

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 10, 1901.

Number 175.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

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

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

The friendly solicitude of republican papers to have the democratic party rid itself of Bryan and Bryanism, would be suspicious were it not for their own positive assurances of good faith.

We are asked whether a congressman is elected for a term of two years or four. Congress consists of a senate and a house of representatives. Senators, therefore, as well as members of the lower house, are congressmen. But neither are elected for four-year terms. Senators are elected for six years and representatives for two.

Because only 6,000 votes out of a possible 35,000 were cast in Columbus, O., in a referendum vote on a bond issue question, the experiment is referred to as a failure, not only by professed enemies of the referendum, but also by such a professed, but somewhat dubious, friend as the distinguished Dr. Gladden. But why does this small vote indicate that the experiment is a failure? Assuming that the question was fairly put, so as to make voters feel that a vote would be worth while (which is far from certain), the Columbus referendum has, for this occasion, done exactly what government purifiers profess to want done. It has disfranchised the unfit.

The movement set on foot by sleeping car porters for the organization of a union, calls public attention to one of the meanest business swindles of the time. Porters are paid from \$15 to \$30 a month by the sleeping car companies. It is well understood that this is not living pay. But the por-

ters are expected to eke it out with tips from travelers, notwithstanding that the travelers are forced to pay a good round price to the company for the accommodations they get. Sleeping car tips, therefore, are in fact not tips to the porters, but tips to the company which hires them and ought to pay them.

A prominent confederate leader died at Chicago this week. Before the civil war he had been treasurer of the United States under Buchanan. In reporting his death one of the Chicago papers described him as being "unreconstructed up to the last moment of his life," saying that "he passed away an uncompromising advocate of dead doctrines, his southern heart sadly out of tune with the new times." It was unfortunate for the American federation of sovereign states that the infamous institution of slavery had at the time of the civil war become so closely identified with the democratic doctrine of state sovereignty as to give to the movement toward centralization of political power the advantage of a moral impulse. It confuses matters. But if the old confederate whose declining years were spent among the tombs of political issues refused to be reconciled because the civil war sowed seeds of empire, he was not without sympathizers in the north among men who have only recently come to understand that at Appomattox not only was an enslaved race set free, but also that a democratic-republican government was imperialized.

Mr. Gorman's democratic convention of Maryland has taken a hint in democracy from the McKinley republicans. It proclaims that—

the success of the democratic party will mean that, while we shall deal with perfect fairness in securing all

the benefits of good government and full and free opportunities for education to all classes, such action must be taken as to prevent the control of the state government from passing into the hands of those who have neither the ability nor the interest to manage public affairs wisely and well.

That Democratic proclamation with reference to American negroes is in precise harmony with the Republican policy regarding the Filipinos and Porto Ricans. The Republican party promises to secure to the latter what the Maryland democrats pledge themselves to secure to the former—"the benefits of good government." But neither intends to allow the other to participate in the process of governing. This has been the programme of tyrants since the beginning of tyranny. They always tyrannize for purposes of giving good government to "inferiors." If they themselves profit unduly, that is only incidental.

Another infamous lynching of colored people is reported—this time from Mississippi. The victims were a man, his mother and his half-sister. A white man and his wife had been murdered. These three negroes, and ten others fell under suspicion. Arrests were made, the three negroes named above being among the prisoners. A mob took the three from the jail, hanged them from the limb of a tree, and riddled their bodies with bullets. The judge and the district attorney are apologetically reported to have begged the mob to allow the law to take its course, but without avail. Neither they nor the sheriff appear to have made any strenuous effort to protect the prisoners. Yet they had before them the example of the brave Georgia sheriff who saved his prisoners and vindicated the law, even though obliged to fire into the murderous mob to do it. The officials who had the Mississippi negro sus-

pects in custody proved themselves to be as cowardly as the brutal white mob that murdered the helpless negro women.

This mob consisted, of course, of "the best people." So did the mob in Alabama, which, according to current press dispatches, has burned a negro at the stake upon accusations of rape. It was a highly respectable and intensely virtuous set of hellhounds, this Alabama mob. But no worse than the Kansas mob which indulged a few months ago in the same exciting pastime of "nigger-burning." And although the methods of these mobs are infinitely more horrible, the mobs are quite as respectable and no more vicious than the one in Tampa which has kidnaped a party of labor leaders in order to stop a strike, or the one at Fort Scott, Kan., which has ordered a temperance agitator to leave the city, or those in Evanston and Chicago which have rotten-egged Dowieite preachers. Between these and the "nigger-burning" mobs there is only a difference of degree, great as the difference is. The spirit that prompts the rotten-egging of men and women preachers of unpopular doctrines, or that drives unwelcome agitators out of a town before a mob for advocating a strike or the closing of saloons, would, if circumstances were as favorable, just as quickly hang an obnoxious negro woman and riddle her body with bullets or burn a suspected negro man and ravish their ears with his agonizing screams. It is all one spirit, capable of going to any lengths of lawlessness; and it is hellish beyond expression.

One could wish that the Boston Beacon would sometimes distinguish contentment with duty, which makes for progress, from contentment with conditions, which makes for decay. Nevertheless the Beacon is one of the many good things that come out of Boston. It is with reluctance, therefore, that we call attention to one of its sins of contentment. It actually optimizes over the treasury statistics

of excessive exports, quoting from the treasury statement of imports and exports for the last fiscal year, in this exultant tone:

The total foreign trade of the United States for the year reached the enormous and unprecedented sum of \$2,310,413,077. The exports were \$1,487,656,544, an increase of \$93,173,462 over 1900, while the imports for 1901 were \$822,756,533, a decrease of \$27,184,651 from the previous year. The excess of exports over imports exceeded that of 1900 by \$120,358,113, and is nearly \$50,000,000 greater than the highest record ever made before—that of 1898.

It is not quite conceivable that so intelligent a paper as the Beacon should really suppose that a growing excess of exports makes the country wealthier. How could an intelligent paper believe that a growing income is dearth and a growing outgo wealth? It must be that that exultant note is intended only to harmonize our foreign trade condition with the paper's policy of cheerfulness.

