey of forty years of graft and political corruption in Pennsylvania, deals largely with the civic revolt in Philadelphia which throttled the gas-deal, and, headed by the mayor, has since carried forward a vigorous reform campaign. The Hon. J. Warner Mills' second installment of "The Economic Struggle in Colorado" deals in a graphic and thrilling way with the tragic conflict between the cattle-men and the sheep-raisers of Colorado. "John D. Rockefeller: A Study of Character, Motive and Duty," by W. G. Joerns, is a striking and incisive arraignment of the man and the system against which there is at the present time so general a revolt on the part of friends of civic morality and personal integrity. "A Vast Educational Scheme" is the title of a most admirable presentation of the merits of the Initiative and Referendum by Eltweed Pomeroy, A. M., President of the National Direct-Legislation League. "A Sane View of the Railway Question," by Linton Satterthwait, is a most thoughtful contribution to the vexed railway problem. The author is a broad-visioned lawyer and his discussion will appeal to thinking Americans. "What of the Italian Immigrant?" by Folger Barker, handles with great judgment a question that confronts all of our larger cities. There are also three leading editorials in which Mr. Flower in his well-known trenchant style considers "The President, Mr. Morton and the Railways," "The Equitable Scandal," and "The Civic Awakening in Philadelphia." Among papers of general interest should be mentioned "A Lawyer's View of the Divorce Question," by Ernest Dale Owen; "Sam. Walter Foss; A New England Poet of the Common Life," by Rev. R. E. Bisbee, A. M.; and "Garland in Ghostland," by the Editor of "The Arena."

Every reader of this paper should subscribe for THE ARENA at once, because the very important papers that are appearing in every issue make it indispensable to persons desiring to keep in touch with the world questions of the day. Ask your dealer to supply you with it regularly.

Subscriptions $2.50 Net a Year. 25 Cents a Copy.
Foreign Subscriptions 12s., 6d.)

ALBERT BRANDT, Publisher
TRENTON, N. J., AND BOSTON, MASS.

The Books of Louis F. Post

ETHICS OF DEMOCRACY

A Series of Optimistic Essays on the Natural Laws of Human Society

Second Edition, with Portrait of the Author. 12mo, bound in rich blue cloth, printed on high-grade, hand-laid paper, gilt top, deckle edges, 398 pages, $2.00; by mail, $2.12.

You have done a great work, one that will live a monument to a man with a great moral purpose, and the ability to put it into plain, simple words within the comprehension of the everyday man. The greatest accomplishment in the work is that you have made complicated problems simple and easy to understand.—*Tom L. Johnson.*

THE PROPHET OF SAN FRANCISCO

A Sketch of Henry George's Life

16mo, bound in cartridge paper, 60 pages, 20 cents postpaid. Ten copies, $1.00 postpaid.

This interesting monograph was a labor of love by Mr. Post, and in it he makes a lucid explanation of the Single Tax philosophy as Henry George expounded it. It is especially valuable for dispelling prejudice and stimulating inquiry among the thoughtful of conservative habits.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.
First National Bank Building, CHICAGO

THINGS AS THEY ARE

By BOLTON HALL

The chapters comprising the first part of this volume are designed to show, in a logical manner, the purpose and order of the development of man. The parables illustrate the principles shown in these chapters.

A vigorous book inspired by a searching but far from bitter philosophy.—*Boston Transcript.*

16mo, cloth, ornamental, gilt top, 75 cents; by mail, 80 cents.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.
First National Bank Bldg., CHICAGO

EVEN AS YOU AND I

By BOLTON HALL

A presentation, by means of popular and simple allegories, of the doctrine of Henry George and the principle which underlies it. A part of the volume is an account of Tolstoy's philosophy, drawn largely from the Russian's difficult work, "Of Life."

The earnest outpourings of a soul devoted to humanity.—*Justice, Philadelphia*

16mo, cloth, ornamental, gilt top, 50 cents; by mail, 54 cents.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.
First National Bank Bldg., CHICAGO

Please mention THE PUBLIC when you write to advertisers.

Digitized by Google