The Public

Fourth Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 27, 1901. Number 160.

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.

Thousands of British lives, together with heavy taxation and a bigger debt, to say nothing of an incalculable loss in prestige, is the price the Salisbury ministry has paid for having 18 months ago chosen war with the South African republic instead of arbitration, and a year ago refused overtures of peace and demanded unconditional surrender.

Senator Depew has a very inadequate conception of the real causes of social unrest, if he thinks, what he is reported as saying, that it may be allayed by the rich ceasing to be exclusive. It is not the exclusiveness of the rich, nor the way in which they spend their money or refuse to spend it, that threatens the disruption of society. It is the way in which they get their money.

The announcement that the Chicago Record-Herald has been mortgaged for $3,600,000, subject to a prior incumbrance of $600,000 is somehow suggestive of the story of the man who, in telling of having lost $36 at poker, concluded with the exclamation: "And the worst of it is that $6 of it was cash!"

A Frenchman who lectures on social conditions has recently tried in Chicago to do some "laboratory" sociological work in the homes of the rich. His plan was to get a situation as butler. But it failed. Every mistress to whom he applied insisted upon a capital amputation of his mustache, to the end that he might appear with a smooth-shaven face, as all good butlers should. As he regarded his mustache as part of his platform dress, he refused to submit to this behest of fashion, even for the advantages of inductive sociological study. It is not so difficult to study the poor. One can be a charity visitor without altering his personal appearance to conform to the conventionalities of the slums.

Ex-Congressman Lewis, of Washington, is credited with proposing for the next national ticket of the democratic party the name of David B. Hill for president and Tom L. Johnson for vice president. Has Mr. Lewis also become a "reorganizer"? If the plutocratic and the democratic factions of the democratic party are to be harmonized by a fusion ticket, why should the candidate of the plutocratic faction be put at the head? The reasonable explanation is that when "reorganizers" talk of "harmony" they really mean "control" for themselves. In passing, it might be remarked that while Mr. Lewis's presidential candidate from Wolfert's Roost is busy with his presidential lightning rods, the vice presidential candidate whom Mr. Lewis proposes is attending strictly to the public affairs of the city of Cleveland, and giving no thought to presidencies or vice presidencies.

Great Britain has for long made much of her income tax, commending it especially as the elastic feature of her fiscal system. In emergencies it could be increased; when the emergencies had passed it could be lowered again. Meantime, the emergency would not disturb business, because general taxation would remain throughout at the ordinary level. That was the argument. It was to be a reserve tax for war. But behold! Mr. Chamberlain's little war in South Africa makes a huge deficit. Does the exchequer propose to meet it with an increase in the income tax? Hardly at all. Only two pence in the pound is the increase of that tax which the ministry has proposed and parliament adopted—four cents increase of tax to five dollars of income! That increase is expected to yield $19,000,000. But the working classes are invited to help out with $25,500,000 from a tax on sugar. And as to business disturbance, does this elastic income tax save that necessity? By no means. Besides the disturbance to the grocery trade through import duties on sugar, the coal industry is to be disturbed by an export duty on coal. The talk about income taxes as "elastic" will appear in future to be very small talk indeed.

Another rumor of Tolstoy's exile gives additional pith and point to his noble letter of a few days ago to the Russian tsar, in which he said:

> Why will you fight with what you can never subdue by force, instead of covering your name with imperishable fame by treading in the way of justice? You protect injustice, sire. Free the peasant from the brutal tyranny of officials. Give him equal rights with other ranks. Do away with the present police system, which demoralizes society, degrades the empire and breeds spies and informers. Do away with the restraints on education so that the road to enlightenment may lie open to all. Prohibit no man from having his free belief only. Let religious persecution cease.

Aguinaldo's address to the Filipino people is a queer document. It is just such a document as a close prisoner of state, disheartened by disaster, surrounded by the agents of a powerful nation, segregated from friendly advisers, confused and baffled by his situation, might be expected to put forth if prompted by vague appeals to his hopes and sinister

excitations of his fears. In one paragraph Aguinaldo says, it will be observed, that his countrymen have declared for peace and that he respects their will—"now that it is known to me!" Known to him! What better opportunities for knowing the will of his countrymen could he have had in close confinement as an American military prisoner at Manila than he had in freedom and as their acknowledged leader? This is at least a suspicious thumb mark on his manifesto. Yet it would be useless to speculate upon the true inwardness of Aguinaldo's conduct in first taking the oath of allegiance to the United States—not as a citizen but as a subject—and then issuing this surrender address to his fellow subjects. Not until he shall have been set free, and got beyond the bounds of the American military power and censorship which center at Manila, will the world know even Aguinaldo's version of this matter. The whole truth may lie concealed in Washington pigeon holes until some successor of Mr. McKinley lets it out.

There was a time when the colleges of this country held morality in some respect. They at least paid to it the familiar tribute which vice is said to pay to virtue, and there is no good reason for suspecting that their respect for it was not as profound and sincere as it appeared. But what shall we say now of Yale, for instance, whose professor of international law, Theodore S. Woolsey, has contributed to the Outlook (April 13, page 855) a paper on "the legal aspects of Aguinaldo's capture," in which there is not even a pretense of genuine respect for moral considerations?

Prof. Woolsey begins with a reference to The Hague treaty, which, though binding only on the parties to it, he regards as "the latest and highest standard of conduct in carrying on hostilities." Referring to that standard, as well as to other guides, he concludes that if the United States were "waging war with a civilized power which was itself governed by similar rules, Gen. Funston would be properly criticized for disguising his men in enemy's uniforms, but not for employing forged letters." But as the Filipinos are not a party to The Hague treaty, he holds that "there was no obligation on the part of the United States army to refrain from using enemy's uniforms for the enemy's deception," and that "the question is thus one of ethics and policy, not of law." Had Prof. Woolsey stopped here he would have been within the limits of his subject, and amenable to criticism only for possible error of judgment or lack of knowledge as a legal expert. But when he had shifted the question from the legal to the ethical forum, he followed after it and defended the infamous episode upon the principle that the end justifies the means. "Contrast the good," he urges, "likely to follow from the hastening of the end of the insurrection by means of Aguinaldo's capture, with the offense of the use of enemy's uniforms—a stratagem illegal in war only with a lawful belligerent—and you have the measure of the justice of the criticisms of this affair."

The devilish perversity of that ethical reasoning will be apparent if we reflect for a moment upon what it involves. Since the laws of war do not govern a civilized nation at war with a people whom it may choose to regard as uncivilized, they not having been formally recognized as a nation, nor invited into the close corporation of The Hague conference, the civilized belligerent is remitted for his rules of conduct to the principles of ethics. And when its officers resort to forgery, deceptive use of enemy's uniforms, violations of enemy's hospitality, and general bad faith so gross that the enemy would be justified by the laws of war in hanging them, their conduct is ethically defensible provided "the good likely to follow from it" is in favorable contrast! This principle would apply, be it observed, not only to the acts of bad faith specified above, but to any other act which the rules of war forbid when both belligerents are "civilized." The civilized nation might, for instance, find ethical justification for firing upon flags of truce, shooting and hanging prisoners, applying "water cure" and other torture to captives, razing villages without notice to noncombatants, poisoning wells, burying the living wounded, slaughtering women and children, or committing any other infamy, provided only that "the good likely to flow from it" were relatively of sufficient importance to the civilized belligerent.

Prof. Woolsey has offered the American people the most perfect possible recipe for getting themselves uncivilized. And that is one of the worst features of the Funston episode. It is not that Aguinaldo was captured. His fall is but an incident, an event among millions multiplied by millions. The horror of it all is that, through exploits like Funston's, outraging all the moral sensibilities, but rewarded magnificently by the president and defended on ethical grounds by a great professor in a great university, the American people are invited to become moral degenerates.

Mark Twain has evoked a scathing criticism from Dr. Wyland Spaulding, president of the Congregational Clerical union of New York. At the meeting of that organization on the 22d, Mr. Spaulding measured Mark's intellectual and moral dimensions with the remark that "all that can be said of Mr. Clemens is that he is a man of low birth and poor breeding." What appears to have excited Mr. Spaulding's aristocratical contempt is the fact, as he states it, that Clemens "has not had the decency, now that there is shown to be no authority for the statement he made, to come out and retract." But the indecency seems to be Mr. Spaulding's rather than Twain's. For Mr. Spaulding alludes to Twain's criticism of a certain missionary in China,

who was reported to have said that he had collected as compensation from Chinese for damages to missionary property done by Boxers, 13 times the amount of the damages, without regard to the question of whether or not those whom he intimidated into payment, had done the injury. The amount proved to be a cable error. What the missionary had said was not 13 times but 1 1-3 times. Mr. Spaulding implies that Twain had not the decency to retract when the error was shown him. But he had. He did retract. His retraction is unequivocal, full and complete. It is published in the April number of the North American Review, and makes spicy reading. What hurts Mr. Spaulding, doubtless, is not Mark's refusal to retract. It couldn't be, since he didn't refuse. But he went beyond a retraction, and inquired with great particularity and embarrassing pertinacity, first, by what right in law or morals the missionary collected anything from men who had done no injury, and, second, what the moral or religious difference is between an extortion of 12 times in excess of actual damage and an extortion of one-third in excess. Mr. Spaulding might give greater satisfaction by answering these inquiries than by denouncing Mark Twain as indecent, poorly bred and low born.