But there may be another explanation. We notice that the Beacon does not give the figures as to all imports and all exports, but only those that relate to merchandise. Possibly the editor, overlooking the record of gold and silver exports and imports, has imagined that our great excess of merchandise imports has been paid for in silver and gold. Or, like Mr. McKinley, he may have supposed that export balances are paid off "in pure gold." If this is the Beacon's idea, it may readily discover its mistake. We tabulate the figures for the fiscal year in question:

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| Excess of merchandise exports | \$664,900,011 |
| Excess of silver exports... | 17,901,139 |
| | \$682,801,150 |
| Excess of gold imports.. | 11,342,332 |
| Excess of all exports..... | \$671,458,818 |

It may be seen, therefore, that when gold, silver and merchandise are considered together, the excess of exports is larger, instead of smaller, than when merchandise alone is considered. Evidently, then, our merchandise excess of outgo was not paid for with a gold and silver excess of

income. Gold and silver taken together did not decrease, it increased, the excess of outgo. Nor was that condition peculiar to the last fiscal year. From June 30, 1865, to June 30, 1900, the excessive exports were as follows:

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| Gold | \$374,212,885 |
| Silver | 587,299,039 |
| Merchandise | 3,575,712,702 |

Total exports\$4,537,224,626

It is, therefore, evident that the excessive merchandise exports for the last fiscal year had not been paid for with gold and silver in advance. We had exported gold and silver for 35 years. Hence, they have not been paid for with gold and silver at all. Adding together the figures of the two foregoing tables, we find that from 1865 to 1901—June 30 in each year—our trade showed in those years the following cheerful balances:

| | |
|---------------------------|---------------|
| Excess of gold exports.. | 362,870,553 |
| Excess of silver exports. | 605,200,178 |
| Excess of mdse exports.. | 4,240,612,713 |

Excess of total exports.\$5,208,683,444

If the Beacon thinks that our excess of merchandise has been paid for with gold and silver it would do well to revise its thinking on that score.

Possibly, however, the Beacon supposes that the excessive merchandise exports (and gold and silver exports, for they are excessive, too) are paid for by the return from abroad of American obligations and the purchase for American account of foreign obligations. In that supposition, also, as we have frequently shown (see this volume, pp. 51 and 165, and volume iii., p. 291), it would be mistaken. Of course many deductions are to be made from our total export balances—such as interest on our securities held abroad, earnings of foreign capital invested here, payment of foreign freights, tourists' expenses, remittances by immigrants to their friends abroad, etc.—but after this is done, there is still an enormous balance unaccounted for. Is it chargeable to returns of American bonds and purchases of foreign bonds? In addition

to what we have heretofore said in support of the negative answer to that question, we reproduce with satisfaction this explanation by W. H. Allen, of New York, printed in the New York Times of July 22:

Some time ago it was claimed that we were lending a good part of this balance to foreign countries, but in a letter to the Times of May 8 I disputed this claim and contended that our annual foreign debts for interest dues, freights and tourists' expenses, etc., had grown so large that they more than offset our enormous trade balances, and hence we had to export specie and mortgage our properties to square the account. Just a few weeks afterward the Sun published a statement fully admitting that we had no money loaned abroad, and that, in fact, we were borrowers, but at the same time contending that the remainder of our trade balances had been exhausted in paying for securities returned from abroad.

This theory of the matter is always based on the assumption that foreign countries are not able to pay cash for what they buy from us, and so are forced to return securities to square the account. A glance at the facts, however, proves this assumption to be ridiculously false. England buys most of our products and holds most of our securities. But England is not short of cash by any means. On the contrary, she is fairly glutted with idle money, as is shown by the low interest rates, the oversubscriptions to the various loans floated there and the heavy investments of her capitalists in this and other countries. A still more conclusive disproof of this theory is furnished by the reports of foreign investments since the beginning of 1898, the period in which we are supposed to have got back the most of these securities. These reports, which are published daily in the leading newspapers, show that within this time the purchases of stocks for foreign account on the stock exchange were vastly in excess of the sales. Outside of Wall street these reports fully justify the belief that since 1897 more foreign capital has been invested in our mines, lands and industrial plants than in any similar period of our history. On the other hand, we find no reports of any kind to show where the foreigners have let go their grip on any of these properties.

There are more important results involved in the balance of trade question than many persons suppose. Protectionism rests upon the notion that a perpetual excess of exports is

essential to prosperity, and therefore that a constant export balance is a constant favorable balance. Destroy this "favorable balance" superstition, and the whole protection superstition tumbles with it. And in such sad plight is the "favorable balance" superstition now, that even the republican press is concerned. Here, for instance, is an extract from a thoughtful editorial in the Chicago Post of July 27, a republican paper:

In economics as in morals no question is settled until it is settled right. Financiers, college professors and politicians are still wrestling with the infinitely complex problem of the "balance of trade." We know that for several years the United States has enjoyed a heavy excess of exports. It has sold "abroad" a great deal more than it has purchased there for import. How, it is asked on all sides, is the balance settled? To what extent are we the world's creditor? . . . The last year in which the balance of trade was adverse to the United States was 1893, the panic year. Every fiscal year since has shown an excess of exports. For the eight years the net favorable balances aggregate \$3,177,992,028. How much of this amount does Europe owe the United States? By some it is believed that our current indebtedness to Europe—freights, interest, dividends, travelers' expenditures, etc.—does not exceed \$200,000,000 annually. If this be true, then only half of the aggregate balance for the eight years is accounted for. What of the other half? There are those who believe that the balance has disappeared, and that at the present time we are borrowers rather than lenders in foreign centers. New York bankers accept this strange view, believing that the balances have gone to cancel returned securities. There is, however, little trustworthy information as regards the movement in securities, and some writers deny that the foreign investors have "unloaded" any extraordinary quantity of our stocks and bonds. . . . We understand that the treasury department is conducting a careful inquiry into this remarkable situation. Let us hope the results will be enlightening and satisfactory. They will bear vitally upon several questions of national economy and politics.

But the results of the treasury investigation will not be satisfactory, nor even explanatory, unless it distinguishes from exports and imports

in general the amount of exports and imports for land purchases and land rents. And by land purchases and rents we do not mean alone those payments that are so in name. A purchase of stock in a gold mine or railway is in part a purchase of land—the mining right in the one case and the right of way in the other. So a dividend on coal stock or railroad stock is in part rent for land. Besides land conveyed thus by corporate stock, there is also land conveyed in the usual way by deed. Take all this kind of landed property—what is represented by corporate stock as well as what is represented by deed. Put in an import column what we have received for it from abroad, and in an export column what we send back for repurchase and for rent (or land dividends); then put into the export column what we pay for foreign land and in the import column what we get back for repurchase and rent (or land dividends). Find the footings of each column, and the difference between the footings. That difference will show whether we are draining foreign countries or foreign countries are draining this country. Should we prove to have a growing export balance on this comparison of land investments, the inference would be inevitable that foreigners are draining us. For whatever is paid by one country to another for the use of its own land is an export without import. It is the distinguishing feature of absentee landlordism. When the facts on this question of absentee landlordism—not only under deeds producing rent, in the ordinary form of individual ownership, but also under shares of stock producing dividends, in the form of corporate ownership—shall have been drawn forth, and not before, will the constant and growing excess of American exports be statistically explained.

