The Public

Third Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1900. Number 142.

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.

What is there about statistics that makes statistical experts so indifferent to facts? Mr. Carroll D. Wright, one of the most noted of these experts, is quoted as telling a Chicago reporter that "never before has labor in this country been so extensively employed at such remunerative wages as today." There are few hired men who do not know this to be false as to themselves. More work without more pay is the rule rather than the exception.

That model democratic association, the Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln league, recently organized at Columbus, O., is preparing to celebrate Lincoln's birthday. The three principal toasts on that occasion will be "Jefferson," "Jackson" and "Lincoln," the emphasis being placed especially upon the latter. This movement is worth imitating over the country. The party to which Lincoln belonged has now so completely identified itself with all that was alien to Lincoln's thoroughly democratic sentiments that it honors his memory best by ignoring him. But the new democracy draws its inspiration as well from Lincoln as from Jefferson. In the combination of these names as a political talisman lies the hope of the democratic democracy.

A New York judge has furnished editorial writers with themes by deciding that later than midnight is an unreasonable hour for a woman to be out of doors. These writers assume that the decision establishes a general prohibition applicable to all women. They refer to the New York law, therefore, as if it were somewhat of the character of curfew. But that was not at all the nature of the criticised decision. The judge laid down no rule regulating the hours at which women must be at home. All he did was to construe a contract. The woman in the case had rented business apartments, with permission to occupy them for living purposes. But this permission was upon the condition that she should have no outer door key and should not demand admittance at unreasonable hours. The latter condition was made to relieve the owner, who also lived in the building, from sitting up all night to let his tenant in. What the judge did was to determine a "reasonable hour" within the meaning of that contract; and he decided, with great liberality toward the tenant, as it seems to us, that later than midnight would not be reasonable.

A philanthropist of Evanston addresses his pastor with several pious suggestions, one of which has to do with the relation of employer and employe. "Every employer should visit the homes of his employes," urges this meddling philanthropist, "to make sure he is paying them wages large enough so they can live in decency and comfort," etc. What would that man say if labor organizations required that "every employe should visit the home of his employer to make sure that he is paying all the wages he can afford to?" He would think, if he did not say it, that the proposition was a gross impertinence. But so is his own. The wages question has nothing to do with social visiting, much less with social Paul Prying. Whether employes have wages enough for their wants, more or less, is none of the employer's affair, any more than the employer's ability to pay is the affair of the employe. The question of wages is a question of business—honest business. If the employer is paying his men what their work is worth to him, his business relations with them are at an end. If that is more than he can afford, or less than they need, there is of course something wrong. But the remedy lies in another direction than in obtruding himself into their homes upon no other credentials than the fact that he is their boss.

When the tories of Great Britain were soliciting votes last fall to return them to power, they protested vehemently that their defeat would bring dishonor to the flag in South Africa, whereas their triumph would be immediately followed by the submission of the Boers. The stubborn Dutchmen were only waiting, they said, for news of a tory victory at the polls to lay down their arms in unconditional surrender. It was argued incidentally that the war was practically over and that only a few guerrilla bands remained in the field, their object being to keep up an appearance of war in the hope that the liberals would come into power at the British elections and reestablish the Boer governments in South Africa. These hustings arguments in the British elections were precisely like republican stump speeches during the McKinley campaign. To recall the one is to understand the other. Substitute in a British speech the name of Aguinaldo for Kruger, the Philippines for South Africa, the Filipinos for the Boers, Americans for British, McKinley for the conservative and Bryan for the liberal candidate, and old glory for the union jack, and you have a fair sample of an American speech. Reverse the process with an American speech and

you produce a British speech. But the British people have now awakened to the hollowness of all that sort of talk. The news from South Africa admonishes them that if the war was nearly over during the elections, it has revived with all the vigor it ever had. They are beginning to suspect that it was not nearly over then, and that they were fooled by tory politicians. This suspicion is well founded. Nor is it the worst of the matter. There is no likelihood of course, that the British will be ultimately defeated; but it is now morally certain that their final victory will come only after the invaded country has been depopulated and devastated.

And as the British outlook in South Africa is growing darker, so is that of the Americans in the Philippines. "Lincoln," the Washington correspondent of the Boston Transcript, predicts a change of policy in the not distant future. He bases his prediction not upon any intimations the administration is throwing out, but upon the fact that President McKinley is an opportunist, coupled with the further fact that the situation in the Philippines is from a military point of view becoming serious. Upon what he regards as good authority, "Lincoln" says that the only solution of the Philippine problem consistent with the continuance of the present policy is extermination. There, then, we have the British tories and the American republicans facing the same alternative regarding the peoples whose countries they are respectively invading. They must either abandon their demands for unconditional surrender or exterminate the objects of their benevolent attentions.

Ex-President Harrison's Ann Arbor speech, which he delivered on the 15th before a large audience at the University of Michigan, is calculated to revive the hopes of those who have feared that the reelection of McKinley might prove to be a conclusive indorsement of the McKinley policy of colonialism. It is a blunt condemnation of that policy throughout. Mr. Harrison makes quick work of demolishing the notion that treaties are the supreme law of the land in the sense of being superior to the constitution. He puts the constitution where its founders placed it. Within its sphere it is superior to all legislation, and all treaty making. Whether it denies powers to congress or confers powers upon congress, the functions of congress are thereby limited. That body can legislate neither against its restraints nor beyond its concessions. The Paris treaty, therefore, in so far as it confers upon congress legislative powers over Puerto Rico and the Philippines, is subject to constitutional limitations. Congress cannot substitute the treaty for the constitution, and legislate at will. Its legislation must recognize the principles of personal rights guaranteed by the constitution, and must do so, not from motives of benevolence, but because the constitution forbids hostile legislation. For this reason it must observe all other constitutional limitations. It can no more disregard the constitutional rule of uniformity in taxation than it can defy the rule about ex post facto laws. From which it follows, of course, that the whole McKinley policy regarding "our new possessions" is unsound. The speech was an able presentation of the doctrine that the constitution does follow the flag.

It is somewhat remarkable that Mr. Harrison should have made this speech, in flat opposition to McKinley's policy, only a few days before the question was to be argued before the supreme court. The case in which that question has been raised is trifling in itself. It involves merely the right to import into the United States a few diamonds from the Philippines free of duty. But that right rests upon the theory that the Philippine people are United States citizens. Should this theory be sustained by the supreme court, President McKinley will be confronted with the alternative of abandoning either his colonial policy or his protection policy, unless he decides to adopt the Bryan plan of dealing with the Philippines. The decision will be awaited with interest by the public generally, and from present appearances not without trepidation by Mr. McKinley and his party friends.

When the colonial question came before the supreme court on Monday last, Attorney General Griggs made the argument in person for the McKinley crown colony policy. Mr. Griggs was very frank. He evaded nothing except the use of one distasteful word. When dwelling upon his proposition that the treaty of Paris, though intended to make the Philippines and Puerto Rico part of the United States, was intended not to make the inhabitants citizens, he was unable to force himself to say that it intended to make them subjects. Yet he left no room for an inference that he regarded them as anything else. Mr. Griggs took the broad ground that congress is superior to the constitution with reference to the inhabitants of all United States territory, except the states. That doctrine is fundamentally the reverse of Mr. Harrison's; and nothing more is needed to turn the republic into an empire.

When Don M. Dickinson and William C. Whitney propose to reorganize the democratic party on Grover Cleveland lines, because Bryan has been twice defeated—a consummation to which they contributed their little utmost—they are acute enough to divert public attention from the low ebb of vitality, not only in principle but also in popular favor, to which their own kind of democrats had brought the party before Bryan came to the leadership. They do this by comparing the Cleveland vote of 1892 with Bryan's vote in 1896 and 1900. But that is not a fair comparison. With reference to the relative popular strength of Clevelandism and Bryanism, the comparison should not be

with the strength of the democratic party when it put Cleveland back into office, but with its strength after he had got in.

Everyone will admit, upon overhauling his memory, that in the spring of 1896, after only three years "more of Cleveland," the democratic party was dead. Cleveland had crushed the life out of it, and its presidential nomination went begging. There was not a well-known politician in the country, from President Cleveland down, who was then willing to accept it. How complete was the work of Clevelandism in destroying the party appears from the 1894 voting, after Cleveland had been 18 months in office. Thirteen of the states that had cast their electoral votes for either him or Weaver in 1892, swung into the republican column in 1894. They were California (except one electoral vote), Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota (except one vote), West Virginia, and Wisconsin. The electoral votes of these states, which turned their backs upon the democratic party in the middle of Cleveland's last term of office, amount to 141. Deducting the California and the North Dakota votes excepted above, and the 22 for Weaver, and we have 117 electoral votes which Cleveland received in 1892 that he would not have received in 1894. As his electoral vote in 1892 was 277, he would thus have had in 1894 only 160. That is 16 less than Bryan got in 1896, and only five more than Bryan got in 1900, when his defeat is described by the Clevelandites as finally and fatally disastrous. It is not Bryanism that has brought the democratic party so low in voting strength, but Clevelandism. Bryanism has given the party that democratic tone of which the slave power formerly and Cleveland latterly divested it; and as the fight goes on Bryanism will give it voting strength also. Even now the popular voting strength of the party is a million or so greater than in Cleveland's day.

Grover Cleveland advises democrats to "rehabilitate" the party, and predicts that "with a sincere return to its old-time doctrines the old-time victories of the democratic party will certainly be won." There is coolness in this, since it was Mr. Cleveland himself who reduced the party to its extremity. But what does he mean by "old-time doctrines" and "old-time victories?" If he refers to Jefferson's doctrines and victories, Bryan is the present representative of the doctrines, and the Cleveland faction have enlisted to prevent the victories. If he means the Jackson doctrines and victories, the same observation holds good. But if he means the pro-slavery doctrines and victories that preceded the civil war, then true democrats want neither. They have no notion of turning back to the democracy of James Buchanan.

