

# The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 20, 1901.

Number 159.

**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.

The principle of the new toriyism is, "Everything for the people, but nothing through the people or by the people." Hail, kindly masters!

Americans complain because the British foreign office and other governmental departments in London persistently speak and write of American citizens as "American subjects." Perhaps this is only the prophetic shadow of a coming fact.

Slowly but surely the facts about the white man's atrocities in China are coming to public knowledge. Among the heathen of the orient "Christian" and "savage" are doubtless by this time synonymous terms.

Suggestive comment is made by the La Crosse Daily Press—which declares for "hastening the day when all men shall be workingmen and no man a slave"—upon Gov. Altgeld's famous remark that "this country does not need two corruptionist parties; one is enough." The Press commends Altgeld's utterance "to those democrats who fear that the party is not strong enough with the plutocrats," and "to those republicans who occasionally marvel because it costs more to elect our presidents than to supply the American masses with bread."

Who was it that said saving doesn't pay? Here is a Toledo gentleman, Dr. Ash, who bought 160 acres of Wisconsin land in 1884 for \$1,000. It included the only natural harbor in the northern part of that state. Some men might have let it get away. But Dr. Ash saved it. Now he has his

reward; for Mr. Rockefeller has given him \$1,000,000 for the land. That experiment in saving did pay. Let poor men stop complaining and profit by Dr. Ash's thrifty example.

That the people of England are weary of Mr. Chamberlain's war in South Africa has long been apparent. The glory of it is all gone, but the enormous expense continues. If a parliamentary election were to occur to-day, it is almost certain that the "khaki" plan of campaign would be a humiliating failure. Had the English people been as thoughtful of this possibility when Chamberlain, Rhodes and the rest involved them so unnecessarily, not to say viciously, in the war for the destruction of the two republics, they would have less in the past to regret and less in the future to fear.

On the 23d and 24th of May an important tax conference is to be held at Buffalo under the auspices of the National Civic Federation. Governors of states are beginning to make quasi official appointments of delegates, and there is a probability that at least some sane suggestions will be made. It is to be hoped that the Australasian method of taxation now in successful operation will not be overlooked in the programme. The governor of Colorado could confer no greater benefit on the public of this country than by appointing Senator James W. Bucklin, the American expert on Australasian fiscal policies and methods, to go to Buffalo as a state delegate.

Pierpont Morgan's proposed chain of dry goods stores across the country is suggestive of the possibility of a trust without special privileges—in other words, of the production of a monopoly by a combination of com-

petitive businesses. It is a fact, however, that each of these combining establishments has legal advantages of various kinds, positive and negative, which are hidden in an economic network. But without considering them, it must be remembered that the same Pierpont Morgan who is organizing the dry goods store trust has organized the railroad trust. Does anyone doubt that Mr. Morgan's railroad trust will promote the interests of his dry goods store trust? And does not the railroad trust rest upon the legal monopoly of land—rights of way and terminal points?

The democratic reorganizers who are rejoicing over the election as mayor of St. Louis of that assistant republican, Rolla Wells, and notifying the democratic democrats of the country that they may "like this or lump it," but it is the kind of medicine they have got to take, overlook one thing. They shut their eyes to the fact that Lee Meriwether, the democratic democrat who contested the St. Louis election with Wells, polled a heavy vote as a third party candidate. It was so heavy that Wells would have been defeated by it, and badly, too, if he had not more than made up for democratic protests against him with the votes of his republican copartisans. Against a vote of 43,000 for Wells and 35,000 for the republican candidate, Meriwether polled 28,500.

The significance of Meriwether's vote, with reference to the next presidential campaign, is that a democratic candidate of the old proslavery and new plutocratic school cannot be elected. If victory is what the reorganizers want they cannot have it with a resurrected James Buchanan for candidate. Neither Grover Cleveland nor any of his set; neither David B. Hill nor any of his;

nor yet any other candidate whatever whom Wm. C. Whitney or the monopolistic crew of plutocratic republicans and their "democratic" partners whose financial interests Whitney represents in democratic politics,—none of these can be elected.

This does not mean that the silver question is alive or will be revived. The silver question is dead; though its heir is not the Wall street fetic, but something more radical and rational than silverism. Neither is this a foolish threat that a third party will be coaxed into being if the old crowd of monopoly mongers foist a candidate of their own upon the democratic party of the nation as they did upon the democratic party of St. Louis. It is not a threat of any kind, foolish or otherwise. It is simply a prediction—as easily made and as sure to be verified as the prediction that the sun will set to-night and rise to-morrow—a prediction that if the monopolists triumph in the national convention of 1904, a new party will instantly spring up which will be to the national election what Meriwether's was to the election in St. Louis, but with this difference, that the vote it polls, while possibly no larger relatively than Meriwether's, cannot be overcome by the aid of a republican machine. If the old democratic incubus cannot be thrown off at the convention it will be thrown off at the ballot box; and if its adherents or apologists have no higher ambition for the democratic party than to have it win at whatever sacrifice of true democratic principle, they had better let somebody else dictate the nomination than the Whitneys, the Clevelands, the Wellses or the Hills. They need not suppose that Bryan is dead because they have bought him a grave.

In his Jefferson day speech at Buffalo, David B. Hill declared, referring to the democratic party, that it has a right to be proud of its ancient political lineage. That is by no means a perfectly true declaration. It may indeed be proud of its Jeffersonian

origin. It may be proud of its Jacksonian reincarnation. It may be proud of its free trade work in the forties and fifties. But what of its pro-slavery record? Have true democrats any reason to be proud of that? And what of the record Mr. Hill would make for it with reference to plutocracy? In a cluster of antithetical phrases in his speech, he threw a bouquet to labor when oppressed, and asserted that the party "respects the vested rights of capital." What did he mean by that? He could not have meant merely the rights of capital. For rights are sacred whether vested or not. He must have intended the word "vested" to have a significance of its own. What then could he have meant but that he would respect what lawyers mean by the term "vested rights"? He must have meant that. But by that term lawyers mean anything, whether good or bad, whether a right or a privilege of destroying rights, provided only that it is vested, that a legal title to it has been acquired. It was precisely this view of rights and wrongs that allied the democratic party with the slave power. The masters had "vested rights" legally in slaves; therefore the slaves had "no rights that white men were bound to respect." And now Mr. Hill brings that narrow view of morality, that lawyer's view of morality, that state prison view of morality—do whatever you please so long as you keep out of the penitentiary—down to present day issues. To the extent that corporations and individuals have acquired, not rights morally, but "vested rights" legally, in powers of private taxation and public plunder, Mr. Hill would have the democratic party respect those "vested rights" no matter whose real rights suffer thereby. Mr. Hanna asks no more.

The Church Militant, official paper of the diocese of Massachusetts of the Episcopal church, takes up John Stuart Mill's old question of what he called "the unearned increment," with something like a

personal application. It seems that about 80 years ago the parish of St. Paul's church bought the property it now occupies on Tremont street for an amount which included a very small sum for the site. But for that site now—the building being regarded by proposing purchasers as of no value, but as an incumbrance—the parish is offered \$1,500,000. "This increase in value," says the Church Militant, "is what is called the 'unearned increment,' and therefore it asks the question: Does that 'unearned increment' belong to the community? Our religious contemporary is perfectly fair about the facts in the case. It concedes not only that the increase in value is pure land value, but also that it has been caused by "the movements of population and business in a given direction." Nevertheless it questions the right of the community to the increase. "If the community," it argues, "gets the increase in valuation of a given property, then equity demands that the community indemnify the citizen whose property has greatly decreased in value because people and business have moved away from him."

That point has never seemed sound to us, nor even logical. Why people whose business and commercial activities produce increased site values in one spot, should be deprived of them by site owners there, unless they indemnify site owners elsewhere for depreciation of site values caused by their own removal or that of others—why such an adjustment should be made passes our comprehension, either as a demand in equity or a proposition in logic. We can understand the contention that landlords are entitled to all land values; but we cannot understand it upon those "equitable" grounds. But the matter is hardly worthy of consideration upon the theory of an "increment" of \$1,500,000 or any other sum. There is no increment, and consequently there is no issue over its ownership.

Mr. Mill's choice of a term was in this instance not a happy one.

The true state of the case with reference to the St. Paul property in Tremont street, Boston, is this: Whereas some 80 years ago the site would have yielded but a small yearly ground rent, it would now yield a very great one, say, \$75,000. The gross value, then as now, is merely an arithmetical calculation, something like a reversal of annuity calculations. Thereby a capitalized value, based upon potential annual value, is ascertained. But this capitalized value is not an increment. It is not an existing tangible thing. It does not so much as represent such a thing. It is merely a rough estimate of the probable profit to be enjoyed through the legal right to collect future ground rents. The real thing to be considered is not this capitalization of future rent, but the present rent upon the basis of which the capitalization rests. To whom does that belong? Surely the answer to this question can by no possibility depend upon an adjustment of appreciations and depreciations. If it were true that Boston, and not St. Paul's parish, is entitled to this year's rental of the Tremont street site, say \$75,000, by what process of reasoning or rational system of equity could the right be nullified if Boston refused to present other site owners with enough money to bring their site rents of this year up to the level of the site rents for previous years when their sites were in greater demand? The question turns not upon adjustments of appreciation and depreciation of site values, but upon the fundamental question of the right of ownership of current ground rent. If that belongs in equity to the site owner, then, be it large or small, higher or lower, appreciated or depreciated, it is nevertheless his property to the full. But if current ground rent belongs in equity to the community, then the whole of it belongs to the community,

not only that which is higher than it used to be, but that also which is lower than it used to be. There is in this problem, when analyzed, no room for the "increment" and "decrement" theory of adjustment.