Superficial social philosophers have pushed the virtue of thrift to such extremes that an attempt of John T. Gibson, writing in the Indianapolis

News, to push the vice of thrift to its extreme, is refreshing:

A few minutes' thought will convince anyone that the industrious man who "lives up to his income" and saves nothing is at least as large a factor in the accumulation of capital as the man who saves. Suppose, for instance, that we would all start in to-morrow and narrow down our expenses to the last notch, "cut off everything except oatmeal gruel, and make it thin at that," with the idea of saving ourselves rich, how long would it be before we should find that instead of being on the highroad to greater wealth and higher civilization, we should be on the back track to poverty and barbarism? There would be no demand for anything except oatmeal, and as no one could sell anything else that he happened to possess, he could not acquire the wherewith to buy oatmeal and would have to produce it himself or starve. There would be no trade, no use for all our fine business blocks, nor for the railroads, nor steamboats, nor factories, nor any of the arts of civilization. The labor-saving principle of the "division of labor" could not be utilized except on the smallest scale in cooperative oatmeal production. Altogether, we should be in a very bad way—a good deal worse off than the Indians were, for they had elbow-room and a game preserve at their back.

One of the peculiarities of the philosophy of thrift as a virtue is the exemption its students allow the rich from its obligations. While they admonish the poor to save, they advise the rich to spend, not only lavishly but frivolously and even foolishly. For this is supposed to promote prosperity. What is a vice in the poor is thus made a virtue in the rich. These inconsistent philosophers might find profit in thinking upon Mr. Gibson's suggestive analysis of the doctrine of saving.

JAMES E. MILLS.

This name has no familiar associations to the mere newspaper reader. Whether its bearer lives or dies is not to that great mob-like public of the least concern. His fate would interest them more if he had been a horse jockey or a prize fighter. But there are circles into which the news of Mr. Mills's death will come with something of a shock. He died on the 25th of July, in Mexico, where he had been

located for several years in the service, as a mining expert, of a large American silver mining interest. In years he had almost lived out the allotted three score and ten.

James E. Mills was a native of New England. His scientific studies were pursued at Harvard college under Agassiz. He afterwards became an assistant of that distinguished naturalist, with whom he remained always upon terms of intimate friendship. Mr. Mills and Prof. Burt G. Wilder were accounted the greatest pupils Agassiz ever had.

Like his fellow student, Mr. Mills was a disciple of Swedenborg; and like their preceptor, he was a Christian evolutionist. In the latter respect he agreed also with his professional and personal friend, the eminent Joseph Le Conte, whose death preceded that of Mr. Mills by less than a month.

As a Swedenborgian, and for a time a minister of that faith, Mr. Mills was distinctly and decidedly averse to all ecclesiastical tendencies, but especially to those of organized Swedenborgianism. His religion was a philosophy rather than a creed, an adjustment of spiritual principles rather than a set of ritualistic observances. The effort of his adult life was to help strip Christianity of its human accretions.

This religious faith commended to his acceptance the economic principles popularized by Henry George. He consequently became a devoted disciple and valued friend of that "prophet of San Francisco."

A close thinker, Mr. Mills was also a fluent writer; but the productions of his pen are limited to essays and pamphlets. These, however, are profound and durable contributions to the subjects of which they treat.

Those subjects are scientific, religious and economic. In the first category is an essay on the building of a sierra. On religious questions strictly Mr. Mills's principal paper is intended to show that repentance is not remorse, but a development of character away from wrong and in the direction of right. All his writings on economic subjects are a blend of the economic and the religious. To him economic righteousness was an external or outward expression of spiritual righteousness. One of his

valuable papers along this line is a plea for service instead of sacrifice. Self-sacrifice, as usually taught, he held to be morbid, and at the bottom of all the excuses for enslavement and impoverishment. Equilibrium of service was his ideal.

In Boston, New York, San Francisco and other American centers of scientific, religious and economic thought, Mr. Mills was long a familiar and respected character. Having made changeless principle, as distinguished from shifting expediency, the standard of all his thinking, he has contributed to the progressive impulses of his period.

PUBLIC WATERWAYS OR PUBLIC RAILWAYS.

The idea of solving the transportation problem by maintaining canals to compete with railways is as antiquated as the school geographies which teach so little about railways and so much about water courses. Railway routes constitute a more important branch of geographical learning, of the practical sort, than the sources and trend and basins of rivers; and for commercial uses, railroad transportation is infinitely superior to river and canal transportation. In these days of electric haste, business cannot afford to waste time on water routes. Their only utility now is as competitive agencies to keep down excessive railway rates. If they are popular for this purpose, it is because a superstitious reverence for vested interests blinds the people to the truth regarding transportation.

Take the Erie canal question for illustration. Efforts are making to enlarge this artificial waterway so as to make it a ship canal. Two independent commissions, appointed by Vice President Roosevelt, when he was governor of New York, have reported with substantial agreement in favor of the principle of enlargement, differing only in details and estimates of cost. A previous commission had recommended the expenditure of \$9,000,000 to bring the canal up to requirements. This sum was appropriated and scandalously wasted; yet the Roosevelt commissions recommend still further and greater expenditure rather than make

recommendations or suggestions that might disturb the vested interests of railway rings.

That New York city is fast losing its preeminence as a commercial center, because of differential freight rates instituted by New York's railways in favor of other points, is conceded. It is to check this tendency that New York officials propose to rebuild the Erie canal. They profess to hope thereby to bring into competition a cheaper service that will compel the railroads, in self defense, to lower their charges and thus redirect the movement of freight to the port of New York. In the execution of this purpose the scheme of canal improvement mentioned above is outlined. It requires an initial expenditure of about \$100,000,000 of state money.

The need for cheap transportation is insistent, and \$100,000,000, if necessary, is not too much to secure it. But success should be assured, to justify a proposition so colossal; and the proposition does not give assurance of success. The mode proposed is not only inefficient, but it would aggravate the condition complained of.