There are more clamorous congratulations over the excessive outgo of commodities for November, when the balance was $71,832,176. But why is this excess of outgo a favorable balance? We get neither gold nor silver for it. It does not pay for previous excessive income; for the excess has for years been continually on the outgo side of the ledger. Why, then, is it favorable? No business man would congratulate himself upon such figures in his own business. Take a storekeeper, for illustration. He has sold more goods in November than he has bought, to the value of $71,832,176. At first blush that would look prosperous. But where is the gold and silver in payment for the goods? None has been received. Where, then, are the checks? He has had no checks. Where are the promissory notes, the bonds and mortgages, the book accounts, the other evidences of credit? He has some, to be sure, but his liabilities far exceed all his credits. Then he has been charging off this balance of commodities against the capital he borrowed to begin business with? Not at all. If his statistics of unpaid for sales were applicable to that account, the account would have been paid off years and years ago. For a generation he has been selling more than he has bought, and got nothing for it. What would be thought of a man whose business was in that state, if he bragged of his continuous excess of outgo? Wouldn't a commission in lunacy be the proper thing? Yet that is precisely the condition of Uncle Sam regarding his excessive exports. He brags volubly about them, but nowhere and at no time does he show how these exports are paid for. No information that can be extracted from him gives the slightest reason to suppose that he ever has been, is now, or ever will be compensated for the excess. He would apparently have equally good reason to boast of his November excess of exports had it been sunk in mid ocean.

In an otherwise sensible explanation of the absurd "favorable balance" of trade theory, the Chicago Chronicle says that after allowing for erroneous statistics, the trade balance is adjusted by freight on merchandise, tourists' expenses, interest and profits on foreign capital invested in this country, etc. "We may rest perfectly assured," it concludes, "that we get, or sooner or later will get, the full value of our exports in services and goods, and something more as profits on sales. We are not a fool people." That would be true if trading were confined to the exchange of services and goods. But what do we get, what have we ever got in the past, what shall we ever get in the future, for the goods that are exported to pay the London Astor his New York ground rents? We do get the use of certain building lots in New York city, and that is a service, indeed; but do we get it in exchange for the goods we export to Astor? Is it a service which he or his ancestors ever rendered? Clearly not. The goods that go to Astor

for New York ground rent are as truly a drain upon the country, increasing its "favorable" balance, as is the food that Irishmen export to pay for Irish land. Nothing comes back in exchange for what goes out. Is it so certain, then, that we are not a fool people?

Some disappointment is expressed by the Chicago Tribune (republican) over the alacrity with which its party leaders at Washington are pushing through the ship subsidy bill. "It was not understood," says the Tribune, "when the spellbinders were urging the people of the northwest to vote in favor of the reelection of President McKinley, that one of the first items on the senatorial programme when congress met would be the passage of a shipping 'subsidy' bill which contemplates the expenditure of $9,000,000 a year for 30 years for the special benefit of a number of rich men residing in eastern cities." But why was not this understood? If the idea was not grasped by the Tribune and its followers, they must belong to that class to which Lincoln referred when he said: "You can fool some of the people all of the time." This subsidy measure, which the Tribune now denounces, was before congress last winter, and the republicans, with few exceptions, rallied to its support. In principle it was openly advocated by Hanna both in congress and during the campaign, was favored with McKinleyistic prudence of expression by President McKinley, was made the subject of an approving plank in the republican platform, and was advocated by Mr. McKinley in his letter of acceptance. If anything at all was stamped with public approval by the election, ship subsidies were. It is too late for the Tribune to object as a party organ. The matter is now a party measure. But the Tribune's objections are none the less valuable. One of them is especially so, since it sufficiently concedes the validity of Bryan's complaint that the republican party stands for the classes and against the masses. In its issue of the 9th it says editorially of the ship subsidy bill that "the attempt being made now to favor the classes at the expense of the masses will give color and point to future appeals like those Mr. Bryan made this year."

But the shipping subsidy ring is not making the headway its members had looked for. Though the bill has the benefit of the president's influence, together with the active support of Senator Hanna, and is, besides, one of the favors for millionaires to which the party managers are pledged in return for campaign contributions, there is reason to hope that it may be defeated, or at least headed off. Many of its plundering provisions have been patched over with amendments. But an examination of these shows it to be as vicious as ever. The amendments are only masks. Ex-Congressman John DeWitt Warner analyzes some of them in a letter to the New York Evening Post. He shows, for instance, that under the amendments the subsidy of an ordinary freight steamer carrying 7,500 tons of freight would be but $4,740 for a voyage for which the passenger steamer the St. Louis, carrying only 3,575 tons of freight, receives a subsidy of $25,000. That is, "in proportion to American exports carried the passenger steamer receives more than 11 times the subsidy that does the freighter." The subsidy bill would, therefore, appear to be for the encouragement of passenger service, rather than freight traffic. Another point to which Mr. Warner calls attention is the Frye amendment requiring subsidized vessels to use in their construction fittings and machinery of American manufacture. It is thus proposed, says Mr. Warner, "first, to give a subsidy to American ship builders on the ground that their materials cost them more than do those of foreigners; and, second, by another provision of the same bill, to make these same American ship builders pay still for more their materials." Well may Mr. Warner denounce this either as "tomfoolery," or as "successful blackmail levied by manufacturers upon the subsidy beggars, as a condition of not yelling 'stop thief' till they get safely away with their treasury loot."

Mr. Warner deals with numerous other points of the subsidy bill, showing that it has been so framed and amended as to distribute subsidies to favored corporations. This alone is enough to condemn the bill. But there are deeper reasons. No matter how fairly subsidies might be distributed among ship builders and ship owners, they would still constitute a robbery of private tax payers for the benefit of private tax eaters. Every man who buys a cigar, or a glass of beer, who wears foreign goods in his clothing, who in any way consumes anything upon which the federal government levies a tax, either through the custom house or the internal revenue office—every such man contributes to the federal treasury. The government lays the heavy hand of its taxing power upon him, and he must pay the tax or refrain from consuming the taxed goods. Now, the government has no moral right to force money out of the pockets of the general public and turn it over to individuals in subsidies. When it does so it commits a robbery, which is none the less stealing because the government is not amenable to punishment. Subsidizing is a synonym for larceny, and the man who advocates it or votes for it commits robbery in his heart. This is the fundamental reason why the shipping subsidy bill should be defeated. It is the reason why it ought to be defeated even if it provided for a fair distribution of the plunder.

Indiana is the last state to contest with Georgia and Colorado for the honors of lynching negroes. In Indiana, however, the mob did no burn-

ing at the stake. It contented itself with commonplace hanging, thereby earning the commendation, we presume, of those good preachers who found nothing to condemn in the Colorado lynching but the fact that the mob burned their victim instead of murdering him humanely. There were three victims in the Indiana case. All of them were negroes. One of them confessed to having committed the murder the mob had set out to avenge. But he confessed under duress and in terror. The law books agree that confessions made under such circumstances are worthless. But the Indiana mobbers were not particular about the value of confessions. They wanted "the nigger," and his confession was good enough for all practical purposes. So they hanged him. And as this negro had in his confession implicated another of his race, the mob hanged him, too. The confessor had also implicated a third negro, who was yet at liberty. But the sheriff put him in jail and held him there securely until the mob came again. Without encountering the least resistance from any official, it dragged the new prisoner out and hanged him also. This was all done in the most orderly and genteel manner imaginable by a mob of all classes, some of the most respectable men of the locality participating, and no masks were worn. When the Colorado lynching occurred its apologists explained it on the theory that the abolition of capital punishment in Colorado has made it necessary for mobs to administer the extreme penalty in aggravated cases. But as capital punishment has not been abolished in Indiana the Colorado excuse will not serve there. The simple explanation of all these lynchings, north and south, is the unreasonable and unreasoning, not to say unchristian, contempt for negroes which prevails among white people. Negroes are lynched not because of their crimes, but because a crime by a negro is felt to be more heinous than the same crime by a white man. So strong is this feeling that even the safeguards which the law adopts to shield the innocent are regarded as superfluities when invoked in behalf of a negro. In the Indiana lynching case, for instance, the mob hanged three men upon the uncorroborated confession of one, the other two protesting their innocence. Even if lynching could be justified under any circumstances, lynching upon no better evidence of guilt than that would condemn the lynchers for criminal lack of intelligence.

Representative Crumpacker, a republican of Indiana, has again introduced a bill reducing congressional representation to the basis of voting population. It is in this way that he proposes to punish states that disfranchise the negro. And it is the only way in which the federal government can punish them. Yet President McKinley opposes Crumpacker's bill. When that gentleman proposed it last year it was pigeon-holed. And such will doubtless be its fate again this year unless Mr. McKinley can be persuaded to favor its adoption. Here is an opportunity for northern negroes who object to the disfranchisement of their race in the southern states. Let them bring their influence to bear in support of the Crumpacker bill. If they neglect to do so, if they allow that bill to be again pigeon-holed without a protest from their leaders or their press, without so much as a petition in its favor, they must not be surprised if the public come to suspect them of having a deeper interest in the plums of republican machine politics than in the maintenance of their constitutional rights as a race.

On the occasion of the public announcement this week of a gift of $1,500,000 to the University of Chicago from John D. Rockefeller, the president of the university, Mr. Harper, took advantage of the opportunity to express his opinion about freedom of speech and its abuse by university professors. The allusion was obvious, of course. Hard upon the heels of the dismissal of Prof. Ross, of Leland Stanford, Jr., university, for giving expresson to views on street car monopolies and coolie labor at variance with those entertained by Mrs. Stanford, the "angel" of the institution, Mr. Harper could not with very good grace have boasted of so munificent a donation of $1,500,000 from the most notoriously absorptive parasite of our monopoly era, without offering assurances that the gift was really and truly a gift and not a bribe.

This assurance Mr. Harper offered specifically. "Mr. Rockefeller has never," he said, "by a single word or act, indicated his dissatisfaction with the instruction given to the students in the university or with the public expression of opinon made by an officer of the university." One could have wished the assurance to be more specific. But Mr. Harper doubtless meant to assert that Mr. Rockefeller's donations have no influence upon sociological instruction at the institution, and in the absence of counter testimony it may be assumed that this is so. When, however, the evils of the system with which Mr. Rockefeller has identified himself and through which he manages to absorb millions of wealth that other men earn, are more clearly recognized and freely exposed at the University of Chicago, there will be less difficulty in believing that there is not some vague and unconscious connection between the policy of the school and the magnitude of Rockefeller's donations.

