The Public

Third Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1900. Number 139.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

Additional evidence of post-election prosperity is furnished by the record of Standard Oil trust stock. The price jumped on the 22d from $720 a share to $741. And since then $800 has been vainly offered for 500 shares to be delivered in January. Who says there is no prosperity?

The press of the country is now publishing the statement that 13,000,000,000 hen's eggs have been laid during the year 1900. If the republican national committee had got hold of this fact before the election there is no telling what McKinley's majority might have been.

In an encyclical issued on the 1st, Pope Leo is reported as saying that "the world has heard enough of the so-called 'rights of man;' let it hear something of the 'rights of God.'" But it is through acknowledging the rights of man that men recognize the rights of God. We are just to God in so far as we are just to men. "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

By its vote of 19 to 10 in favor of public as against private sessions of the Cuban constitutional convention, that body gives earnest of a determination to avoid the snares that are being laid to deprive Cuba of independence. Since the proceedings of the convention are to be open to continual public observation and criticism, trickery in the interest of "the better classes" will not be so easy. This decision of the convention gives reason for hope that, in spite of all efforts to prevent it, the constitution to be framed will be submited for approval to the people of Cuba.

There is grim significance in the news item from Manila that "the military courts are now returning numerous death sentences upon natives." Though the item is so worded as to make an impression that these sentences are imposed for crimes, the fact that "arson" and "murder" are specified, is suspicious. What in time of peace is arson may in time of war be an act of military necessity, while murder in peace may be justifiable homicide in war; and when our military tribunals in the Philippines impose numerous sentences of death for arson and murder, one must not be blamed for suspecting that these proceedings are possibly covers for punishing prisoners of war for acts of war.

By reference to the treasury statistics (for latest summary see page 522) it appears that this country, since the foundation of the government, has exported—merchandise, gold and silver, all told—the enormous sum, in excess of what it has imported, of $5,206,153,753. And to that fact protectionists point with pride, calling the excess our "favorable balance of trade." But why? How can the outgo from a country, amounting in a period of upwards of a hundred years to over five billion dollars more than the income during the same period—how can that excess be regarded as favorable? Are we living in a looking glass, where everything is reversed?

That Baptist clergyman who complained at a ministers' meeting in Chicago that a large proportion of church members care more for pleasure than for the salvation of their own souls, and that they go to church as a matter of respectability rather than for spiritual benefit, has ample basis for his complaint. But this is not altogether the fault of church members. If the church, while assuming to be an exponent of Christianity, has really come to be little better than a weekly social club, it is because the Christian spirit has been corrupted out of it. And the idea that the great object in life for every man is to save his own soul has had not a little to do in promoting the corrupting process. In the preaching of this ideal of sublimated selfishness the profound truth that he who would save his soul must lose it for his brother's sake has been ignored.

"Be not disturbed! There is no danger from empire; there is no fear for the republic." These were the soothing words with which President McKinley, at the Union league banquet in Philadelphia, where he was the guest of honor, closed a speech in which he advocated "a beneficent government" in the Philippines "under American sovereignty." It is remarkable that in the selection of a preposition Mr. McKinley implied only that empire though at hand is not dangerous. It was not danger "of" empire about which he reassured his audience, but danger "from" empire. This, however, may well have been a slip of speech; a significan slip, but nevertheless only a verbal accident. But there was no slip in his advocacy of a government in the Philippines "under American sovereignty." And that in itself would be empire. When the American republic deliberately proceeds to the permanent government of peoples who, though under our sovereignty, are not and are not allowed to be of our nation, this republic becomes an empire, no matter how beneficent the paternal government it confers. That was the way Rome became an empire. That is

what makes Great Britain an empire. That will make us an empire. These soothing words of McKinley sound like echoes from the speeches of "patriotic" orators of the dead and buried republics of antiquity, at the period of transition from republicanism to imperialism. They are the republican sugar that coats the imperial pill.

The franchise-owning corporations of Illinois were startled last week by a court decision which the Chicago public school teachers have procured in the course of their crusade for the enforcement of the state law for the taxation of corporate franchise values. Attention was called in these columns last spring (No. 105, page 2) to that crusade. The public authorities of Chicago had announced earlier in the year, that for lack of funds the public schools must close early, and the already low salaries of the teachers must be cut. The teachers were by this announcement brought together in an organization, and two of their number, Miss Catharine Goggin and Miss Margaret A. Haley, were employed by them to find out why the supply of money for school purposes was inadequate, and to take measures to remedy the restricted condition of the public revenue if such measures were possible. These ladies were not long in discovering that the law regarding the taxation of corporate franchises and stock had been grossly, persistently and shamelessly violated by the state board of equalization, and they instituted legal proceedings to compel the board to do its duty in that connection. In this they have been so far successful as to secure from the court of first resort a decision against the board, which, though not conclusive, has frightened its members and greatly excited the owners of street franchises in Chicago.

The legal proceedings in which this decision was rendered were begun by a mandamus petition praying that the state board of equalization be compelled to tax the value of corporation franchises by taxing the difference between the assessed value of their tangible property and the fair cash value of their capital stock. This is required by the law, which directs the board to adopt rules for ascertaining the fair cash value of such stock. In accordance with that direction a rule was adopted by the board in 1873. By that rule the market value of the shares of capital stock of a corporation and the market value of its indebtedness are to be added together, and from this sum the assessed value of its tangible stock is to be deducted, the balance being taken to be the taxable capital stock. But this rule has never been observed; and on the value of their franchises, as indicated by the excess in market value of their stock over the assessed value of their tangible property, the corporations have escaped taxation.

Without attempting fully to account for this manifest delinquency of the state board of equalization, it may be suggested that the fact that members of such boards enjoy railroad favors and are not infrequently retained as railroad lawyers—by "general retainer"—possibly has something to do with it. But be the explanation what it may, this board has steadily neglected to obey the law regarding the taxation of franchise values, and when the Chicago school teachers began their mandamus proceedings, it filed a demurrer to the petition, its principal point being that the board is a judicial body and cannot be coerced by the courts. At first, the board and the corporations, confident of the legal soundness of this objection to the mandamus proceedings, were inclined to be cynical. But they were deeply stirred when, on the 21st, the court overruled their demurrer. That made it necessary for them to come to an issue upon the facts, which they have now done by filing an answer to the petition. The question of law having been decided against them, and there being no real dispute about the facts, the corporations will have to submit to taxation upon their franchise values, as indicated by the market value of their stock, unless at last the supreme court of the state shall reverse the principle of the decision which has just been rendered. Thus far the school teachers, who are now targets for the venomous wit of railroad lawyers and the animadversions of monopoly newspapers, have come out ahead. Their public spirit is worthy of all commendation.

One of the Chicago papers attacks the work of the school teachers in remarkable fashion. While admitting that the board of equalization has been derelict regarding the taxation of corporate franchises, it advances the astonishing proposition that "the fight to enforce on the members of the board an adequate sense of their duties belongs with those citizens who pay taxes, not to the class who derive their support from the tax payers." As if public school teachers were tax eaters and not tax payers! On the contrary, these people give full value in their work for their salaries. They are not tax eaters. But they are tax payers. The fact that they pay their taxes indirectly in higher rents for the houses they live in, and higher prices for the goods they consume, does not take them out of the tax-paying class. If we would find a class that pays no taxes, we should look not for those who, like school teachers, are commonly esteemed non-tax payers, but for those who, like franchise owners and land monopolists, deceptively classify themselves as tax payers. The latter get from the public, without rendering any equivalent, much more than they pay in taxes. Instead of being tax payers, they are in reality tax collectors, who keep most of what they collect.

At the convention of the national irrigation congress, held in Chicago last week, resolutions asking congressional appropriations for the irrigation of arid lands were adopted, in which the following clause appears:

That water of all streams should forever remain subject to public con-

trol, and the right to use water for irrigation should inhere in the land irrigated, and its beneficial use be the basis, the measure, and the limit of the right.

Exactly what that means is not very clear. It reads as if it were intended to pacify objectors who see in the agitation for reclaiming arid lands a grand scheme in aid of land monopoly. But there is really no guarantee in it against monopolization of the benefits of irrigation through monopoly of land. If the right to the use of water for irrigation is to "inhere in the land irrigated," the benefit will certainly not go to the users. It will go to the owners. In rent or price the grabbers of arid land will take from users the pecuniary benefits of congressional irrigation. Is this what the irrigating congress intended?

Gov. Roosevelt's decision in the New York ice trust case makes another exhibition of this swashbuckling demagogue in his true character. He decides that there is no case against the democratic mayor of New York, and so dismisses the charges. Yet upon the stump, during the campaign, he never lost an opportunity to imply that Mayor Van Wyck's connection with the ice trust was in gross violation of official duty.

One of Mr. McKinley's most ardent supporters, Charles R. Flint, understands the significance of the election in one respect, and makes no secret of his opinion. In a paper which he read at Mont Clair, N. J., on the 23d, Mr. Flint assured his auditors that the trusts have come to stay. He added:

That fact was settled in our recent presidential election. The justice and wisdom of combination in business, the "trust," was as distinct an issue as the single standard, and it was as unflinchingly ratified by the people.