In reporting from newspaper sources the action of the Maryland legislature on the Australian land tax reform proposed in that body (page 3), we were misled as to some of the facts. Upon the authority of Jackson H. Ralston, a well-known Washington lawyer and resident of Maryland, we are now able to explain that—

at the last regular session of the legislature, a bill providing for a constitutional amendment, permitting home rule in taxation (in other words, allowing land value taxation) was introduced by Mr. Bryan, state senator from Baltimore city, a democrat; was unanimously reported by the committee on constitutional amendments, having a democratic majority; passed the senate unanimously; was unanimously reported favorably in the house by another committee, having a democratic majority; and finally was overwhelmingly defeated on the third reading by the votes of both democrats and republicans, the only supporters being democrats. At the special session, just adjourned, a resolution providing for the appointment of three hold-over senators to investigate the subject was introduced by Mr. Hubner, a democrat; was unfavorably reported, and was finally defeated, principally upon the plea that although the resolution provided otherwise, the state would be subjected to expense in connection with the operations of such committee.

After observing that "from this brief history no partisan inference can be drawn one way or the other, although it is probable that upon the final extra session vote, the democratic majority may have been against the resolution," Mr. Ralston makes the following statement and suggestion:

Since the adjournment of the special session, a number of us have written to the bureau of labor statistics, presided over by a democrat, and are promised that that body will immediately enter into an investigation of the subject and report to the next legislature. We suggest that throughout the states of the union persons interested in tax reform pursue a similar course toward their respective labor bureaus.

Further public steps toward the organization of a white man's republican party in the south, under the patronage of President McKinley, have been taken since our remarks upon that subject last week. Senator McLaurin, nominally a democrat but really a McKinley republican, delivered a speech in Charlotte, N. C., on the 18th, in which he virtually and almost expressly severed his relations with the democratic party. He has since denied that he intended to renounce allegiance to the democracy. He proposes, he says, to work "within democratic lines." But as he intends to support President McKinley's "expansion" and plutocratic policy, his working within democratic lines is a species of political Funstonism, which all the more justifies Senator Tillman's open charge that McLaurin has neither conscience nor principles. Despite his disclaimer, however, the subsequent report of his conference at Washington with Senator Hanna was not necessary to confirm the growing conviction of those who have observed his reeling political career that he is promoting the administration's plans for dropping the negroes of the south and organizing the aristocrats as republicans. These gentlemen may be building better than they know. Such a republican party would doubtless result in splitting the negroes as well as the whites, and that would in a little time, in the very nature of things, remove the race question from southern politics in the only way in which it can be removed permanently—by securing equality of political rights to all.

In the interest of the American export trade, Mr. O. P. Austin, chief of the bureau of treasury statistics at Washington, makes a unique proposition. He suggests a "floating exposition," consisting of a fleet of vessels loaded with samples of American products, including manufactures, to go "from port to port and continent to continent," exhibiting its variegated cargoes to the buyers of the world. The idea is excellent. As Mr. Austin says in support of his suggestion, "the imports of Asia, Oceania, Africa and the American countries south of the United States amount to $2,000,000,000 every year," and consist almost entirely of the class of goods which this country has to sell; "yet our sales to those grand divisions in the best year of our commerce, 1900, only amounted to about $200,000,000, or ten per cent. of their purchases." It is his belief that American sales to the people of those parts of the world would be immensely aided by the "floating exposition" he proposes. That might very well be. Moreover, such a fleet would contribute immeasurably more to the peace of the world and good will among men than the destructive

fleets with which nations are accustomed to interchanging courtesies.

Yet there would be no need for organizing a "floating exposition," if we would but open our ports to the foreign products our people wish to buy. Could we import goods freely in exchange for the goods we are so solicitous to export, our merchant marine would revive, and American "floating expositions" in great fleets would reach every continent. Still, the only objection we see to Mr. Austin's suggestion of an organized fleet of this kind is the fact that when our merchants had sold their goods abroad, the American custom house embargo would fine them heavily for the imports they received in exchange for their exports. Why not strengthen his proposition by coupling it with one to abolish the tariff?

Orville T. Bright, county superintendent of schools of Cook county, Ill., complains of the so-called "educational charts" in use in the schools of the country. He says they contain "the greatest lies ever printed." His complaint is just, if the charts are at all like the one which he describes as a sample. "Here is an object lesson," he says, "on a chart supposed to teach commercial arithmetic. It shows the farmer working hard for little money, the mechanic toiling hard for low wages; and opposed to them is a young man with hair parted in the middle selling ribbon over a counter and another young man over his books. The latter two are pictured as enjoying prosperity, the bookkeeper receiving a salary of $2,400 a year—the greatest lies ever printed." But these charts are only vulgar expressions of the good-natured lies with which the ambitions of our school children are stuffed. Examples of "self-made men," or of "the man and the opportunity," are held up to children and young people generally as indications of what education and industry will enable anyone to accomplish. The fact that these men have merely drawn prizes in an industrial lottery in which blanks are to prizes as nine to one, together with the fact that the drawing isn't square, is concealed. This view of life is not only false. It demoralizes the individual, and it puts obstacles in the way of such societary reform as might abolish the industrial lottery.

PETER KROPOTKIN, COMMUNIST-ANARCHIST.

One of the natural laws of verbal expression—natural because it takes account of a characteristic of human nature—discourages the use of words which, however accurate their denotations, have misleading connotations. That law is ignored in our country when Peter Kropotkin is described as a "communist-anarchist."

Though this term denotes his philosophy with more exactness than some other term might, its American connotations are confusing. It states what is true, but it suggests what is false. In this country the term "communist" conveys an impression of immorality, derived from a vulgar tradition regarding the Oneida community, as well as an impression of unrestrained ferocity, derived from newspaper and magazine stories of the Paris commune, while the term "anarchy" suggests a deep-dyed conspiracy for the overthrow of government and the destruction of social order. Yet, in fact, the one is an ideal system of cooperation, and the other is the extreme of the Jeffersonian doctrine that that government is best which governs least.

At its worst, communist-anarchism is an iridescent dream, too irrational for realization, and, even if realized, too, oppressively lovely for human enjoyment. At its best, as its advocates see it, it is a practicable Utopia, where all would willingly work and freely share, where crime would be disreputable and honor and honesty would reign, where peace would prevail and the lion would lie down with the lamb—where, in a word, the highest possibilities of human brotherhood would come true.

Violent measures for removing governmental obstacles in the way of this realization are indeed advocated and promoted by some communist-anarchists. Possibly most of them look forward to a bloody climax to the existing order. But violence as a means of effecting revolutions is not peculiar to them. It has been the accompaniment if not the instrument of all the great revolts against established authority in the world's history. The right or wrong of communist-anarchism must not be judged by this non-characteristic incident. It must be determined by the philosophy and ideals of the agitation. Nor should the fact be overlooked that even the force men among communist-anarchists advocate peaceable measures up to the point at which they claim that government invades their rights as individuals. They peaceably refrain from participating in government, proposing resort to violence only when government attempts by violence to compel their participation. To illustrate, they refuse to vote at elections, and while they are left in freedom in this respect, they would make no violent demonstration against voting; but if government should try by violence to compel them to vote, they would justify resort to forcible resistance. That illustration indicates quite fully the scope of the force idea in communist-anarchism.

It is unfortunate that this sociological movement should have been so named as to foster such radically false notions of its character as prevail. But we are not criticising either the name or those who have adopted it. All revolutionary movements are subject to misapprehension, and every conceivable name has possibilities of being misleading, through its vulgar connotations. So far from criticising, we are trying to point out to those whom the connotations of "communist-anarchist" do mislead, the fact, and what we take to be the chief cause, of their error. The principles involved make the mere question of name a matter of trivial importance. To the principles, then, let us turn.

One of the great scientists of our time, a geographer of acknowledged eminence, Peter Kropotkin, appears before the American people as the leading apostle of communist-an-

archism. He is not alone in prominence in this respect, and within the cult he is not preeminent. But as he does represent the cult correctly, and of all its representatives is best known to and understood by the general public, he may fairly be considered as the world's exponent of the communist-anarchist philosophy and ideals.

At first one would take him to be merely an advocate of local self-government, a civic principle which Americans cannot with good grace oppose. True enough, he does denounce the "state," and here is another cause of misunderstanding. It is due to the common use of that term in America to describe the unit of government in the American system. But Kropotkin does not particularly denounce the state of New York or of Illinois or Ohio. What he means by "state" is better conveyed to the American mind by the term "empire"—a centralized government which reaches out with power into the remotest places and regulates the affairs of localities without the consent of the people affected. American democrats, who, before President Cleveland's centralizing precedent, protested against centralization of power in the federal government, were moved by a similar impulse to that which moves Kropotkin. It is powers of government centralized that he intends to condemn, when he denounces the "state."

He does not condemn government. He would abolish the state, but government he would retain. Apparently recognizing society as an organism, as something which while made by mankind is not organized by men but grows in obedience to natural law, he treats government as one of its instruments. But he observes that there are different kinds of government. "State" or imperial government—"a power placed above society," with "a territorial concentration, and a concentration of many functions of the life of society in the hands of a few or even of all," as he says in his lecture on the historic role of the state—is in his opinion bad; but communal government with federated communes is his ideal.