Of Mr. Harper's abstract views on free speech by professors in their class rooms, it is possible to speak strongly and favorably. He advocated freedom of expression, even though it be abused. "For the abuse of such liberty," he said, "is not so great an evil as its restriction." That is unqualifiedly true. And in defining abuse of free speech by professors Mr.

Harper did not lay himself open to serious criticism. On the contrary, his views essentially are perfectly sound. We quote his words:

> A professor is guilty of abuse who promulgates as truth opinions which have not been scientifically tested by his colleagues in the same department of research. A professor abuses his liberty who takes advantage of the classroom to promulgate the partisan views of one or another of the political parties. A professor should not speak with authority on subjects not connected with his department of work. A professor abuses his freedom of expression when he speaks without exercising that quality which it must be confessed in some cases the professor lacks, ordinarily called common sense.

If fidelity to these rules were conditions of Mr. Rockefeller's gifts to the university, the public could make no complaint on that account. Yet it is fair to ask, how long it might be before the opinions of a courageous professor of economics, if they happened to run counter to Mr. Rockefeller's pecuniary interests, would be "scientifically tested" by his less courageous "colleagues in the same department of research."

Charles Francis Adams, the distinguished Bostonian, has evoked extended comment by his endorsement of the taxation doctrines of Henry George. This is no new departure by him. Several years ago he put himself on record to the same effect in a letter to a Washington banquet to which he had been invited. But his recent letter, addressed to C. B. Fillebrown, president of the Massachusetts Single Tax league, and printed in full in the Boston papers early in the present month, embodies an extended argument in support of the George idea. Although he says but little on the moral aspects of the question, about which, as he observes, a great deal might be said, Mr. Adams declares it to be the most important side of all, and one that admits, so far as he can see, of but one opinion, and that in favor of the proposed reform. Even from the selfish point of view he sees an advantage in the single tax, though he fears that at first it might bear harshly upon farmers. Mr. Adams's fear in this respect is doubtless due to his assumption that the exemption of improvements and personal property of farmers would not be so great as the increased tax that would fall upon their land. He also ignores the effects of the greater business activity that would instantly follow the release from taxes of business enterprise, and the discouragement by heavier taxation of mere speculation in land. It is fairly certain that every working farmer whose land is farm land and is reasonably improved, would pay lower taxes under the George system than he pays now. But, as Mr. Adams says, "with the single tax as with many other things, the adage, no less fitting than it is homely and old, would probably be found true: "The proof of the pudding is in the eating." And that proof seems now to be not so far out of reach as only a few years ago it was. The frank declarations of men like Mr. Adams, the report of the Colorado tax commission, the approval in greater or less degree of such influential papers as the Springfield Republican, the Boston Herald, the Boston Post, and the Boston Beacon, and the greater willingness of conscientious men of affairs everywhere to consider the subject, all indicate the possibility of an early adoption of this system, at least to the extent to which it has been adopted and found satisfactory in Australasia.

Galveston furnishes an example of the direction in which the pecuniary benefits of public improvements go. Since the destruction of that city by the tidal wave last fall, Galveston building lots have had hardly any value. But the talk of a sea wall has put a little life into land speculation. The actual erection of a sea wall would add millions to the value of those lots. Real estate dealers understand this, whether the public does or not. One of them advertised in the Galveston News about a month ago, soliciting purchasers of lots on the expectation of congressional improvements. "Buy property now and here," his advertisements read; "Galveston will have a gigantic sea wall in front, a mammoth moat in rear, a channel 36 feet deep and 1,200 feet wide in front of docks. The present republican congress will build it. Hurrah for McKinley and the sea wall!! Bargain No. 1," etc., etc. Thoughtful people may fairly ask why congress should pay for these improvements out of the funds of all the people, when the private building lots of Galveston will be enhanced in value to a far greater amount than the cost of the improvements. Why not give the benefited property owners of Galveston, instead of the non-benefited taxpayers of the United States, the privilege of paying for the improvements?

When the Salisbury government passed the act of 1896 for the relief of British farmers, the farmers were warned by the keener sighted and more outspoken liberals that the act was in truth one for the relief of landlords. Instead of lifting taxes from the working farmers who farm farms, they predicted that it would relieve the idle farmers who farm farmers. This prediction has now been verified. Before the act, so the London Speaker explains, landlords were constrained to make the tenants a rebate from their rent equal to half their tax. But after the act, which remitted to farmers half their tax, the landlords exacted full rent. It is the landlords, therefore, and not the tenants, who profit by the act for the relief of agricultural distress. There is a lesson in this. It is sharply suggestive of a truth that admits of no intelligent controversy, namely, that financial benefits conferred by government invariably tend to the enrichment of landowners.

On the subject of municipal taxation, the American League of Municipalities, which closed its sessions at Charleston, adopted sensible resolutions. Premising that "the fundamental principle of free institutions

is local self-government," these resolutions demand that "every county or town and every city be granted the right to regulate the assessment and taxation of property at its discretion, provided any increase or reduction of assessment must be uniform throughout such county, town or city, and not made on the ground of ownership." The meaning of the last clause is not very clear. But, taken as a whole, the resolution is an unqualified endorsement of the beneficent principle of home rule in taxation, which the legislatures of several states have for a few years past been considering. It will doubtless receive most emphatic, and it is to be hoped favorable attention, this year from the legislature of Colorado, on the proposal of the Bucklin tax commission to empower cities and counties to adopt the Australasian land value tax. Another good point about the resolution of the league is a demand that "so much state revenue as may be required in excess of that derived from specific taxes should be apportioned to and paid by the counties or towns in proportion to county or town revenue." This would make the state board of equalization a mere clerical body, with no judicial powers. Its duty would begin and end with a simple computation, upon the basis of local expenditures, of the proportion which each locality should contribute to state expenses. As the local expenditures of a county for the previous year were to the local expenditures of all the counties of the state, so would the state taxes of that county for the present year be to the total of state taxation. This method would divest the state board of equalization of the mischievous power it now exercises, and taken together with the system of home rule in taxation would tend to work substantial justice.

In a quotation from a congressional report, which appeared last week in the article on "The Washington Centennial," page 567, we made an error in copying which needs correction. Instead of quoting the report as saying that under certain circumstances the tax rate of the city of Washington would be "60 cents on the dollar—a lower rate than that of any large city in the country," we should have quoted "60 cents on the $100." So far from being a low rate, 60 cents on the dollar would be enormously high. This must be so obvious to the reader that the correction is quite unnecessary except for the purpose of supplying the true figures.

THE LARGER PATRIOTISM.

Lust of empire, which has brought out all that is worst in the British character and lured Americans from their republican ideals, puts patriotism upon trial; for in this mania for conquest it is to the patriotic instinct of the people that imperial appeals are made, and upon their patriotic aspirations that imperial hopes are borne. What is patriotism, that it can be thus enlisted in aggressive warfare? Is that a virtue which lends its influence so readily to national wickedness?

To say that patriotism is love of country gives no light. Love of country must itself be explained. It cannot mean love of a country's soil, of its trees and hills and rocks and rills. If that were its meaning a large proportion of the inhabitants of every nation would be without love of country, for not a rood of old mother earth belongs to them, nor can they use any of it without paying toll. Love of country, then, must be nothing less than love of one's neighbors within a nation's boundaries. And in the narrower sense this truly is patriotism.

But love of neighbors means more than a sentimental emotion of affection for what one may call his own—as his wife, his family, his friends, his neighbors, his house, his horse, his cattle. Such love is only one of the forms of selfishness, more subtle but not less vicious when the object of it is one's neighbor than when it is one's own person or his own property. The maxim of this spurious love of country, "my country right or wrong," is the same in essence as "myself right or wrong." Love of one's neighbors within the boundaries of his nation—love, that is, of one's countrymen—if it be love of them in very truth, must consist in devotion to the ideals and institutions of the country which guarantee equal rights to all one's countrymen.

If that be patriotism, however, then is there a larger patriotism, a patriotism which embraces the world and is the political expression of the golden rule. In the jurisdiction of this larger patriotism it is treason to make war save for the preservation of equal rights. It is treason as well as criminal aggression to pursue a policy of forcible annexation. For he who truly loves his neighbors within his own country, who loves them to the extent of cherishing their rights equally with his own, cannot draw the line at his own country. He must abhor any invasion by his countrymen of the country of others, which he would repel if his own were the country invaded.

This larger patriotism is the antithesis of that spirit of imperialism which, appealing to spurious patriotism, condemns all opposition as treason. Imperialism would subjugate inferior peoples on pretense of elevating them; the larger patriotism would encourage all peoples to elevate themselves. Imperialism is the national pharisee, who thanks God that he is better than other men; the larger patriotism is the national apostle spreading by practice as well as precept the civilizing principle of him who rebuked the pharisee and taught men that principle of love which is justice and that rule of righteousness which directs each to do to others as he would have others do to him.

NEWS

A brilliant Boer victory has suddenly revived general interest in the military situation in South Africa. The fight in which this victory was won occurred at Nooitgedacht, in the Magalies mountains, about 22 miles west of Pretoria. Gen. Clements occupied the district with British troops. The Boers in the region were under the command of Gen. Delary, whose force was supposed to consist of 1,000 men. Unknown to Clements, so the British story runs, Delary was suddenly reenforced by 3,000 men under Commandant Bovers, and at daybreak on the 13th the Boer attack was made. A furious battle followed. It was hottest during the morning

hours, but lasted until four o'clock in the afternoon, when Gen. Clements retreated to Reitfontein. He arrived there early in the morning of the following day, having fought a rear-guard action all the way. Lord Kitchener reports that four companies of the Northumberland fusiliers surrendered a commanding position in the battle, after holding out while their ammunition lasted. Five British officers and nine men, at least, were killed, besides 18 officers and 555 men who were missing. After the battle the Boers released their prisoners—five officers and 316 men. They then separated in two bodies, one of which moved west and the other north.

What is equivalent to another Boer victory is the escape, now conceded, of Gen. DeWet from Gen. Knox. He had crossed the Caledon last week, as told on page 569, but Gen. Knox was then pursuing him northward, and a running fight was in progress. Later reports indicate that DeWet, while pursued by Knox, confronted the British line in the region of Ladybrand and Thabanchu, which extends from Blomfontein to the Basutoland border, and was thus once more surrounded. He made several attempts to get through the British line, and on the 14th had succeeded and was again free to continue his northward march. Gen. Knox was obliged to abandon pursuit, in order to defend Cape Colony from the invasion noted below.