Not all the influential men of Great Britain are anxious to reestablish the old system of protection. One of them at least, Sir Christopher Furness, M. P., appears to be a Tom Johnson free trader. He is a wealthy ship owner, ship builder and railroad president, who in a recent article in the London Daily Mail combatted the tory demand for protective duties, saying:

Instead of restricting the natural development of industry; instead of endeavoring to divert trade from its natural channels by so-called "protective" tariffs which confer special privileges and create monopolies by means of which the few benefit at the expense of the many, we should, I maintain, carry to their logical conclusion the great free trade principles. As yet exchange is only partially free, and before we can have true freedom of trade, not exchange only, but production also, must be free from all monopolies and restrictions. . . . Our present system of taxation operates in large part as a direct fine upon trade and industry. The true fiscal policy for this country is not "protection," but gradual transference to land values of the dead weight of rates and taxes that now hampers trade and industry. The taxation of land values would loosen the grip of the land monopolists, and labor and capital could then secure on reasonable terms land for farming, mining, building, manufacturing, etc. . . . "Protection" is economically unsound; we must, if our trade and industry are to survive, move step by step towards the free trade ideal.

Referring to the capture of Aguinaldo, the New York Evening Post asserts rather apologetically of the war in the Philippine islands that "in order that public opinion may have a chance to develop and find expression, there must be peace in the islands." As a bare statement that is true. Peace is the first necessity of popular government. But why the peace that reigned in Warsaw? Why the peace of subjugation? The Phil-

ippine islands were at peace under their own de facto government, when the American authorities disturbed the peace by asserting rights of sovereignty. To restore peace they have now only to relinquish that claim. Is this nation so deficient in magnanimity that it is unable to appreciate the righteousness of the cause of a people upon whom it is waging aggressive war? Must it have the defenders of their country quit their resistance before it can decide the merits of their case?

The recent demonstration by James Lane Allen that the injustice of the Philippine war is so great that there is nothing in the literature which it has produced to justify it, that the muse of poetry has been hushed into absolute silence, and that all literary celebration of it has been stifled and a condemnatory literature is taking its place, is one of the reasons, no doubt, why President McKinley is taking his way this summer, in his "swinging-round-the-circle" trip, to Boston and Harvard, where the tradition, at least, of literary productivity still resides. Harvard is to give McKinley the honorary degree of doctor of laws, for Harvard is among the foremost of worshipers, always, at the feet of success, it does not matter very much what sort of success it may be. Harvard has, too, a number of English, or British, professors and instructors, besides a gorgeous example of imitation-Englishman in its professor of English literature, who has recently, in an elaborate work on American literature, sized up American authors according to their respective family connections and social standing. But McKinley's quest will be in vain. The muses have long fled Harvard, snubbed by plutocracy and athleticism, and are not to be invoked with "pulls." All Hanna's cash, though potent in picking up colored delegates for a national convention, will fail in the attempt to hustle up literary men above the grade of the hack writer of editorials for the party organ, who

is very often in these days writing the opposite of all he really believes.

A very thoughtful editorial criticism of the report of the congressional industrial commission's tax expert may be found in the issue of the 12th of the Chicago Post. This expert, "curiously enough," as the Post says, "is led to advocate the imposition of an income tax," to remove inequalities and approximate to uniform and equitable taxation, notwithstanding that income taxes are condemned by experience. "The movement for home rule, or local option in taxation," pursues the Post, "seems to have escaped his notice, though it holds out much more promise of substantial improvement than any other plan yet devised;" and it concludes:

If there is a tendency to income taxation by states, the naked eye of the layman fails to discern it. The commission's expert must have drawn upon his imagination for his facts. The result of the gratifying movement for local option in taxation will probably be quite different from that predicted by the industrial commission. The idea of exempting all personal property is growing in favor, and in some communities (Hawaii, among others) there is even talk about placing taxes on land values alone. Reform lies in the direction of simplicity, certainty and equity.

Philadelphia has been undergoing an experience with anarchy of the vicious sort, the director of public safety—Heaven save the mark!—being the anarchist in chief. It is over Emma Goldman, who does not believe in government and who makes very excellent speeches in support of her faith. The Philadelphia director of public safety does not agree with Miss Goldman. Neither do we. But he adopts a method of answering her arguments which is not only not recognized in books on logic, even as a fallacy, but which is in our judgment one of the worst of crimes. He abuses his power as a policeman, charged with the execution of the law, to violate the law of free speech by forcibly preventing Miss Goldman from addressing her

fellow citizens upon the subject of her opinions. He makes no pretense of street obstruction, but forbids her holding meetings anywhere, even in her own halls. This is worse than stealing. It is worse than murder. For it undermines the whole body of the law. There can be no government where free speech is suppressed. Legalized violence there may be, but no government. Government derives all its just powers from the consent of the governed, and the consent of the governed cannot be ascertained if their opinions regarding government are suppressed. The North American, of Philadelphia, calls the director of public safety a fool. He is worse than a fool. He is a criminal, guilty of one of the worst crimes that a public officer can commit against a self-governing people.

The story of what this man has done seems almost incredible. It suggests that possibly he is neither fool nor criminal, but insane. His interference with free speech began, it appears, on the 7th, when a squad of police prevented an advertised meeting of the Social Science club of Philadelphia, at which Miss Goldman had been announced to speak. Both she and the members of the club were stopped from entering their hall. On the 8th the police announced that Miss Goldman would not be allowed to speak in Philadelphia at all. On the 9th they prevented her speaking to the shirtmakers' union, where her topic was to have been "Trades Unionism;" and a little later, having followed her to the Labor Lyceum, they ordered the labor organizations there in session not to listen her. It was on this day, also, that the police department issued orders to all labor organizations forbidding their having Miss Goldman speak at their meetings, and notified all owners of halls not to rent them for meetings of "anarchistic tendencies." When an application was made to rent Odd Fellows' Temple hall for a meeting to protest against these arbitrary orders, the

police authorities forbade the trustees to rent it. As an indication of the insanity of the department the answer of the director of public safety to a request of the Single Tax club for information was very significant. The club explained to him on the 11th that it had been its custom to allow the fullest discussion of all social and economic questions, and asked the intended effect of the police orders upon its meetings; to which the director replied that no discussion of the subject of anarchism would be allowed, and if it were discussed the meetings would be suppressed. It was then explained to him that at the meeting that night there would be a protest against the action of the police, and that while the club did not advocate anarchism it would discuss the principles of that school of thought. "Attempt it and I'll close your meeting," was the reply of the director. Not only in this case, but generally, the director announced that he would not allow the subject of anarchy to be discussed even adversely. It is inconceivable that the people of Philadelphia, sluggish as so many of them undoubtedly are, will allow this reckless interference with public meetings and free speech to go on without rebuke. It is not a question of whether Miss Goldman's doctrines are right; it is a question of whether a Russian censorship is tolerable.

The post office department is again trying to economize without touching the exorbitant charges for railway service. This time, however, the plan proposed, though it diverts attention from the swindling railroad contracts, is not in itself illegitimate. The idea is to cut off from second-class privileges those publications which depend upon merchandize premiums for getting circulation. The exclusion would deprive of these privileges all papers which offer a bonus or premium other than another publication having second-class rights. A little protection weakness is exposed by the depart-

ment when it appeals to the press in favor of this plan by saying that the advertising which the papers to be excluded get—and that is really all that they exist for—“legitimately belongs to bona fide newspapers and periodicals, which are supported by the public upon their actual news or literary value.” That is not a valid plea. Advertising legitimately belongs to nobody except the persons to whom the advertisers award it. Yet it is true that the legitimate uses of the second-class service are for genuine news and literary periodicals, and not for imitations of these, which get large circulations by giving extravagant premiums with a view not to serving the public with a desired publication, but to securing for an advertising medium of the third class in postal classification the lower postage rates of mediums of the second-class.

If our excessive exports are liquidating our indebtedness abroad, incurred during the 30 years or so succeeding the civil war, as is solemnly asserted by the unyielding supporters of that “favorable balance” theory (men who have learned at last that our excessive exports are not paid for with gold), these men have a little contradiction to explain. How could our excessive exports during that period, if excessive exporting is favorable, have run us into debt? And while they are formulating that explanation, they might contribute still further to the general stock of information by letting the public know what kind of balance it will be when, our debts abroad all paid, excessive importing sets in to pay us with a profit for our then current exports. Will that import balance be unfavorable?

A prediction we made long ago and have frequently repeated is coming true. The administration has begun to organize a white man’s party in the south, beginning with South Carolina. John Capers, formerly a democrat, but now a McKinley re-

publican, whom the president has appointed district attorney of South Carolina, authorizes an interview in which he says: “I hope that we shall be able to organize a republican party in South Carolina that will be a credit to our state and represent the best elements of the community.” “Best” elements means, as usual in such cases, the best in the sense adopted by the rich young woman of Hood’s verses, who believed that “those who have naught are naughty.” For our part we welcome this movement. When the aristocrats of the south get out of the democratic party there, it may become democratic. At present it is little better than a survival of the proslavery democracy of the fifties.

A wholesome decision has been made by the federal court of appeals at St. Louis. The question arose on an act of the Kansas legislature which had authorized township governments to issue bonds for the erection of sorghum sugar mills. In a suit for interest on these bonds, the court holds that they are void, the promotion of manufacturing enterprises being a private and not a public business. We say this is a wholesome decision because, while we believe that manufacturing and all other wealth production should be encouraged, we believe the encouragement should consist exclusively in relieving all productive enterprises from the burdens of taxation, and not in furnishing bounties to some enterprises at the expense of taxpayers.

An irritating typographical error occurred last week, on page 3, which took all meaning out of the latter part of the editorial beginning “Our attention has been called.” We therefore reproduce so much of the distorted part of the article as is necessary to make it intelligible. The three last sentences should read as follows:

We might properly observe, however, that Mr. Casson has not very carefully analyzed the Gilman problem if he thinks it nothing but a

question of storekeeping. Tariffs and other taxes, tea gardens and other kinds of land, and disinherited labor, all entered in to give to Gilman, on the one hand, abnormal commercial power, and to make his employes, on the other, abnormally weak as contracting parties. The Gilman problem is much less a question of competitive storekeeping than of legal monopoly.