In defense of this ideal he turns to history. "Throughout the whole history of our civilization," he says in the lecture quoted from above, "two traditions, two opposed tendencies, have been in conflict: the Roman tradition and the popular tradition; the imperial tradition and the federalist tradition; the authoritarian one and the libertarian one. And again, on the eve of the great social revolution, these two traditions stand face to face."

Thus far Kropotkin is not distinguishable from a state rights democrat of the old school in the United States. We do not allude, of course, to the defense of slavery to which state rights democrats were accidentally committed. The resemblance relates to the idea of federated communes. As Kropotkin seems thus far to treat the commune as his governmental unit, so the state rights democrat treated the American state as our governmental unit. And that is the American tradition.

But there is in truth a lesser unit than the state, or province, or kingdom, or whatever in different countries this political division may be called—a unit which the state rights democrat ignored, but which Kropotkin considers. We of this country would distinguish it as the township or the city, and all real believers in self government here now demand that this unit be given full power to govern itself in all matters of local concern. If that were done, and our states and nation were then formed by federations of townships and cities—as our nation is now formed, nominally, by a federation of states—we should realize Kropotkin's theory of a communal federative government.

That is the ideal that gives to communist-anarchism the first half of its name. The other half denotes the non-coercive character of this mode of government. To quote further from the same lecture, Kropotkin says, alluding to the "imperial" and "federalist" currents of history, or, as he also calls them, the "authoritarian" and the "libertarian:"

> **Between these two currents, always full of life, always battling in humanity—the current of the people and the current of the minorities which thirst for political and religious domination—our choice is made. We again take up the current which led men in the twelfth century to organize themselves on the basis of a free understanding, of free initiative of the individual, of free federation of those interested.**

Here we find the ideal. It is individualism within communism. The participation of each individual in communal and federal action—that is his participation in government—is at all times to depend upon his free consent. It is assumed that this would establish individual liberty, as well as communal government, in respect alike to political concerns and economic interests, and so give to the principle of brotherhood full scope and incentive to develop.

Kropotkin is a sociologist of the inductive or historical school.

Though this school professes to have substituted induction from ascertained facts, for deduction from assumed principles, as its mode of sociological inquiry, that is not in reality its distinguishing characteristic. What it really does is to rely for its conclusions upon induction from vast but necessarily incomplete collections of what purport to be historical facts, and to abandon altogether, not only deduction from self-evident moral truths, but also induction from the large and simple and ever present facts of human nature and human environment. We should not unfairly satirize the historical school of sociology if we said that if they were asked whether a man who had fallen overboard in the lake would try to catch hold of a life preserver if it came within reach, they would disregard one of the best known of human instincts, that of self preservation, and reserve their opinions until they had collected a mass of historical data indicating what men have done under similar circumstances; or that, if they were asked whether theft is a social virtue, they would disregard the self-evident moral principle of right as between man and man, and from historical data conclude that in some countries and epochs theft probably is a social virtue while in some it apparently is not.

Of the usefulness of history for advice and warning there is no room for doubt. Guizot was right when he said that "a people who can

understand and act upon the counsels which God has given it, in the past events of its history, is safe in the most dangerous crises of its fate." History, that is to say, is experience at second hand, and is to a people what personal experience is to an individual. It is full of practical lessons.

But when it is used as the sole basis for moral and economic philosophy, history furnishes anything but a solid foundation. Even when its facts are indisputable, which is seldom so, and even if all the pertinent facts were known, which is never so, it would prove at most no more than that under certain historical conditions certain effects follow certain events. It does not prove that the historical conditions are either good or inevitable, nor indicate what would have happened had good instead of evil conditions given the historical impulse. One should as little expect to ascertain the laws of normal social development exclusively from the history of a society reeking with the abominations of special privilege, as to ascertain the laws of normal physical life exclusively from a case of smallpox. Yet this is what the historical school has done. It has become a school in which logical analyses of conditions have been displaced by loose and almost arbitrary classifications of miscellaneous data.

The essential defects of that method are strikingly illustrated by Kropotkin. His sociological thought is extremely superficial. This is no reflection upon his mental powers. It does not imply that he would not be clean cut and profound if his method were provocative of analytical thought. In mechanics it is possible to arrange a device by means of which a light draught animal can lift a load which an elephant couldn't even budge with a different arrangement of tackle. It is so with modes of thought. A command of logical analysis will give depth to naturally shallow thinkers, when the historical method would make profound ones superficial.

In economic thought this superficiality was exhibited markedly by Kropotkin when he spoke on the 21st at Central Music hall, Chicago.

At one point he attributed the value of the Central Music hall to all mankind; not only to the living and the moderns, but to the dead and the ancients.

Now, the value of the site of that hall may in a sense be said to be caused by vast numbers of people who have had nothing whatever to do with erecting or maintaining the building. For the site value represents the premium which it is worth one's while to pay for the use of that scarce kind of site rather than take up with one for which there is no special demand; and the people of Chicago—not the owner of the site, but the people generally—make that kind of site scarce. But Kropotkin didn't mean the site. He meant the building. And his reason for saying that even men who lived long ago contributed to its erection was the fact that the knowledge without which it could not have been erected has been accumulating through the centuries. He believed, accordingly, that the building ought to be common property.

A little reflection should have admonished him that the contributions of the past to the knowledge of the present do not affect the moral and economic title to their products of those who actually do the work of the present. Though they do not originate all the necessary knowledge, they do have to make that knowledge their own by their own labor and study. They do have to acquire skill in its use by their own effort. And with the knowledge so made their own, and the skill so acquired by themselves, they become competent, as otherwise they could not, to erect buildings. The building in question was, therefore, the product of those whose work drew it forth from the storehouses of nature. And if there is any truth at all in the principle of free trade, each worker was morally and economically competent to transfer his undivided interest in that building to others until the entire title had concentrated in one man, who in turn was likewise competent to trade it to another. If anyone thereby gets what he has not earned, it isn't because the title to the building is bad or incomplete; it is because freedom of production and trade is so restricted by governmental interference as to have given him an advantage.

Kropotkin's radical error in this matter consists in his confusion of the body of knowledge, no part of which anyone can utilize without by his own labor making it his own, (injuring no one but rather benefiting all by doing so), with the wealth which the individual laborers who have equipped themselves with that knowledge are able to and do produce.

Another instance. Also in his Chicago speech, Kropotkin drew a picture of a communist-anarchist society. It was made up not only of political but also of economic communities in a complete federation, all resting upon individual consent. To indicate the advantage of this society in one respect, he remarked that he would like to own a telescope, but under the existing order could never hope to do so. Then he explained what he would do if we were living in a communist-anarchist society. He would work five hours a day, say, in his own guild, for the necessaries of life; and to get him a telescope he would join the telescope makers' guild and work extra hours there, for probably a year, when the coveted telescope would be his. Involved in this illustration was the idea that everybody should do some work in handcraft. But its main purpose was politico-economic.

Could any conception be more superficial? Could any suggestion from a sociological and economic thinker to a people accustomed to division of labor and trade be more primitive? If Kropotkin worked overtime at his own trade, he could get a better telescope in less time by swapping with regular telescope makers — or, as in practice would be the case, by putting his products upon the general market and buying a telescope. If this cannot be done now—and truly it cannot—the reason is not because we lack a communist-anarchist society, with its arbitrary methods of ascertaining human wants, and its complex design of federated guilds and communities. It is because the imperial kinds of government we have, and of which Kropotkin justly complains, put obstacles between him and the telescope makers so that they

cannot freely trade. What we need to remedy the evil is not what Kropotkin advocates, but free trade in its fullness.

The same neglect of logical analysis, of clearly distinguishing things that are essentially different, which characterizes Kropotkin's economic thought, also distorts his political philosophy. With his eyes fixed upon the history of governments, he overlooks the fact that there are principles of government which history has ignored. Because history has ignored them he also ignores them. Yet the very name of his philosophy is verbally suggestive of the true key to the whole riddle of government.

Communist-anarchism expresses at once the idea of the community and the idea of the individual. And just as the latter half of the term implies that individual concerns should be independent of government, the former half suggests that common concerns necessitate government. That implication and that suggestion, each correlative to the other, are the very truth. It is a truth, too, which, once perceived, makes political history intelligible, and if applied would relieve Kropotkin's whole social philosophy of its confusions.

As applied to individual concerns, the doctrine of anarchy, or no government, is absolutely sound. Neither one person, nor a large minority, nor a majority however great, has the right to govern any mature and sane man in respect of things that concern him individually.

But there are concerns which are common in their nature. The preservation of the peace is a common concern; so is the prevention of the invasion by one person or set of persons of the rights of others, which is, indeed, a part of the peace question; so is the regulation of land tenure; so is the establishment of highways. These are concerns, so to speak, of the commune, and it is for the commune to regulate them.

How shall the commune do that? There is no rational alternative. It must be done by common consent, of course. No person or clique has a divine commission to administer common affairs. But how is common consent to be ascertained? In the nature of things there is only one way. It must be ascertained by majority vote. To require unanimity regarding communal affairs is to turn over the commune to the rule of the minority, and it may be often of only one person. No aggregation of intelligent individuals would tolerate the despotism which that would involve. But a majority vote furnishes, as a rule, a fair indication of common opinion; and so long as it affects only common affairs and not individual affairs, it cannot even at the worst work substantial harm.