Mr. Flint is clearly right in his assumption that McKinley represented the trust side of the trust issue. But it remains to be seen whether Mr. McKinley and the coterie of trust financiers that surrounds him, can fasten the trust system perpetually upon this country. Issues like that are not settled by one presidential election. It is still part of the issue between plutocracy and democracy, part of the conflict between the plundering classes, on one hand, whom Mr. McKinley represents and of whom Flint is a type, and "Bryanism" on the other. When the people open their eyes to the radical difference between competitive enterprise, whether on a small scale or a large one, and the monopoly of natural resources and highway rights, which constitutes the basis of trusts, the Flints and the McKinleys may awake to a realization of the fact that their beloved system of trusts has not received a final popular indorsement.

If the McKinley republicans were at all sensitive they would be ashamed of the speeches their orators made in the campaign about the New York ice trust. This trust was thrust forward repeatedly as evidence of the willingness of democrats, despite their clamor against trusts, to profit by them. No weight should have been given to that, for the question was and is not who profits by trusts, but whether trusts are wrong. But the republicans thought it good politics to divert attention from the real question by this little side play. Yet the facts now disclosed show that the New York ice trust was, from top to bottom, a republican affair. The democratic mayor had nothing to do with it as a trust. He had bought stock in the ice company, and nothing more. But the officers were republicans. Some of them were leading republicans. And the sole basis of the organization as a trust—namely, its dock monopoly—had been granted, not by the present democratic administration of the city, but under the administration of the republican Mayor Strong.

At the National Good Roads convention, which met in Chicago last week, Mr. H. H. Gross, the road expert of the United States department of agriculture, read a paper in which he stated that—

the influence of hard roads upon farm property is to add five dollars in value for every one dollar spent on the roads.

Coming, as that statement does, from a federal official, who may be supposed to speak with a sense of responsibility, it is highly suggestive of the sources from which the expense of road building should be drawn. If one dollar's worth of road building adds five dollars to the value of adjacent property, then it is clear that the adjacent property ought to bear the entire expense. Five dollars for one should be good enough profit for anybody's investment. Yet the convention before which that paper was read passed resolutions urging congress to appropriate $150,000 for good roads purposes. In other words, it asked congress to spend $150,000 out of a common treasury for the purpose of adding $750,000 to the value of a certain class of private property!

By all means let us have good roads. We cannot have too many, nor can they be too good. But let us not allow this most excellent reform to be turned into another method for enriching some property owners at the expense of the general public. Good roads, like good streets, do enhance the value of neighboring landed property. They enhance the value of nothing else. They financially benefit no one but the owners of this property. Of course, they are a common convenience. But those who enjoy the convenience they offer pay for it in indirect ways, and the pay ultimately reaches the pockets of the adjacent property owners. Let the property owners, then, and not the general public, pay for making and maintaining the roads. This is demanded by every principle of common honesty.

Gov. Thomas, of Colorado, has the sympathy and should have the active encouragement and support of all law-abiding people in his efforts to bring the lynching mob of Lincoln county to justice. He has ordered the sheriff of that county to arrest the men who took the young negro from lawful custody and burned him at the stake, and

has directed the attorney general to assist in prosecuting them. The authorities of Colorado have no easy job before them in this attempt the governor is making to vindicate the majesty of the law against these fiendish lynchers. A perverted public sentiment in the county where the lynching crime was committed may make it exceedingly difficult if not impossible to secure convictions. For that reason there should be such an unrestrained expression of opinion against the lynching, and against the people of any community who will allow so grave a crime to go unpunished, that no jury in Lincoln county could be found to acquit any of the lynchers whose participation in the outrage is legally proved. Nothing could be more wholesome in its bearing upon the race problem than the conviction and full punishment for murder of some of the leaders in a negro lynching. It will be to the lasting honor of Colorado to set the example.

The echo of a familiar sound comes back to this country from London. A distinguished member of parliament, Sir Howard Vincent, who is also honorary secretary of the United Empire Trade league, proclaims the desire of his league to compel American manufacturers to contribute annually several millions sterling to the British exchequer, by means of a protective tariff. "Preferential duties would help us tremendously," he says; "they would make you Americans pay something for the use of our rich markets. You charge us about 40 per cent. advalorem for the privilege of selling our goods in America, and we commit an egregrious folly in admitting your goods free of duty."

Sir Howard's words read like McKinleyism translated into British. Here is all the familiar nonsense about charging foreigners for the privilege of markets. Foreigners do not pay for market privileges. Those privileges, when there is a charge for them, are paid for by the home buyers. By imposing a tariff of 40 per cent. upon British goods sold in America, we of this country thereby increase the price of those goods to American buyers; for competition would compel the English to sell them to our people for less if it were not for the tariff. Precisely so, if the English impose a tariff upon American goods, will English buyers of those goods have to pay that tariff. There is something spectacular in the egregious folly of full grown men who think that tax duties upon foreign goods are borne by the foreign seller instead of the domestic consumer.

HENRY GEORGE, DEMOCRAT.

I.

"Whenever you call a man a democrat," once observed a shrewd Texan negro, "you always want to specify the brand; because there are more different kinds than of any other cattle, and they don't all herd."

It was a wise bit of political philosophy. Democrats vary in their democracy all the way from the "hail fellow" species at one extreme to the exclusive order at the other, with a great diversity of types between.

The exclusive species of democracy is described by persons acquainted with it as most delightful. It flourishes at its best in England. Within the charmed sphere of the British aristocracy the democratic spirit is said to be all-pervasive. Wealth distinction cuts no figure. Even ancient lineage and superior titles are upon the common level in this holy of holies, where all who are considered fit to enter at all are considered equally fit. The ideal is equality of rights, regardless of every superficial distinction. But to the British aristocracy, whoever is outside is "canaille," having no rights except such as the law happens to secure.

Somewhat similar is the democracy of our own southern states. Purer democracy, as far as it goes, one could hardly wish for or expect to find. But its fraternal principles do not extend to the negro race. Within their own circles southern whites cling to the equality doctrine of the declaration of independence with a devotion and apply it with a fidelity that excite admiration until one discovers how exclusive they are. Yet this exclusiveness is not a conscious exception to democratic principles. It is an expression of a more or less subconscious conviction—an inheritance from the slavery regime—that the negro is not a man.

Within their narrow limits, exclusive types of democracy are democratic to the core; but the "hail fellow" variety, which is at the farther extreme and is most common in the northern states of this country, is nothing but veneer—a wretched counterfeit of democracy. Though its devotees are condescending good fellows with men who are regarded as inferior, and bumptiously obtrusive with those who are recognized as superior, they are champions of nobody's rights as rights, not even of their own. To the democratic principle of equality of rights among men, with its correlative duties, they are utterly indifferent.

From these two extremes there is a gradation of variety in democracy to that perfect type which acknowledges as within the scope of its fraternal principles the whole human race, regardless of all distinctions. Of that order of democracy Henry George stood preeminent as a representative.

Not that George alone adopted the true democratic ideal. The roll is a long one of the men who have done that. But George did more. He not only made this his ideal of democracy, but he pointed out the way, the only way, in which that ideal can be realized. To the desire for democracy he married the know-how. To that intense love for justice, which is the essence of democracy, he united that political and economic wisdom whereby alone justice can be secured. Thereby he developed democracy from a nebular sentiment into a social force. It is this that makes him preeminent as a democrat.

II.

The story of the life of such a man cannot fail to interest democrats of every grade; especially in times like these, when the nobler ideals of democracy are boldly challenged even in countries where the democratic movement has made its greatest ad-

vances. And right well is that story told by George's son, upon whom has fallen the congenial task of telling it.*

In this biography there is no attempt at philosophizing. George's place in history is left, without a plea, to the critics who are yet to deal with his work. There is nothing fulsome where much in that way might be forgiven. Nor is there any affectation. The story is told as unreservedly, as simply and as candidly as if it had come from the pen of a stranger, yet with an evident warmth of affection which testifies no less to the loyalty of a devoted disciple than to the personal respect and love of a son and companion. It comes up to the full measure of the publishers' estimate, who describe the book as "a strong, dignified and impressive record of one of the most extraordinary men our country has produced."

So well has the younger George performed the delicate task of writing his eminent father's biography, that while his book, together with the writings of George himself, furnishes all the material future historians will need to account for this great democrat and to assign him his true place in the intellectual development of the race, it also lays before the reader a biographical narrative of exceptional human interest and of peculiarly American flavor.

III.

Henry George was born in Philadelphia, of Scottish-American and Anglo-American ancestry, on the 2nd of September, 1839, when the abolition agitation was beginning to excite that rancorous discussion which culminated in the civil war and the extinction of chattel slavery.

Though his parents were in moderately comfortable circumstances, his school education was cut off early by his own ambition to get out into the world. At less than 14 years of age, when he had been in the high school only five months, he induced his father to let him go to work. Becoming first an errand boy in a Philadelphia crockery house, he afterward obtained a clerkship with a marine adjuster, and two years later, at the age of 16, went to sea, making a voyage around the world in a sailing vessel before the mast. After 14 months of a sailor's life, he became a type-setter in a Philadelphia printing office. But that employment he soon abandoned for a trip to Boston as able seaman on a topsail schooner loaded with coal; and after repeated failures he secured sufficient influence to get him a berth as ship's steward on a United States lighthouse steamer bound for San Francisco, on which he sailed through the Golden Gate in 1858, a youth of 19, with but little means and no prospect of employment.

At this time there was a gold digging craze in the Frazer river valley, and George joined the procession of gold seekers, working his way from San Francisco as a sailor. But his hopes of wealth were disappointed. Within a few months he returned to San Francisco "dead broke."