**CRIMINAL CLASSES.**

What to do with the criminal classes is an ever-recurring problem. It is usually treated as if these classes were beasts, and it were supplementary to the problem of what to do with hawks, or rats, or foxes, or wolves or other beasts and birds of prey that pester mankind. At best it is treated as if the criminal classes were a different kind of human from ourselves, having not only a different environment, but different heredity and radically different moral impulses.

Until that attitude is changed for one more considerate, the problem will not be solved. All the whipping posts that can be erected, all the novel methods of legalized homicide that can be invented, all the perfunctory red-tape kindness that professional penal reformers can devise, all the learning of “scientific” penology, will not in the least degree advance the solution of the criminal problem until the criminal classes are sincerely and intelligently considered as men like other men.

The first point for consideration along that line is motive.

In itself criminal motive is nobody’s concern but the criminal’s. It does, indeed, go deeper than criminal action. It is, indeed, the essence of crime. When fostered it does build up criminal character. But criminal motive in itself injures no one but him in whom it exists. It is distinctively an individual affair, an evil to be reformed by the individual in response to his own choice and in his own way. Organized society has no function regarding it.

For the reformation of motives, we may teach and preach and admonish; but we must do so as individuals to individuals. We have no right to put men’s motives into moral straight jackets by force. And we could not if

we would. The individual mind and the individual conscience are things which cannot be controlled by external force either for good or for evil. The great architect of the universe, personification of all wisdom and all good, appreciates the importance of intellectual and moral freedom, even if the best and wisest among us will not. He has made it impossible for men by force to regulate the motives of other men.

Criminal motive not embodied in action harmful to others, raises a spiritual question alone. There is no social problem, no question for the penologist, no right in organized society to resort to force, until criminal motive translates itself into criminal conduct.

Nor is this a special plea for the criminal classes. It is simply a recognition of a universal right. Criminal motives are not confined to the criminal classes. They exist in greater or less degree in all classes and in all individuals. The best among us are not wholly free from crime, in so far as motive constitutes crime. For what is criminal motive at bottom but selfish desire? Whoever wishes for what in justice belongs to another, whoever aspires to dominion over others, even "for their own good," whoever prizes privileges for himself above the rights of others—all such harbor criminal motives. And it makes no difference whether their selfish desires are confined within legal limitations or not. A wrong is none the less a wrong for having legal sanction. We may change its name by law, but we cannot thereby change its character. It is still essentially a crime, and, the desire for its advantages is still a criminal motive. In criminal motive, then, the race is at one with itself. Within that realm there are no distinctly criminal classes, for all classes are criminal.

But when criminal motive does translate itself into harmful action, then a criminal class is distinguishable and the power of organized society is challenged.

Social order—not disorder, but order—both the degree of order that now exists and all possibilities of attaining to higher degrees, depends upon social peace. There must be

peace that orderliness may develop unto perfection. And peace there cannot be so long as criminal motives generate criminal actions, unless society, with the superior power of general organization, maintains peace by protecting individuals from aggression.

Now there is a universally recognized class with which aggression is habitual. It is the class that includes pickpockets, highwaymen, confidence men, forgers, and incidentally murderers—a predatory class. With that class criminal motive embodied in criminal action constitutes an aggression upon individual rights and consequently an infraction of the social peace. It thereby raises up a plain social duty. The duty of society is clear enough to prevent such depredations as far as possible, and if necessary for that purpose to punish depredators when detected. It is at least clear that men of that kind should be forcibly restrained.

Thus far the most conservative reader will doubtless agree with us. If he finds any fault it will probably be that we are not severe enough. For the class to which we have referred is what is commonly distinguished as the criminal class, and that is a class with which your conservative, especially if he is a churchman of the pious variety, has little patience. He may be humane, and have theories about reforming this criminal class. Possibly he may be addicted to the reformatory theory of an enforced hygienic diet. Or he may prefer forcible kindness. If old-fashioned, he may have confidence in religious tracts; if new fashioned he may come out strong on heredity, and favor physical dismemberment or at least prohibition of marriages among criminals. But he is more likely to indulge the conviction that the only reformed criminals are dead criminals.

Over the question of severity in the treatment of the criminal class, we have no desire now to raise any of the issues with conservatives that may exist between us. On the contrary, we will go as far as they in demanding that crime be prevented; and as far as they can justify their demands on principles of prevention, in also demanding the punishment of crimi-

nals. If it could be demonstrated that the death penalty is a necessary and effective deterrent, and not more injurious to those who inflict than to those who suffer it, we should favor even the death penalty for the restraint of the criminal classes. We believe it to be of vital importance to society that society repress crime.

We should not look, however, for professional criminals in the so-called criminal classes alone. Nor yet among those only whose crimes are denounced by the criminal law. All crimes are not enumerated in the criminal law; neither are the worst crimes enumerated there, for the worst crimes of modern society are legally sanctioned by society itself. And while we do not characterize beneficiaries of these crimes as criminal in any conventional sense, we are bound to admit that most of them are criminal essentially. For with most of them—not only the rich, but also the comparatively poor—a wrongful motive (desire to appropriate what of right belongs to others), and a wrongful action (use of influence to perpetuate the sanctioning by society of such appropriations) do coincide, and in that coincidence is the perfection of crime.

Those are the criminals who are chiefly responsible for the existence of a so-called criminal class.

They set a pernicious example of getting incomes without doing useful work. If such as they may do this with the sanction of a criminal law the nature of which they control, why may not persons less advantageously situated do it in defiance of that law? This inquiry may not play a conscious part in the development of the ethics of the disreputable criminal class; but if one of their ethical experts should lay it before a moralist of the respectable criminal class, what plausible answer could he make without begging the question? We must remember, too, in this connection, that conscious influences for evil are never the most potent. It is the unconscious influence of an evil example, the influence that is not recognized and could not be explained if it were, that has possibilities of incalculable harm. Such influences are the familiar phenomena of legalized theft,

which manifest themselves in the unearned fortunes that distinguish the age in which we live.

Nor is it by pernicious example alone that the reputable criminal class produces and fosters the disreputable. It does it also and chiefly by forcing abnormal individual development into a mould of disorderly social development.

What, for illustration, could contribute more effectively to the creation and propagation of a disreputable criminal class than a law denying to everybody except a favored few and their assigns the right to live? Since only these few and their favorites, and purchasers from them of life rights, could live without committing legal depredations, a class would inevitably grow up which would prey upon all other classes. Even though they might buy the right to live, and buy it cheap, yet it is conceivable that under the influence of environment—and heredity, if you insist upon it—they would prefer a precarious but strenuous life of disreputable crime to a reputable existence at the price of legalized blackmail. The old "free traders," who would now be known as "smugglers," were examples of this disposition to become lawless criminals rather than submit to the exactions of lawful criminals.

But it is not necessary to imagine an institution which makes of the natural right to live a legal privilege. The right to live necessitates the right to a place on the earth to live upon, and the right to live the social life necessitates the right to live on the earth at places where social opportunities cluster. To deny the latter right is to deny social life; to deny the former is to deny life altogether. Yet the law denies both. Except to a favorite few and their assigns, the right to a place upon the earth is denied. Babies are born by the hundreds of thousands every year, who have no legal right upon this planet. It is true that they may buy a right of babies whose ancestors were in the game of grab. But they must buy it by supporting in greater or less degree those other babies with their labor, as both classes grow up. It is true, too, that they may buy some places for very little. But if they

would buy where social opportunities cluster they must pay dear. Some of these places are so rich in social opportunities that even a few square feet could not be bought with all the earnings of a day laborer accumulated since the birth of Christ. But whether the price be high or low, it is a price for the right to live—for the bare right to live if low; for the right to live the social life if high. In either case it is legalized crime, whereby some of the people are forced either to support others in idleness by reputable labor, or to prey as a criminal class upon the community.

While that phase of the problem of dealing with the criminal classes remains unnoticed by criminologists, the possibility that those "scientists" will solve the problem is hopeless.

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Cleveland, April 15.—There has been a civic revolution in Cleveland. Last summer the "gray wolves," as we call them in Chicago, seemed to be in hopeless possession of the city government. To-night the whole pack is dispersed. It is entirely within bounds to say that this is due to the election of Tom L. Johnson as mayor.

Johnson's campaign, which closed with his election by some 6,000 majority in this republican city on the 1st, was a single tax campaign. The specific issue, to be sure, was a demand for three-cent fares on the street railroads, with ultimate municipal ownership. But Johnson's well-known views on the Henry George land and fiscal reform, and his characteristic refusal to minimize his radicalism, made the single tax the most prominent and persistent subject of discussion. In this way that subject was brought definitely to the attention of the voters of Cleveland; but it was doubtless a minor factor in producing the result. Probably the most important factor was something of which Mr. Johnson would be least proud as a cause of his victory—public confidence in his administrative ability.

But even at this early day evidence that that confidence was not misplaced has accumulated. The people of Cleveland are obviously well pleased. Yet there is a comical distrust among some of the particularly good people, as if they wondered when Johnson's jack-in-the-box would

pop out at them. Probably this distrust on the part of those who luxuriate in special privileges will not be wholly disappointed.

Johnson's first move was to take possession of the mayor's office in time to prevent his predecessor from signing away the lake front to the railroads. Prior to his election the council had passed and Mayor Farley had signed an ordinance directing the mayor to enter into a contract transferring the lake front to the railroads in fee. Johnson brought suit, as a citizen to enjoin the mayor from signing this contract, his contention being that the state owns the land and that the city holds it in trust. That injunction would have expired on the 4th at 11 o'clock; but at 10:30 Johnson had qualified as mayor and taken possession of the office. The railroads are now trying to compel him, by legal action, to sign the contract transferring this immense property to them; but they will have to secure a decree of the highest court to which the case can go before they succeed in that design.