It is not enough, however, to consider only the government of the commune. There are degrees of communal interests, reaching up to the level of what we now understand by international relations. But there would be no difficulty in applying the principle of government here suggested. With the individual as such (that is, in reference to purely individual concerns) wholly outside the coercive operation of all government, the local settlement or commune would be the unit of government, for there would be the point at which common concerns would take their rise. In the line of the principle, whatever affected that settlement exclusively, would be subject exclusively to its control. But wider interests, necessitating federations, would come under the control of all the communes which those wider interests affected. To illustrate with our own familiar political divisions, township government should be absolute in township concerns; county government should have jurisdiction over the larger concerns in which several contiguous townships are involved; state government over the still larger ones; and national government over those that are national or international.

In that principle of classification lies the political truth toward which Kropotkin vaguely reaches out when he rejects the omnipresent and individual-destroying imperial power of the socialist programme, and endeavors to substitute for it a system of no-government, which involves, nevertheless, a communal government of uncertain and not altogether inviting possibilities. Appropriate government for communal affairs on their different levels, and no government for the individual in what concerns him only as an individual, is the communist-anarchism, or communal individualism, which not only deserves acceptance, but is within the possibilities of adoption in this country. The trend toward it is indicated by the growing popularity in various forms, but especally with reference to taxation, of the movement for local self-government.

NEWS

Aguinaldo's address to the Filipinos has been completed and published. It was given out at Manila on the 19th and appeared in the American papers on the 20th. Following is its text:

I believe I am not in error in presuming that the unhappy fate to which my adverse fortune has led me is not a surprise to those who have been familiar with the progress of the war. The lessons taught with a full meaning, and which have recently come to my knowledge, suggest with irresistible force that a complete termination of hostilities and lasting peace are not only desirable, but absolutely essential to the welfare of the Philippine islands.

The Filipinos have never been dismayed at their weakness nor have they faltered in following the path pointed out by their fortitude and courage. The time has come, however, in which they find their advance along this path to be impeded by an irresistible force which, while it restrains them, yet enlightens their minds and opens to them another course, presenting them the cause of peace. This cause has been joyfully embraced by the majority of my fellow-countrymen, who have already united around the glorious sovereign banner of the United States. In this banner they repose their trust and belief that under its protection the Filipino people will attain all those promised liberties which they are beginning to enjoy.

The country has declared unmistakably in favor of peace. So be it. There has been enough blood, enough tears and enough desolation. This wish cannot be ignored by the men still in arms if they are animated by a desire to serve our noble people, which has thus clearly manifested its will. So do I respect this will, now that it is known to me.

After mature deliberation I resolutely proclaim to the world that I cannot refuse to heed the voice of a

people longing for peace, nor the lamentations of thousands of families yearning to see their dear ones enjoying the liberty and the promised generosity of the great American nation.

By acknowledging and accepting the sovereignty of the United States throughout the Philippine archipelago, as I now do, and without any reservation whatsover, I believe that I am serving thee, my beloved country. May happiness be thine.

On the day following the promulgation of his address, Aguinaldo was removed from his prison in the Molaconang palace to a private residence, though he is still held under military restraint, and on the 21st the newspaper correspondents were for the first time allowed to interview him. Before these interviews were permitted, the Associated press reporter described the circumstances of the address, deriving his information evidently from American military sources. He said that—

Aguinaldo composed his address without assistance. The original draft was in Tagalog. It was afterwards translated into Spanish. It is believed Aguinaldo is sincerely desirous of peace. He is not an educated man, but is possessed of considerable character and improves on acquaintance. Aguinaldo is not anxious to visit the United States, and it is considered best that he should remain here pending the completion of the work of pacification.

But when the correspondents were admitted to Aguinaldo's presence on the 21st, the representative of the Chicago Tribune, an administration organ, made this report of his visit:

Aguinaldo is still noncommunicative, fearing that if he talks on the situation he will be misrepresented and his position thus jeopardized. He said: "I will make no definite statements on public or private questions until I am familiar with the situation. I am learning English and studying the American government." When asked if he desired to visit the United States, Aguinaldo replied: "Yes, greatly; but I am at the disposition of the authorities."

The Associated press reporter, who also saw Aguinaldo on the 21st, wrote of him:

He was rather reluctant to talk for publication and considered every question carefully before answering. He said he was doing all he could to assist in the pacification of the Philippines, and expressed himself as surprised at what the Americans had accomplished. When he was first captured, he went on to say, he was greatly astonished to find that a majority of the Filipinos entertained the opinion that American sovereignty was preferable to independence, but now he was inclined to believe that way himself. He explained that since the dissolution of the insurgent congress and the declaration of guerrilla warfare the chiefs had operated to all intents and purposes independently. They recognized him as commander in chief, sending him reports occasionally, and he issued some orders; but for the last seven months communication had been difficult and he had been almost disconnected. "I am now urging in the strongest possible manner," said Aguinaldo, "that all insurgents should surrender and swear allegiance to the United States." . . . . When questioned regarding the report that he would visit the United States he replied that he would like to do so, but had made no plans as yet, placing himself entirely at the disposition of the United States government. In concluding the interview, he observed: "Every word in my address to my countrymen, the Filipinos, came from my heart. I hope the Americans believe me thoroughly sincere in my efforts to secure peace, and, under American auspices, to promote the welfare and prosperity of the Philippines."

In considering the value of these interviews, it must not be forgotten that Aguinaldo is under the disabilities of a military prisoner, and that the reporters are subject to military censorship.

The Chicago Tribune correspondent's interview, the first given by Aguinaldo, comprises some information of historical interest, which for that reason we reproduce:

He said: "I was often close to the Americans. I expected to make my greatest stand at Calumpit. When I abandoned Tarlac I commanded 1,500 riflemen. I anticipated Gen. Wheaton's landing at San Fabian. I planned to retreat to Nueva Vizcaya, but was frustrated by the brave Gen. Lawton. I slipped through the cordon with 250 men only four hours before the landing party came ashore." In response to a question concerning his opinion of the American troops, he said: "How terrible are the Americans. They are splendid and ferocious fighters. I no sooner built arsenals and barracks than they destroyed them. Col. Marsh chased me in the most lively manner for two months in the western mountains until I worked eastward with 30 horses and 80 men. I crossed the Cagayan and lived on the east coast for eight months. My outposts often saw the Americans, but I did not participate in a single engagement, though I once commanded 40,000 riflemen. The watchfulness of the army and navy practically destroyed filibustering to Luzon."

Civil organization in the Philippines under the president's commission continues, with the usual appointment of natives as local presidents or governors and of American army officers as local treasurers. The island of Cebu was reported on the 19th as having been organized, with Juleo Llorente as governor and Capt. Frederick Young, of the Forty-fourth regiment, as treasurer, Maj. James Case, of the same regiment, being appointed supervisor. That the Philippine conflict is regarded by the Washington administration as virtually at an end is indicated by an order of the 18th from Secretary Root to Gen. MacArthur, directing the reduction of the army in the archipelago to 40,000 men. The secretary is reported to have decided also that no more native Filipinos shall be enlisted, and that those already in the American military service shall be mustered out.

American casualties in the Philippines since July 1, 1898, inclusive of the current official reports given out in detail at Washington to April 24, 1901, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91)	1,847
Killed reported from May 16, 1900, to the date of the presidential election, November 6, 1900	100
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period	468
Total deaths to presidential election	2,415
Killed reported since presidential election	36
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period	200
Total deaths	2,651
Wounded since July 1, 1898	2,424
Total casualties since July, '98	5,075
Total casualties to last report	5,044
Total deaths to last report	2,634
Total wounded to last report	2,410

The Cuban commission, which was to have left Havana on the 20th for Washington to confer with President McKinley (p. 24), has undergone a

change of personnel. Senor Berriel resigned and Senor Betancourt was appointed to fill the vacancy. The commission arrived at Jacksonville, Fla., on the 22d, and resumed its journey to Washington on the 23d, reaching that city on the 24th. At Jacksonville, one member, Gen. Portuondo, gave to the press the following outline of Cuba's position:

Ninety-nine per cent. of the Cuban people desire absolute independence. It is their wish that military occupation by the United States come to an end at once. It may be said that a small element of Spaniards from a purely commercial motive favor annexation, but the wish for independence is felt by many Cubans and Spaniards alike. Those Spaniards who favor annexation are not impelled by any love for the United States. They hate Americans, but they seem to wish some sort of guarantee as to their property and business interests. Peace with the Americans without the independence of Cuba is impossible—I mean moral peace. I do not mean to say that in the event independence is not granted war or revolution would follow, but there would be no sympathy, no friendliness between the peoples.

At Washington Gen. Portuondo repeated the foregoing statement, in substance, to the reporters; but beyond that the commission refused to say anything until they should have had their interview with the president, which is set for the 25th.

Gov. Gen. Wood preceded the Cuban commission. He sailed directly for New York on the 20th and reached there on the 23d. In a newspaper interview at New York upon his arrival he denied that the Cuban convention had voted, as heretofore reported (page 10), to reject the Platt amendment. Gen. Wood said:

The constitutional convention has never voted on or rejected the Platt amendment. This I can state positively, notwithstanding the reports to the contrary which have been sent to the United States from Havana. Things have been cabled here which had not the slightest foundation in fact, which described strained relations between the representatives of the United States and those of the Cuban people. Everything has been harmonious since I went to Cuba and the convention now in session is a thoroughly representative one. Before the Platt amendment was passed by congress the Cubans knew the desires of this government on the issues which the amendment contains, because they were submitted to them through the executive.