Then followed a fluctuating experience.

Now he was a compositor in a printing house, from which he was driven for lack of work. Then he became a weigher in a rice mill, which soon after closed down. As a "hobo" he tramped toward the California gold diggings, but was unable to reach them. Once more as a compositor, at boys' pay on a San Francisco weekly, he rose to the foremanship. Forced out of that by a change of owners he formed a partnership with some San Francisco printers for the publication of an evening paper; but the introduction into San Francisco at that time of telegraphic news controlled by a monopoly, deprived the young paper of all possibility of competition, and it went down.

At this crisis in his career, and with but a single coin to his name, George married a young woman no richer than himself. They removed to Sacramento, where he had obtained precarious work as a "sub" compositor on a daily paper, and there their eldest child, the author of the biography, was born. An altercation with the foreman of the composing room culminated in George's discharge, and he returned with his little family to San Francisco.

Here his battle with poverty was renewed, continuing until it reached the extreme and drove him to the verge of despair. He canvassed for newspaper subscribers on commission. He tried to sell clothes wringers from house to house. He set type at odd intervals as opportunity offered, sometimes failing to get his pay for work done. He started a job printing office with two friends, which proved so profitless that he had to abandon it. When his poverty was at its worst, his second child—Richard F. George, the sculptor—was born. So great had the deprivations of the family been that the boy came into the world starving, and George desperately went upon the street determined to get money from the first man whose appearance might indicate that he had any to give. Fortunately the first wayfarer of that description was a modern Samaritan who believed George's story, and, feeling for his distress, gave him the five dollars he demanded. Telling of this experience years afterward, to illustrate his belief that criminal actions are attributable rather to environment than to wicked natures, George said that if this man had not given him the money, he believed he was desperate enough to have killed him.

But brighter days were at hand.

George got more profitable work at his trade as a printer and began to study and practice writing. His first serious attempt at composition, a bit of personal introspection in the form of an essay on the profitable employment of time, was prophetic of the powers he subsequently developed as a profound thinker, close reasoner and forcible and charming writer. That was in the spring of 1865, when he was 26 years of age.

Soon afterward he wrote "A Plea for the Supernatural," which was published in the Californian, to which Bret Harte and Mark Twain were the star contributors, and was republished in a Boston periodical.

Upon Lincoln's assassination he sent to the Alta Californian an intensely dramatic essay on this great murder, which appeared with the announcement that it was from the pen of one of the paper's printers. Upon the strength of that composi-

* The Life of Henry George, by his son, Henry George, Jr. New York: Doubleday & McClure Company. Price $1.50.

tion the editor of the Alta Californian brought George down from the composing room to a reporter's desk.

While working as a reporter George wrote for his paper a "letter to the editor" on Lincoln's character, which, to his surprise and gratification, appeared the next day not as an irresponsible communication, but as the leading editorial. Although he did some type-setting after that, his career as a journalist had now begun. In 1867 he became managing editor of the San Francisco Times. In 1868 he was for a short time managing editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, which he left because De Young's policy was repugnant to him, going east as the agent for an independent news association. He was editor of the Oakland Transcript in 1869 and of the Sacramento Reporter in 1870, leaving the latter because the railroad interests bought it, and he was given the option of quitting the paper or editorially supporting railroad monopoly.

At intervals meanwhile he had contributed important articles to other papers and magazines, including among the former the New York Tribune. Under the managing editorship of John Russell Young, the Tribune engaged him to write up the new transcontinental railroad and the country through which it passed, but under the editorship of Whitelaw Reid his letters on this subject were suppressed.

His most important production at this period appeared in the October number, 1868, of Bret Harte's "Overland Monthly." It was entitled "What the Railroad Will Bring Us," and is especially remarkable now for the accuracy of its prediction as to the future of California.

George's observations of the telegraphic monopoly of the east, and the tendency to land concentration on the Pacific coast, inspired him with a desire to get into the legislature for the purpose of trying to check these evils. He had been a republican protectionist until a protection speech he listened to made him a free trader, after which he affiliated with the democratic party. To this party, therefore, he applied for a legislative nomination. But the party machine refused because he would not pay an assessment.

At a subsequent election he was nominated but defeated, the railroad interests, which he had opposed even at the risk of his livelihood, making him an especial mark of their hostility.

Several years afterward he was a candidate for delegate to the California constitutional convention. The candidacy was self-announced, his object being to put himself in a position to urge the land and tax reform which he was then developing and with which his name is now irrevocably associated. Both the democratic party and the workingmen's party, under the leadership of Denis Kearney, nominated him after his announcement; and he would certainly have been elected but for his refusal to submit to Kearney's dictation. Asked at the workingmen's ratification meeting to subscribe to the party platform and acknowledge Kearney's leadership, he replied that he would acknowledge no man as leader to do his thinking for him, and that, as there were some planks in the platform to which he did not agree, he would oppose them. His speech in which he took this ground and declared that he would receive the nomination as a free man or not at all, was greeted with hisses and the Kearney nomination was revoked. At the election, having only the democratic nomination, he was defeated, though he led the ticket.

Meanwhile, in 1872 he attended the national democratic convention as a delegate, and was the member from California of the committee appointed to notify Horace Greeley of his nomination for the presidency.

At that time George was the editor and part proprietor of a new paper, the San Francisco Evening Post, which, under his editorship, was an aggressive and successful people's paper. But in an evil hour the paper borrowed money of Senator John P. Jones for the purpose of enlarging its plant. This was upon the generous suggestion of Mr. Jones. In the midst of the financial hurricane that soon afterward struck the city and caused the suspension of even the Bank of California, Jones foreclosed his debt. George might nevertheless have remained in editorial charge. Jones wished him to do so. But that would have necessitated his supporting the railway ring, and for the second time he decided to abandon his private interests rather than conserve them at the expense of what he regarded as his public duty. He accordingly walked penniless out of the office of the paper he had after so much labor succeeded in establishing.

Had it not been for the good will of the governor of the state he would have walked back into apparently hopeless poverty. But Gov. Irwin appointed him state inspector of gas meters. The duties of this office, the only public office George ever held, were not onerous, and he found time for public speaking, for writing occasional articles on public questions, and especially for the creation of the book that has made his fame national and international and in all probability will long perpetuate it—"Progress and Poverty."

When this book had been completed George encountered great difficulty in securing a publisher. After the eastern houses had rejected the manuscript he published a small edition by subscription at San Francisco, and it made a deep impression. But still no eastern publishers would give the work their imprint. Finally, however, Appleton, of New York, and Keegan Paul, Trench & Co., of London, took it up. This was in the early eighties, when George had but slightly passed his fortieth year and had gone to New York to live. The book soon obtained a large sale, though not a profitable one to the author, and its influence upon public thought began to tell.

Additional books from his pen followed as the years went by, though his time was well occupied with other work. He went to Ireland and England in 1881 as a newspaper correspondent, incidentally taking a minor part in the Irish agitation, and returned to England in 1884, for a lecturing tour that made his name a household word throughout England and Scotland.

Among his magazine contributions at this time was one on "Money and Elections" in the North American Review for March, 1883. It advocated

the introduction of the Australian ballot, and was the forerunner of the agitation which culminated in the general adoption in the United States of that system of voting.

In 1886 Mr. George made his memorable campaign for mayor of New York. He ran as the labor candidate on a platform which explicitly demanded what has since come to be known as the single tax.

When the nomination was offered him he shrank from trying to make a third party, knowing that such movements, by the insignificant vote they command, usually do their cause more harm than good. But he agreed to accept the nomination provided a petition signed by 30,000 voters were obtained requesting him to do so. His object was to secure a reasonable guarantee of popular support. The petition being promptly signed by the required number George accepted the nomination.

His adversaries were Abram S. Hewitt, who was elected, and Theodore Roosevelt (now vice president-elect), who came out third in the contest. Roosevelt was the regular republican candidate. Hewitt was the union candidate of the two machines of the democratic party—the county democracy and Tammany hall. Then as now, Tammany hall was a stench in the nostrils of all the "better element" of New York; but no sooner had George's candidacy given signs of extraordinary strength than the "better element" welcomed affiliation with Tammany hall to "save society" from Georgeism.

George's motive in making this mayoralty campaign was not for the sake of a possible office, but in the hope of arousing the democratic masses to a realization of the nature of the economic and political evils from which they suffer. An incident which his biographer narrates illustrates his purpose rather emphatically. At a conversation between himself and William M. Ivins, a politician who was then the city chamberlain, and who assumed that George's ambition was personal, Mr. Ivins assured George that he could not be elected mayor, or, if elected, could not be counted in, and offered if he would withdraw to procure him a congressional nomination that would be absolutely equivalent to election. George asked:

"Why, if I cannot possibly get the office, do you want me to withdraw?"

"You cannot be elected," was the reply, "but your running will raise hell."

George's answer ended the negotiation. "You have relieved me of embarrassment," he said; "I do not want the responsibility and the work of the office of the mayor of New York, but I do want to raise hell."

In the sense in which both men meant it, George's running did "raise hell." Never before had politicians of both parties and all factions, and plutocrats of every variety, been so unpleasantly disturbed. Never before had they rushed so precipitately into each other's arms. Never before had the "better element" and Tammany hall felt so much at home in each other's society. It seemed to them as if the common people of New York had risen in mass to drive the money changers—both the "better element" among them and the worse element—out of the political temple. And George's vote of 68,100, nearly 8,000 more than Roosevelt's and barely 25,000 less than Hewitt's, afforded startling testimony that the fears of the privileged classes had not been groundless.