Maintenance, interest charges, and amortization of the principal will necessitate an annual burden of from \$10,000,000 to \$12,000,000. If the traffic on the canals is doubled, about 8,000,000 tons of freight will be accommodated, consisting mainly of lumber, cereals, iron and coal—bulky and slow-moving freight. Each ton moved will cost the state \$1.25 or more, on a highway extending only part of the distance. Added to this indirect burden will be the direct charge for freightage paid by the shippers. Persons and perishable freight cannot be carried in barges, no matter how moderate the charges, and therefore improved canals cannot be of benefit in this most important regard.

Paradoxical as it sounds, canals to succeed must fail. Their utilization indicates excessive railroad rates. It is certain that the railroads will meet the competition of the canals, else the canal scheme is chimerical. But they will reduce rates only on that portion of the business which canal service is capable of dividing with them, recouping their loss by increased charges for services in which

they are unopposed. During the open season they may carry bulky freight at a loss, and by thus forcing the canals to cost more than the service they render is worth, arouse a public clamor for the abandonment of state management of our canals, and eventually throw the canals into the hands of the very interest they are intended to compete with.

An independent right of way, open to all transporters, is the essential purpose of the canal promoters. But a plan more certain and less expensive than canals is possible. The distance from New York to Buffalo, about 450 miles, can be spanned by a railroad highway at a cost of about \$50,000 per mile. Estimating construction at the extravagant cost of \$100,000 per mile, the railed highway could be built for less than half the cost of enlarging the canal.

The state could upon a public highway supply the motive power, permitting any shipper or company of shippers to use the service under proper regulations, as at present with barge owners over a waterway. Transportation companies would then be compelled to do business at competitive rates. There would thus be established an effective competition—without the intervention of state authority arbitrarily fixing rates—that would reduce the cost of service to a business basis of profit. It would place all operators and shippers on an equality of opportunity, and wreck a nest of monopolies now supported by railroad favoritism.

BENJAMIN DOBLIN.

New York.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

New York, Aug. 4.—On the subject of improvements in railway travel, there is something suggestive about the changes that have been made between Chicago and New York.

A score or so of years ago, the best accommodations were such only as the ordinary sleeping car afforded. The nearest approach to the convenience, comfort and luxury now enjoyable was the sleeping car state room; and that was only an approximate approach—approximating present possibilities of comfort about as a journey to New York would ap-

proximate in point of distance a trip around the world.

Now, however, the accommodations of first-class hotel life, combined with great speed, are offered by the leading roads. On the Lake Shore, for instance, the limited express makes the journey in 24 hours to the minute. Its stops are few and only at the most important points.

It does not stop at all between Albany and New York, but rolls along the perennially picturesque Hudson at the unbroken pace of nearly 50 miles an hour. One of its cars is half observation and half compartment; and, like the rest of the train, all luxurious. In the observation room a stenographer and type writer serves passengers free of charge. A maid attends upon lady passengers, and a cheerful porter is always in evidence at the touch of an electric bell. In the compartments one can buy a berth as in a sleeping car, though at a slightly higher price—higher than the price on western roads. This is almost as great an improvement upon berths as berths were upon seats. The compartment is sacred to its sole occupant, unless heavy travel necessitates the sale of upper berths. In that event two passengers instead of one are assigned to a room. But be the occupants one or two, privacy is preserved and neither need leave the room from one end of the journey to the other, so complete are its appointments. The chief advantage of these compartments, however, is the opportunity they afford for dressing in privacy and without discomfort. One must have had experience in the gymnastics necessary to prepare for bed or for breakfast in a sleeping car berth, with toilet facilities 20 berths away, more or less, in order fully to appreciate the comfort of making those preparations in a sleeping chamber where all facilities are at hand and no gymnastical contortions are needed.

But that is not all. The whole train (the appropriated seats and compartments alone excepted), is at the service of every passenger. Besides the observation room, a delightful lounging place—all window—from which the panorama of scenery may be observed as it slips by, a buffet car makes an attractive smoking-room. Both are well supplied with reading matter, including periodicals and a library of books, and the whole train is brilliantly lighted at night with electric lamps. This sumptuous hotel on wheels includes a dining car, where meals are served at regular hours for the uniform price of one

dollar; and they are meals such as no hotel offers for less than from \$1.50 to \$2.00.

Altogether, a trip to New York on the Lake Shore limited is a luxurious though short vacation. But I have not written of it merely to describe it. The advertising folders do that better than I can. My object is to contrast these luxurious possibilities of modern travel with the comparative discomfort to which travelers who must economize expenses are forced to submit.

Though vast improvements in traveling facilities have been made, few are to be enjoyed without extra expense. There is very little improvement in accommodation or service for the old price between New York and Chicago. On the Lake Shore line the traveler must pay \$20 for fare alone. That has been the fare for years. True, he may have a cheaper ticket if he wishes; but if he buys one he must "go steerage," his best accommodations being those of the common smoking car. Live stock, also, is carried cheaper. But having paid this charge of \$20, the old-time fare, the traveler may secure a sleeping berth and the comforts and conveniences of a sleeping car for \$5 more. This price, also, has remained unchanged for years. If, however, he wants a compartment, it is not enough for him to pay the extra \$2, making \$7 in all for sleeping compartment accommodations. There are no compartment cars on ordinary trains, and he must pay \$4 extra fare to go by the "limited." Unless he pays that, he foregoes the luxury of a compartment car. To get dining car privileges he need not pay the extra fare; other trains also carry dining cars. But he must pay it for dollar meals as good as those served on the "limited."

So improvement in travel sums up very much more to the advantage of the rich traveler than of the poor one. Whereas first-class travel between New York and Chicago, ten to twenty years ago, cost \$25 in addition to meals, first-class travel to-day, in addition to meals, costs \$31. And though the lower grade of accommodation is in some respects better now than first-class accommodation then—slightly quicker time, somewhat safer and more convenient cars—yet the price is the same; and a wide gap has been created between the two grades of first-class travel now in vogue, a gap so wide as to give to the lower one impressively the character of second class. The distinct improvements in travel are "limited" to travelers who pay extra.

Nor is that the worst of it. Extra service ought to command extra pay. But in order to give these advantages to persons who pay extra, the common traveler is assessed. His fare has not been reduced. He pays more, comparatively, than the value of the service he gets, and the difference is applied to the maintenance of the limited express, which does not pay. The extra charge for its conveniences is enough to keep off the "common herd," but not enough to make up the difference in cost. A convenience for the "nobility" who use it, it is supported partly at the expense of the "proletariat" who cannot afford to.