Gen. Wood arrived in Washington on the 24th, and went immediately into a close conference with Secretary Root and Senator Platt, of Platt amendment fame, which lasted four hours.

British affairs in connection with the war in South Africa rank with us next in importance to our own colonial problems, and in England they rank first. The dark outlook noted last week was not improved by the submission in parliament on the 18th, by Sir Michael E. Hicks-Beach, chancellor of the exchequer, of the British financial statement or budget. He is reported to have made "a most depressing speech, which sobered both sides of the commons." Here is one of its striking passages:

I aim at no transient popularity. I ask for no cheers, and I expect none. I come to tell the nation the truth and the whole truth. It is necessary for the salvation of the nation that I should do so. You have had your feast. You have all, liberals and tories, been mad for rioting and expenditure. Now comes the reckoning, and you may laugh or not as you please.

The budget disclosed the stunning fact that the South African war has cost Great Britain $775,000,000—twice the cost of the Crimean war. The total estimated expenditure for the present year was put at $661,275,000, which would leave a deficit of about $275,000,000. To meet this deficit the chancellor proposed an increase of the income tax from a shilling to 14 pence in the pound, it being assumed that the extra two pence would yield $19,000,000. And inasmuch as, to use his language, a "public necessity has arisen for some duty of which the laboring classes should bear a fair share," the chancellor proposed to tax sugar, hoping to realize therefrom $25,500,000. Another proposed tax, one that has not been known in England for 45 years, was one shilling a ton (25 cents) on exports of coal, estimated to yield $10,500,000. From the aggregate of this new taxation, therefore, an additional revenue of $55,000,000 was expected. With the aid of this additional income, supplemented by reductions in expenditures, the chancellor reduced his estimated deficit from $275,000,000 to $204,785,000; and in order to provide for that and certain other financial needs he asked power to borrow $300,000,000. After the budget had been briefly discussed, Mr. Balfour, first lord of the treasury, moved a division of the house on the proposed sugar duties, and they were imposed by a vote of 183 to 125. The proposed export duty on coal was then adopted by a vote of 171 to 127. At a subsequent session the loan of $300,000,000 was authorized.

There are various reports of sporadic fighting in South Africa, but none of any important moment.

NEWS NOTES.

—The bishop of Oxford, Right Rev. William Stubbs, D. D., died on the 22d at the age of 76.

—Coal deposits have been discovered in Iceland which appear to be the largest in the world.

—William J. Bryan lectured on the 24th before the Catholic Woman's National league, at Handel hall, Chicago, on "Civilization."

—A British military force in West Africa is reported on the 24th from London as having completed a successful campaign against the slave-trading emirs in northern Nigeria.

—The Texas bill to allow towns and cities to exempt personal property and improvements from taxation passed the lower house, but was not reached in the senate before adjournment.

—An active movement has been set on foot by Harvard graduates in opposition to the proposed action of the university in conferring upon President McKinley the honorary degree of LL. D.

—Prof. Frederick Starr, the anthropologist of the University of Chicago, has just returned from Mexico, where he has been for the past four months completing his studies of the Pueblo Indian.

—The "Greater New York Democracy" was formed on the 18th to oppose the election of any candidates at the municipal election next autumn who may be nominated by Tammany Hall.

—Kropotkin, the Russian exile, famous geographer and distinguished communist-anarchist, lectured on the 21st at Central Music hall, Chicago, on the philosophy and ideals of communist-anarchism.

—Dr. Walter C. Browning, of Philadelphia, has rendered to the Chris L. Magee estate a bill for $190,000 for

medical services for a period of 21 months. The charges itemized are at the rate of $80 an hour.

—An Atlanta judge refused on the 20th to approve a charter for a Christian Science institution for the treatment of disease, holding that no person has the right to treat disease in Georgia unless he is a regularly licensed medical practitioner.

—It is reported from London that the Russian tsar contemplates issuing invitations to the civilized nations to be represented at a congress for the further consideration of the measures for permanent peace that occupied the attention of the peace congress at The Hague.

—A new Chilean ministry was appointed on the 21st. The conservative ministry had been forced out of office and a liberal ministry organized; but the latter did not suit a majority of the liberals in congress, and they passed a resolution of want of confidence, pursuant to which the liberal ministry resigned. The ministry just appointed takes their place, the new premier being Anibal Zanartu.

—The Ohio state board of equalization has increased the tax valuation of Cleveland from $126,905,410 to $150,631,762. The Cleveland chamber of commerce had entertained the board at considerable expense to exert an influence against the increase, but Mayor Johnson in addressing them declared that the valuation ought to be increased 50 per cent., and they have about split the difference by increasing it nearly 25 per cent.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States for March, as given by the March treasury sheet, were as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold, and S for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M	$124,975,744	$75,949,088	$49,026,656 exp
G	490,269	2,487,019	1,996,750 imp
S	5,150,186	2.731,733	2,418,453 exp
	$130,616,199	$81,167,840	$49,448,359 exp

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1900, to and including March 31, 1901, as given by the treasury reports, were as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold, and S for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M ...	$1,140,170,728	$599,483,391	$540,687,337 exp
G ...	32,822,191	58,755,136	25,912,945 imp
S	50,370,852	29,361,795	21,009,057 exp
	$1,223,363,771	$687,580,322	$535,783,449 exp

—Extraordinary wind and snowstorms for this season of the year have prevailed in the Ohio valley. Two feet of snow fell at Akron, and at Youngstown a foot; at Cleveland the snowstorm was the worst of the year, with the wind blowing at the rate of 60 miles an hour; the snow fall was two feet deep on the level and from six to ten feet in drifts at places in Kentucky, West Virginia and western Pennsylvania; telegraph communication between the west and the east was cut off, and railroad trains were blocked. Along the Ohio river the country was flooded by extraordinary high water, and many cities threatened. The storm occurred on the 20th.

MISCELLANY

IMPERIALISM.

For The Public.

We've whited all the sepulchers—now fling
the paint-brush by;
We've trained the roses o'er the wall—they
laugh into the sky;
Around the gilded charnel house the golden-rod grows high,
And in the shadow of the tomb the violets
bloom—and die.

Amid the rose and lily bloom our children
laugh and play,
And by the foetid charnel house their baby
hearts are gay;
But through the lattice of the vines creeps
out the black plague's breath,
And where the roses fall away looks out—
the face of death!

Now, gather all the little ones within the
garden bloom,
And heap the rose-leaves 'round the walls
that hide the loathsome gloom;
And though within that veiled gloom we
see the death's-head grin—
Oh, call the babies 'round us, and bequeath
them that within!

VIRGINIA M. BUTTERFIELD.

OUR PLEDGE TO CUBA.

An extract from the speech delivered by the Hon. Wm. Sulzer, of New York, in the House of Representatives, on March 1, 1901. Reprinted from the Congressional Record.

We patriotically proclaimed that the war was to be waged for liberty, for freedom, and for humanity, and called all the world to witness our noble intentions and our undying devotion to the fundamental tenets of the fathers as embodied in the immortal declaration of independence. As proof of this let me read and again put in the Record the resolution of congress declaring war against Spain, approved by the president on the 20th day of April 1898:

Joint resolution for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the Island of Cuba, and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the president of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect.

Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the Island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battleship with 266 of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Habana, and cannot longer be endured, as has been set forth by the president of the United States in his message to congress of April 11, 1898, upon which the action of congress was invited; therefore,

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, First. That the people of the Island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the government of the United States does hereby demand, that the government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the Island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the president of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several states, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

THOMAS B. REED,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
GARRET A HOBART,
Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate.
Approved April 20, 1898.
WILLIAM M'KINLEY.

There is nothing doubtful, nothing ambiguous about that resolution. It pledged the sacred honor of the government and the solemn word of our people to drive Spain from Cuba; declared that the Cubans are, and of right ought to be, free and independent, and disclaimed any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island. The question is, it seems to me: Shall we keep our word or break it? Shall we live up to our sacred promise or abjectly stultify ourselves in order that personal pelf may follow political perfidy?

Let us be honest. We must not forget. We should keep our word. We should fulfill the letetr and the spirit of the promise. We should do our duty and give the Cubans absolute freedom and independence. There should be no conditions. Any different policy now, any deviation from our promise of three years ago, will be national dishonor and a stultification that must bring to the cheek of every honest American the blush of shame. Shall the plighted faith of the nation be kept?

MAYOR JOHNSON AS INTERVIEWED BY CREELMAN.

An interview with Hon. Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland, as reported under date of Cleveland, O., April 15, by Jas. Creelman for the New York Journal of April 16.

With the second desperate struggle for the control of Greater New York impending, New Yorkers have seen Tom Johnson take possession of the mayor's office in Cleveland with such moral rage and such reckless disregard of political theories that this seventh city of the nation has suddenly been turned into a laboratory for the working out of great municipal problems.

The new mayor has arrested the attention of the whole country by the sudden stroke through which he seized his office, just in time to prevent his predecessor from signing away a large part of the lake front to a railway company.

He has ordered dangerous buildings torn down, has set policemen at the doors of immoral dens and has begun to organize a department of the city government for the equalization of taxes—a system that will make the franchise owners bear their just share of the burdens of taxation.

He has gone at the public problems of this great and rich city as Grover Cleveland attacked the political corruption of Buffalo, but he goes deeper than Mr. Cleveland ever went.