Immediately after the mayoralty campaign of 1886 George began the publication at New York of a weekly paper, the Standard, which for almost six years was the newspaper representative of the ideas with reference to labor and land that he had sought to popularize and for the dissemination of which all his energies, from the time he began to write "Progress and Poverty," had with undivided purpose been devoted, as they continued to be to the hour of his death.

It was in furtherance of this purpose that he came enthusiastically to the support of Grover Cleveland in 1888 and 1892, when Mr. Cleveland had raised the free trade issue, to the agitation of which George looked for the propagation of his own more radical views. His motive was the same when, a few years later, he accepted a call to lead another mayoralty fight, this time in Greater New York, toward the end of which he died.

The opening words of his last speech in that campaign, uttered to an audience of workingmen on the evening before he died, are the key to his aspirations and character as an agitator, and distinguish his quality as a democrat. Having been introduced by the chairman of the meeting as "a great friend of labor" he began:

"I have never claimed to be a special friend of labor. Let us have done with this call for special privileges for labor. Labor does not want special privileges. I have never advocated nor asked for special rights or special sympathy for workingmen. What I stand for is the equal rights of all men."

IV.

It was George's experience in New York in 1869, when he came east to act as agent for the Pacific coast independent news association, that gave final direction to his career and made him at last the prophet of a new crusade.

He had indeed seen poverty, and had known poverty himself; but until then he had never come face to face with the shocking contrasts between poverty and luxury which the American metropolis has long displayed. He had never yet observed debasing and hopeless want in the midst of abounding wealth. When this diseased condition had thrust itself upon his attention, the thought of it would not let him rest. It forced him to ask himself over and over again why poverty persists when and where wealth abounds. This was to him the problem which the sphinx of fate puts to modern society, and which not to answer is to be destroyed.

He at once began a thorough study of political economy. But he accepted the dicta of no teacher. He demanded proof for every proposition. Not that proof which consists in collections of obscure little facts and masses of dubious statistics, but that which consists in the harmony of the large, determining and familiar facts of social life.

The answer to the riddle of the sphinx did not come to him at once.

But when he did perceive it, it burst upon him as a flash of light. While editing the Oakland paper, when the extension of the transcontinental railway from Sacramento to Oakland was still an unaccomplished but promising project, it was his custom to seek recreation and exercise by taking long horse back rides into the open country. One day, when upon one of these rides, and far out into the foothills, he met a teamster, whom he asked, merely by way of passing the time of day, what land was worth there.

"I don't know, exactly," replied the teamster; "but there is a man over there who will sell land for a thousand dollars an acre."

George had long before noticed that with the expectation of increased population to follow the extension of the great railroad to Oakland, land in Oakland had risen in value. But he had connected the increase of land value with the expected increase of population only in a loose way, and had not associated the two facts at all with his vexatious problem. It had never yet occurred to him that the universally familiar phenomenon of increasing land values with expectation of increasing population was the key to the other common phenomenon which had been forced upon his attention by its emphatic manifestation in New York,—the phenomenon of the persistence of poverty with advancing wealth. But now, in the light of this enormous increase in the value of common pasture land to $1,000 an acre in the expectation of its being needed soon for building lots, all these relationships were disclosed.

He saw that with the growth of population land grows in value, and the men who work it must pay for the privilege. He saw more. Not only does land value grow with population; which, as all economists recognize, increases productive power. It grows also with the growth of any other productive energy—labor saving invention for example. Nor does land value grow alone with growth of population and growth of invention, but it grows also with the expectation of these, so that in progressive communities land value is an exorbitant pecuniary premium upon the possibilities of improvement in advance of the realization of improvement. Consequently the labor that uses land (and no labor is possible without it), must directly or indirectly—in higher rent or lower wages—pay for the privilege a price which keeps pace with, and often rises far above the value of the use. Thus in the long run labor loses and land monopoly secures the pecuniary advantages of material progress.

George turned back from his ride with a new thought, a radical and revolutionary thought. He had seen Paul's cross in the sky.

It was now clear to Henry George not only why poverty persists in spite of industrial advance, but why democracy fails. And the more he studied and observed and reflected, the clearer he saw that the truth he had brought back from that horseback ride harmonizes with every other truth — material, political, moral.

Although reared at a time when the epithet "abolitionist" was somewhat more offensive than "anarchist" is to-day, and under influences that were not hostile to the institution of slavery, he was nevertheless even in his youth instinctively an abolitionist. In obedience to a bent of mind that always characterized him, he refused to put policy before principle. The slaves either had the same right to freedom as other men, or they had not. If they had, freedom was their instant due. That was the principle, and in his judgment the policy that ran counter to it must of necessity be bad policy. This characteristic devotion to principle determined his future from the instant that the explanation of poverty in spite of progress flashed upon him.

Since the pecuniary benefits of advancing civilization are sucked away from the industrious, ultimately by land monopoly no matter how many minor monopolies may intervene, the question of right immediately arose. Between nonproducing land monopoly and all-producing labor, the claims of land monopoly could have no standing in the forum of conscience. Believing that all men have by nature an equal right to natural bounties, it followed with him that in natural justice no one can have a superior right to the ownership of land. Equal rights to land, then, and therefore to land values as distinguished from labor values, became the objective of the crusade upon which George was about to enter.

The principle settled, nothing remained but method. And this was found in a system of taxation that harmonizes with the best fiscal principles—the abolition of all taxes upon industry, and the raising of common revenues from what in justice is a common fund, namely, land values. Not only would government be thereby supported without burdening production, but speculative investments in land would be so completely discouraged that the monopolization of vacant land in expectation of rising values, now so universal, would cease. Unused land would consequently be thrown open to free use. The industrious would thus be encouraged to produce, with a guaranty of security in the enjoyment of the full value of their work; while leisure classes, whether poor or rich, would find their only possibility of sustenance in resorting to honest work.

In such a state of society, and only in such, can democracy flourish.

V.

In elaboration and illustration of this political and economic philosophy, Henry George wrote several books, His first was "Our Land and Land Policy," a pamphlet published in 1871, and now out of print. The next was his master book upon the subject, "Progress and Poverty," published in 1879, which has been translated into every civilized tongue, and has had an immense circulation. After that came "The Land Question," originally "The Irish Land Question;" and then "Social Problems," a series of brief essays on social subjects of common and perennial interest. The fifth book was "Protection or Free Trade," in which George drove the principle of free trade directly to its logical conclusion, proposing to set trade free not only from so-called protective tariff duties, but from all duties and taxes which in any way or to any degree hamper exchange. This book was followed by "The Condition of Labor," an open letter to the pope in reply to his encyclical. It deals elementarily with the general subject,

and especially with its ethical aspects. Next came "The Perplexed Philosopher," a cutting criticism of Herbert Spencer as a lost leader in the agitation for equal rights to the use of the earth. Finally, in "The Science of Political Economy," an unfinished but powerful work, published after the author's death and just as he had left the manuscript, the whole structure of economic teaching is overhauled and the foundations of a true natural science of political economy, as George saw it, are laid.

VI.

In all of George's books the depth, the purity, the universality and the practicability of his democracy are the notable qualities. In the story of his life, also, they stand out in bold relief. These qualities eminently distinguish the man, the thinker, the writer, the agitator, the politician, the orator and the statesman—for statesman he was, and of a high order, though he never held either a legislative or an executive office.

Democracy was to him not a label, but a life. And as important to him as the ideal was the rational method of realizing it. He knew that political democracy cannot flourish while economic aristocracy remains; and seeing that land monopoly—at all times, under all circumstances, and regardless of the disguises of changing industrial methods—is the fundamental cause of economic aristocracy, he sought its destruction. He was a democrat who knew how, and how alone, democracy can be firmly planted and effectively fostered; and this knowledge, together with his work in popularizing it and his example of devotion to ideals, is his bequest to mankind.

Henry George could not found libraries, nor colleges, nor hospitals with the earnings of other men's toil. But he did better. He planted in the minds and hearts of his generation the seed of a gloriously beneficent truth, in the fruition of which all need for paternal endowments will pass away. He left to the race a legacy of practicable democracy.

Speaking of Platt and Croker, it doesn't make the average voter feel any more comfortable to catch the devil and the deep sea winking at each other over his head.—Puck.

NEWS

President Kruger's reception in France was unexpectedly enthusiastic. He arrived at Marseilles on the 22d, on board the Dutch warship Gelderland. There he was welcomed by a great outpouring of the people, who made their sympathy unmistakably manifest. At a formal reception, committees from both Paris and Marseilles presented him with addresses. Replying to these, he thanked the people and the government of France, and said that the English people, had they been better informed, would never have consented to the Transvaal war. For himself, he assured the committees and his immense audience that ever since Jameson had tried to seize the two South African republics he had never ceased to demand a tribunal of arbitration. But the British government had persistently refused to join in this peaceable method of settlement. He then charged the British government with inhumanity, saying:

During my life I have had to fight many times the savages of the tribes of Africa, but the barbarians we have to fight now are worse than the others. They even urge the Kaffirs against us. They burn the farms we worked so hard to construct and they drive out our women and children, whose husbands and brothers they have killed or taken prisoners, leaving them unprotected and roofless and often without bread to eat.