Other fights besides those of Delary and DeWet are reported by Lord Kitchener. He tells of engagements at Lichtenburg, at Bethlehem, at Vrede, and at Vryheid, in all of which the Boers attacked and were repulsed. Also of one near Zastron, in the southeasterly part of the Orange Free State, in which the Boers surrounded a party of Brabant's horse and captured 107, after killing four and wounding 16. To offset this disaster, Gen. Methuen is credited with the capture of a Boer "lager" consisting of 15 wagons, 15,000 rounds of ammunition, 4,600 cattle and 2,000 sheep. From other sources there is a report that Boers have crossed the Orange river and raided Cape Colony at two separate points 100 miles apart. One raid was upon Philipstown, between Colesburg and Kimberley, and the other upon Kaapdal, near Aliwai North. The latter raid is reported to have driven back a British force sent to meet it; but there are no particulars. The former is fully verified. A Boer force estimated at 3,000 has crossed the river and penetrated as far as Philipstrom, 40 miles south. The raiders are encouraged by the Dutch population, and the situation is so serious that Gen. Knox has been recalled from his pursuit of DeWet to give his attention to the defense of Cape Colony.

This news from South Africa has had a dispiriting effect upon the British public, which had so recently been assured by the ministry that the war was virtually at an end. Even Lord Salisbury in his speech on the 18th at the annual conference of the National Union of conservative associations was decidedly pessimistic. And although Lord Kitchener now has 210,000 troops in the field, more are being sent. The colonial office announces its decision also to enlist 5,000 men in South Africa for a constabulary force. Lord Kitchener has requested and the New Zealand government has consented that the New Zealand troops remain until the war is over. Kitchener is reported also to have demanded that the imperial government send him immediately every available mounted man; and the queen has appealed to the militia, yeomanry and colonial troops to continue in the field. The proposed thanksgiving services in honor of Lord Roberts' return have been abandoned. In parliament the news from South Africa has furnished ammunition to the opposition. Lloyd-George, one of the liberal members, created a sensation on the 15th by declaring in a speech upon the floor that—

> DeWet is making England the laughing stock of the world. We have 210,000 men in the field, yet we are unable to protect ourselves from disaster at the hands of small commandos drawn from a pastoral population.

Parliament took a recess on the 15th until the middle of February. The session closed with the reading of the queen's speech as follows:

> My lords and gentlemen: I thank you for the liberal provision you have made for the expenses incurred by the operations of my armies in South Africa and China.

In the American congress two important decisions have been made, one by the lower house and the other by the senate. On the 15th the lower house passed the bill reducing war taxes. The only test vote was on the question of making a revenue reduction of $40,000,000 or of $70,000,000, the republicans supporting the smaller and the democrats the larger reduction. When the democratic proposition came to a vote it was defeated by 155 to 131. It was upon the Hay-Pauncefote treaty (see page 568) that the senate took decisive action. This was with reference to "the Davis amendment," which was reported last spring by the committee on foreign relations. It is as follows:

> It is agreed, however, that none of the immediately foregoing conditions and stipulations in sections numbered 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of this article shall apply to measures which the United States may find it necessary to take for securing by its own forces the defense of the United States and the maintenance of public order.

The senate had divided over the treaty into three factions. The first, led by Senator Morgan, favored the treaty as originally drawn. The second, led by Lodge, favored the Davis amendment; believing that the United States ought to reserve the right to protect the canal in time of war. The third favored the retention by the United States of the right to erect fortifications on the canal. On the 13th the vote on the Davis amendment was taken. It was supported by the first and the third factions and received 65 votes. There were only 17 votes against it. Subsequently the senate fixed the 20th for a final vote upon all pending amendments and the treaty itself.

To understand the conflict over the Hay-Pauncefote treaty it is necessary to recall the origin and one of the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Prior to 1850 Great Britain established a protectorate over the Mosquito Indians along the north coast of Nicaragua, and in doing so took possession of San Juan del Norte, now Greytown, the natural eastern terminus of any Nicaraguan canal that might be built. Against this act the United States protested, and the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of April 19, 1850, resulted. One of the provisions of that treaty forbids either country to obtain control over or special commercial advantages in any ship canal between the two oceans. This provision is held by Great Britain to be still in force. By some American statesmen it is regarded as obsolete.

Indisputably it has never been abrogated by treaty. In these circumstances a supplementary treaty was negotiated last winter by Secretary Hay for the United States and Lord Pauncefote for Great Britain, which is the treaty now under consideration by the senate. It gives to the United States the right to construct and manage the long contemplated canal; and for the purpose of making the canal neutral pursuant to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, it adopts seven rules (see No. 97, page 9). These rules require the canal to be kept open to all nations in time of war as in time of peace, upon equal terms, and forbid any act of war within the canal or the three-mile limit at either end. The object of "the Davis amendment" is so to modify the rules as to permit the United States to defend itself and maintain public order by such measures as it may find necessary—in other words, to commit acts of war if necessary for general order or its own defense.

The Chinese negotiations were still at a stand until the 19th, when all the foreign ministers at Peking agreed upon the terms of their joint note containing the demands upon China. This agreement is said to include the modifications proposed by Great Britain, but no disclosure of the joint note has yet been made. The Chinese envoys announce that they have now received formal credentials from the emperor.

Reports from Manila indicate the continuance of military activity in the Philippines. Several small engagements, with American casualties in both killed and wounded, are noted; but nothing important or definite is reported. A proclamation is announced to be issued on the 20th by Gen. MacArthur which will proclaim that in the future "the laws of war will be strictly enforced." The specific character of this proclamation is not yet intelligibly reported.

American casualties since July 1, 1898, inclusive of the current official reports given out in detail at Washington to December 19, 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	17
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period	76
Total deaths	2,508
Wounded since July 1, 1898	2,373
Total casualties since July, '98	4,881
Total casualties to last week	4,881
Total deaths to last week	2,508

The convention of the American Federation of Labor, the opening of which at Louisville on the 6th was reported last week, adjourned on the 15th, after selecting Scranton, Pa., as the place for the next annual convention. The socialist resolution regarding trusts which had been adopted at the previous convention was modified this year so as to read:

> Resolved, That this twentieth convention of the American Federation of Labor reaffirm its position upon the trust question by urging the unorganized working people to organize in their respective trades as the best means of resisting the encroachments of trusts and monopolies. And we also renew the recommendation that trade workingmen generally study the development of trusts and monopolies.

In the same general connection the convention adopted, by a vote of 4,169 to 685, the following declaration as a substitute for three socialist resolutions which had been moved, and also as outlining the policy of the federation:

> We cheerfully accept and desire all the assistance and usefulness which may or can be given the trade-union movement by all reform forces. The aspirations, hopes and aims of the trades union members are very similar to the expressed wishes of the greater body of socialists; namely, that the burdens of toil may be made lighter, and that each worker shall enjoy the complete benefit of that which he produces. That men and women shall receive a great amount of liberty; that the years to come may be made brighter than the past or present, are the ideals of us all. But we take the position, nevertheless, that because of personal, local, national or other reasons the workers of our country reach different conclusions as to the method of reaching the desired end, even though there may be little difference among us as to the desirability of reaching that end. We assert as forcibly as we are capable of asserting that the trade union movement is the true and legitimate channel through which the toilers should seek not only present amelioration but future emancipation. We hold that the trade unions throughout our country and Canada do not now, nor do we believe they will in the future, declare against the discussion of any question in their meetings, either of an economic or of a political nature, but they are, and we think justly, committed against the indorsement or introduction of race prejudices, religious differences or partisan politics. We declare it to be the inherent duty of our several unions to publish in their journals, to discuss in their meetings, and the members thereof to study in their homes, all questions of a public nature which have reference to their industrial or political liberty; but we as firmly declare that it is not within the constitutional or any other power of the American Federation of Labor to legislate, resolve or specify to which political party members of our unions shall belong or for which party they shall vote.

Another important resolve of the convention favored voluntary but opposed compulsory arbitration in labor controversies. Samuel Gompers, of New York, was reelected president.

At last the complete vote at the presidential election is officially reported. Montana, the last state to furnish official figures, did so on the 19th. Following are the returns collected from official data by the Chicago Chronicle of the 20th:

	McKinley.	Bryan.
Alabama	53,669	96,368
Arkansas	44,700	81,142
California	164,755	124,965
Colorado	93,141	122,944
Connecticut	102,545	74,010
Delaware	22,457	18,856
Florida	7,499	28,007
Georgia	35,035	81,700
Idaho	28,306	30,522
Illinois	597,985	503,061
Indiana	336,003	309,584
Iowa	307,818	209,466
Kansas	187,881	162,077
Kentucky	226,801	234,899
Louisiana	14,233	53,671
Maine	65,435	36,822
Maryland	136,185	122,238
Massachusetts	238,866	156,997
Michigan	316,269	211,685
Minnesota	190,461	112,901
Mississippi	5,703	51,706
Missouri	314,093	351,913
Montana	25,375	27,146
Nebraska	121,835	114,013
Nevada	3,849	6,347
New Hampshire	54,803	35,489
New Jersey	221,701	164,808
New York	821,992	678,386
North Carolina	132,997	157,736
North Dakota	35,891	20,519
Ohio	543,918	474,882

Oregon	46,526	33,385
Pennsylvania	712,665	424,232
Rhode Island	33,784	19,812
South Carolina	3,579	47,233
South Dakota	54,530	39,544
Tennessee	123,004	145,250
Texas	130,641	267,432
Utah	47,139	45,006
Vermont	42,568	12,849
Virginia	117,151	146,177
Washington	57,456	44,833
West Virginia	119,821	98,807
Wisconsin	265,866	159,285
Wyoming	14,432	10,164
Totals	7,221,363	6,358,869

According to these returns Mr. McKinley and Mr. Bryan together received 13,580,232, and Mr. McKinley's plurality was 862,494. There are as yet no complete returns of the vote for minor parties. And the figures as to McKinley and Bryan cannot be accepted wth full confidence. Telegraphic and typographic errors must be allowed for.