I saw Mayor Johnson when he arrived at his office this morning—a burly, rosy-cheeked, curly-haired, hazel-eyed man, who forced his way through the picturesque crowd that was massed in the shadowy corridors and ante-room, nodding, shaking hands, smiling, but moving straight on to his desk like a man who had work to do and would not be delayed.

Words can hardly express the sense of energy conveyed by the personality of this extraordinary man, yet nature has given him the plump, laughing, unwrinkled aspect of an ease lover. For all that his good-natured, round figure and jolly face show, he might be an amiable, lazy, mediaeval abbot spending most of his time sprawled out at the table.

But when he dropped into his swinging chair before his desk and whirled this way and that to make decisions or give directions his countenance took on an expression of power, alertness and determination which is not easy to describe.

Those who have seen Tom Johnson in evening dress in the Waldorf-Astoria lolling about among the cushions have wondered how a man apparently consecrated by nature to caressing indolence could have risen in a few years from poverty to great wealth. But if they had seen Mr. Johnson as I saw him this morning in the mayor's office in Cleveland they would have recognized the terrific industry and dominating personality which has made the world a level road for him. He has the mind of an idealist, in the body of an ox.

"What would I do if I were mayor of New York? But I am not mayor of New York. I am mayor of Cleveland. My work is here."

Mr. Johnson smiled and showed two rows of sound white teeth. His strong fingers played with a red cornelian seal hanging on his watch chain.

"I am not a reformer," he said. "I dislike that word. It suggests a crablike motion to me. It is identified with backward movement. I don't want to be known as a reformer. I want to see progress made in our cities—real progress, not sham reform.

"What is true of Cleveland is generally true of New York. The two great steps which are necessary now lead to the public ownership of municipal monopolies and the equalization of taxes. Vice in our great cities is largely the result of injustice, of involuntary poverty, the product of unequal conditions.

"The worst evils of municipal government and municipal politics are due to the struggle for valuable public franchises. That is the main source of corruption. When we have put the street railway companies and other private owners of municipal monopolies out of politics we have solved one of the most tremendous problems of city government.

"So long as you continue to grant these valuable franchises to private companies the companies will remain in politics, and will, as a rule, control politics for their own ends. That is the trouble in New York and Cleveland to-day. If I were mayor of New York instead of Cleveland I would urge the passage of a law providing for a three-cent fare on all street and elevated railways, just as I am determined to secure that system here.

"But that is only a step toward the real thing—the public ownership of street railways."

Mayor Johnson stood up, walked to the window and pointed to the steel rails of the trolley railway shining down the gray sweep of granite pavement.

"Why should not the city of Cleveland own these streaks of steel as it owns that pavement or the water pipes under it? Why should Cleveland or New York vote away monopolies based on the right to use the streets?

"You say that the army of street railway employes would be used in politics, would work to keep some party in power."

Mr. Johnson laughed and slapped his knee.

"And you think the street railway systems are not in politics now? It is extraordinary to see how little penetration the public has. Now I have built, owned and managed street railways on a pretty big scale. That is a subject I can fairly claim acquaintance with. I know the inside of it and the outside of it.

"And I can tell the people of New York, as I tell the people of Cleveland, that the street railways keep their power simply by being in politics.

"They are at the bottom of municipal politics. If they are willing to spend vast sums every year to keep their monopolies, they are bound to stimulate a struggle for office for the sake of the rich spoils they offer. The worst element in politics will fight harder than the best element to get positions which will give them a chance to share in the plunder.

"I don't lay the blame on the poor, corrupt aldermen or on the street railways. They are simply the victims of custom and habit. I blame the system which offers monopolies as prizes for corrupt politics.

"This system invites corruption and paralyzes progress. Let any citizen of New York or Cleveland look at the matter thoughtfully and he must see that the great cities will never free their elections and their governments from the prime source of corruption until they own their own street railways, and all other monopolies founded on public grants.

"It is a waste of time to talk about corruption in the police force, or corruption in the board of aldermen, while we ignore the all-moving power which dominates and demoralizes municipal politics.

"Of course you will have corruption, of course you will have official incompetency and official cowardice, until you remove from politics altogether the struggle for private ownership of public franchises. That is the overwhelming issue in municipal politics to-day.

"If I were mayor of New York I would work to have the street rail-

ways and all other owners of city monopolies pay taxes on the full value of their property. That is what I want done here in Cleveland. Tax the possessions of the street railway companies on the basis of the selling value of their stock.

"That is a fair and businesslike proposition. The street railway companies of Cleveland refused a value of $29,000,000. They pay taxes only on a valuation of $2,000,000. The other street railways pay taxes on about three per cent. of their value.

"But small property owners have to pay taxes on 50, 60, 80 and 90 per cent. of the value of their property."

"I tell you that, if I were mayor of New York, I would use my power and influence to change the system of assessing taxes. I would have a public court to equalize taxes. I would have the tax assessors present their figures in court, in the presence of the public.

"I would have large wall maps in each case showing the location of the property assessed, and giving the value of the surrounding property in bold, plain figures, so that the members of the court and the public could see at a glance whether there was any apparent discrepancy in the assessed values. I would not allow assessments to be fixed in secret.

"I would make the process as public as possible, so that favoritism would be detected instantly. And I would have the system of valuing property for taxation a continuous one, raising or lowering values, according to the changes of circumstances and conditions. I would abolish the present plan of fixing values at certain periods, or in certain years, and keeping them without change.

"If the owners of great estates and the street railway companies were to be compelled by such a system to pay their fair share of taxes as poorer owners of small dwellings and owners of tenement houses are forced to pay, the tax rate of New York would be reduced one-half.

"This is a practical matter, not a mere doctrine. It squares with business principles. It is just and reasonable. The taxpayers and the rent payers of New York have a tremendous stake in this question, for it lies at the very root of municipal evils. When New York owns her own street railways and other city monopolies, and when the publicity attending the equalization of taxes makes the big property owner pay at the same rate imposed on the small property owner, not only will taxes be lower and rents lower, but local politics will be freed from the principal incentive to corruption—corruption that eats into parties and primaries as well as into sworn officials."

The mayor walked up and down the room with his hands locked behind him. The "high rollers" of the Waldorf-Astoria would not have recognized Tom Johnson, the rosy sybarite, in this serious, stern-mouthed man.

"All this can be accomplished in a year, if the people of New York are in earnest about it," he said. "This question of cities is the greatest practical question of the time. It is pressing for a remedy and the remedy is plain.

"Take the Brooklyn Bridge company. It has been owned and operated, not by one, but by two cities. Yet, notwithstanding the admittedly rotten element in New York and Brooklyn municipal affairs, that railway, under Superintendent Martin's management, has been the best and cheapest railway in the world.

"No one has ever accused the employes of the Brooklyn Bridge railway of using their positions for political purposes. There, right in the heart of the Greater New York, you have a perfect and practical illustration of the great principle for which New Yorkers should fight night and day.

"In my opinion the people of New York will be fools if they let the state legislature take away from them the right to manage their own affairs. They should resist all charters and all legislation which interferes with home rule, and they should fight for three-cent railway fares and public and continuous equalization of taxes as the first step toward the public ownership of monopolies. That is progress. That is common sense."

As the mayor ceased speaking the door of his office was opened and a river of office seekers rolled in. But the mayor turned his back on them and went to work at his desk.

"We must take up this question of clear sidewalks to-day," he said to his secretary. "Things must move."

The widow is gathering nettles for her children's dinner; a perfumed seigneur, delicately lounging in the Oeil-de-Boeuf, has an alchemy whereby he will extract from her the third nettle, and name it Rent and Law; such an arrangement must end. Ought it not?—Thomas Carlyle, French Revolution (Book 6, Chapter 3).

ONE CODE OF MORALITY.

THE LAW WHICH BINDS THE INDIVIDUAL ALSO BINDS THE NATION.

A speech delivered by Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of the Vine Street Congregational church of Cincinnati, at the Manhattan Single Tax club's dinner in honor of Thomas Jefferson, held in New York on the evening of April 13.

In a letter to James Madison, Thomas Jefferson used these words:

I know of but one code of morality for men, whether acting singly or collectively. He who says I will be a rogue when I act in company with a hundred others, but an honest man when I act alone, will be believed in the former assertion, but not in the latter.

If Thomas Jefferson could know the drift of our national life to-day, and if he could return to give us a word of counsel, I believe he would improve the opportunity by solemnly reminding us that there is not one code of morality for individuals and another for nations.

If this is a Christian civilization, if we are not a nation of atheists, we must hold that there can be no enduring progress or prosperity which is not founded on righteousness, and that righteousness alone exalteth a nation. And national righteousness is nothing at all but an empty phrase if it is not what Thomas Jefferson said it was. National righteousness is the recognition, in the conduct of public affairs, of the same code of morality which men universally agree to be binding on them in their private life.

We hear much about the nation's duty. If a nation has duties, it must also have a conscience, a moral code, and must distinguish between right and wrong.

But, while the word duty is a good one for the politician to conjure with, we submit that it is often used to-day as a blind by which to win the support of well-meaning people to policies which are immoral, and which it is their duty to shun. In order to do this, another doctrine of national duty is taught, quite the reverse of the teaching of Jefferson. It is taught that the nation is under no moral obligation to respect that code of morality which is binding upon the individual. This doctrine, stated or implied, lies at the foundation of the gospel of imperialism. A prominent preacher in the west was more honest than politic when he boldly stated and defended this double standard of morality.