He declared, however, that whatever the British might do, the Boers would never surrender. "I assure you," he said, "that if the Transvaal and the Orange Free State must lose their independence, it will be because all the Boer people have been destroyed, with their women and children."

From Marseilles Kruger went directly to Paris. At every stop of his train great crowds gave him hearty welcome. "The French presidential and ministerial tours," cables one correspondent, "sink into absolute insignificance when compared with the triumphal march of President Kruger." The sentiment in favor of intervention was so pronounced that President Loubet forced the ministry, against the inclinations of a majority, which included the premier, to consent to receive Kruger officially as a foreign sovereign. This decision was secured because England had not notified the powers of the annexation of the Transvaal. It was therefore considered that Kruger could be recognized officially by France without offense to England. Accordingly, when Kruger arrived in Paris on the 24th, where for 12 hours the people who came to greet him thronged the boulevards in a solid mass of humanity for a space of three miles, and overflowed into the side streets, he was given military honors and conducted in state to the Elysee palace for a call upon the president of France. The call was returned in state by President Loubet within an hour, when an appointment was made for a diplomatic interview with the French foreign minister with reference to the object of Kruger's visit. The interview took place on the 26th, Dr. Leyds, representing the Transvaal and submitting to the French foreign minister, M. Delcasse, the draft of a preliminary proposition prepared under the direction of Kruger.

From South Africa the news that escapes the British censor is exceedingly disquieting in London. It is now feared that Kitchener will have to reconquer the Orange Free State before he can begin the Weylerization of the Transvaal. Botha and De Wet appear to have joined forces near Bloemfontein; and the British under French have been pursued from Middleburg, which is on the Lorenzo Marques railroad a few miles east of Pretoria in the Transvaal, down as far as Standerton, which is on the Ladysmith road near the Orange Free State border. Kitchener's plan of operations is described by the Pietermaritzburg correspondent of the London Daily Mail, who says that the Transvaal and the Orange Free State are to be divided into circumscribed areas, with a mobile British force apportioned to each area, and that all Boers and neutrals are to be taken to the coast and kept there until the country is cleared. These plans are now being carried out, and to facilitate Kitchener's operations, he has been recommended to the queen by the British ministry for appointment as lieutenant general, an appointment which will give him supreme command in South Africa as soon as Gen. Roberts leaves the country.

Fighting in the Philippines continues without abatement. Numerous small engagements have occurred during the past week. The most important took place on the 22d, within 35 miles of Manila, where 1,000

Americans surrounded and captured a stone fortress. Most of the Filipino garrison escaped. On the 25th an American detachment was ambushed near Malolos with the loss of three wounded and two killed.

American casualties since July 1, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out in detail at Washington to November 28, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91)	1,847
Killed reported from May 16, 1900, to the date of the presidential election, November 6, 1900	100
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period	468
Total deaths to presidential election	2,415
Killed reported since presidential election	13
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period	76
Total deaths	2,504
Wounded since July 1, 1898	2,362
Total casualties since July 1, 1898	4,866
Total casualties to last week	4,858
Total deaths to last week	2,500

The first legislation by the Philippine commission for the establishment of provincial civil government under American sovereignty was enacted on the 23d. It was an act for the government of the province of Benguet, a province in the western part of Luzon near the Lingayen gulf. The province is to have a governor; voters must be 18 years of age and must have taken the oath of allegiance to the United States; ecclesiastics and soldiers are debarred from office; and, after the manner of the Spanish regime, delinquent tax payers are to be required to work out their taxes on the roads.

Over in China the foreign representatives are now officially reported by the American minister at Peking to have reached an agreement. It is one which is likely to force the American government either out of the concert of European nations or deeper into the European scheme for the ultimate dismemberment of the Chinese empire. This agreement does not appear to vary much in terms from the joint note unofficially reported two weeks ago (page 505) to have been formulated by the powers. In substance it is as follows:

(1) Execution by Chinese government of 11 designated princes and other dignitaries. (2) Indemnity for murder of missionaries and damages to property of foreigners. (3) Indemnity for military expenses of foreign governments. (4) Substitution of a foreign minister for the tsung-li-yamen. (5) Access by ministers from other countries to the presence of the emperor. (6) Razing of forts at Taku and elsewhere on Chinese coast, and prohibition of importation of munitions of war. (7) Permanent foreign legation guards and permanent foreign guards from Peking to Taku. (8) Erection of a monument to Baron von Ketteler on the site of his murder, and dispatch of a Chinese prince to Berlin with a formal apology. (9) Suppression of wars by imperial proclamation, removal and punishment of all officials who in future fail to protect foreigners, and suspension of provincial civil service examinations for five years.

In agreeing to these terms the American minister is said to have disobeyed his instructions, which were to the effect that he should assent to such demands only as it was reasonably certain that the Chinese authorities would accept and could comply with. These terms are regarded as on the part of China quite impossible.

NEWS NOTES.

—The national irrigation congress closed a three days' session on the 24th at Chicago.

—Sixto Lopez, the Filipino representative, is in Boston, where he has created a favorable impression among thoughtful people.

—The American Secular and Free Thought federation, better known as "free thinkers," closed the sessions of its twenty-fourth annual convention at Cincinnati on the 25th.

—Senator Cushman K. Davis, of Minnesota, chairman of the senate committee on foreign relations, died at his home in St. Paul on the 27th. He was 62 years old.

—William J. Bryan will make his first speech since the close of the campaign at a public banquet to be given by the Jacksonian club of Lincoln, Neb., on the 26th of December.

—A Zanzibar dispatch of the 26th tells of the rising of the warlike tribe of Somalis, 4,000 strong, in Jubaland, British East Africa. The British commissioner was slain during a night attack on the 13th.

—Sir Arthur Sullivan, the great English composer and author of many popular and tuneful operas, including "Pinafore" and "Mikado," died at his London home on the 22d from heart failure. He was 58 years old.

—The official canvass of the vote of the state of Illinois for president and governor is reported as follows:

President, McKinley, republican	597,965
President, Bryan, democrat	501,975
President, Woolley, prohibitionist	17,835
President, Debs, social democrat	9,672
Governor, Yates, republican	580,198
Governor, Alschuler, democrat	518,966
Governor, Barnes, prohibitionist	15,643
Governor, Perry, social democrat	8,617

—Dowie's English lacemakers, who were detained by the immigration officials at Philadelphia for two weeks, charged with violating the alien contract labor law, were on the 26th granted permission by the United States treasury department to practice their trade in this country, on the ground that lacemaking, though carried on in this country, is so insignificant in proportions as to be classified properly as a new industry.

—At the next regular banquet of the Massachusetts Single Tax league, to be given at the rooms of the Catholic union, 1682 Washington street, Boston, the guests of honor are to be a company of Catholic clergymen, including Vicar General Byrne. The Rev. Robert J. Johnson, rector of the Gate of Heaven church, South Boston, is to answer the question: "Is the single tax theory condemned by the Catholic church, or condemnable upon ethical grounds?"

—Gov. Roosevelt on the 23d formally declined to remove Mayor Van Wyck, of New York, from office upon the charges of official connection with the American Ice company, better known as the "ice trust." The governor decides that, "while Mayor Van Wyck was undoubtedly a stockholder in the American Ice company, still there was no proof that he had willfully violated the law forbidding a public official to hold stock in a company doing business with the city." Mayor Van Wyck had shown, in his reply to the charges, that the dock privileges upon which the "ice trust" monopoly rested had been granted during the term of his predecessor, the late Mayor Strong.

—Owing to typographical errors in the official canvass of the vote on November 6, 1900, in Cook county, Ill., we reproduce the figures as corrected from official data:

	Vote.	Plurality.
Rep. (McKinley, president)	203,760	17,567
Republican (Yates, governor)	190,622	.....
Democratic (Bryan, president)	186,193	.....
Dem. (Alschuler, governor)	198,196	7,573
Pro. (Woolley, president)	3,490	.....
People's (Barker, president	211	.....
Social Dem. (Debs, president)	6,752	.....
Soc. Lab. (Maloney, president)	434	.....
United Chris (——, president)	184	.....
Union Reform (Ellis, presid't)	160	.....
Local:		
Rep. (Deneen, state's att'y)	205,709	26,013
Dem. (Goldzier, state's att'y)	179,696	.....
Pro. (Hawk, state's attorney)	5,236	.....
People's (Becker, state's att'y)	153	.....
Soc. Dem. (Morgan, st's att'y)	6,227	.....
Single Tax (Cooling, st's att'y)	503	.....

MISCELLANY

We are grateful for the following correction of reference. One of our subscribers writes: "In an article (Public of November 17, page 509) entitled 'The History of the "Consent" Doctrine,' reprinted from the Springfield Republican, a reference is made to Hooker's 'Ecclesiastical Polity,' book 1, paragraph 4. On opening Hooker I found paragraph 4 of book 1 devoted to the 'Laws Which the Angels Obey,' and it was only after industrious search that we found the paragraph you cite from Hooker. The reference should be 'book 1, paragraph 10.'"

HENRY GEORGE.

For The Public.

On reading the "Life of Henry George," written by his son, Henry George, Jr.

Again I hear his dauntless voice,
Again my heart with his is one,
Again I hear great souls rejoice
At deathless work supremely done,
And see once more the millions stirred
At his incomparable word.

EDWARD ROBESON TAYLOR.

San Francisco, Cal., Nov. 1, 1900.

THE BRITISH WAR-OF EXTERMINATION.

Verbatim copy from Johannesburg Gazette, July 21, 1900.