NEWS NOTES.

—Justus H. Schwab, the well-known communist, died on the 18th in New York.

—Michael G. Mulhall, the great English authority on statistics, died in London on the 13th, aged 66 years.

—William J. Bryan is to begin the publication at Lincoln, early in January, of a dollar weekly paper to be called The Commoner.

—Oswald Ottendorfer, editor and publisher of the New York Staats Zeitung, died at his home in New York on the 15th, aged 74 years.

—The annual donations to the pope, known as "Peter's pence," from the Catholics of all countries for the jubilee year 1900 exceeds $1,500,000.

—John Redmond was elected president of the United Irish league at the Irish national convention at Dublin on the 13th, over which he presided.

—The French chamber of deputies on the 19th passed an amnesty bill which exempts all implicated in strikes, public disturbances and the celebrated Dreyfus affair.

—John Addison Porter, former secretary to President McKinley, died at his home at Pomfret, Conn., on the 15th, from the result of a surgical operation. He was 44 years old

—The Chosen Friends, one of the largest fraternal insurance orders in the United States, has been declared insolvent in a suit brought by the attorney general of Indiana. A receiver has been appointed.

—The gold production of the world for 1899, as estimated by the director of the mint at Washington, was $306,584,900, of which the United States produced $71,053,400 and the Klondike about $16,000,000.

—Daniel C. Gilman, president of Johns Hopkins university, was elected on the 14th to succeed Carl Schurz as president of the National Civil Service Reform league. Mr. Schurz having declined a reelection after a service of eight years.

—In a severe storm on the 16th the German naval training ship Guesenau was sunk on the rocks off the entrance to the port of Malaga, on the southern coast of Spain. More than 140 of the crew of 450 were drowned, including the commander.

—A monument will be erected at Mackinac island, Mich., in honor of Pere Marquette, the Jesuit missionary and explorer of the Mississippi valley by the Marquette Monument association, the officers of which are Franklin MacVeagh, E. O. Brown and W. J. Onahan, all of Chicago.

—The United States war department has posted a statement denying the truth of the report, repeated in these columns on page 570, to the effect that the United States transport Hancock had brought to San Francisco from Manila the remains of 1,500 soldiers killed in the Philippines and China.

—Southern negroes, 200 in number, left Nashville, Tenn., on the 19th, for Honolulu, where they will work on sugar plantations. Hawaiian planters are offering many inducements, such as paying their expenses and exempting them from taxation for three years in the islands, in order to secure 10,000 more negroes from the south.

—An elaborate memorial service to the late Thomas G. Shearman has been arranged for at Plymouth church, Brooklyn, for December 30. Rev. Mr. Hillis, pastor of the church, will preside, and the principal speakers will be William Lloyd Garrison, Tom L. Johnson, Edward M. Shepard and John S. Crosby. The January issue of the National Single Taxer will be a Thomas G. Shearman memorial number.

—A conference of labor leaders and labor employers for the conciliation and arbitration of labor troubles, was held at Chicago on the 17th and 18th under the aupices of the National Civic Federation. Compulsory arbitration was vigorously debated, but in the address to the public was declared to be as yet impractical in the United States. A committee of 12 members, equally divided between the employing and the employe classes, was appointed to formulate plans of conciliation.

—The social democratic party has nominated a municipal ticket for the Chicago municipal election to be held next April. The candidate for mayor is John Collins. A clause of the platform favoring municipal ownership of street railways was rejected by a vote of 130 to 33. The platform adopted demands municipal employment for the unemployed; municipal assistance to workingmen on strike; adequate school facilities (including free books, clothing and meals); strict enforcement of the law protecting child labor by the municipality; and adequate provision by the municipality for medical and hospital care of the sick and disabled.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, and closes with the last issue of that publication at hand upon going to press.

Senate. Dec. 10-15, 1900.

On the 10th Charles A. Towne, of Minnesota, was sworn in as the successor in the senate of the late C. K. Davis, after which the senate went into executive session. [The object of this executive session was understood to be the consideration of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.] The Grout oleomargarine bill recently passed by the house was introduced on the 11th and referred to the committee on agriculture. The credentials of W. A. Clark and Martin Maginnis, senatorial appointees from Montana, were discussed; after which, the consideration of the ship subsidy bill being again resumed, Mr. Clay made a long speech opposing its passage. On the 12th the senate met and immediately adjourned to attend the exercises in honor of the one hundredth anniversary of the occupation of Washington by the federal government, which took place in the hall of representatives before the diplomatic corps and invited guests. Among the resolutions introduced on the 13th was one by Mr. Money authorizing the president to open negotiations with Great Britain for the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. After this resolution had been tabled and consideration of the ship subsidy bill resumed Mr. Hanna spoke at length advocating the passage of that bill. Following Mr. Hanna's speech the senate went into executive session. [Again for the evident purpose of considering the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.] On the 14th the concurrent resolution providing for a congressional recess from December 21, 1900, until January 3, 1901, was agreed to. The credentials of the Montana senatorial appointees were further discussed, after which the senate again went into executive session. An amendment to the ship subsidy bill was submitted on the same day by Mr. Allen providing for a bounty on agricultural exports which was ordered to be printed and tabled. The only business of the 15th was done in executive session.

House.

On the 10th the house went into committee of the whole for the consideration of the legislative, judicial and executive appropriation bill, providing for an outlay for the various departments of the government approximating $25,000,000. After two hours' consideration the bill was passed. A resolution, authorizing an inquiry into the custom of hazing at the West Point Military academy in connection with the case of the late Cadet Oscar L. Booz reported to have died from injuries resulting from hazing while a student at West Point, was adopted on the 11th, after which the house went into committee of the whole for the consideration of the war revenue reduction bill which authorizes a reduction of $40,000,000 in taxation from the war revenue bill of 1898. On the afternoon of the 12th the exercises in honor of the one hundredth anniversary of the occupation of Washington as the nation's capital were held in the hall of representatives in the presence of the president, cabinet and diplomatic corps. On the 13th consideration of the war revenue reduction bill was resumed and continued on the 14th when an amendment to the bill was adopted reducing the tax on beer from $2.00 to $1.60 per barrel. The bill was finally passed on the 15th after an amendment to tax express companies and one proposing a substitute bill reducing the war revenues by $70,000,000 had been defeated

MISCELLANY

THE QUESTION.

For The Public.

"Yet I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widen'd with the process of the suns."

The grass is sodden with gore,
The harvest trampled and torn,
The river runs red
With blood of the dead,
A groan on the breeze is borne!

Brave men from country and town,
Brave men from palace and cot,
Cut down in the flower,
Of life's joyous hour,
Like vermin to fester and rot!

Each husband, brother and son,
So dear to a woman at home,
With bullet and sword
All pierced and gored,
They lie 'neath the pitiless dome!

The vultures wheel in the sky,
The wolves leap hence from afar;
The sly jackals wait
Till the hour waxeth late;
There'll be feasting beneath the red star!

And this when a cycle has passed,
This deed the nations have done,
Whose spires point the way,
The people all pray
To God and His peace loving Son.

Must slaughter forever go on?
Can we ne'er say of war—deceased?
Shall red-handed might
Make ever the right,
With man as with ravenous beast?

Will the reign of peace never come?
When love shall dominate hate?
And nations with law
Shall stifle the maw
Of primitive, brutal-browed fate?

The words that shepherds heard sung
That night when angels came down
To herald the birth
Of the Saviour of earth
In far away Bethlehem town:

Peace on earth—good will toward men;
Was it true or was it a lie?
This message of love
Once sent from above
To help mankind live—not die?

Peace on earth—good will toward men;
When nations this gospel have learned,
All hatred and wrong
Will dissolve into song
And swords to plowshares be turned.

The grass is sodden with gore,
The harvest trampled and torn,
The river runs red
With blood of the dead,
A groan on the breeze is borne!

TOWNSEND ALLEN.

LET US STOP REFERRING TO "CHRISTENDOM."

An extract from a contributed article published in the London Times during last October.

Christianity, the golden rule of ethics, is only for slaves. Lust, guided by prudence, is the only law for free men, whether acting nationally or singly. Deeds of a type once denounced as predatory and criminal are now applauded as clever. Business men, statesmen and churchmen cheer them. A rising spirit of virile, uncompromising egotism is observable in all civilized nations, but nowhere else has it gained vigor of late as in the United States.

THE ORANGE INDUSTRY.

Two years hence, if if not next year, the California orange crop will supply every market in the country, and, it is asserted, at prices that will exclude all foreign competition, without the aid of a protective tariff. Last year 12,000 car loads of oranges and lemons were shipped from that state, and this season the crop is estimated at from 15,000 to 18,000 cars. Yet there are 200,000 trees which have not yet come into bearing.

In Florida the yield for the present year will be 1,000,000 boxes, or 3,300 cars. Arizona has developed this industry to the extent of shipping 100 cars a week, and yet, previous to 1873, oranges were not commercially grown in the United States. All we ate were imported.

A nearer view heightens the meaning of these figures. Thus 50 cities east of California receive one car load or more of oranges per week from the coast. This is not large, when thought of in connection with New York, but when spoken of in connection with Dayton, Utica, Indianapolis, Grand Rapids and the like, it becomes more interesting. Lots of five cars are frequently cut out of through trains at Detroit and distributed up the east coast of Michigan—thus Mount Clemens, one car; Saginaw, one car; Kalamazoo, one car, and so on.—"Fruit Growing in America." by Theodore Dreiser, in the November Harper's.

PLAYING AT POVERTY.

Having read of several actual experiences and perused a few novels dealing with the same social problem, one of Detroit's wealthy young men, highly educated and in deadly earnest, decided to rent a room in one of the poorest quarters in the city, live by the sweat of his brow and do the best he could. He fell among strange people and had rough experiences, but the novelty of the thing and his zeal kept him going quite awhile.

He even slept with his head out of the window during some of the hottest nights, whipped a drunken man who was abusing a little boy, lived within his earnings, though he thought and dreamed of discarded luxuries.

But the strain was too much. He began to draw on his resources and mitigate the trials of his new position. He even gave a little supper with guests from among his new associates, with the result that a majority of them were not able to go to work when the whistle blew the next morning. As a climax he sent several sick children on a trip up the lakes and had good food furnished for the invalids of the neighborhood. Then he suddenly escaped and returned to his old ways and associations. Within a week, though dressed to the limit of his position, he was recognized by one of his chums of the seamy side.