The new mayor's activity in saving the lake front property has been followed in rapid succession by several decisive moves which bode no good to several kinds of social parasites, but promise well for the people of Cleveland. He has ordered all combustible rookeries within the fire limits to be pulled down. He has ordered bill boards within the fire limits to be taken away. He has put policemen in uniform at the entrances to dives and gambling hells, and so made a successful start toward breaking them up. All this is pursuant to his pledge to enforce the law. And he has sent an official inquiry to certain street railroads for their authority to use a certain important street—wherein there is much meaning which is not concealed. It is Johnson's preliminary step toward redeeming his promise to give Cleveland three-cent fares if possible.

One of Mayor Johnson's first acts was to set Peter Witt at work compiling a comparative statement of real estate taxation in Cleveland. No better selection could have been possible. Witt has had experience as an assessor, and besides being alert is thoroughly and intelligently devoted to the fiscal work that Johnson has in hand. He is a blacklisted molder, whose enforced exclusion from his trade has had the effect of turning

his attention to the study of municipal affairs. From the work that Witt is preparing, developments that are useful as well as startling may be confidently looked for.

Another of Johnson's appointments is at least unique. He has chosen the Rev. Harris R. Cooley, pastor of the Cedar Avenue Disciples' church of which President Garfield's mother was a member, and a prominent single tax advocate of Ohio, to a place in his cabinet as director of charities. When the mayor consulted with reference to Mr. Cooley, one friend heartily approved the appointment, but made the reservation that he supposed Mr. Cooley's business experience was limited. Johnson replied: "There is plenty of business experience lying around loose; what I want for this position is a man of judgment and heart." About those qualifications there was no doubt, and Mr. Cooley is now performing the functions of director of charities in the mayor's cabinet as well as those of pastor of the church to which he has ministered for nearly a quarter of a century.

Most impressive, however, of all Mr. Johnson's acts thus far was his organization of the new council, for he it was who organized it. The council consists of 22 members, half of them being elected every year. In the last council there was a gray wolf combine. Thirteen members were united for any sort of profitable deviltry. This combination was broken up by the failure of some of its members to secure reelection. Of the hold-over members four are democrats and seven are republicans. Of the new members, six are democrats and five are republicans. The council, therefore, is republican by two majorities. Out of this material Mayor Johnson gathered six republicans and six democrats, who were believed to be straight men, and secured from them a pledge to organize the council against the gray wolves and the corporations. He proposed, to begin with, that as the council was republican, the republican members of this entirely novel kind of combine should select the candidates for council officials, and that the democrats should support them if they were the right kind of men with reference to the purpose of the combine. This was agreed to, and as a result the president, the vice president and the clerk agreed to by the 12 whom Johnson had got together were elected with virtual unanimity. Every councilman voted for them rather than expose the

fact that he was not in the honest combine. The only exception was on the vote for clerk. The old clerk had been in office twelve years. Johnson had said to him before election: "It is more important to defeat you than to elect me; but I am going for both." He was a marked man as a go-between. The candidate of Johnson's combine had made a record in the council for his hostility to monopoly legislation in favor of the street car corporations. In this instance only three besides the combine voted for the new clerk, the others scattering their votes. It was indeed a new kind of combine—perhaps the first in the history of municipal politics in which good government instead of bad, the people instead of corporations, was the object. And it worked with thrilling precision. For the first time in many years the corporate monopolies had no part in the organization of the city council.

Of course there is much talk about Johnson as a new comet in the political firmament. A whole political career has been mapped out for him. He is to run for governor next fall—or for senator—and with his election to either office as a stepping stone, he is to contest the next presidential nomination with all comers, Bryan included. This talk is entirely in the air. Johnson has no purpose of contesting the presidential nomination. He has no disposition to allow himself to be put into an attitude of hostility to Bryan. Since 1896, though disagreeing with Bryan on the silver question, he has regarded that gentleman as leading the democratic party up out of the jungles of plutocracy and monopoly, and has looked upon himself politically as being in the fight with Bryan and not against him. There are no indications of any change in this respect. Quite the contrary. Neither will Johnson be a candidate in the fall for senator or for governor. This he definitely declares in a way which to all who know him puts doubt out of the case. The whole matter may be summed up in the single statement that Johnson is mayor of Cleveland and intends to devote himself absolutely to the business of that office until the end of his term. He will allow nothing to interfere with this purpose. Neither state politics nor national politics will be permitted to divert his attention from the important civic obligations he has accepted in behalf of the city of Cleveland.

L. F. P.

## NEWS

After the action of the Cuban constitutional convention, reported last week (p. 10), that body on the 12th adopted a more conciliatory motion regarding the so-called Platt amendment than the one it had previously passed rejecting the amendment peremptorily. It simply expressed the opinion, by a vote of 18 to 10 that the convention is opposed to the terms in some respects and to the substance in others, of the Platt amendment. The especially objectionable clauses of the amendment are the third, sixth and seventh. Those clauses are as follows:

III. That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

VI. That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

VII. That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the president of the United States.

The motion was carried in connection with one providing for the appointment of a commission to wait upon President McKinley. Still more conciliatory action was taken on the 13th. The motion of the 12th was reconsidered and the whole matter left in abeyance until the return of the commission, which is required to endeavor to make a satisfactory agreement with President McKinley. The resolution appointing it provides, however, that nothing it shall agree to or offer shall be binding unless accepted by the Cuban convention as a whole. Senors Diego, Tamayo, Capote, Berriel, Portuendo and I. Lorente constitute the commission. It is to leave for Washington on the 20th under the escort of Gov. Gen. Wood.

From the Philippines there is no

definite news except the appointment of Gen. Delgado, late Filipino commander of the Island of Panay, as American governor of the province of Iloilo, at a salary of \$3,000, with an American army officer as treasurer at the same salary. Aguinaldo is still held in close custody, no word being allowed to come from him except as military officers dole it out in gossip and totally irresponsible fashion to reporters. Nothing as yet reported from Manila on this subject is trustworthy.

South Africa, like the Philippines, gives out but little news except irresponsible gossip. Besides the report of the two Boer defeats, and the reelection of Mr. Steyn as president of the Orange Free State, there is nothing trustworthy to report.

One piece of South African gossip, however, is significant. It is said that a seditious movement is spreading among the natives, under the lead of native ministers. Its cry is "Africa for Africans."

In England, however, the South African outlook is dark, and the darkness has been intensified by the official publication at London of a blue book containing recent official dispatches from Sir Alfred Milner. In one of these, dated February 6, he writes:

It is no use denying that the last half year has been one of retrogression. Seven months ago this colony was perfectly quiet, at least as far as the Orange River. The southern half of the Orange River colony was rapidly settling down, and even a considerable portion of the Transvaal, notably the southwestern districts, seemed to have definitely accepted British authority and to rejoice at the opportunity to return to orderly government and the pursuits of peace. To-day the scene is completely altered. The fact that the enemy are now broken up into a great number of small forces, raiding in every direction, and that our troops are similarly broken up in their pursuit, makes the area of actual fighting, and consequently of destruction, much wider than would be the case in a conflict between equal numbers operating in large masses.

There are two important items of Chinese news. One was given out from Washington on the 13th. It is a statement that the indemnities demanded of China by the allied pow-

ers, exclusive of the claims of private individuals, are as follows:

Russia .....	\$90,000,000
France .....	40,000,000
Germany .....	70,000,000
Japan .....	30,000,000
Great Britain .....	24,000,000
United States .....	25,000,000
Belgium .....	5,790,000
Italy, Austria and Spain...	30,000,000
	\$314,790,000

The other item is a report of the 15th, from London, that Japan has issued an ultimatum to China demanding either that Russia be ejected from Manchuria or that the occupation of that province be made international. A late dispatch reports the destruction by fire of the palace of the Chinese empress at Peking, which was occupied by Count Walderssee.

NEWS NOTES.

—The latter part of June, 1902, has been fixed for the coronation of King Edward VII. of England.

—The British war office has determined that from June 1 the British army shall purchase no foreign meats.

—George Q. Cannon, for more than 20 years the head of the Mormon church, died at Monterey, Cal., on the 12th.

—At the recent annual meeting of the International Kindergarten union, held at Chicago, Mrs. Alice H. Putnam was elected president.

—Gen. Alexander C. McClurg, head of the Chicago publishing house of A. C. McClurg & Co., died of Bright's disease at St. Augustine, Fla., on the 15th, aged 67.

—Owing to illness Kropotkin's lecture engagements at Chicago have been set ahead one week. His lecture at Central Music hall, therefore, is to come off on the 21st at 8 p. m.

—Jefferson's birthday was celebrated at Chicago on the 13th by the Iroquois club. Judge Edward F. Dunne presided, and besides himself the speakers were S. S. Gregory, Sigmond Zeisler and Judge Tuley.

—President McKinley will begin a tour of the continent on the 29th, on board a special train consisting of a presidential car, two private compartment cars, and two private sleeping cars. The trip is to last seven weeks.

—Relative to the prosecution of Christian Scientists at Milwaukee, reported last week on page 10, the circuit court has decided that healing by means of prayer is not medical practice within the meaning of the law regulating that profession.

—A bill providing that after January 1, 1902, no common law marriage in New York shall be legal unless the

parties sign a written agreement of marriage in the presence of witnesses and file it with the clerk of the city or county, became a law on the 12th.

—Judge Wofford, of the criminal court of Kansas City, Mo., is said to seldom send juvenile offenders to jail or reform school. He releases them upon their agreement to report to him at regular intervals. The police testify to unexpectedly good results from this practice.

—The suit brought in New Orleans (vol. iii., p. 824) to prevent the shipment of mules and horses from that port to South Africa as materials of war for the British forces has been decided against the plaintiffs, on the ground that the matter is not within the cognizance of a court of equity.