By Order of the British Government.
V. R. means Victoria Regina (Queen).

V. R.
PUBLIC NOTICE.

It is hereby notified for information that unless the men at present on commando belonging to families in the Town and District of Krugersdorp surrender themselves and hand in their arms to the Imperial Authorities by the 20th July, the whole of their properties will be confiscated and their families turned out destitute and homeless.

By order,
G. H. M. RITCHIE, Capt. K. Horse,
Dist. Supt. Police.
Krugersdorp, 9th July, 1900.

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN.

A POPULISTIC ATTEMPT.

For The Public.

"Prisoner," said the old-fashioned judge to a dusky culprit at the bar, "you stand charged with having stolen your neighbors' chickens; what do you say to the charge—guilty, or not guilty?"

Recalling a familiar campaign cry of the recent elections, the prisoner replied:

"Sir, I condescend to respond neither guilty nor not guilty. You must understand, sir, that stealing chickens from my neighbors is one of my avocations, and I regard this proceeding on their part as a populistic attempt to array class against class." P.

THE MENACE OF A LARGE STANDING ARMY TO A GREAT NATION.

An extract from Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1870, Chap. V, pp. 90, 91.)

The power of the sword is more sensibly felt in an extensive monarchy than in a small community. It has been calculated by the ablest of politicians, that no state, without being soon exhausted, can maintain above the hundredth part of its members in arms and idleness. But although this relative proportion may be uniform the influence of the army on the rest of the society will vary according to the degree of its positive strength. The advantages of military science and discipline cannot be exerted, unless a proper number of soldiers are united into one body, and actuated by one soul. With a handful of men, such a union would be ineffective; with an unwieldy host it would be impracticable; and the powers of the machine would be alike destroyed by the extreme minuteness, or the excessive weight, of its springs. To illustrate this observation we need only reflect that there is no superiority of natural strength, artificial weapons or acquired skill, which could enable one man to keep in constant subjection one hundred of his fellow creatures; the tyrant of a single town, or a small district, would soon discover that 100 armed followers were a weak defense against 10,000 peasants or citizens; but 100,000 well disciplined soldiers will command, with despotic sway, 10,000,000 of subjects; and a body of 10,000 or 15,000 guards will strike terror into the most numerous populace that ever crowded the streets of an immense capital.

RENOUNCE THE RELIGIOUS PROTECTORATE.

In the considerable fraction of the earth with which our foreign policies have to do there are several other sore spots besides the one in the Philippines. One of them is in China and concerns the results of missionary labors. Our practice, and that of other able-bodied missionary nations, has been to compel China to receive and protect their converts. When the converts were ill-used their custom has been to appeal for protection to the missionaries, who appealed to the nearest consul, who complained to the American minister, who complained to the Chinese government, which apologized and gave redress. The upshot of all this was that the missionaries wielded a secular power in China which conflicted with the power of the local Chinese authorities. That was an evil. It got the missionaries disliked by the Chinese, and it led to abuses, for there is abundant testimony that a good many rapscallion Chinese affected to be converted in order to be protected by missionaries against the justice of their own country. The defects of the system are apparent not only to the worldly-minded, but to some of the missionaries, and to persons sincerely interested in their work. Lord Salisbury in England called attention to them, and they have been fairly discussed by some of the church papers in this country. President Smyth, of Foochow college, in China, says the system is a failure; that it checks and stunts all missionary success; that it fails to protect in times of crises, and itself brings crises on. He would withdraw all foreign protection from Chinese converts and have the western governments renounce the religious protectorate altogether. He seems to have pretty sound ideas, but the chance that they will prevail is not so good as one could wish.—Editorial in Life of Oct. 25.

MOTHERHOOD IN THE GUTTERS.

Mrs. Lizzie O'Neill, 111 Jefferson street, arrested for drunkenness, was yesterday saved from a sentence to the workhouse by the earnest and touching pleading of her little nine-year-old daughter. The scene took place in Justice Dooley's court in the Maxwell street police station. Mrs. O'Neill had been found the evening before in a helpless condition and was taken to the station, where she spent the night.

It was learned that her husband had died when her daughter Mary was but two years old and that the mother had since that time labored in downtown restaurants in order to support herself and the little one. She became addicted to the drink habit, however, and yesterday could give no good excuse for her disorderly conduct. The justice was about to sentence her to the workhouse when a small and neat-appearing girl pushed her way through the motley crowd and asked if she might say something.

"Who are you, my little one?" asked the justice.

"I'm Mary and she's my mother," answered the child as she clutched the dress of Mrs. O'Neill. "And she is awful good to me. If you let her go I know she will never drink again. She

is the only friend I have," cried the child between sobs, "and if you send her away I'll die."

But the justice was obdurate and declared that the woman should receive light punishment. Mrs. O'Neill begged frantically for release as the judge set about entering an order for punishment. Suddenly the child spoke again.

"Mr. Judge," she said, "ain't you got some children at home?"

The question was too much for the magistrate. He immediately stopped writing, spoke kind words to the sobbing child and told her to take her mother home.—Chicago Chronicle of Nov. 22.

A GERMAN SATIRE ON AMERICAN CHARACTER.

Under the title, "A Self-Made Man: A Story for Good Little Boys," appears in the St. Petersburger Zeitung (a German paper published in the Russian capital) a satirical little sketch written ostensibly "for the American school reader," and hitting off American character as seen at that distance. The sketch runs in the main as below, according to the translation made for The Literary Digest, from which we take also the above description of the sketch.

There was once a little boy, and his name was Freddie. He did much for the entertainment of the neighborhood by fishing in other people's private ponds and picking other people's fruits. When he was scolded for it he would proudly say: "I am a free citizen of a free country." The neighbors wanted his father to whip him, but the father said he would not thus degrade a future president of the United States. Such things could be done only in enslaved Europe. And Freddie grew and prospered. He always attacked boys who were weaker than himself, beat them, and took away their pennies in the name of civilization and humanity. For, in Freddie's veins ran strong and pure the undiluted blood of the noble Anglo-Saxon.

One day Freddie's father was told that his son had swindled a friend of the family with a bogus dollar, and had gotten 85 cents change. And the father was deeply moved, and said: "I always knew Freddie would some day be a great man." Then he turned Freddie's pockets inside out and transferred the 85 cents to his own. After that Freddie was placed with a wise merchant who taught him that two and two make five. Freddie was wiser than he, and learned how to make two and two equal to nine. Then his boss made him a partner. And Freddie was worthy of the trust. He managed to get hold of all the shares and to give his old boss the bounce. And all the people were loud in their praises of Freddie.

Then Freddie bought sugar and sold it at a quarter of its value until he had ruined all competition, when he made good his losses tenfold by raising the price enormously. And all the people praised Freddie.

Freddie built a railroad to ruin the road which ran through his city, and he succeeded, and made the public pay. He oiled the machinery of congress and worked it so that tariffs excluded everything he wished to sell dear, and there was no competition. And the people still more praised Freddie. All the papers published vile portraits of him; he was called the man of the hour and the Napoleon of Finance. Freddie had become a great American.

But Freddie was not proud. He remained the same, humble, pious, God-fearing Freddie. He went diligently to church, and when the pastor spoke of the divine blessing which is certain to be showerd upon honest work, he would be moved to tears and nod his head in approval.

Freddie still lives. He is busy "making his fiftieth million. He makes it honestly out of the profits of sales of grain to the starving millions of India. Freddie is the pride of his fellow citizens, and the most shining example of an American self-made man in the most idealistic sense of the word.

THE MENACE TO AMERICA.

Extract from a pamphlet with the above title, by Rev. Joseph Henry Crooker. Published by the American Anti-Imperialist League of Chicago.

A political doctrine is now preached in our midst that is the most alarming evidence of moral decay that ever appeared in American history. Its baleful significance consists, not simply in its moral hatefulness, but in the fact that its advocates are so numerous and so prominent.

It is this: A powerful nation, representative of civilization, has the right, for the general good of humanity, to buy, conquer, subjugate, control and govern feeble and backward races and peoples, without reference to their wishes or opinions.

This is preached from pulpits as the Gospel of Christ. It is proclaimed in executive documents as American statesmanship. It is defended in legislative halls as the beginning of a more glorious chapter in human history. It is boastfully declaimed from the platform as the first great act in the regeneration of mankind. It is published in innumerable editorials, red with cries for blood and hot with lust for gold, as the call of God to the American people.

But how came these men to know so clearly the mind of the Almighty? Was the cant of piety ever more infamously used? Was selfishness ever more wantonly arrayed in the vestments of sanctity? Is this the modern chivalry of the strong to the weak? Then let us surrender all our fair ideals and admit that might alone makes right. Is this the duty of great nations to small peoples? Then morality is a fiction. Is this the Gospel of Jesus? Then let us repudiate the Golden Rule. Is this the crowning lesson of America to the world? Then let us renounce our democracy.

This doctrine is the maxim of bigotry: "The end justifies the means," reshaped by the ambition of reckless politicians and enforced by the greed of selfish speculators. It is infinitely worse than the policy of the old ecclesiastics, for they had in view the salvation of others, while the advocates of this seek the subjugation of others. The colonial motive, now stirring among us, is not love for others. The mask is too thin and too black to deceive even a savage Filipino.