"I knowed all along that you was a swell cove," asserted this philosopher of the poor district. "The trouble with you fellows what go out to experiment is that you puts on life-preservers. You could stand a twist or two and a pretty rough wrench when the thermometer is behavin' so scan'lous, but all the time there was the bank account and the rich friends to fall back on. You couldn't hold out so you took some of the rest of us into your good fortune. You don't know nothin' about it, yet. If you want to go against the real thing, just turn that fortune over to me, fall back on yourself and tackle this here proposition of living on what you can make with your hands, with a million other hands reachin' for the same thing."—Detroit Free Press.

HIGH STREET, KENSINGTON.

Is it possible that these are human beings, and these also? On the one side a crowd gorged with money, considering what merest trifle it may buy, what faintest want it may gratify—if only a scarf to adorn the drawing-room mirror with, or a pair of kid gloves to match its bonnet; and on the other side a crowd pining, perishing, for want of the most imperative necessities of life—physical, mental and moral—and the two crowds close together, staring, within a foot of each other! What a sight! "For mere sheer cruelty," says a friend of mine, "there's nothing like Respectability," and as I gaze at this spectacle I think I understand what he means.

It is not that these delicate bred women (and men) have no hearts. But their cardiac ganglions are torpid, quite torpid. Bred in luxury and ease, they have seldom been called on to make sacrifices for each other; physical deprivation is a mere name to them; the life of human toil and human fellowship has passed them by; their affectional natures have become dwarfed;

their power of sympathy contracted within the four walls of a stuffy respectability; and so the one thing which might at the same instant deliver them and the gutter things, and give them both a reasonable interest in existence, is, alas, as matters are, quite impossible. A gulf is fixed; the policeman walks with his truncheon along the curb. A brougham drives up and scatters the ragged ones. A footman obsequiously opens the door; and another leaden-eyed lady wrapped in furs disappears into "Barker's."

It is all very strange. I walk up and down and wonder if it is a dream—some quite solid and indigestible nightmare. Supposing (I think) it were some tribe in the interior of Africa of which we heard that the natives had these customs. That a certain class among them were in the habit of walking up and down a shady promenade, on one side of which are heaped great stores of bananas, mealies, dates, cotton cloth, beads and Sheffield knives—from which heaps said promenaders helped themselves freely to all they wanted; while on the other side, in the burning heat, stood a row of poor creatures (of the same tribe) in continual torture for want of food, waiting for hours and hours and hours, and all their lives, for bits of refuse to be thrown to them. What should we say to that? And yet, whatever plentiful villainous cruelties and burnings and other torments savages (chiefly under the influence of superstition) do perpetrate, I doubt whether any traveler has yet told us of such a scene of sheer cold-blooded indifference as that which I am describing.

And yet it goes on, and will go on—till the frame of this present anti-social "society" is rent in twain. The beggars still stand, offering their ingenious trifles in the gutter; the shops spread their piles of goods (grapes at 5s. 6d. to 7s. a pound, bonnets at 27s. each) in the windows; the policeman and the footman still marshal the show—and between goes the weary stream of stony faces whose aspect chills one to the bone. And this is High street, Kensington, or "that part of Heaven which is called Hell."—Edward Carpenter.

SUBSIDIZE FARM WAGONS — WHY NOT?

In these days, when so much is said about the subsidizing of ocean steamship lines, it seems strange and unfair that no attention should be paid to other means of conveyance which are equally useful, though they have no lobby to extol their merits.

It is true that the railroads indirectly receive some recognition from the government in the form of mail contracts, the compensation under which is, to say the least of it, liberal. But, passing the railroads by, there are other means of transportation which are not receiving from the government or the believers in the virtue of subsidies the attention they deserve.

The craft which navigate the great lakes play a most useful part. They carry from points of production to points of consumption immense cargoes of wheat and other grain, of coal, and of iron ore. Then there are the river boats which ply upon the Mississippi and its tributaries and many southern rivers. They carry to the seaboard the cotton of the planter and take his supplies to him. They are useful but ignored instruments of commerce. That they navigate fresh water instead of salt water is no reason why subsidies should be denied them if subsidies are to be given at all. Next come the canalboats which, on artificial highways, still play a great part in our internal commerce.

There are still humbler instrumentalities for carrying on the great work of transportation and commerce. There is the prairie schooner, for instance. The man habituated to palace cars may turn up his nose at it, but it has done more for the development of this country in the past than all the steamers upon all the seas and oceans. The navigators of the lowly craft in question have suffered greater hardships perhaps than any other class of mariners in eistence.

The prairie schooner, homely but serviceable, which has carried the American flag over hill and plain, from the Potomac to the Pacific, has been superseded by the farm wagon. Why should not it have a subsidy? Where would American agriculture be without it? The man who guides the devious course of the farm wagon for considerable distances along the muddy roads of a western prairie suffers as much for his country as the man who owns a coal mine or a palatial steamship line running to Liverpool or Southampton.

If subsidies are going around they should be distributed with a generous hand, without partiality or discrimination. The farmer ought to have his share. If it were provided that he should be paid yearly a subsidy for every farm wagon he had in use, the total amount to be paid to depend on the number and length of trips made, he would receive a goodly number of dollars from the national treasury. He would get more for his crops.

As strong an argument can be made for the farmer as for the owner of the coal mine, who wishes a subsidy so that he can get more for his product. The argument for the farmer is as sound economically as that for the proprietor of the ocean steamship, who undoubtedly would make more money if the government should give him some. If he got money enough from it to make it profitable he would run his vessels to every port where it is unprofitable to run them now.

This subsidy business is promoted by speculators who have an eye single to what they can get out of it. They claim that this country can make iron and steel more cheaply than they can be made elsewhere. They dilate on the facilities which the United States has for manufacturing bridges, locomotives, and other metal products economically and rapidly. They say there ought to be American ships to take these American products abroad. They fail to explain why steel and iron ships cannot be built here as cheaply as in England or Germany.

If they cannot be, and American ships are needed, the best way to get them will be to repeal the antiquated and obsolete navigation laws. If congress will not do that and is resolved to vote subsidies, then all carriers should be treated alike, beginning with the farm wagon and ending with the "ocean greyhound." Every proprietor of an instrument of commerce and transportation should receive his proportionate largess from the government.—Chicago Tribune of Dec. 8.

WE DO NOT WANT THE KINGDOM TO COME.

Christianity or the "way" was no more a religion than the Mosaic dispensation was a religion. The latter became such, it is true. So that Paul, the apostle, when describing his ante-Christian life, naturally and truthfully uses the term, saying that "after the straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee." But he is referring to degenerate days—to a time in which the old national boasts of the presence of God and the possession of a glorious and righteous code were no longer heard; a time when instead of these exultant cries there fell, from the lips of the high priests upon the ears of the kingliest man the world ever saw, these words: "Away with Him! Away with Him! Crucify Him! We have no king but Caesar!" Yes, a time when the propinquity of God was a nightmare

and belief in it heresy; when the law had become a burden and evasion of obedience a fine art; when the only god or king wanted was one who knew his place and kept it, attending strictly to his own business, and content therein with such bargains might be made in accordance with long-standing custom and arrangement. But this Judaism of the days of the Christ and Saint Paul was no more the Judaism of Moses and Joshua than modern Christianity is the Christianity of the apostles. . . . It has come to pass that the so-called church no less than the world needs conviction of sin as rooted in unbelief and therefore unnecessary, of righteousness as possible through the incarnation, and of judgment as certain because an ever present fact. All talk of necessary evil is infidel. Constant harping upon the string of "our poor weak human nature" is atheistic cant—self-chosen chronic invalidism. Postponement of judgment is simply willful blindness—the stupidity of the ostrich with his head in the sand. Again, the church requires to be taught once more the lesson given to Nicodemus, that the Spirit breatheth where he listeth—that it is as absurd for men to set bounds to his field of operation as it would be to attempt to direct the motions of the planets or the course of the winds. Saint Peter learned the lesson and taught it to the brethren. It seems to have been forgotten. Forgotten also, or willfully ignored, is the fact that such statements of the Christ as these: "No man can serve two masters. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon;" "He that would save his life shall lose it;" "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all necessary things shall be added unto you;" "Except ye be converted and become as little children ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven," are of social and ecclesiastical application no less than individual.

No longer is the voice of the church, the voice of the apostle, saying: "Silver and gold have I none; but what I have give I thee. In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, walk." Instead of this, it is the church which is chronically invalid and begging. The modern cry is for endowment, without which (though it be tantamount to indirect taxation of the poor) according to ecclesiastical authority the work in certain districts cannot go on. (Query: What has become of the original endowment of the Spirit of the living God?). . . .

After all, however, the most dismal and heart-breaking failure has been and is in the matter of the treatment of children. In no other sphere of activity is infidelity more manifest or the waste consequent thereon more awful. As Alden truly says:

> The newness of life which comes with every generation is a divinely ordained force for our social regeneration. Forever the Master places the child in our midst as a symbol of His kingdom—the power to renew and remold our life. Every child is a fresh manifestation of the Christ, divinely born, sent even as he was sent for our inspiration and leadership; and received in this way a single generation of children would renovate the world. Instead of availing ourselves of this marvelous power, we put these leaders behind us and impose upon them the hard and fast mold of an older life, striving with them to anticipate the Gospel of our Lord in their hearts by the maxims of worldly experience and the forms and traditions of a worldly ecclesiasticism.