—William F. Bryan, on whose nomination by the democrats for mayor of Peoria on a platform requiring a reservation in all street franchises of the right of the city to purchase without paying for value of franchise we commented in vol. iii at page 785, was elected on the 16th by a plurality of 2,940.

—The Bucklin amendment to the constitution of Colorado, authorizing counties to adopt at their own pleasure the Australasian system of taxation, has been signed by the governor. It still requires popular indorsement at the fall election of 1902. This amendment was fully described in volume iii.

—The monthly statement of the treasury department for March shows on hand March 31:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000 00
Available cash balance..	158,443,521 89
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$308,443,521 89</b>
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1900 .....	\$305,705,654 78

Decrease .....

—The treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the federal government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1900, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff .....	\$180,224,214 71
Internal Revenue..	226,391,594 45
Miscellaneous .....	28,501,800 69
	\$435,117,109 85
Expenses:	
Civil and Misc.....	\$93,238,217 14
War .....	114,517,341 87
Navy .....	45,158,870 01
Indians .....	8,780,565 31
Pensions .....	106,537,909 27
Interest .....	24,587,536 44
	\$392,820,140 04

Surplus .....

—Rev. C. H. Mann, editor of the New Church Messenger (Swedenborgian), lectured at Steinway hall, Chicago, on the 12th and the 16th. His first lecture answered the inquiry: "Who is the spiritual man?" and his second described the parentage, conception and birth of the spiritual man.

On the 19th, at eight in the evening, at the same place, Mr. Mann will explain the developing stages of the spiritual man's life.

—Jefferson's birthday was celebrated on the 13th by the Manhattan Single Tax club of New York for the thirteenth time. It was made the occasion of a dinner at the Marlborough hotel, at which 250 guests were in attendance. James W. Brown, president of the club, presided, and a speech by John S. Crosby, of New York, on Jefferson; one by Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of Cincinnati, on national and individual morality; one by Louis F. Post, of Chicago, on the declaration of independence, and one by Lawson Purdy, of New York, on the single tax, comprised the regular programme.

## MISCELLANY

### PLEA OF THE FILIPINO.

For The Public.

Sons of the patriot brave who spurned the grasping hand of British George,  
Sons of the men of Bunker Hill, of Lexington and Valley Forge,  
On bloody fields your fathers won the right to live 'neath Freedom's star;  
And we, led by that sacred light, have followed in their steps afar.

The independence of our land! Is this too great a good, my brothers?  
Is liberty for you alone, and must you force your rule on others?  
If this be so, then tell me why our hearts respond to one desire!  
The patriot Filipino's soul thrills with your Patrick Henry's fire,  
Echoes the words of Jefferson, gives thanks to God for Lincoln's pen.  
We do not want "benevolence;" give us but Justice! we are men.

Shake this mad dream of conquest off that drives you to disgraceful deeds,  
That lauds the Anglo-Saxon race, and styles all others "lesser breeds."  
Heed not the smooth hypocrisy that prates of destined work to do—  
An empire led by destiny was overthrown at Waterloo.

The road you follow ends in crime, in outrage on humanity,  
Nor can you cover up the wrong by "civilizing" charity.  
You may subdue by force of arms a weaker nation than your own;  
You may enforce obedience by leveled guns around us thrown;  
You may ensnare by shameless arts the trusted leaders of our war;  
But might will ne'er make conquest right, nor long the road to freedom bar.

Our people will, they must, be free, their feet are steadfast to that goal,  
Nor martial force nor empire's might can fasten fetters on a soul;  
They can but kill, the body finds equality beneath the sod;  
The spirit that they cannot kill will go unfettered to its God.

ROBERT T. WHITE LAW.

### A DEFINITION OF IMPERIALISM.

Imperialism is the method of governing people without constitutional restraints. Imperialism is any government, no matter how benevolent or wise, which is not self-government. To suspect Jefferson of imperialism is to commit treason to his memory. He thoroughly believed that there was no government better than self-government. — Sigmund Zeisler, before Chicago Iroquois Club, April 13.

### THINGS ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN MEN.

A scaffold on the new East river bridge in New York fell one day last week, owing to a rotten rope. One painter fell with it and was killed by striking the abutment, 135 feet below. The other painter saved himself by grasping a rope, but he let fall a pot of black paint, which, like the first painter, struck on the abutment and marked the granite. For this carelessness he was at once discharged. Whether the dead man marked the granite with his blood, we do not know. We hope not, as his family might be mulcted in damages for his carelessness. It is not surprising that workmen are generally poor when they show so little consideration for their employer's interests. Let us have another "Message to Garcia," from the facile pen of Elbert Hubbard. — Wilmington (Del.) Justice.

### TOM L. JOHNSON IS NOT LOOKING FOR ANY POLITICAL JOB.

Now that Tom L. Johnson has won his fight against the united opposition of corrupt democrats and republican monopolists, the prostituted press, republican and bourbon alike, pretend to believe that all this flutter of alarm is due to the fear that he is in hot pursuit of some one's political job. The fact is he is not looking for a job of any kind, and least of all for a political one. He candidly said so during his campaign; but part of the curse that rests on those who are given over to a strange delusion to believe a lie is, that they cannot believe the truth when it is told to them. Mr. Johnson is not losing any sleep in worrying about how he will secure for himself a senator's seat, a governor's chair, or even a president's mansion. He has set himself a greater work than any political job-chasing. He has given up all private undertakings that he may be entirely free to do it. He has never failed in any of his former undertak-

ings and he will not fail in this one. That is the reason why the corrupt politicians and the equally corrupt newspapers of both parties are alarmed. But there is reviving hope in the hearts of the prisoners of poverty immured in the dungeons of monopoly, for they hear the clanging blows of a true deliverer ringing on their prison gates.—Joseph Leggett,

### THE CAPTURE OF AGUINALDO.

While the newspapers are applauding and imperialist orators are shouting themselves hoarse in praise of Funston for the capture of Aguinaldo, it may not be amiss for thoughtful men to ask what are we applauding? Since the beginning of history all people have held in high esteem that man or that nation which is always honorable in war, and have very properly held in contempt all who have resorted to treachery to overcome their foes. David disdained to capture Saul, his mortal enemy, while Saul was unknowingly in his power, and all honorable men have tried to emulate the example of Israel's greatest and noblest king.

It remains to be seen whether the capture of Aguinaldo will stop the war in the Philippines. If it does, his capture, by treachery, will be a fitting close to a series of the blackest acts ever perpetrated by a civilized nation. Let us quote briefly from George Kennan, whom all will remember as the famous and fearless investigator of Russian "benevolence" in Siberia. Writing from the Philippines he says:

"We have offered them many verbal assurances of benevolent intention, but, at the same time, we have killed their unresisting wounded; we hold 1,500 or 2,000 of them in prison; we have established a penal colony in Guam for their leaders; and we are now resorting, directly or indirectly, to the old Spanish inquisitorial methods, such as the 'water torture,' in order to compel silent prisoners to speak or reluctant witnesses to testify."

Volumes could be written from what has already come to light of America's acts of wanton, barbaric cruelty, practiced upon the Filipinos, struggling for the sweetest thing on earth—liberty; and now comes the culminating act of the horrible drama. With the full knowledge and consent of the head of the army and the nation, our army officers, assuming the role of the aiders and bribers of Judas Iscariot and Benedict Arnold, go forth as spies, guided by traitors, and with

lying lips gain the presence of the president of the Philippine republic and make him their prisoner.

Suppose that the British had by such treachery captured Washington at Valley Forge, they would have justly received the condemnation of Christendom. Suppose Gen. MacArthur had been captured by such treacherous methods by the Filipinos, then "Filipino treachery" would have received world-wide condemnation. Yet the rabble is heaping encomiums on our officers for an act of base treachery, unrivaled in the history of civilized warfare, but the truly brave and the truly patriotic will, after the first flush of exultation is over, always hang their heads in shame when they remember that Funston and those who ordered or aided in that treacherous plot are Americans.—Hon. John A. Gilkey, of Montesano, Wash., in the Seattle Times.

#### "MONOPOLY HAS THE NATION BY THE THROAT."

Extract from the address of Judge Edward F. Dunne, president of the Iroquois club, of Chicago, at the banquet given by the club in memory of Jefferson, April 13.

Monopoly has the nation by the throat. One large corporation practically controls all the steel manufacturing industries of the country; another all the illuminating oil; another all the anthracite coal; two control our sugar; two our matches, and four kill and sell to the people of the United States all the meat they eat, and embalm and can all the scraps that are left over and find ready sale for the same to the government of the United States for consumption by soldiers in the regular army. Nearly every article of merchandise in common use, from the cradles in which the babies are rocked to the coffins in which we lay our dead to rest, are controlled by the trusts, and Mr. McKinley's late attorney general declared that the imperial power of the republic was powerless to manage, regulate or control them. The power which can be and is so energetically used to force a government upon 10,000,000 protesting and unwilling people 10,000 miles away becomes palsied and paralyzed when it comes in contact with a man, or an aggregation of men, which controls \$10,000,000.

The cabinet is composed of plutocrats, or the tools of plutocrats; the senate chamber is filled with them; the choice appointments in the army and navy are given to their relations or satellites, and through such men and their influence the spirit of imperial-

ism is rapidly impregnating the official departments of the country.

Republican simplicity and virtue are disappearing. The principles of the declaration of independence have been repudiated and trampled under foot. The Monroe doctrine, which has been asserted with unanimity and courage by democratic and republican administrations for 75 years, has been cast to the winds.