This kind of favoritism may not have contributed to generate the sentiment against corporate ownership of the means of transportation, for few have taken the pains to analyze it; and in itself it is not very important, being a result, probably, rather than a cause, of the advancing tendency to class distinctions in this country. But be the cause or causes what they may, that hostile sentiment exists and is steadily growing.

Its principal manifestations are with reference to municipal service. They are apparent everywhere, in small towns and in large cities alike. Wherever private ownership of municipal monopolies exists, there agitation for municipal ownership is rampant. And nowhere is it more marked than in the city of New York.

In support of the municipal ownership idea a largely attended dollar dinner was given yesterday at College Point, one of the Long Island Sound resorts in Greater New York. Chairs were set for 617 guests—the number of tickets sold—and they were nearly all occupied. Col. A. P. Ketchum, a prominent republican, presided, and among the local speakers were Fred W. Hinrichs, of Brooklyn, a democrat, and Gen. H. E. Tremain, of New York, and Lucien Knapp, of Queens, republicans.

The dinner was organized by "The Franchise Tax and Municipal Ownership League," which demands that no further franchises be granted in Greater New York, and that those which have been granted beyond recall be specially taxed. The underlying principle of this league, therefore, though limited in application, is that of the single tax. It is consequently being vigorously supported by single tax leaders such as D. B. Van Vleck, A. J. Boulton, Sylvester

Malone, George W. Everett, Samuel Seabury and James R. Brown. But the principal leadership in the movement includes democrats and republicans of local prominence and influence, whose high standing testifies to the inroads that radical sentiment, in the true sense of that much abused term, has made in the ranks of conservatives.

Politically the movement evidently aims at contesting the approaching municipal election with Tammany hall on the question of municipal ownership and franchise taxation. This has had the effect of causing some prominent single tax men to hold aloof. Though they do not want to antagonize the others, and nothing like dissension has occurred or is probable, they suspect a union of the league with the republican party upon some partisan republican as the anti-Tammany candidate for mayor. If such a combination were successful there, it would put the enormous political power of Greater New York into the hands of the national republican party during the next presidential campaign, and by thus securing the state to the republicans might turn aside political currents of vastly greater importance to the single tax cause than a local defeat of Tammany hall this year.

Special reasons for a heated agitation of the municipal ownership policy in New York are apparent, when the situation with reference to transportation rights is considered.

In the face of a popular vote for municipal transportation, and even in professed compliance with it—a profession that borders on the hypocritical—public interests in New York are being corralled by a ring which by comparison makes the old Tweed ring seem more than half angelic. This ring is composed of gentlemen—some of the richest, and ablest, and hitherto most respected and trusted gentlemen of the metropolis. As the inwardness of their proceedings unfolds, the full meaning of the familiar Kansas beer story is realized. Said a Kansas politician to the members of a committee whose meeting in his office had come to a close—

"Boys, I have some beer stowed away in a cool place. Let's drink it."

As Kansas is a prohibition state the committee was enthusiastic.

"But hold on, boys," said the host, raising his hand for a further hearing; "hold on! Before I bring in that

beer I want to know whether you are going to drink like gentlemen or like hogs?"

"Oh, that's all right, Bill," answered one of the party, "we'll drink like gentlemen fast enough." The others joined in the assurance.

"Well, if you're going to drink like gentlemen," the host replied, "I'll have to get more beer. Hogs know when they've had enough."

These New York gentlemen, whose behavior recalls Tweed's famous query: "What are you going to do about it?" are some of them members and some of them advisers and influencers of the rapid transit board. That board is empowered to construct and regulate the use of a municipal rapid transit system—the great underground system now in course of construction. This was authorized by a popular vote. The ballot read simply, "for (or against) municipal construction of the rapid transit road." But the statute authorizing the vote empowered the board, in its own discretion, to do the work by contract. It did not require the board to do that. It merely trusted its judgment and honor.

The board decided to resort to contract. That decision might very well have been in good faith. But for bidding on the contract, the board adopted conditions which effectually discouraged every bidder but one; and after accepting his bid, it modified these conditions so as to relieve him of obligations that other bidders had been unwilling to assume. Not only did it thus give out the contract at a price several millions in advance of what the work, under sub-contract, is being actually done for, but it arranged to have the city lend the favored contractor the necessary capital for construction at the low interest rate of four per cent.

In other words, the city itself is constructing the system. It provides the capital, and at high wages it hires the chief constructor. But it does so in a form which gives to him all the benefits of contractorship without any of its risks.

The board then provides that the contractor shall have a lease of the road for operation for 50 years, with privilege of renewal for 25 years more, for a certain rental, upon condition of charging not more than a certain fare. Some idea of its fidelity may be got from the fact that the rental it demands is the lowest and the fare it allows is the highest that he law permits. Besides this, it is suspected, with reasonable shrewdness, that the

board itself is actually, though of course not nominally, responsible for certain convenient vagaries of the laws under which it acts, and behind which it hides when criticised.

The contractor to whom the rapid transit board has been so generously considerate is, of course, only a middleman, the real party in interest being the Metropolitan Traction company. This powerful monopoly, assisted by its highly respectable republican, democratic and non-partisan coadjutors, is acquiring as complete control of Greater New York as the robber barons had of the Rhine; and the rapid transit board appears to be its very obedient servant. Corruption on the part of the board cannot be proved. Indeed, in the vulgar sense of corruption, there probably is none. That kind went out with Tweed. But there is not much room to doubt that financial, professional and property interests are being played upon, to the destruction of public rights, with the same effect, to the same end, and with more real turpitude than would be involved in coarse corruption of the Tweed type. It is as probable as Tweed's venality before his spectacular exposure. This opinion has at any rate taken root in the public mind of New York, and not a few immaculate reputations are likely to suffer thereby. Already some very available mayoral material, of altitudinous respectability, has been counted out on grave suspicion. L. F. P.

NEWS

Our latest report on the steel strike (p. 264) closed with the 31st, when the compromise terms proposed by the executive committee of the strikers had been rejected by the trust. After an all-day session on the 1st the committee decided to go to New York in a body for a further personal interview with Morgan. They had been invited to do this by President Schwab, of the steel trust. On the 3d, accordingly, the committee, consisting of 15 officials of the Amalgamated association, met Mr. Morgan and eight other representatives of the steel trust in secret conference at New York. At this meeting the steel trust officials offered the following terms of settlement as their ultimatum:

Preamble. Conditions under which we are willing to advise a settlement of the labor difficulties:

Tin Plate Company—Should proceed

under the contract signed with the Amalgamated association as of July 1, 1901.