A similar motive and policy piled the fagots about every burning martyr. It turned every thumbscrew that tortured heretics. It laid on the lash that drew blood from the back of every suffering slave. This teaching unbars the bottomless pit and lets loose upon the world every demon that ever vexed the human race. It unchains every wild passion that has lingered in man's blood since it flowed upward from the brute. It prepares the path by which the despot will reach his throne of tyranny and it arms him with instruments of oppression.

It was against this denial of both God and humanity that the barons hurled themselves at Runnymede. For its overthrow Old Ironsides fought at Naseby and Marston Moor. To banish this theory of human affairs from the new world Washington suffered at Valley Forge and contended at Yorktown. To destroy the last vestige of this hateful policy, Grant conquered at Appomattox. This is not true Americanism, but the contradiction of every principle for which we have contended and in which we have gloried for over a century. This is not the upward way of civilization, but the backward descent to barbarism.

If this be duty, let us recite no more the Master's creed of love. If this be

destiny, let us proclaim no more the rights of men. If this be patriotism, let us sing no more "America." We must rewrite the "Star-Spangled Banner," and make its theme the praise of conquest and colonization. We must erase the motto: "E Pluribus Unum," and inscribe instead: "One nation in authority over many people." We must tear up the declaration of independence and put in its place: "A Summary of the Duties of Colonists to Their Master." But this is political atheism.

Something more than the welfare of distant peoples is at stake. We condemn this teaching and policy, not simply to secure justice for the brown man, but to insure justice and freedom for ourselves. The motive of our protest is more than friendship for him; it is devotion to principles of liberty that are the necessary conditions of universal human progress. The feelings of sympathy and justice ought to rule us in these relations. But every advocate of our present national policy outrages these sentiments whenever he makes his defense. His words ring false. And yet, the heart of the matter lies far deeper. The true glory of America is imperiled. The happiness of our descendants is assailed. The mission of America as the representative and guardian of liberty is in question. The perpetuity of free institutions hangs in the balance.

"A HOLY WAR."

Extracts from an article on "The Last Days of Pretoria," by Richard Harding Davis, published in the October Scribner.

I left Pretoria with every reason for regret. I had come to it a stranger and had found friends among men whom I had learned to like for themselves and for their cause. I had come prejudiced against them, believing them to be all the English press and my English friends had painted them —semibarbarous, uncouth, money-loving, and treacherous in warfare. I found them simple to the limit of their own disadvantage, magnanimous to their enemies, independent and kindly. I had heard much of the corruption of their officials; and I saw daily their chief minister of state, at a time when every foreign resident was driving through Pretoria in a carriage, passing to and from the government building in a tram-car, their president living in a whitewashed cottage, their generals serving for months at the front without pay and without hope of medals or titles. Their ignorance of the usages and customs of the great world outside of their own mountains, for which the English held them in such derision, harmed no one so greatly as it harmed themselves. Had they known the outside world, had they been able to overcome their distrust of the foreigner, had they understood in what way to make use of him, how to manipulate the press of the world to tell the truth in their behalf as cleverly as the English had used it to misrepresent them; had they known how to make capital of the sympathies of the French, the Americans and the Germans, and to turn it to their own account; had they known which men to send abroad to tell the facts, to plead and to explain; had they known which foreign adventurer was the one to follow implicitly on the battle-field and which to "vootsak" to the border; had they been men of the world instead of farmers in total ignorance of it, they might have brought about intervention, or an honorable peace. The very unworldliness of the Boer, at which the Englishman sneers, did much, I believe, to save Great Britain from greater humiliations, from more frequent "reverses" and more costly defeats. . . .

I had entered Pretoria in the days of her successes and I was deserting at the moment of her fall. I do not know when I had left a place with as heavy a heart, and as the train at last pulled free of the town and ran parallel to the Middleburg highway, each mounted Boer it passed seemed, as he waved his sombrero, to beckon us back again. The great veldt, throbbing in the heat of the sun and flashing with brilliant yellow lights and purple shadows, seemed to reproach us. The hot, barren kopjes with their stunted cacti, the splashing waterfalls, and the twisting white river that raced the train, all filled me with regret. They had never looked more beautiful or more to be desired, or more as the scene set for a country men could choose to call home. The sight of the men to whom it really was home, who were fighting for it, and who were to continue to fight for it, stirred me with pride in them. I saw them for the last time even as I was steaming away from them to another continent, to other interests and other friends. They were jogging patiently through the high grass on our right, and spreading out fan-wise over the red kopjes that lay between them and Irene, where the sultry air was shaken with heavy vibrations of hot-throated guns. They trotted forward alone or in pairs, each an independent fighting man with his rifle and blanket swung across his shoulders and his canvas water-bottle, rusty coffee-pot and bundle of green fodder dangling from his saddle. I knew as the train carried us away from the sight of them that no soldier in pipe-clay, gauntlets and gold lace would ever again mean to me what these burghers meant — these long-bearded, strong-eyed Boers with their drooping cavalier hats, their bristling bands of cartridges, their upright seat in the saddle and the rifle rising above them like the lance of the crusader. They are the last of the crusaders. They rode out to fight for a cause as old as the days of Pharaoh and the children of Israel, against an enemy ten times as mighty as was Washington's in his war for independence. As I see it, it has been a holy war, this war of the burgher crusader, and his motives are as fine as any that ever called a "minute man" from his farm or sent a knight of the Cross to die for it in Palestine. Still, in spite of his cause, the Boer is losing, and in time his end may come, and he may fall. But when he falls he will not fall alone; with him will end a great principle, the principle for which our forefathers fought—the right of self-government, the principle of independence.

COOPERATIVE FACTORIES AND MONOPOLIES.

Those who are in the habit of looking a little below the surface of things may see more than at first appears in a press item regarding the production of glass in Indiana by establishments owned and operated by the workmen in cooperation. It is stated that these establishments are prosperous and that they are on the increase, and the significant point is made that "It is not possible for any trust to get a corner on the sand from which glass is made, and consequently there is no hindrance to the cooperative plan being applied to this industry."

Some time ago when there was an active labor trouble in the anthracite coal regions of Pennsylvania, an old miner recalled the day when an expert coal miner could go into the hills with a few tools, and, working for himself, make wages, at taking out coal, that would be considered fabulous these days. But, said he, "All the coal lands are now owned by the coal companies. That part of these lands [a very large part] which they are not using for mining operations they simply hold for the purpose of preventing others from using it, and

a man must now work for one of these companies on its terms or not at all." And he might have added: "Thus these companies pervent free competition in the coal market on the one hand, and on the other are able to make terms with the miners which they could not come anywhere near making with them if coal, like the sand from which glass is made, could not be cornered by a trust." It seems to us that the two instances when contrasted are very illuminating, and that among other things they may serve to show the essential difference between socalled trusts and trusts.

A commercial organization which has not, and perhaps cannot, control the supply of its raw material, and which cannot or does not, control or monopolize in any way the means of transportation either of raw material or of finished product, must obviously depend for its success upon good management, i. e., upon its ability to supply the public with a desirable article at a fair price, and so long as it does that, and the conditions are such that any others—workmen cooperating among themselves, or capitalists cooperating among themselves (in the form of joint stock companies or otherwise), can freely enter into the business and compete for trade, we do not see how any reasonable complaint can be brought against them, no matter how large they may be nor how many separate manufacturing establishments they may own. There is, it seems to us, entirely too much railing against "capital" and "capitalism." There is, in fact, scarcely any severer competition than is to be found among capitalists themselves. This competition is clearly shown in the bidding for municipal and other interest-bearing bonds which, when they are sold, bring a premium that reduces the net interest to the competitive rate for returns on capital, and that rate at the present time is somewhere about two per cent. This must be taken as the return which commercial operations of all kinds show to be about the average net interest received on capital, deducting for losses and for cost or value of supervision and management. There is no monopoly of capital; the competitive bidding for bonds and other forms of safe investments show clearly that there is not, and workmen themselves by their own building and loan association operations and by the use that is made of their money by savings banks, may easily convince themselves that this is so.

On the other hand, capital may be used to secure harmful monopolies, but when this is the case it is the monopoly, not the capital, that injures others. In fact, many valuable monopolies, especially franchise monopolies, have been practically without the use of capital. They have been "granted" or given away by thoughtless or corrupt representatives of the people, and in such cases, though it is a little more clearly seen that it is monopoly and not capital that is the offender, it is no more true that it is so than in those cases where capital has been used merely to secure the monopoly.

When capital is used in such operations as cooperative glass making establishments, which establishments sell their product in the market in competition with other producers, it is, of course, manifest that there is no monopoly, no matter how much capital may be invested in the enterprise, nor how large the factory may be. But supposing it were possible to monopolize the supply of sand for glass making, and a portion of the capital were used for that purpose, and free competition of other establishments in that way prevented, it ought to be quite clear that it would not be capital that would be the oppressor, but the monopoly of sand, and we beg to suggest that much of the discussion of these subjects would be far more effective for real good if a little more discrimination were used. It is nonsense, for instance, to class a combination of tool building concerns, buying its material in the open markets and controlling no monopolies whatever, with the Standard Oil company, or the anthracite coal trust, both of which last mentioned concerns are successful chiefly because of having secured monopolies that prevent competition on equal terms.—American Machinist of Aug. 9.

MUNICIPAL TAXATION OF LAND VALUES IN PRUSSIA.