#### CROWDED OUT.

Dr. Edward Everett Hale says in the course of an article appearing in the Christian Register not long ago: "There is no doubt that the work of the world becomes lighter for those who are in it"—meaning evidently those who are in the work, or have work to do—"but what," he asks, "shall we do with those who are crowded out?" Those thus referred to as "crowded out" of the world's work—crowded out of opportunity to earn a livelihood, such opportunity being monopolized in other ways—he goes on to add, are typified by the writers of two letters which he prints—letters received by him "within 24 hours." "I could easily," he says, "print 50 more such letters if it would do any good." There is no end to them apparently. The story told in them, given condensed in the Friends' Intelligencer of last week, runs as follows:

The writer of one of the two letters is a business man, a salesman, 55 years old, who is crowded out because the factory with which he has been connected "will probably merge into a trust." He is not needed; he has the best recommendations, but the prospect of a place is not promising; with a family dependent upon him, the prospect is not cheerful. The other writer is an older man, formerly a soldier, who gets "state aid" of \$12 a month, and a national pension of six dollars a month, but who is afflicted by rheumatism, and finds that for any work which he is able to do every employer prefers a "hustling" younger man.

Yet "the country is prosperous!" We hear no end of the assertions to that effect. It is so represented by the trade papers—and are not most of the great journals of the country trade papers?—but especially by the mouth-pieces of a certain stripe of partisans very abundant in these days. The country is prosperous, but prosperous for whom? Prosperous for the trusts and their servitors—so long as they can manage to keep on good terms with this mighty modern master of men—but how is it with the rest? The "crowded out," high and low, can tell, and some who have a racking, most oppressive fear of them, an innumerable host, lest

they may be crowded out—they can tell, too, if they only would. Tens of thousands of them are getting ready to tell, and some day they will tell in a voice that will shake the land.—Editorial in City and State (Philadelphia) of Mar. 23.

#### NO RACE PROBLEM IN NEW ZEALAND.

"The fact that London papers commented so severely on the expected acceptance of a detachment of Maoris for service in South Africa," said a visiting New Zealander, "shows ignorance of the nature and appearance of the New Zealand aborigines. It is generally known that they are infinitely superior to the bushmen of Australia, but the papers have referred to them as a race inferior to the Indians, who have not been used in the Boer war because their employment would have been 'an insult to the Dutch.' As a matter of fact, neither statement is quite true. The Maoris in question were more than likely half-breeds. They are not, even when full-blooded, a black, or, until old age, a dark race. Young Maoris of unmixed blood are light brown, and when there is a mixture of European blood they cannot, in color, be distinguished from white men. They are a race so noble that intermarriage has not been considered a disgrace to white men, and in this way there has been created a half-breed people of fine intelligence and high character. It is well known that many members of the New Zealand parliament are Maoris, some of them full-blooded, and the colonial secretary was at one time a half-breed.

"There is no 'race problem' in New Zealand. Maoris and Europeans live together in mutual respect, their children attending the same schools and intermarriage is common. In addition to the high racial standing of the Maoris they have shown as a people a genius for warfare. Before the coming of the white men they had perfected a fine system of attack, and especially of defense. So that they would have made good soldiers had Mr. Chamberlain accepted their proffered service, and only the idea of their being Maoris could have given offense, as their color would very likely not have betrayed it at all. And as to the British government's refusal to use Indian troops, that is due, as everyone ought to know, to the fact that England has good reason to refrain from allowing her Indian subjects to taste white blood. The 'superior race' idea has to be

given a prominent place in India, and England would be foolish, indeed, to teach the rank and file of the Indian troops that when it comes to fighting 'racial superiority' has, for the nonce, to retire to the background."—N. Y. Tribune.

#### MORE ABOUT "PUTZ."

For The Public.

A recent editorial in the New York Evening Post, criticising Mr. Bryan's democratic speech and ways, called attention to the fact that people still like a leader to surround himself with something of awe and aloofness. This is true. It is perhaps due to an inherited disposition, based on natural, primitive respect for externals, which has been played upon and fostered by rulers.

Kings and emperors have understood the effect of surrounding themselves with the majesty that doth hedge them. Crowns, scepters, thrones, robes, all the paraphernalia of external dignity, have been a designed part of the programme of superiority and oppression.

It is impossible that the people, after centuries of deception, should at once emancipate themselves from the low spirit that stands in awe of such symbols and instruments of privilege and position. It is also natural that many people should still be subservient to the assumed mien of dignity and power. They have not yet learned to distinguish real dignity, which is real worthiness, from false dignity. Many still have the valet spirit.

The best friends of the people have never stooped to use external show or to assume airs in order to beget respect and reverence. Jefferson and Lincoln are noble examples.

In America to-day there is an evident tendency to return to external marks of rank and distinction. Against this tendency every lover of democracy ought to contend. It is a subtle, insidious and dangerous tendency. It is insidious because it seems to be too trifling to oppose. It is dangerous because people love show, and can easily be led to worship shams under a fine show.

The argument for it is subtle and specious; for there is truth in aesthetics. The feeling for order and dignity and beauty is laudable and ought to be cultivated. So, for every advance in ritual and parade there can be found an element of truth in the advocacy. But there is plenty of room for the cultivation of aesthetics in democracy without marking distinctions or investing the elected

servants of the people and other rulers with the stale paraphernalia of old regimes.

Whatever fictitious thing separates man from his fellows is opposed to liberty and democracy. Buckle's tenth chapter is very suggestive on this point, and has lessons for us to-day.

J. H. DILLARD.

#### THE SPRINGFIELD REPUBLICAN ON "TOM JOHNSON IN POLITICS."

The most likely possibility for future democratic leadership which the western municipal elections have evolved is Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland. This is being recognized in the organs of all parties, and the manner in which Johnson has just taken office, after his noteworthy triumph at the polls, affords additional reasons for regarding him as a character possessed of great strength in any appeal for popular favor.

Presumably the mayor-elect of Cleveland, under the law, can claim the office as soon as he can secure his certificate of election. Anyhow, the facts are that the last city council of Cleveland had passed an ordinance transferring to the Pennsylvania railroad, for a small consideration, a valuable part of the lake front. Mayor Farley was about to sign this ordinance when Johnson went into court and secured an order restraining the mayor, for a stated period, from signing the bill. That period expired at 11 o'clock last Thursday morning. At 23 minutes after ten o'clock Johnson went before the city clerk and asked for the certificate of his election which had just been prepared. He then presented his official bond duly made out, took the oath of office before a notary and had public record made of the exact hour of the day—having in mind possible legal proceedings from the railroad company. He then hastened to the mayor's office and took possession—the retiring mayor being unceremoniously requested to move out. Thus Johnson came into possession of the office a few minutes before the court's order expired, and the ordinance in question will not be signed, for, in Johnson's opinion, it bestows upon the railroad company a most valuable tract of land without adequate compensation.

He is thus revealed as a man whose large business experience and wealth have made him resourceful to the last degree, and in any championship of the public interest which he chooses to undertake his great strength is unquestioned. His popular personal qualities are also to be taken into ac-

count in estimating his possibilities as a leading factor in democratic politics. The politicians are bringing up other considerations in his favor. They point to the fact that he was opposed to the silver part of the Chicago platform, and that he thus does not antagonize the gold democrats. But he remained with his party, and has been and is very friendly with Bryan, and is thus agreeable to the silver or Bryan element. He is by birth a southern man, and that is considered another fact in his favor. And as a man who has long advocated public policies opposed to his own selfish interests—speaking for free trade when he was making money out of protection, as in the manufacture of steel rails, standing with Henry George for the single tax on land monopoly when he owns much land, and declaring for public ownership of public service corporations when he has and is profiting heavily from private ownership, as of street railways—such a personality appeals with great force to the favor of the masses of the people, and must command a good deal of respect and admiration from men of all classes; for there is no question of his sincerity in all this, and no essential element of inconsistency, since he takes the ground that while the people insist upon having things as they are, he is legitimately moved to make the most of the situation for himself.

When corporate wealth and privilege are obtaining such a mastery in the nation as appears at present, a man like this one might easily, it would seem, make himself a great power in politics. As a figure in the demoralized ranks of the democracy he is evidently worth watching.—Springfield (Mass.) Republican of April 12.

#### CHINESE MOTHER'S SONG.

O hush your cries, my baby,  
And rest your tired head,  
For every tiny thing has crept  
Into its cozy bed:  
O hush! the winds of night will bear  
Your plaintive cries about,  
And the Christian man will get you if  
you don't watch out.

O hush your cries, your father dear  
Is hiding in the hills;  
He's hiding from the priests that make  
Our fields run bloody rills;  
With Bible and with musket they're  
Converting all about—  
The mission man will get you if you don't  
watch out.

And if you're caught, the love wherewith  
The Buddha fills the mind  
They'll turn to smiling falsehood,  
Covering hatred of your kind;  
O hush! with cross and Bible they  
Are prowling all about—  
And they'll civilize you, baby, if you don't  
watch out!

—Frederick Manley, in Life.

### THE DANGEROUS CLASSES IN SOCIETY.

An address delivered by Ernest H. Crosby at the New York State Conference of Religion, on November 21, 1900, in the city of New York. This address was reprinted from the stenographer's notes in response to various requests for copies.

If I were a detective and were asked by my chief to apprehend the ring-leaders of the dangerous classes in the republic I would not go to the Tenderloin district; I would not go to the Bowery or the East side; I would not go to the almshouse or the insane asylum, or Blackwell's island. I would not even go to police headquarters. I think I should station myself, or should have stationed myself, at the door of the chamber of commerce dinner last night. Or, still better, I think I should have put myself on the curbstone, two weeks ago, at the sound money parade. I believe I should have had an opportunity there of finding at least some of the men, who, quite innocently and ignorantly, I assume, are really the leaders of the classes that are most dangerous in a republic. I take it, as the other speakers have this evening, that the dangerous classes in a republic are those that are dangerous to the republic. Lunatics and paupers and ordinary criminals are dangerous in all kinds of nations, and not very dangerous at that. I do not know whether it ever occurred to you, but an ordinary crime is almost as good as a sermon. It shocks everybody. It makes them really better. I know when I see a man humpbacked and bent over it always makes me stand up straighter, take in a good breath and try to have a better figure than I had before. You read about an ordinary, vile murder. It is the best kind of sermon against murder that could be preached. The crimes dangerous to a republic or any other country are those which the great mass of people applaud. Those are the dangerous crimes.