American Steel Hoop Company—Company should sign the scale for all the mills owned by the American Steel Hoop company that were signed for last year.

American Sheet Steel Company—Company should sign the scale for all the mills of this company that were signed for last year except the old Meadow mill and the Saltsburgh mills.

The strikers' committee responded with the following:

We, the members of the executive board of the Amalgamated association, hereby present the following proposition as a reply to that received from the United States Steel corporation:

Sheet Mills—All mills signed for last year, with the exception of Saltsburg and Scottdale and with the addition of McKeesport and Wellsville.

Hoop Mills—All mills now known to be organized, viz., Youngstown, Girard, Greenville, Pomeroy, Warren, Lindsay, McCutcheon, Clarke, Bar Mill, Monessen, Mingo, 12-inch, nine-inch and hoop mills of the Cleveland Rolling Mill company, tin mills—all mills except Monessen.

Note—All other matters of detail to be left for settlement by conference.

In making public this proposition and that of the trust representatives, the strikers' committee explained that at the last conference, as at those preceding it, they had required the signing of the wages scales for all the mills owned and operated by the United States Steel corporation, while in the proposition given above they asked that "the scales be signed for none but those mills which are organized and where the men ceasing to work have signified their desire to be connected with the Amalgamated association." This modification had been made, they further explained, because the trust officials declared that the strikers wished to force men into the organization against their will and desire. The strikers therefore asked that the scale be signed for only those men who desired it. Each party rejected the ultimatum of the other, and the conference abruptly adjourned. Soon afterward Mr. Shaffer, president of the Amalgamated association, authorized this announcement:

Within a week every union man and every union man at heart in the employ of the United States Steel corporation will be asked to join in the strike now being waged by the Amalgamated association. We must set-

tle whether unionism is to stand or fall.

It was nearly a week, however, before the call for a general strike appeared. On the 8th it was sent to the Amalgamated association's vice presidents of all the districts in which there are mills owned and operated by the steel trust, and to the officials of the constituent organizations in the mills. Following is the text of the strike call:

Brethren: The officials of the United States steel trust have refused to recognize as union men those who are now striking for the right to organize. The executive board has authorized me to issue a call upon all Amalgamated and other union men in name and heart to join in the movement to fight for labor's rights. We must fight or give up forever our personal liberties. You will be told that you have signed contracts, but you never agreed to surrender those contracts to the United States Steel corporation. Its officers think you were sold to them just as the mills were, contracts and all. Remember, before you agreed to any contract you took an obligation to the Amalgamated association. It now calls you to help in this hour of need. Unless the trouble is settled on or before Saturday, August 10, 1901, the mills will close when the last turn is made on that day. Brethren, this is the call to preserve our organization. We trust you and need you. Come and help us, and may right come to a just cause. Fraternalty yours.

The call bears the simple signature of T. J. Shaffer, without other official designation than the word "president." Unless, therefore, a settlement is made during the present week, which is not at all probable, the strike now estimated to comprise 50,000 men, will extend to over 200,000 after the 10th.

The industrial war in the United States has a sanguinary counterpart in two civil wars in South America—one in Venezuela and the other in Colombia. Our last report of these wars (vol. iii. p. 682) was made last winter. They appear to be raging still. The Venezuelan president, Castro, has caused a disruption in his cabinet by insisting upon recognizing the Colombian rebels as belligerents, and sending home the Colombian minister. The reason he urges is that the government in power in Colombia is responsible for irregular invasions from Colombia over the Venezuelan frontier. But Castro's secretary of

war, Senor Pulido, resisting Castro's policy on the ground that the invasions are not encouraged by the Colombian government but are carried on in defiance of it by Colombian rebels, has resigned. His successor is Senor Guerra, a well-known military leader of Venezuela. There is no further definite information, but it is inferred that the two countries are upon the eve of international war. Meanwhile, not only is the rebellion in Colombia still in progress, but that in Venezuela has revived. Its leader now is Gen. Carlos Rangel Garbiras, at one time president of the Venezuelan senate. But he raises the banner of Gen. Hernandez, under whom the rebellion against Castro was begun at the time of Castro's accession to the presidency upon the success of the rebellion of 1899, which was led by Castro and Hernandez against President Andrade (see The Public, No. 85, page 8, and vol. iii., p. 153). Gen. Garbiras having crossed the frontier from Colombia, a battle occurred on the 4th between his force (said by President Castro to be supported by 22 battalions of Colombian troops), and the Venezuelan army. President Castro claims a victory. About the same time a series of engagements was reported to have taken place in May between the Colombian rebels and Colombian troops. All the reports on this entire subject are vague, and until further news is received no clear explanation of the situation is possible. The indefinite news is due in part to a Venezuelan censorship, Castro having proclaimed military law throughout Venezuela.

No news of permanent value, other than the foregoing, is reported through the regular news channels; but the socialist papers give extended reports of the socialist convention at Indianapolis, which closed its sessions on the 1st. These reports do not differ materially from the one appearing in these columns last week, which closed with the proceedings of the 31st. On the 1st the unification resolution was adopted. It is as follows:

Resolved, That the social democratic party, with headquarters at Springfield, Mass.; the social democratic party, with headquarters at Chicago; the socialist party of the state of Texas; the socialist parties of the states of Kentucky, Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska, hereby surrender their separate and independent existence and

merge and amalgamate into one organization.

The name of the unified party is the "Socialist Party." It amalgamates all the socialist parties of the country except the Socialist Labor party, which is the original organization.

NEWS NOTES.

—Rear Admiral Henry L. Howison has been appointed to the place on the Schley court of inquiry made vacant by the request (p. 265) of Rear Admiral Kimberly to be excused.

—Dowager Empress Frederick of Germany, eldest child of Queen Victoria of England, and mother of the emperor of Germany, died at Cronberg on the 5th, at the age of 60 years.

—The Iowa republican convention, held at Cedar Rapids on the 7th, nominated A. B. Cummins, of Des Moines, for governor—860 to 780. His nomination was a defeat for the faction hitherto dominating the party.

—The British house of lords decided on the 5th, in a case on appeal before it, that a boycott by a labor organization against an employer to compel the dismissal of a nonunion employe is actionable because its object is not to benefit organized workmen, but to injure a nonunionist.