"The individualist," says this preacher, "has no category of national conduct except his own individual conscience. * * * Because

the individual has no right to murder he thinks the nation has no right to slay."

Well, then, if those simple precepts of morality accepted by the individual conscience are not binding on the nation, what code of morality is binding? Jefferson knew no other code. In truth, there is no other code. Instead of suggesting any other code to take the place of the code of the individual conscience, the imperialist takes refuge in a cloud of words. To quote again from this preacher, the nation is not to be guided by that contracted code of morality which is sufficient for the individual, but it is to be guided by what he calls "inspirations," which, he says, "are set above the grammar of common ethics and make an ethics of their own."

But we are not satisfied with rhetoric. We want to know what these "inspirations" are which are so much above the grammar of common ethics that they make an ethics of their own. Pressed for an explanation, he tells us: "The best policy for a state is that which its own life exfigures."

Now, suppose Sambo were to invade this preacher's henroost. The preacher, discovering him, undertakes to preach Sambo a sermon on the text, "Thou shalt not steal." The preacher quotes Scripture to him, reasons with him, appeals to his sense of justice, but all in vain. Sambo meets every argument with the preacher's own phrases. He says he does not recognize the law, Thou shalt not steal. He insists that his code does not say anything about stealing. He declares, with an air of mystery, that he is guided by inspirations which are quite above the grammar of common ethics. In justification of his act he pleads his appetite for chickens and tells the preacher he always follows the course which his own life exfigures.

In other words, those who cast aside the moral code of the individual as inapplicable to the nation put nothing but empty phrases in its place. Gloss it over as they may, their real teaching is that in the conduct of the national affairs all moral obligations may be repudiated. With them the phrase national duty means no more than the term destiny. It means, as Lowell says, "National recklessness as to right or wrong."

What then shall we say of the politician who urges us as citizens to violate what as individuals we recognize as the most sacred principles of morality? What shall we say when with air of Omniscience he tells us that it is the manifest destiny of the nation to abandon the path of honor and justice?

When in defense of this national immorality he invokes the names of duty and of God we must say of him in words that were once applied to Philip II. of Spain: "His unctuous piety only adds to the abhorrence with which we regard him." And what are those preachers who make common cause with the politicians in their efforts to dull those simple moral perceptions without which there can be no public morality—what are they but blind leaders of the blind, who bless the things that curse mankind and curse men with their blessings?

It is true that a nation has peculiar functions to perform, but in the performance of those functions there is no code of morals to guide it but the code which the individual should follow in his private life. It is expedient for individuals to delegate certain activities to their public servants, but, just as these individuals can delegate no powers but their own, so they can delegate no moral code but their own. It is wrong for the nation to do what, in case there were no government, it would not be right for the individual to do. It is wrong for individual citizens to allow their public servants to do for them what they would not feel justified in doing for themselves if there were no government. National righteousness means that or nothing.

I learned at the feet of Henry George that philosophy of social reform which teaches that if men will seek first the kingdom of righteousness, all the blessings of a just social order will be added unto them. But this does not mean that social improvement will follow that kind of preaching which applies the moral code to the private life only. It means that individuals cannot hope to enjoy the blessings of a just social order until they awake to the necessity of making their public acts as moral as their private life; until the legislative and administrative acts of their governments are just and right. It is a fact that men who are irreproachable in their private life may vote for policies which are infamous. This is because they have not been taught that to be truly moral and to do their full duty to their fellow man they must see to it that they are as just in the capacity of citizens as they are as fathers and neighbors.

"Thou shalt not steal." The law does not say thou shalt not be caught stealing a little. It does not say some allowance should be made in favor of the man who steals a respectably large amount. It does not say: "Thou shalt not steal contrary to the laws of the state." There are respectable ways of stealing and ways that are not respectable. There are illegal ways of stealing and ways that are perfectly legal. We generally want to know how much a man steals and how he steals it before we decide whether to send him to the penitentiary or the senate. If clergymen had preached as many sermons about the thieves in the halls of legislation as they have preached about the poor thieves on the cross there would be some lawmakers on the cross, fewer thieves making laws, more men in the pulpit and better citizens in the churches.

How can the preacher feel that he is teaching a morality that meets the needs of modern life who does not remind men that by far the greater part of the thieving in this world is carried on under the protection of the unjust laws of the state by which forms of robbery have been legalized?

Here in the Astor tenements a few years ago 43 families were found huddled together in rooms intended for 16 families. Women were sewing there for 30 cents a day. From a fourth to a third of this income went to pay rent. I tell you it was these people who equipped the Astor battery which was sent to Cuba. It is the wealth of these people which is represented in the private yachts that go lolling about the summer resorts with their idle crews. It is the wealth of these people which is paraded on the avenues where ladies give dinner parties to their lap dogs. The wine that flows at the banquets of Dives is crimson with the blood of these wretches who pay the rich man's taxes, make his clothes, prepare his feed, furnish his house, nurse his children and dig his grave, all for the boon of living upon the land which they have by their common labor made valuable, and which belongs to them by every law under Heaven save the law which man in his blindness has made.

Whenever one man is permitted to get something for nothing, another man is compelled to take nothing for something. "Thou shalt not steal!" Does that mean merely that we shall not pick one another's pockets? Does it not mean, also, that we are not to put laws on the statute books that en-

able some to get wealth which they have not earned, and which, therefore, deprive others of wealth which they have earned? How can there be any sound public morality which does not recognize the immorality of our tariff laws, land laws and laws protecting the ownership of the great monopolies? The wealth which by such laws is filched from the world's workers is like the insignificant mountain streams. From every cottage in the land these streams flow in such threads at first as scarcely attract attention, but from these beginnings comes the power of the raging river of wealth whose banks are strewn with the wrecks of homes and whose torrents toy with their helpless victims.

Every unjust law on our statute books is a link in the chain of the industrial slave. There is no social salvation except in an enlightened social conscience which acknowledges the same code of morality for public as for private life.

"Thou shalt not kill!" The preacher sneers at the man who is bigoted enough to suppose that because he may not murder, therefore the nation may not slay. I submit that unless the command is as binding upon the nation as upon the individual there is no moral code to guide the nation and no moral restraint to be put upon the rule of force and greed. On what principles can the nation ever be justified in taking life except the principle that would justify the individual in taking life in case there were no government? If the government takes life under any other circumstances it commits murder, and the blood is upon those who teach that a nation may slay at will.

If a highwayman makes an attack upon my life I am justified in taking his life, if necessary, to protect my own. Upon that principle, and upon no other, is a nation ever justified in shedding human blood. It may be that the doctrine of non-resistance is even higher than this. It may be that I should so shrink from violence as to prefer to lose my own rather than to take the life of another. I will not now discuss that. But certainly that common code of morality would not justify me in taking life unless it were necessary to save my own from violence. If there is any justification for capital punishment, it can only be on the ground that public servants are required to do what, without the government, each individual would have the right to do for himself, namely, to protect himself from murderous attack. We may equip armies to resist criminal aggression when the life of the nation is attacked. But when a nation fights not for its own homes, but for the homes of others; when a nation fights, not to maintain the integrity of its own national life, but to rob others of their nationality, that is murder, and, as for myself, I feel that I cannot encourage my country in such a course without putting the mark of Cain upon my own brow.

If the purchase of one man is a crime, what is the moral code which makes the purchase of ten million men a virtue? My neighbor is a Catholic. Have I a right to go into his house and kill him because he will not turn Protestant? If I may not kill men because they will not accept my views of religion, whence comes my right to equip armies and slay my brothers because they will not accept my views of government? "Go ye into all the world and shoot the Gospel into every creature," is the imperialist version of the gospel of the Nazarene.

Last summer, in Chicago, at high noon, a man was dragged from Van Buren street into an alley and murdered for $33. Are we horrified when a man is murdered for $33 by the uncouth robbers of the slums, and yet do we share in the guilt of a public policy which murders by tens of thousands for gold fields or for islands, for the expansion of a dishonest trade or the glory of a dishonored flag?

I read a book the other day written by one of the professors in your Columbia university. It reminds me of a remark by Wendell Phillips when he was asked why there was so much learning in Cambridge. His reply was that nobody ever took any away. The Columbia professor, in a chapter on the present colonial policy of the nation, did not attempt to justify the morality of it, but held that it was something that all nations had done, and that this nation was bound to do it, and he told the obstructionists that they were foolish to trouble themselves to denounce the immorality of a course that was inevitable. The subtle atheism of that advice was concealed, of course, beneath a profusion of words. You would have supposed that the professor stood close to the throne of Omniscience, that he was gifted with a knowledge of coming events more than ordinary mortals, that he was such an intimate of the Deity that he could with perfect safety set aside the common perception of morality to be guided by considerations of what he and the Almighty knew was going to be rather than by what his own heart told him ought to be!

I have read upon the crumbling walls of the cities of the dead the moral of the centuries, that when the ship of faith is not guided by faith in eternal justice its manifest destiny is to drift to its destruction. The American farmer may yet lean upon his hoe with the emptiness of the European peasant in his face. New York and San Francisco may go the way of London and Paris, Madrid and Constantinople, Nineveh and Babylon. This always has been and always must be until some nation proves her claim to immortality by putting justice on the throne to administer the laws of nature.

The tissue of the life to be
We weave with colors all our own,
And in the field of destiny
We reap as we have sown.