Yes. In spite of Christ's solemn warning, the little ones are despised. Instead of trying to be like them, allowing them to convert us, we must needs do all in our power to make them like ourselves, regarding them not as pure in heart and so capable of seeing God as we, alas, cannot; but rather as things empty which we are to fill, as things plastic which by us must be formed and fashioned to make their way in the world. So for five days in the week and two sessions per day we send them to school to be taught by experienced and trained teachers, arithmetic, grammar, geography, etc., and on one day in the week for about three-quarters of an hour to a Sunday school to be taught (?) by the most amateurish of amateurs the things which in theory concern their everlasting weal or woe. We go on quoting the Lord's words, "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not," and then do we suffer them to come to him? Not exactly. Not quite all the way. We bring them to baptism, send them to Sunday school, and perhaps take them to church. Baptism is a pious custom; they will be out of harm's way in the Sunday school; and they are not likely to hear anything dangerous in church. It is a good habit to acquire—this church going. It pays in the end. So far we suffer them and forbid them not. But let a boy exhibit in ever so small a degree the messianic instinct, let him insist on being natural, let him attempt to live in accordance with the fundamental law of seeking first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and how soon will pressure be brought to bear to turn him from his purpose, to conform him to his environment, to make of him "a practical man." Worse, if possible, is this: that instead of the presumption being that the child's development may and therefore should be like that of the Son of Mary, a daily increase in wisdom and stature in favor with God and man, the idea is that a certain amount of folly, etc., is inevitable, and that he asserted this. He did no such thing. He did say that there should be occasions of stumbling, and he added: "Woe to that man"—not that child—"by whom the occasion cometh."

The plain truth is that while faithful, brave and godly believers are praying (as such have always prayed, "Thy kingdom come," with intelligent sincerity, the religious classes of to-day, as classes, do not want the kingdom to come just yet. They have no longing for a regime here upon the earth in which respect of persons, special privileges, patent rights, individual and class distinctions are no more. They may do very well in heaven or when the millennium comes—whatever that may mean. But till then let heaven and earth, religious and secular, saints and sinners, rewards and punishments be carefully differentiated. Disunion must and shall be preserved. The modern Pharisees have no heart hunger for or faith in the possibility of a social order in which justice no less than charity shall be swallowed up of love. Society without a leisure class, patrons, policemen, fags and scapegoats is to them unthinkable.

Therefore, although the kingdom of heaven is at hand, and the way thereinto wide open, they neither enter in themselves nor do they suffer them that are entering to go in—if they can prevent it. But, thank God, the way is so plain and the open door so wide that they cannot stop them all. And so, in spite of all seeming and in the face of all obstacles and occasions of stumbling, the kingdom of God, the reign of righteousness, is coming in our midst, and will come till it be come indeed.—Rev. Gustavus Tuckerman, of St. Louis, in The Coming Age, of March, 1900.

FARM BURNING IN SOUTH AFRICA.

An extract from a letter written by Mr. John Morley, M. P., to the editor of the London Times. We reprint from the Manchester Guardian of Nov. 17.

You seem to quarrel with me this morning for speaking of "a black caldron of confession" in South Africa. Five or six days ago I received

from an Englishman, a man of position and responsibility in the Cape Colony, a narrative for which I hope you may be so good as to find space. It is signed Ellie Cronje, and dated October 15. There is nothing sensational about the story; it is only an ordinary incident of warfare as now conducted in South Africa. The writer, I am told, is educated, and has been brought up in a refined way, the daughter of a better-class yeoman:

Our farm lies three hours' distant from Winburg. My father and four brothers joined the commandos in the beginning of October, the fifth brother left for the front on the 8th of January. One of the four who went first, being ill, came home, but for a short time only. Two of my brothers were taken prisoners, one with Gen. Cronje in February, and one, after being wounded at Koodoesrand, was taken at Bloemfontein. On the 10th of May we had our last visit from my father, since then we have not seen him.

My mother, a lady teacher from the neighboring village, and myself, with our servants, were alone on the farm after May 10. A week after that date Gen. —— camped for the night on the farm. Next day we received our passes from two policemen sent out to the farm by order of the provost marshal. Gen. —— with his force passed a few days later. They also camped on the farm for the night, the general sending up a night watch to guard the house. Only a few of the soldiers called at the house to buy food.

On July 6 Gen. —— camped about half an hour's distance from the house, remaining for a few days. Lieut. M—— came to the house with his men and other soldiers; they bought food, some paying for what they got, and others not. They poured into every room in the house except my mother's bedroom; they took many little things from the sitting, dining and bed-rooms. There was a poster on the door of the wagon-house, given by the order of the provost marshal, stating that nothing was to be removed without his orders; of this they took no notice, and took our bullock wagon, mealies, harness and vegetables, also a load of forage, 12 oxen, poultry and other things. We asked Lieut. M—— for a receipt; he said we should get one from his men. After he went we asked his men, but they said they had no right to give receipts. So we got nothing for all these things. Our oxen were sent to Ficksburg by one of our own native servants, who on his return gave us his pass, which stated that he was not to be interfered with, as he had been sent in charge of captured stock. This pass we kept for future use, but after awhile the boy demanded it, evidently at the instigation of some one or other, and for fear of annoyance we gave it to him. After this troops passed several times, but gave us no trouble. A force again passed in September; we asked a captain who the A few officers with their soldiers, High-general was, and he told us Gen. ——; this —— was not long for we soon found it was landers, called at the house to buy eggs, butter and ham, which they paid for. These men were very nice. Then Gen. —— with some of his officers and men came. They were very uncivil. They took the cart, etc., and cleared the wagon-house, leaving us no means of getting about. They took dried fruits, blankets, and from the loft even servants' clothing was taken. Gen. —— marched into the kitchen and told me he was going to burn the house, and asked what reasons I could give that he should not do so. I said: "In the first place it is cruel to treat families as you are treating them, and, in the second, what is to become of my poor mother?" He said: "Oh, you must not think of your old mother now." . . . He also said we would not get an inch of ground, even if my father did come back, and, further, that we were the most cunning, slyest, cleverest people he had ever had to do with. "You send the Boers nice things, have news of your father, and when we come and ask where the Boers are you pretend to be quite innocent, and say we have not seen them for months." He left, and sent two wagons for forage, etc. On September 16 a small fight took place close to the farm. On the 17th six English came to the house and asked who the owner of the farm was, whether he was still on commando, who my mother was, and whether any of my brothers were fighting. We answered these questions. They then asked if the Boers called at the house when passing, and whether any had actually entered the house, and who these were. We told them the Boers did call when they passed; how could we prevent them, our own people, when we could not keep the soldiers out? Mother said she never asked their names, and added: "I do not ask you what your name is; you go away, and I never know to whom I have been speaking." Just before riding away they called the boy aside and told him to tell my mother to carry out her furniture, because they were coming back with Col. ——'s men to burn the house. We had about an hour, and carried out furniture from the drawing-room and two bedrooms, our piano and sideboard. While we were busy the troops came. They poured something over the floor to make it burn, and soon the dwelling-house and the outside buildings were in flames, and our comfortable home was gone. My mother, our lady friend and I remained outside amongst the things we had removed and watched the burning.

One of the men asked where we intended sleeping that night. I said if I had burned the house, I would have known where to have gone and what to have done. Others said: "You have to thank President Steyn and Kruger for this. Why do they not come and give in? Why do they go about like robbers?" So we said: "They will never give in; they are fighting for their country, and you are fighting women because you know they will not shoot back." We also asked would they give in if we were fighting them and started burning their houses and sending women out in the open veldt without a morsel of food because their husbands, fathers and brothers would not give in. While we were still carrying out things, the cutlery was taken from the sideboard drawers along with a lot of things from the kitchen. That night we slept out among the furniture, standing on the "werf," the wind carrying sparks over our head. Twice during the night the stables caught fire, and twice we got up to put that out, so that we might have some shelter for the next night. Next day we had the stables cleaned and some of our goods carried in there, and there we slept the second night. They took our remaining horses, cattle and other things, and were going to send and gather the sheep. I asked for one cow to be left; the reply was not one—not one. Thirteen wagons were sent to take all the homeless women to the town. On that day 17 other families had been made homeless. Most of them are very poor and have a lot of little children. We did not want to go to the town, and asked to be left on the farm, hoping to be allowed to remain in the stables. There was no help for it; we had to go. We have our own house in the town, and were promised we might go into that.

At ten we were put on an open bullock wagon and were sent into the town, which we reached at 7:30 that night, after having been exposed to the hot sun all day. The major calmly said: "You are only common working people and used to such a rough life."

When we got to the town they refused to give us our house and sent us to the hotel, paying for us. This was on September 20. On the 23d the commandant came to see us, and said we were to go either to Bloemfontein or to the Colony; should we refuse we would be sent later on with other women in open trucks to Bloemfontein and placed in tents there. These were his orders.

At Winburg there were a number of families less fortunate than ourselves, who were obliged to crowd together. They received food from the military, but were without any comforts for the little children, the sick, and the old women. These people had been able to bring nothing with them. A woman had with her twins of five months old, children of her daughter, who had died soon after their birth. When sent in she had asked for milk for these children, but it was not given her. These are only instances out of many cases of equal suffering. These unfortunate women were told by the commandant that on no account would they be allowed to remain where they were; they would be sent to a woman's camp at Bloemfontein. Can anyone imagine without indignation the misery of such a place, with no privacy, the herding together of young and old, and barely the necessaries of life?

I will not give offense to-day by intruding any unfashionable reflections about humanity, pity and the like, and I go the full length with those who say that if you enter on a war you will have to face squalor, brutality and inhumanity. Of course that is the essence of war, though there are degrees even there. But consider the unwisdom of these fire-raisings and of all their attendant abominations. Consider the resentment that is being accummulated in the mind of every Dutch-speaking man and woman in South Africa. "Burning down a farmhouse," well says my English correspondent, "is an easy thing to write about, but only an agriculturist who knows the slow patient toil of years that it costs to make a home in the wilderness can appreciate the full meaning of the work that is being carried out in the Orange Free State and Transvaal. You compared annexation to compul-

sory liquidation in bankruptcy, but what liquidator ever destroyed the assets in the estate by way of settlement?" Is that not an apt and sober question?

THREE DUKES FROM SPAIN.

There came three dukes all the way from Spain,
A courting to my daughter Jane.
My daughter Jane she was so young,
She could not bear their flattering tongue.
They offered love, and rank, and gold;
I schooled her till she grew quite bold.
"Keep all your gold," my daughter said,
"And let me have your land instead.
The noble Don who gives his land,
Alone may hope to win my hand."
One noble duke could not refrain,
His land obtained my daughter Jane.
Jane owned the land, and I owned Jane,
And very soon the duke from Spain—
The meaning of the bargain knew,
I had his land and money too!
—Rev. S. Brazier.