Now, what is the danger to the republic? You have been told already, in the words of that most conservative man, in many ways, at any rate, Prof. Sumner, of Yale college. It is the conflict of plutocracy with democracy. The danger to this country is plutocracy. I do not think we feel that fact as deeply as we should. I have got some figures here—only a few—from Dr. Spahr's book on "The Distribution of Wealth." One per cent. of the families in this country own more than half of the wealth. Suppose Benjamin Franklin were here to-night, or Thomas Jefferson, and we were told that

What would we expect to hear from him? Is that no danger to the republic? Seven-eighths of the families in this country (think what a mass that is!) hold only one-eighth of the wealth. And I know perfectly well that that condition of things is getting more and more accentuated every year. The showing 20 years ago would have been infinitely better. We know the accumulation of wealth is going on by leaps and bounds. Every year it becomes concentrated in larger sums and in fewer hands. It is not necessary to prove that the poor are growing poorer. I do not suppose that is the fact. The fact is that an aristocracy of extremely powerful and rich people is growing up. Do we want such an aristocracy? Our ancestors did not. They fought in England and in this country for hundreds of years, from the time of King John—perhaps even before that—for the purpose of securing a certain degree of liberty and power and equality for themselves and each individual among themselves. I know some people who argue now that all we want is prosperity. We do not care how it comes. We would like to have it trickling down from the strong box of somebody up above us. I do not believe in that kind of prosperity. I would rather have a dollar a day as a freeman than five dollars a day as anybody else's henchman. That is the true Anglo-Saxon spirit.

Another strange idea that people have got into their minds is that the Anglo-Saxons got their great fame and reputation by taking away the rights of other people. This is not so. They got their great fame by standing up for their own rights. It is only in this way that we can keep up the reputation of the Anglo-Saxon race. As soon as people begin to take away the rights of other people they begin to lose their own. We are in very serious danger of being caught in this vulgar kind of trap. I want to spend a little time to show you that we have some rights that we do not enjoy, that we ought to stand up for quite as vigorously as our ancestors did for theirs.

Let us study a little the methods by which these accumulations of wealth are brought together. In almost every case you will see that they arise from a monopoly created by law; that they are artificial products. I am talking now about perfectly legitimate and successful business. Take the two greatest fortunes here in New York. One is held by a gentleman who received in a single year (if we are to believe an affidavit made by his partner in a suit in which he was engaged)

an income of twenty-five millions. There may be a mistake about that, but it was reported by the papers as contained in an affidavit in a suit brought against him by his partner. That fortune was built up almost entirely by the assistance of the protective tariff. If it had not been for that I doubt if there would be very much fortune there. It is perfectly clear that we simply have created that fortune ourselves by our stupidity and folly.

Take the other greatest fortune here in New York, built up, I suppose—we won't say in the first place—but partially, by the ability to monopolize a natural product, oil. But I believe that was really a minor consideration. I don't believe that was the principal part of it. The real foundation of that fortune was the ability to manipulate the railroad monopoly. You listened to an address last night by Mr. Henry D. Lloyd, who has written a book called "Wealth Against Commonwealth," which ought to be read by every American citizen. Every page has at the foot references to the testimony upon which it is based. Either the Standard Oil company or its predecessor, which built up the original business in some wonderful manner which I confess I do not understand at all, seemed to get complete control of two or three railroads, including the Pennsylvania and New York Central. At that time people went about saying what great and powerful men the Vanderbilts were, and all the time they were completely in the hands of the great oil monopoly, which not only got the railroads to carry their oil free, but made the railroads divide what they received from their competitors and pay half to them because they sent their oil over that road. So the Standard Oil company not only had its oil carried for nothing, but got one-half the price its competitors paid. This may have been perfectly legal and legitimate. I don't know anything about it. But if we had any conception of our rights in railroads chartered by our legislatures, over land which was bought by our authorization, such things would not be possible.

Take the great number of fortunes made in real estate. John Stuart Mill, who certainly was not a radical, called attention to the evil of allowing private individuals to take the unearned increment of land to themselves. It is my own belief that the land monopoly is responsible for a great many of the iniquities in society to-day. I am always being told that I am a great deal

too progressive and too radical, because I say that every child born into this country ought to have some share in the land that God made. But I am only going as far as Moses did. Moses provided that every Israelitish child who was born should have a right in the land in which he was born. That seems to me a wise and sensible provision, and we ought to find some way by which we could do the same thing ourselves. If we did, people would not be in possession of large fortunes simply because they happened to own a frog pond along Broadway or Fifth avenue. It seems a foolish way of accumulating wealth—foolish for those who don't do it.

Take the matter of breweries. All brewers are rich. None of them ever fail. I believe that brewing differs from every other industry in the country in that respect, and the reason is the internal revenue law. They are hedged around by the expenses which have to be incurred by any competitor for the purpose of competing with them in the matter of internal revenue, which makes it impossible to compete with them at all.

Take the matter of patents. In a certain way the idea of patents is a very good thing. There ought to be some way of rewarding the inventor, although the patent law never does reward the inventor; it rewards somebody who has already cleaned the inventor out. Still the idea is a very good one. But how is it with the telephone monopoly? It ought to have run out a year ago. Why didn't it run out? Why is it that it has some 15 or 20 years more to run? Because some compliant clerk in the patent office failed to put some paper on record, so that the 15 or 20 years never began to run at all until about a year ago. The Bell Telephone company has got the monopoly now for a great many more years. It is a fraud from the word go.

Take a familiar kind of land monopoly, which concerns the use of our public streets. If I had the time I could spend a half hour on that subject alone. The gas companies using our streets charge perfectly extortionate rates. Nobody can compete with them. It is the same with the trolley lines—with this Fourth avenue trolley line that goes by this door; for this part of the line it does not pay anything to anybody under the sun, and for the rest of it very little. I went with others to Albany a couple of years ago to work in favor of the corporation franchise act, which simply requires that these corporations (in-

cluding gas companies, trolley line companies and others) that use our streets should pay on their watered stock—their capital which they have never paid for—should pay the same tax that you and I pay on our personal property. I had not the remotest idea that the bill would ever pass. That is the kind of bill I generally go up about. But I went up to appear before the senate and assembly committee, knowing they wouldn't pay any attention to me. The bill never would have passed if it had not been for Gov. Roosevelt. It was a piece of common decency and honesty, but it never would have passed if it had not been for Gov. Roosevelt and Senator Ford, who took some interest in it. To my mind, it was by far the finest thing that Gov. Roosevelt ever did. I wonder he never talks about it.

Our ancestors made a little trouble 120 years ago about a little tiny tuppenny tax on tea. I don't suppose anybody would have ever felt it in the world. It was almost a ridiculous thing to say anything about. But they did not believe in the principle of taxation without representation. I wonder how long Sam Adams or Benjamin Franklin would have paid five cents for a three-cent ride in one of our street cars and hung on by the strap when they had paid for a seat without trying to get up some kind of an unparliamentary disturbance?

The Metropolitan Traction company has at least eighty millions of watered stock, on which I understand it pays seven per cent.; that is, on a value which we have given them, and for which they never paid a cent. Is not this taxation without representation? It is the same way with the gas companies and other companies.

I remember some years ago looking into the Brooklyn Trolley company. I am not very good on statistics, but you can take what I say as being true in a general way, which is more than you can say of most people. It is not very fresh in my memory, but I think the real value of the company's plant, some years ago, was \$9,000,000, though it was capitalized, I think, at \$25,000,000. Then there was a little one-mile-long company in Montague street, which was capitalized at \$200,000. To this they leased the whole of the rest of the system—I don't know how many miles—but the little Montague street company took the whole. Then they went down to West Virginia and organized a company there, and that company bought these shares, amounting to \$200,000, of the Montague street line, which had already leased all the

other trolley lines of Brooklyn. You don't understand it? I don't understand it myself. It is like the three-card monte game at Coney Island, "Now you see it, and now you don't." You never put your finger on the right card. They wanted to mix up the whole business so that nobody would know how much it cost, in order that they might make 20, 50, 100 per cent. in dividends, and nobody be the wiser. That gives you a little idea of how these things are done. Water is a pretty word. Watered stock. Doesn't that sound nice? The only water about watered stock is the sweat of other people's brows. That is all there is of it. You cannot get money without earning it, unless somebody else earns it without getting it, and all of you pious people who get dividends in the Metropolitan company every three months or every six months are simply, in many cases, taking away the reward of somebody else's labor. You may say: What shall we do about it? But that is the fact. That is the way in which the great monopolistic businesses of our country are built up. For that reason I say the monopolists constitute the really dangerous class in this country. I would like to tell a little story about a trolley company, to show how great monopolists treat the common laboring men. Laboring men have great confidence in legislation. They got a bill passed that no railway company in New York and Brooklyn should exact more than ten hours' work a day from its employes. The trolley lines in Brooklyn, like almost every other line in the city, paid no attention to the law. The men had to work for 11 hours or 11½ hours—it made no difference how long. The employes in Brooklyn determined to test that question and have it perfectly clear. They went before Judge Moore, of the county court in Brooklyn, and said: "See here, we want the directors of this company arrested and fined, because the law says they shan't exact more than ten hours' labor a day from their men, and they are exacting 11 hours' labor from them." Judge Moore rendered a decision in which he ruled the case out on the ground that the company did not exact more than ten hours a day, because the men were at liberty to go anywhere else to work if they wanted to. That was his decision. Do we wonder that there is some feeling against courts and the directors of companies under such circumstances?

There is no end to this taking of the public resources of the state and using them as private property. We have

seen how the Ramapo company tried to get possession of all the rivers and lakes in this state. We have seen a company, in fact, formed to take possession of Niagara falls and use that tremendous power. Once get a corporation to water its stock with Niagara falls, and I don't exactly know where the system is going to end.