Ten years have just elapsed since William II. asked John Miquel, the ex-communist and friend of Karl Marx, to be his minister of finance, and within these ten years that most versatile statesman has revolutionized our whole system of taxation. It is certainly a somewhat unusual and eventful career by which this man, beginning as an avowed revolutionist, has risen through the positions of bank director and lord burgomaster of Frankfort to ministerial honor at Berlin and to the trusteeship of the "Junker" party. But though his party denomination has changed, the man has changed little. As a pillar of the same throne which he was bent on overthrowing in the year 1848, he has shaped into facts his ideas of taxation, and especially of land taxation, moderated, of course, by the practical considerations which a Prussian minister has to take into account, but still in such a radical form as would have been simply impossible if he had remained in the ranks of the opposition. A land nationalizer in principle, he has put into operation new taxation laws which only need to be extended and generally applied in the future in order entirely to tax away the "unearned increment." And another feature of his social legislation is that he has intrusted the task of administering it not to the state but to the municipalities.

The Prussian laws on the taxation of land and buildings date as far back as 1861. They were bright examples of the work of what we call the "Manchester school" of economic thought, and they entirely handed over the interests of the community to the enterprising speculator. According to the act of 1861, taxes were only levied from landed property which yielded an immediate profit, and the taxes were imposed on this profit. Thus the most valuable building land inside and outside the cities was only taxed if potatoes or corn was grown upon it, and the taxes were imposed on the value of its agricultural yield (Ertrags-Steuer). The actual value of land of this kind might amount to thousands and tens of thousands of pounds, but so long as it lay vacant and yielded no agricultural profit, or was not let, say, as warehouse, yard, or otherwise, no taxes whatever were paid on the ground values, which grew incessantly from year to year—nay, from day to day—with the advent of every newborn inhabitant of the city who required an abode upon this earth. The same principles were applied to landed property on which buildings had been erected. They were taxed according to their yield, not according to their real value.

The speculators, of course, were not slow to take advantage of this sort of legislation. They seized upon the whole of the prospective building area round the growing cities, and declined to sell a bit of it until the toiling community was in such urgent need of house-room for its ever-increasing population as to be forced to pay the

demanded price. You in England, where happily the one-family house is still a national feature, cannot imagine the gigantic dimensions of the profits of the speculator in Berlin, in Munich, in Frankfort, in Cologne, in Dusseldorf, and other industrial centers, where one house generally shelters 20 to 30 families, and where, consequently, a piece of land can be exploited in a manner unknown to you. A rood of land which was bought by the speculator 12 to 15 years ago for £35 is, in certain places, now sold for not less than £1,050, but it often fetches £1,400 in our city, which only numbers 200,000 inhabitants. In and around Berlin these profits are, of course, on a more gigantic scale. The speculators, mostly consolidated into rings and trusts, were easily able to await their time, for legislation protected them from any trouble in the shape of taxes. Their "losses" of interest were made up a hundredfold by the incessant increase of land values.

Now when Mr. Miquel came into power he touched the speculator in two ways. First of all he introduced a property tax in addition to the income tax, based, like the latter, on a declaration by the person taxed. Every person who is possessed of property worth £300 and more is required, under a heavy penalty, to make an annual declaration of the actual value, and to pay taxes on that value. Landed property round the cities, even if left vacant or used for agricultural purposes, must be "declared" according to the speculative value as building land, if it has such a value at all. But this property tax, which is levied by the state, is no great burden on the speculator; its amount is only one-half per mille of the value. So the speculator whose land is worth £50,000 only pays £25 a year.

But now the municipality steps in. The Prussian state has, by the act of 1893, renounced the right of levying land taxes, and has transferred it to the municipalities. By the same act the latter are empowered to levy land taxes from the real or "common" value (gemeiner Wert) of land and buildings, and quite a number of our great cities have recently complied with the request of Miquel to avail themselves of these powers. The corporation of our city (Dusseldorf on Rhine) have resolved to levy a rate of two per cent. of the real capital value of every building and of all the landed property within the borders of the city. This new mode of taxation of land values has been introduced on the ground of social justice. The general idea, it was said when this new mode of taxation was recommended to the town council, was not that the total amount of the land tax should be enlarged—although that has been the effect—but that individual taxpayers should be more fairly treated. From the following tables it will be seen how the new tax is working. They are confined to examples which our burgomaster thought fit to publish before the introduction of the tax. The big speculators do not appear in the tables. The amount of the tax is given in shillings, which correspond exactly with the German marks:

TABLE A.

Agricultural land close to the building area.

	Amount of taxes. Formerly. Tax on yield.		Now. 2 p. c. of capital value.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.
Parcel A	2	1	24	10
Parcel B	0	9	9	3
Parcel C	0	10	7	0
Parcel D	0	11	5	5
Parcel E	1	10	4	8
Parcel F	0	0½	0	1
Parcel G	0	4	0	6
Parcel H	9	2	34	5

TABLE B.

Speculative building land, mostly used for agricultural purposes.

	Amount of taxes. Formerly. Tax on yield.		Now. 2 p. c. of capital value.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.
Parcel A	26	9	314	6
Parcel B	2	7	150	0
Parcel C	0	9	50	0
Parcel D	6	1	368	0
Parcel E	4	9	134	5
Parcel F	2	9	180	0
Parcel G	0	0	12	10
Parcel H	10	2	240	0
Parcel I	0	4	30	0
Parcel K	0	0	0	0
Parcel L	0	7	81	0
Parcel M	3	7	138	0

TABLE C.

Workmen's dwelling houses, mostly occupied by the poorest class.

	Amount of taxes. Formerly. Tax on yield.	Now. 2 p. c. of capital value.
	s.	s.
House A, 20 families	230	109
House B, 14 families	140	72
House C, 16 families	305	140
House D, 12 families	280	157
House E, 15 families	242	153
House F, 20 families	230	150
House G, 13 families	87	60
House H, 17 families	220	165
House I, 10 families	187	157

TABLE D.

Houses of the better class, mostly occupied by one family.

	Amount of taxes. Formerly. Tax on yield.	Now. 2 p. c. of capital value.
	s.	s.
House A	265	360
House B	860	900
House C	235	430
House D (Freemasons' clubhouse)	224	500
House E (clubhouse)	698	912
House F (a farmhouse, the land and gardens of which have become buildings sites)	40	1,200

TABLE E.

Factories.

	Amount of taxes. Formerly. Tax on yield.	Now. 2 p. c. of capital value.
	s.	s.
Premises A, engineering	465	1,600
Premises B, engineering	746	2,200
Premises C, engineering	1,104	2,600
Premises D, engineering	1,238	2,257
Premises E, engineering	919	2,000
Premises F, textile	294	1,000
Premises G, textile	552	700

TABLE F.

Market gardens in the outskirts.

	Amount of taxes. Formerly. Tax on yield.	Now. 2 p. c. of capital value.	
	s.	s.	d.
Business A	6	3	0
Business B	20	30	0
Business C	5	4	2
Business D	8	12	0
Business E	24	20	0

These tables hardly need comment. They undoubtedly show that the taxation of the actual value instead of the yield is a step in the right direction. This mode of taxation works admirably. It relieves weak shoulders and puts the burden on those who can pay and ought to pay.—G. Stoffers, in Manchester Guardian, October 15, 1900.

"I thought you said the war in the Philippines was practically over."

"Well?"

"Well, I see in the paper this morning that our troops routed a detachment of the enemy and killed 100 of them."

"My boy, that makes it still more practically over, doesn't it?"—Catholic Standard and Times.

"Roberts says that the majority of the burghers still at large are fighting under compulsion."

"Well, that isn't fair! But, say! the minority must be scrappers from away back."—Puck.

Our message to the heathen is that salvation is free and cotton goods are cheap.—Puck.

BOOK NOTICES.

In "The Monetary Revolution" (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co.) Andrew J. Osborne advocates a system of money based upon an arbitrary labor unit, as that "six hours of labor on the surface of the earth of any kind might be the minimum equivalent of the dollar." Mr. Osborne's

views are fundamentally affected by the theory that interest, instead of being an increment of labor-produced capital, is a premium for the use of money.

The January number of the Quarterly Economist (Cedar Rapids, Ia.: Frank Vierth. Price 10 cents), contains several articles of interest to investigators of the single tax theory, besides a special article on direct legislation.

Edward Atkinson has just published the sixth and final number of his "Anti-Imperialist" (Brookline, Mass.: Edward Atkinson. Price, 10 cents), in which he shows from official data the cost of the McKinley war in the Philippines. Along with the statistics is a collection of valuable documents pertinent to the subject.

A compact and comprehensive presentation of the various phases of direct legislation by popular vote is made in "Direct Legislation" (Philadelphia: C. F. Taylor, 1520 Chestnut street. Price, 25 cents), by Prof. Frank Parsons.

William M. Salter's address on "The Ethical Elements in Socialism and Individualism" (Philadelphia: S. Burns Weston, 1305 Arch street. Price, 5 cents) does not profess to be more than a very general discussion of the subject, in which Mr. Salter argues neither for socialism nor individualism, but merely suggests a mode of approach or point of view. It seems to us that he has not sufficiently emphasized the principle of competition, which fundamentally distinguishes the two schools. Individualism stands for free competition; socialism would abolish all competition. Had Mr. Salter given full value to this distinction he could hardly have premised that whereas socialism has never been tried individualism has virtually had the field down to the present time. It is true that socialism has not been tried as socialism, but restrictions upon competition have so completely ruled the roast throughout historic times that individualism has not been tried at all.

The edition of "The Public" this week is 6,000.