—Admirers of Herbert S. Bigelow, pastor of the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, and a lecturer and orator of distinguished ability and national reputation, are organizing a fund to place his services more freely at the disposal of the radical democracy. A pledge of \$100 for every additional \$100 raised has been secured to start with.

MISCELLANY

ABOLISH MONOPOLY.

Why hesitate? Ye are full-bearded men.
With God-implanted will, and courage, if
Ye dare but show it. Never yet was will
But found some way or means to work it
out,
Nor e'er did fortune frown on him who
dared.

Shall we in presence of this grievous
wrong,
In this supremest moment of all time,
Stand trembling, cowering, when with one
bold stroke
These groaning millions might be ever
free?
And that one stroke, so just, so greatly
good,
So level with the happiness of man,
That all the angels will applaud the deed.
—E. R. Taylor.

THE LARGEST SHIP IN THE WORLD.

To say that she is 700 feet long, with a beam of 75 feet

and a depth of 49 feet, gives the average reader very little idea of the vastness of this great ship.

The Celtic could carry more passengers than the great Waldorf-Astoria could accommodate. Imagine that three full regiments of infantry could find accommodations on board and not be crowded; picture the New York city hall in her capacious hold with the clock tower alone sticking above the upper deck and a faint notion of the size of this mammoth of the sea may be gleaned.

The Oceanic is four feet longer than the Celtic, but she is by no means as wide nor as deep. The Celtic has a gross register of 20,880 tons—3,600 tons greater than the Oceanic—and her displacement, when loaded, is 37,700 tons. — Chicago Record-Herald.

THE TESTIMONY OF ENGLISH SOLDIERS.

From The New Age, of London.

In view of the capital the jingo press is making out of the Vlakfontein incident—all unproved though it is up to the present—it is well to have testimony as to the general conduct of the Boers in relation to wounded British soldiers. Mr. John Bernard Seeley, M. P., writes to the Times:

During the 17 months that I served in South Africa I had, perhaps, rather exceptional opportunities of learning how our wounded were treated by the Boers. On two different occasions men under my command who were dangerously wounded were attended to by the Boers; in each case they were tended with the greatest kindness and care, and the wounded men themselves begged me to thank those who had been so good to them; on both occasions the general in command of the column conveyed his thanks either personally or by letter.

"British Fairplay" writes to the Daily News in much the same strain:

During the 13 months I served in the English ranks as a volunteer I never saw or heard from my comrades of any such conduct on the part of the Boers, but have repeatedly heard expressions from our fellows who had the misfortune to be wounded or taken prisoners of fair and even generous treatment, and it would be ungrateful if I did not protest, both on my own behalf and that of my comrades, against such cowardly slander, and I appeal to Englishmen to support my protest.

"JOHN DOE" WOULD'N'T DO.

Walter Richards was a persistent jointkeeper in Topeka and his barkeeper was Henry Schmidt. One day the city attorney drew warrants for the arrest of both men, but, not remembering the name of the German, the document was made for "Walter Richards and his barkeeper, John Doe." In due time the men were ar-

rested, but Schmidt was highly indignant that he should be called John Doe. "Dot iss not mine name," he said to those who would listen. "Better go down to the court and make the judge fix it," said a joker who had listened to Henry's tale of woe. And Henry did go down to the court to fix it. Marching up to his honor he said: "Chudge, don't you know me?"

"Well," said the judge, in some surprise, "I have seen you often, but I don't seem to remember your name."

"Mine name, chudge, iss Henry Schmidt, aber in Chermany it was Heinrich Schmidt. More as ten thousand peoples in Tobeka know Henry Schmidt. For more as ten year I drove dot bread vagon for Henry Vesper, und for more as two year I draw dot beer far Valt Richards. Dot bollcemans come und dells me I vas John Doe! So long as America in I have been, I more vas not insulted. If mine name not back be schanged, I get me by Mr. Overmeyer some injunctions out."

And with head erect and indignation oozing from every pore Mr. Schmidt walked out of court never to be called back again, for the judge, though stern, was possessed of humor.—Kansas City Journal.

TWO NOBLE MEN.

Not long ago Albert L. Johnson, John Mitchell, president of the United Iron Workers, and I took dinner together in New York. Mr. Johnson had expressed a desire to meet the miners' president, for whom he had conceived a liking. The cause of it dated back to the great anthracite strike, which Mitchell was so ably managing. One day after I had been up at the mines I happened to drop into Mr. Johnson's New York office, and got to talking with him about the strike. He sat listening for a long time. Suddenly he drew his check-book from his pocket and wrote a check to my order for \$1,000. "In my opinion starvation is the chief enemy the miners have to meet in this strike. Go, give that to Mitchell if you think it wise. I want to see those men win."

I went straight to Hazleton and to the strike headquarters; told Mitchell about the check and what it was for, and presented it to him. To my astonishment he would not even take the slip of paper in his hands.

"I cannot find words to express my appreciation," he said, simply. "But I must refuse. This is the men's fight. I am here to carry out their will.

We have a little money—not much—but enough for present pressing needs. I think we shall win, and win soon. If we do not win soon, we shall want outside help. I'll be glad then to take this check if it shall be again offered. But just now we must be above suspicion of every kind. The curse of many labor fights has been the leaders who have betrayed the men. There will be no betraying here. No man shall have even the least ground for suspecting the leaders in this fight."

I knew that John Mitchell was under terrible pressure for money to relieve want among the idle miners. I had seen pain in his face as he turned away woman after woman who had come piteously imploring enough money to put food in hungry little mouths at home. But he braved that to keep his name clean.

Mr. Johnson was astounded when I handed him back his check. All he said was: "I like that man's pluck, and I want to shake his hand some day."

So, a few weeks ago, when Mr. Mitchell came on to New York to attend the arbitration convention, under the auspices of the Civic Federation, I brought the two men together. That evening Albert Johnson did most of the talking. His subjects were taken in the main from his vast store of personal experiences with men and things. One anecdote he related will always remain in my memory. He said that when his brother Tom and he were, a year or two ago, in England together, his brother said to him one day, as they strolled through a great art gallery—one of the famous exhibitions of the world: "Albert, if you had your choice of a single picture, which one of all this great collection would you select?"

With scarcely a moment's hesitation, Albert Johnson pointed to a canvas depicting a man, implored on the one side by his wife to return to work, and called on the other side by his fellow-workmen to strike. "There," he said; "there is one of the great common tragedies of life. In which direction lies the paramount duty? I'd rather have that piece of canvas than all the rest of the paintings put together."—Henry George, Jr., in Philadelphia North American.