How are we going to put an end to the existence of dangers of this kind? Not by punishing people for doing what most of us would do under the same circumstances, but by doing all we can to put before the people a new ideal, and by legislation making it impossible for people to succeed in rolling up wealth in this way. If we could tax the unearned increment out of the land, if we could tax the water out of stock, it seems to me that would be a beginning in the right direction. Far more important, if we could hold up the ideal that to be honest and honorable a man must have only what he earns, and nothing more. If we could preach some such ideal as that, I think we should find that we are advancing in the right direction. Our business ideal now is, Get all you can for nothing. The more you can get for nothing the more successful you are. That should be replaced by the ideal of only getting what we are honestly entitled to. If my work is worth \$50,000 a year, let me have it; but don't make it possible for me to succeed in getting anything outside of that \$50,000. As long as the Wall street ideal, "Grab all you can get," is the national ideal, just so long we are going to have the great problem of the monopolist class and the pauper class. It is not a mere coincidence that Wall street and Tammany Hall are in the same city. The two things go together. Wall street is the principal seat of the disease of making money at the expense of other people. Fourteenth street is nothing but a boil on the surface. It seems more unsightly, but it merely shows that the other thing exists beneath the surface.

Let us do what we can to raise up another ideal. Most of us are too old to undertake to apply it in our own lives; but let us show that we think the proper thing for people to do is to confine themselves to their own earnings, and not make it the great object of their lives to get away the earnings of other people.

Yoder—Why are you studying that work on philosophy?  
 Mix—I want to learn if Funston would have gotten more credit if he had captured a criminal.

G. T. E.

She had just hurt her ankle, and waited impatiently for a car. As she climbed aboard she saw that not a seat was unoccupied. Several men were standing, and two had seats. One of these was intoxicated, and she pulled her dress aside with an expression of intense disgust. But the hurt ankle throbbed cruelly, and she turned to the other man, asking timidly:

"Might I have your seat? My ankle—"

He looked up from his paper a moment, then turned back a gruff "No."

She flushed angrily and stepped forward. But the other passenger had taken in the scene and, rising unsteadily, offered his seat with a heavy bow. Then he addressed the gentleman with the paper with a ponderous gravity:

"See 'ere, I'm drunk, but I'll get over it. You're a hog—never get over it."—University of Chicago Weekly.

I believe that there is not a single argument that may be used against women's suffrage, that may not be used against our form of government.—Mrs. Susan Look Avery, in Chicago, April 6.

Self-government cannot be taught to one people by another people. It is something that must be learned by experience.—The Commoner.

Miss Imper—My Uncle Jacob is a gentleman of the old school.

Miss Britt—How nice!

Miss Imper—Yes; but it is unbearable to listen to him when he is upholding the obsolete idea that no man is good enough to rule another man without the other's consent.

G. T. E.

Freddie (who has been brought up with a pianola, rushing frantically upstairs from the drawing-room)—Oh! Mamma, mamma! There's a man downstairs playing the piano with his hands!—Life.

Miss Sympul—Those heathen Boxers in China must be horrible creatures!

Mr. Saylor—They are; but think how much more enterprising they would be if they were Christian Boxers.

G. T. E.

The contrast commonly drawn between idealism and realism is false. The true contrast is between the ideal (which is real and eternal) and the phenomenal (which is unreal and transitory).—Rev. Gustavus Tuckerman.

Some men are so prone to imagine evil that they would find fault with Mr. McKinley if he should proffer the services of Gen. Funston to Great Britain to effect the capture of De Wet.

G. T. E.

"What are you doing?" asked one of his friends who had happened in.

"I am writing my resignation," replied the professor of something or other in the proprietary university.

"What are you doing that for?"

"Because I am going to make a speech this evening in which I shall probably express an independent opinion."—Chicago Tribune.

The Congressman — But are you loyal to the administration?

The Place-Seeker—Most emphatically I am. I indorse even the panegyrics on the Filipino Benedict Arnolds.

G. T. E.

"What kind of paintings did you say they were, Frances?" said a mother to a small daughter who was describing a "view" to which she had been invited.

"They were these impressionless paintings, mamma."—Detroit Free Press.

Weppnere—Noah is entitled to more credit than that which is commonly given him.

Faren—How is that?

Weppnere—He built the ark without the help of a subsidy.

G. T. E.

First Correspondent (in China)—I'm tired of sending word that the situation is critical.

Second Correspondent—So am I. I just cabled that the situation is not un-critical.—Puck.

"Well, I see they are going to have a real naval arch."

"What's the idea of that?"

"Oh, I suppose it's to commemorate the way Dewey has been forgotten."—Life.

Old Friend—And so both of your children are studying professions?

Hostess—Yes, my daughter is in a polytechnic college studying mechan-

**THE PUBLIC**

will be sent to any address in the United States, Canada or Mexico,

**ON TRIAL**

for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of

**SIX WEEKS FOR TEN CENTS.**

Send subscriptions with addresses to **THE PUBLIC, Box 667, Chicago.**

ical engineering, and my son is in Paris learning dressmaking.—N. Y Weekly.

### BOOK NOTICES.

"Edward Carpenter, Poet and Prophet" (Philadelphia: The Conservator), by Ernest Crosby, comes from Walter L. Sinton, 70 Dearborn St., Chicago, along with a speech by Mr. Crosby on "The Dangerous Classes in Society." Interesting as Mr. Crosby's sketch of Carpenter's poetry and prophecy is, one passes with genuine satisfaction from the poetic dreamer to Crosby's own virile speech. The reason for satisfaction is that Crosby's speech sets up the standard of rights, which is the backbone of brotherhood. Men like Carpenter, however lovable personally, however bold and picturesque their arrangements of a diseased society, however dreamily delightful their poetic effusions, hold out no rational hope of better things, simply because their conception of social righteousness is a boneless sympathy, instead of a rigid principle of correlated rights and duties.

"Health and a Day," meaning health and an opportunity (Boston: James H. West Co.), by Lewis G. Janes, author of "Life as a Fine Art," "A Study of Primitive Christianity," "Evolution of Morals," "Social Ideals and Social Progress," etc., is ideal in conception as a work on health. As a bit of literary work it is delightful. Of the advice it gives opinions may differ, but none of it is bad and most of it is good. This is no mere doctor's book for the care of a two-legged perambulating carcass. It is a book which regards individual bodily health as simply a part of the health of the whole—the body, the mind, the spirit, the family and the community. "Character is only a larger way of spelling 'health,'" writes the author as he begins a chapter on food for body and mind; and the key to his social ideal is found in his admonition that "man must respect his social obligations; society must respect the rights of individual men and women." The scheme of the book rests firmly upon the conception of universality of law.

\*To anyone clipping this advertisement and enclosing 10 cents I will send paper free for six months.—H. G. W.

\* \* \* \* \*  
"LET THE NATION OWN THE TRUSTS."

## The Challenge

A 16-Page Weekly

50 CENTS A YEAR.

H. GAYLORD WILSHIRE,  
EDITOR.

Los Angeles.

\* \* \* \* \*  
Wilshire offers Bryan \$5,000 to debate with him. Send for free sample copy.

### ATTORNEYS.

#### Chicago.

**C**HARLES A. BUTLER,  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Suite 614, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.  
Telephone, Main 7711.

**H**ARRIS F. WILLIAMS,  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
806 Chamber of Commerce Building,  
CHICAGO.

WALTER A. LANTZ. T. G. MCELLIGOTT  
Telephone Central 2254.

**L**ANTZ & MCELLIGOTT.  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,  
1025-1030 Unity Building, 79 Dearborn St., Chicago.

**C**HARLES H. ROBERTS,  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,  
614 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

#### Houston.

**E**WING & RING,  
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,  
HOUSTON, TEXAS.  
Presley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

#### New York.

**F**RED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,  
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,  
BENNETT BLDG.  
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.  
Tel. Call, 1358 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.  
NEW YORK.

### WRITERS, CORRESPONDENTS or REPORTERS

Wanted everywhere. Stories, news, ideas, poems, illustrated articles, advance news, drawings, photographs, unique articles, etc., etc., purchased. Articles revised and prepared for publication. Books published. Send for particulars and full information before sending articles.

The Bulletin Press Association, New York.

### Volume III of The Public

Complete Volumes, including index, sent post-paid at Regular Subscription price, \$1.00.

Bound Volumes Now Ready.  
Price, \$2.00. Express charges to be paid by consignee. Address,

PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

### ALTGELD'S ORATORY

Of which THE PUBLIC said "a remarkable book... will interest and benefit any reader"—is published in cloth binding only and will be mailed to any address for 50 cents. Mention THE PUBLIC and we will add without charge a copy of the International Socialist Review (\$1.00 a year or 10 cents a copy). CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers, 36 Fifth Avenue, CHICAGO.

### Rare OLD Books!

CATALOGUE FREE.

THE ANTIQUARIAN BOOK STORE,  
43 East Van Buren Street,  
CHICAGO.

## The Public

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

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.

WE DON'T SELL OUR

## CIGARS

FOR LESS THAN THEY ARE  
WORTH. WE DON'T HAVE  
TO. THEY ARE FULL VALUE.  
NO MORE, NO LESS.

J. & B. MOOS,

95 Randolph Street, 58-64 Dearborn  
Street. - - - CHICAGO, ILL.

### GIBSON ART GALLERIES

CHICAGO'S GREATEST  
PHOTOGRAPHERS .:

N. W. Corner Wabash and Adams.

P. S.—Group pictures of Chicago  
Single Taxers on sale at our galleries.

### BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

Emerson Binding Covers in which  
THE PUBLIC may be filed away week by  
week, making at the end of the year a  
reasonably well-bound volume, may be  
ordered through this office. Price, 80  
cents, postpaid. tf

For any Book on Earth  
Old or New

CATALOGUES FREE.

Write to  
H. H. TIMBY,  
Book Hunter,  
Conneaut, Ohio.