It is computed that at least 3,000,000 of China's population pass their entire lives on the country's waterways, living and dying on the boats on which they have been born. The reason chiefly responsible for this is that existence under these conditions entails a desirable freedom from the attentions of tax-gatherers, police magistrates and recruiting officers for the imperial army and similar drawbacks to residence ashore. Then, there is no house rent to be paid, either, by these boat dwellers, for these floating habitations are in nearly every instance handed down from father to son, from one generation to another.—Chicago Daily News.

Little Waldo—I have come to the conclusion that there is no such person as Santa Claus.

Little Emerson—Indeed?

Little Waldo—It is hardly possible that one producer should be able to supply the wants of so many consumers.—Puck.

The Beautiful Roe of the Adirondacks trembled piteously.

"Ah, me," she moaned. "The open season has come."

The Lordly Buck laughed at her fears.

"Oh, it's all very well for you!" cried the Roe. "You have horns and are in no danger of being shot! But I look just like a hunter at a distance."

It could not be maintained that her alarm was devoid of logical justification.—Detroit Journal.

It must be confessed that the White Man sometimes adds to his burden by holding up the Other Man and forcibly appropriating his burden.—Puck.

Public Libraries, Reading Rooms and Clubs which receive THE PUBLIC weekly:

Mobile, Ala., Ettel's Restaurant, 72 Dauphin St.
Reading Room, Y. M. C. A.
Berkeley, Cal., Public Library.
Pasadena, Cal., Public Library.
San Francisco, Cal., Mechanics' Institute Library.
Colorado Springs, Col., Free Reading Room.
Reading Room Colo. Coll.
Como, Col., Reading Rooms.
Denver, Col., Public Library.
La Junta, Col., Public Library.
Wilmington, Del., Institute Free Library, 8th and Market Sts.
Young Men's Single Tax Club, 610½ Market St., 3d floor.
Orlando, Fla., Direct-Legislation Reading Rooms.
Chicago, Ill., Ashland Club, 575 Washington Blvd.
C. L. & A. Club, 38th St. & Cottage Grove Ave.
E. M. & I. Club, 39th & Wabash Ave.
Englewood Free Reading Room, 769 W. 63d St.
L. & A. Asso., 61st & State.
Public Library.
Reading Room Atlantic Hotel, cor. Van Buren and Sherman Sts.
Reading Room, Chicago Post Office.
Reading Room, Inst. Ch., 3825 Dearborn St.
Six Branch Reading Rooms of Public Library.
Y. M. C. A. Reading Room, Hyde Park.
Elgin, Ill., Gail Borden Public Library.
Y. M. C. A. Library.
Geneva, Ill., Public Library.
Maywood, Ill., Public Library.
Normal, Ill., Library Ill. State Normal Univ.
Peoria, Ill., Creve Coeur Club, 213 S. Jefferson Ave.
Public Library.
Urbana, Ill., University Library.
Muncie, Ind., Trades' Council Library.
Terre Haute, Ind., Reading Room of Central Labor Union.
Cedar Rapids, Ia., Public Library.
Des Moines, Ia., Library Drake Univ.
Public Library.
Sioux City, Ia., Public Library.
Atchison, Kan., Public Library.
Manhattan, Kan., Library K. S. A. C.
New Orleans, La., Arena Club, 610 Julia St.
Chess, Checkers & Whist Club.
Fisk Free Library.
Press Club.
Brunswick, Me., Reading Room Bowdoin College.
Boston, Mass., Public Library.
Lynn, Mass., Public Library.
Mattapoisett, Mass., Mattapoisett Library.
New Bedford, Mass., Free Public Library.
Stoneham, Mass., Public Library.
Stoughton, Mass., Public Library.
Wakefield, Mass., Public Reading Room.
Wellesley, Mass., Public Library.
Worcester, Mass., Free Public Library.
Detroit, Mich., Trades' Council Library, Hilsendegen Blk.
Midland, Mich., Free Reading Room.
Minneapolis, Minn., Public Library.
St. Louis, Mo., Free Reading Room of St. Stephen's House, 520 Rutger St.
Public Library.
Reading Room of Aschenbroedel Club, 604 Market St.
Students' Library, Concordia Inst.
Helena, Mont., Public Library.
Newark, N. J., Free Public Library.
Albuquerque, N. M., Public Library.
Brooklyn, N. Y., Brooklyn Library, Montague St.
Pratt Institute Free Library, Ryerson St.
Buffalo, N. Y., Buffalo Dem. Club.
Public Library.
Fort Hamilton, N. Y., Free Public Library, 5th Ave., opp. 95th St.
New York, N. Y., Manhattan Club of Yorkville, 1523 First Ave.
Manhattan Single Tax Club, 27 W. 42d St.
Reform Club, 5th Ave. and 27th St.
Social Reform Club, 45 University Pl.
Riverhead, N. Y., Free Reading Room.
Syracuse, N. Y., Central Library.
Wyoming, N. Y., Free Library.
Yonkers, N. Y., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Cincinnati, Ohio, Public Library.
Cleveland, Ohio, Case Library.
Goodrich House.
Columbus, Ohio, City Public Library.
Newark, Ohio, Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Toledo, Ohio, Library Traveling Men's Asso.
Troy, Ohio, Public Library.
Youngstown, Ohio, Haselton Public Library.
Hotel Radcliffe.
Public Library.
Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Portland, Ore., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Silverton, Ore., Library Liberal University.
Allegheny, Pa., Carnegie Library.
Braddock, Pa., Carnegie Library.
Conemaugh, Pa., P. R. Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
DuBois Pa., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Erie, Pa., Public Library.
Homestead, Pa., Carnegie Library.
Johnstown, Pa., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
McKees Rocks, Pa., R. R. Reading Room Y. W. C. A.
Philadelphia, Pa., Economic Library, I. O. O. F. Bldg.
Free Library, 1217-1221 Chestnut St.
Reading Room Phila. Polyclinic.
Pittsburgh, Pa., Carnegie Library—Lawrenceville Branch, West End Branch and Wylie Ave. Branch.
Central Library.
Y. M. C. A. Reading Rooms at East Liberty Branch and 43d and Butler Sts.
Reading, Pa., Library, 5th & Franklin Sts.
Wilmerding, Pa., Public Library.
Peacedale, R. I., Narragansett Library.
Providence, R. I., Public Library.
Sioux Falls, S. D., Public Library.
El Paso, Tex., Public Library, City Hall.
Houston, Tex., Houston Lyceum.
Olympia, Wash., I. O. O. F. Library.
Seattle, Wash., Public Library.
Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Milwaukee, Wis., South Side Branch of Public Library.

(The Public is not admitted to the Y. M. C. A. Reading Room at 7th & Penn Ave. at Pittsburgh, Pa.)

BOOK NOTICES.

The International Socialist Review (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co., 56 Fifth avenue), A. M. Simons, editor, contains in the December number a stenographic reproduction of Prof. George D. Herron's speech in Chicago on the 18th of November, in which he advocated socialist unity in politics. There is also an announcement that Prof. Herron is hereafter to edit in the Review a department of "Socialism and Religion," and that he will contribute regularly to no other periodical. Another regular department of the Review is that of "The World of Labor," edited by Max S. Hayes, of Cleveland.

In "A Treatise Upon the Law and Practice of Taxation in Missouri" (Columbia, Mo.: E. W. Stephens), Frederick N. Judson, of the St. Louis bar, has produced a work of value not only to lawyers, but to students of the taxation problem generally. The spirit in which the book is written makes it of more than passing interest to readers outside of Missouri. Instead of confining himself to a legal and technical view of the subject, the author has endeavored to handle it as a historian and an economist as well as a lawyer. The scope of the work is best described in the author's own words: "The law of taxation cannot be understood, even by lawyers, without knowledge of the recognized economic principles, which are based on human experience; and citizens demanding reform in taxation, as

well as lawyers who construe and apply the law, must know what our taxation is, how it has been developed historically, how it is construed by the courts and enforced in practical administration. The law and practice of taxation should therefore be construed together." The work has an introduction and three parts. In Part I the historical development of taxation in Missouri is traced, and in Part II, "Missouri Taxation in 1900" is discussed. Mr. Judson condemns the general property tax as a failure "in the first requisite of an equal and just system of taxation, the taxation of all property upon the same basis of valuation. . . . . In attempting to reach personal property, intangible as well as tangible, the law is a confessed failure, not only in Missouri, but wherever the system is in force." In Part III, "Taxation of the Future" is considered, and a short chapter is devoted to the work for tax reform in Missouri by the single taxers. The author praises the efficient service they have rendered in "exposing the injustice and inequalities of our 'general property tax;'" in advocating the taxation of franchises, and in opposing license taxes. He pays a tribute to the earnestness of their convictions and to their disinterested public spirit. Although he is not an advocate of "their social theory which denies the righteousness of private property in land," he thinks that the tendency of tax reform is along the lines indicated by the single taxers, but that there will not be a "single tax," because land and taxable franchises will not be the only subjects of taxation. After advocating certain administrative reforms, Mr. Judson comes to the following conclusion: "These forms of taxation, tax upon real estate and tax upon corporate property and franchises (without deduction for mortgage liens), supplemented by an inheritance tax, would, it is believed, make efficient substitutes for the present inefficient system of reaching personal property. The forms of personal property, which are not reached by the first two, would certainly be reached by the latter." From the foregoing quotation it will be seen that the author is under the influence of the "ability to pay" theory of taxation. His failure to realize that a just and equal system must tax in proportion to the benefits received from government is a blemish which vitiates his conclusion and seriously mars the value of the work as a whole. It leads him to practically repudiate the deduction he has drawn from his own investigations in regard to the impossibility and folly of attempting to tax personal property. This he shows with almost the clearness of the late Thomas G. Shearman, and yet when he comes to formulate his ideal scheme of taxation he is led by his theory that "the basis of a fair and just taxation system is taxation of all property in the state once and once only" to devise a new method of "reaching personal property." The historical and descriptive portions of the book (except as influenced by this theory) are admirable. The failures and abuses of the present system are most succinctly set forth. The work is a very valuable contribution to the literature of the subject, economic as well as legal, and is especially worthy of careful study by all citizens of Missouri.

Victor E. Brown.

Chicago.

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

The Public

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY,
1401 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:
THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.