Possibly the professor is right. It may be inevitable that America should learn to her sorrow that standing armies stand first upon the backs of the common people and then trample upon their liberties. But what the future has in store is no business of mine. I had rather go down before the forces that lead my country to destruction than mount upon the ruins of her fortune.

THE EVIL THAT GOOD MEN DO.

Has it occurred to you that about all the serious harm ever done in this cool world has been done by the Good People? It is the historic fact.

Not the little, ephemeral personalities like sneakthieving, murder and the benevolent assimilation of a neighbor's wife. Acts harm the actors. These poor fools harm society no more than a madman kills it when he cuts his own throat. The criminal is absolutely powerless as a factor in evolution. We know him, if only late; and he knows himself. Whether we ever catch him and hang him, counts little. His punishment and his futility are in him and on him, anyhow.

But all the great, long, deep, generic wrongs; all the ignorance and bigotry and oppression in human history—all these have been committed by the Good People.

Who blocked the new message of the Nazarene? The rabble? No, the orthodox. Whom does Christ curse—the brute Roman soldiery? Nay, the Good People. Rabbles do not adjudicate systems of religion—such things are approved or rejected by the religious.

Who stood in the path of Luther's reformation—the slums? No, the church. Who silenced Galileo—the

dunces? No, the scientists. Who made the Spanish inquisition a by-word for cruelty—the bad people? Oh, no! The most pious, orthodox, God-fearing people in Spain. Who hanged witches and flogged Quakers in New England—the riffraff? Not at all; the most virtuous of our Puritan forefathers. The unregenerate do not care enough what another man believes to roast or rack him into orthodoxy; to be so cruel needs men who would die for the faith themselves. Even in our modern version of the inquisition—church heresy trials—it is not the backsliders who play inquisitor.

Who kept negro slavery alive in this country? Not the Legrees (who were few) but the minister of the Gospel who preached and prayed for the "divine institution" of slavery, and proved by the Bible the righteousness of slaveholding; and the orthodox congregations which kept that kind of ministers to do their conscience. Who maintained the war of the rebellion four years and more? The camp followers and "hard cases?" Never! Scoundrels and scrubs are as small a drop in the bucket below Mason and Dixon's line as above it—and it is an abolition Yankee who admits this. That war lived because the sober, home-loving, law-abiding, God-fearing people of the south believed in it. They fought as scrubs never will fight—and they made the scrubs fight, who would have run away as soon as the brute excitement wore off. Only, all these Good People were mistaken.

It is needless to continue the parallel. All history runs the same way. It means something. And the first thing it means is that men can't wholesale their duty. It is a retail business. It means that a majority of the people in any country "mean well;" that they generally start wrong and wind up about right. And their itinerary is so invariably of one method that the student of history knows what to expect. When you see a stolid multitude of Good People; and here and there among them a Good Man arising, with brains in the upper end of him, and disagreeing with the crowd at his proper cost; and the word spreads, and persecution spreads with it—why, then you may reasonably figure that in a year or five years or a generation the crowd will agree with the man who wouldn't agree with the crowd. It works that way—whether it be one golden-rule carpenter against Mosaic Palestine; or one protesting monk against Catholic Europe; or one Puritan against a United States half slaveholding and half consenting to slavery. It doesn't mean that every man who protests is right, any more than that every crowd is right by conforming. But when men with heads and hearts begin to break out for conscience' sake; when they brave their own party, their own social peers—why, then the crowd that thinks by platoons might as well make up its mind to right-about face. For it is going to have to.—Chas. F. Lummis, in The Land of Sunshine.

"LAST SCENE OF ALL."

At first the infant
Doubling his fists and countering on the nurse's jaw,
Then the school-boy with his padded mitts,
Punching the bag and licking all his class.
And then the ranchman, sleeping on the turf,
Living on dried buffalo and knocking down
And sitting on the cowboy! Full of vim
And biting nails in two for fun. Then the soldier,
Scattering great armies with his awful look,
Dashing up hills through deadly showers of lead
And smiling as it were the harmless sport
Of some enchanting summer's holiday.
Next the grim governor defying lobbyists,
Confounding bosses, writing histories
With one hand tied behind him, speaking to
The multitudes in spite of flying rocks
And whirling bricks! Shouting defiance at the tough,
And brandishing his fists full in the bully's face.
And then the hunter, strangling wild beasts,
Tying the mountain lion in a knot
And hurling it across the precipice.
Last scene of all, vice president,
Sitting with nodding head and limbs relaxed,
Hearing the oft-repeated tales
Of isthmian canals and subsidies
And Sampson-Schley affairs—in mere oblivion,
Sans mitts, sans spurs, sans gun, sans—ay, but wait.

—S. E. Kiser, in Chicago Times-Herald.

Now, at last, it was plain the Tiger's pursuers were gaining upon her.

She will certainly be destroyed!

But, no! The great beast has thrown her two cubs to the hunters, and while the latter are dispatching these she makes good her escape in the thicket.

"This," explained our guide, "is the famous Tiger of Tammany, of which you have doubtless heard. She has sacrficed her two cubs, Vice and Corruption, to save herself. Oh, no! it is no trouble for her to raise cubs!"

We asked the guide if the hunters were actuated by a desire to make an end of the Tiger, or by the love of sport, merely; but of this he professed not to know.—Puck.

The Spanish Sugar Planter — He swore that he would carry out his agreement.

His Cuban Partner—But he is an American.

G. T. E.

In India, where women have always been drudges, the deference paid by Englishmen to ladies is always a matter of curious interest. An educated Mohammedan gentleman was talking to an old resident of the Punjab, who has written on the subject. Said the Mohammedan: "Now that the queen is dead, will you Englishmen take off your hats to ladies?" When told certainly this would be done, and asked why he made the inquiry, he said: "We thought you used to take off your hats to ladies because a lady was the ruler of the country."—Chicago Chronicle.

Judge—You are charged with stealing six turkeys from Col. Smilax. Have you any witnesses?

Rastus—No, sah; you bet I ain't. I doan steal turkeys befo' witnesses, sah. —Chicago Chronicle.

"Oh, father, father!" wailed the beautiful American girl who loved, "why have you forbidden Senor Independez, the noble Cuban, to call on me?"

"Because, my daughter," replied the new-school patriot, sternly, but with a touch of sadness in his voice, "I discovered that he wrote in your autograph album the treasonable sentiment: 'Beware of the man that speaks not the truth.'"

G. T. E.

Wherever the ownership of the soil is so engrossed by a small part of the community that the far larger number are compelled to pay whatever the few may see fit to exact for the privilege of occupying it and cultivating the earth, there is something very like slavery.—Horace Greeley.

But the colony multiplies, while the space still continues the same, the com-

mon rights, the equal inheritance of mankind, are engrossed by the bold and crafty; each field and forest is circumscribed by the landmarks of a jealous master. . . . In the progress from primitive equality to final injustice the steps are silent, the shades are almost imperceptible, and the absolute monopoly is guarded by positive laws and artificial reason.—Edward Gibbon, "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" (Chap. 44, Sec. 2).

BOOK NOTICES.

The "International Geographical Manual of the World" (Chicago: International Globe Company, room 415 Continental National Bank Building. Price $2) is a handy reference pamphlet for geographical purposes. It is made especially valuable by a "flat-globe" which accompanies and is explained by it. Of this "globe" the publishers say that there is no other presentation of the earth's surface so valuable for reference "in reading history, books of travel, discovery, geographical research, monthly periodicals and daily and weekly papers;" and we are inclined to believe that their claim is not extravagant. Though the "globe" is flat, presenting half the earth's surface on one side of a disc and the other half on the other side, yet it is so arranged as to offer nearly if not quite all the advantages of a true globe. Being printed upon flat surfaces the maps cannot, of course, be accurate in relative dimensions. Such advantages as are peculiar to the actual globular form are, therefore, missing. But apart from the inaccuracies that are inseparable from the polyconic projection, which is the one necessarily adopted, this "flat-globe" appears to lack none of the advantages of a globe and to possess some conveniences which all but very large globes lack. Indeed, for purposes of ready reference we find it more convenient than a globe of the same size would be and quite as helpful.

MAGAZINES FOR APRIL.

—Since the suspension of the National Single Taxer, a need has been felt among the followers of Henry George for a periodical publication which would regularly and systematically gather the news of the movement. This need the April number of "Why" (Cedar Rapids, Ia.: Frank Vierth. Price 25 cents a year) announces its intention of undertaking to supply in future issues without increase of price. It is at the same time to continue publishing, as heretofore, at least one paper on single tax principles. The papers in this number are "A Mysterious Disappearance," by Lewis Freeland, and a contribution from William S. Rann, assistant corporation counsel of Buffalo.

—The Pilgrim (Battle Creek, Mich. Price $1 a year), which contains a defense of Mrs. Nation, from the pen of ex-Gov. St. John, announces that with the May number it will come under the editorship of Willis J. Abbot. Mr. Abbot has a national reputation in journalism. He was responsible editor of the Chicago Times during part of the period when that paper was at its best as a leader of public opinion, and managed the editorial page of the New York Journal when that page was really great. The bulletin of the democratic party in the last presidential campaign was edited by Mr. Abbot under the direction of the national committee. A new department—hints for right living—which he intends establishing in The Pilgrim, is to be edited by Dr. Julia Holmes Smith, the Chicago physician whose name is familiar throughout the state of Illinois.