RESTRICTING THE SUFFRAGE.

There are people—and they do not live in the south—who would gladly restrict the suffrage far beyond the color line, where the southerners would stop. It is not the negro alone

who is threatened by the disfranchisement laws passed in the southern states and by the talk now grown almost fashionable, even in the north, against the fifteenth amendment. The ruling class in North Carolina has elaborated the theory that ignorant white men inherit with their blood a capacity to exercise the franchise wisely and well, but that notion will not be widely accepted. Every person has in mind some one with a white skin whom he considers incapable of casting his vote intelligently, while the people in any city who exercise the franchise absolutely without party or class prejudice are so few that a small hall could contain them.

Mr. Lecky is very emphatic in the opinion that democracy is doomed to failure, and, of course, he criticises severely the extension of the suffrage which the nineteenth century has witnessed in all the civilized nations.

In meeting the assaults of the critics of democracy, it is no more possible to deny somewhat of their indictment against the weakness and corruption of white rule, by masses, than it is to deny the incoherence and incapacity of the black race in politics. Many of the facts cited are strictly true. . . . The chances are, however, that the representative of the educated or the property-holding class is as likely to be swayed by class bias, or party prejudice, or one-sided reading, or selfish interest, as the day laborer. The history of the race under aristocratic or oligarchical governments is full of evidence showing that one class cannot be trusted to look after the interests of other classes. A great mass of humane and creditable labor legislation, for example, which has been enacted during the latter part of the nineteenth century, has been secured solely because the extension of the suffrage has given representation to the great body of wage-earners, and invested them with the political power to compel the enactment of laws in their behalf.

The educational and uplifting influence of the franchise upon the common people was powerfully argued by John Stuart Mill, and the brief experience already had in democracy tends strongly to confirm his views; but it is not necessary to discuss the question elaborately. One thing should be held to strongly, and that is the right of every great class of society to political representation in the government. Above all the workers of whatever grade should not be eliminated. Our

methods of representation may be faulty. Minority representation is certainly desirable in a truly good government, and it is possible to say something in favor of the Belgian system of plural voting, that is, allowing one vote to every citizen and then granting two votes to a much smaller class that pays a certain amount to the state in taxes, and three votes to a still smaller class that is assumed to be of exceptional service to the state because of property or education or special training. But, whatever the system adopted, every class or grade should have its right to representation held sacred on the simple ground of self-protection and self-preservation. The southern movement to disfranchise the negroes is a blow at the fundamental principle of political rights, since it aims to destroy entirely the political representation of a whole body of citizens, a class that contributes industrially to the wealth of society, that pays taxes and can be drawn upon to defend the state in war. The disfranchisement of any other class would be no less and no more objectionable.

When the democratic principle is assailed by a crusade against a particular portion of the electorate, the standing of other portions is inevitably threatened. For this reason the success of the present movement against black voters, acquiesced in by the tacit demeanor of the whole nation, would be followed sooner or later by efforts to restrict the suffrage among white men.—Springfield Republican.

AN AMERICAN LETTER FROM SOUTH AFRICA.

The following letter from Walter L. Richardson, a former resident of Pasadena, Cal., was published in the Pasadena Weekly News of July 17:

Rooedeport, June 2, 1901.

Generally speaking, this is a fine, healthy climate to live in. Winter time is now upon us. The grass has all dried up and been burned off by the soldiers. The veldt now presents a most desolate appearance. There is ice nearly every morning, and to-day a cold south wind is blowing that can penetrate three overcoats. I feel sorry for the poor Boers who are out on commando. Some of them are well provided for, but others who are not fortunate enough to come in contact with British convoys have not enough clothing or food. The Boer is now entirely dependent upon his enemy for supplies. When one seriously thinks over the conditions here it is most

laughable. Here are 250,000 British soldiers in the country, which they have occupied for a year. The whole expense of governing, etc., rests with the British; they also are obliged to feed all the Boer women and children who have been rendered homeless by the war, and all the Boer prisoners in various parts of the world. They are also supplying the enemy with ammunition, guns, food, clothing, etc., for he takes it just when and where he pleases, always destroying the train, which the British have to pay the railroad company for. It has been costing the British government a little more than a million dollars a day to carry this business on.

It has already cost over \$760,000,000 and is liable to cost twice as much more before the last Boer is subdued, if Britain can last that long. On the other hand, the Boer has nothing, and in that his strength lies. He has all the cunning of the native, is a dead shot, moves in small bodies, strikes a blow and runs, and is constantly picking off the enemy.

Time is nothing to him. He is playing the waiting game, and in my opinion it is just a question of who can wait the longest who will be the victor. England cannot afford to let go here now, for she would lose her hold in South Africa and be the laughing stock of the world. But she will see as year after year goes by and this vast debt of millions upon millions accumulates to grind and crush the very life out of the working classes of Great Britain, that something must be done, or, as old Bismarck said, "England's policy in South Africa will be her downfall." The other night about 30 Boers came into a Jew's store at Moraisburg (near here).

They changed all of their shoes for new ones, took everything that they wanted, the commandant saying as they left: "Just hand our cards to the officer in command," pointing to the pile of cast-off boots.

There are plenty of Boers about, but they lie pretty low in bush veldt just north of here.

I expect to be leaving the Transvaal soon. Shall go to Natal, then travel awhile before I come home.

There are a lot of new regulations in British liberty, freedom and justice.

You may not believe what I am about to say, but it is so, and that is why I, among hundreds of others, are leaving the country.

The new government has inaugurated a system of absolute slavery for

the Kaffir. When I saw that I said: "White man, look out; they will have you soon." Here it is, and I hear you say impossible. No man working can be employed in the mines that will not work for \$1.25 a day and board. The regular pay of five or six dollars a day will be paid, but only \$1.25 goes to the wage-earner, and the balance will be paid over to a fund for widows and orphans of British soldiers. They are more liberal with the managers and staffs, who will receive about half pay, the balance going to the same fund. At last, my noble British friend, you have found a way to get rid of us foreigners. You arrested hundreds of us and sent hundreds away out of the country for no reason only that we were foreigners. You tried to force us to take up arms against the Boers when we had sworn to be neutral; but that failed; you tried to starve us out, but that would not work; but at last you have taken the right course. This new edict has fairly knocked the wind out of some of these loyal Britishers. Well, I go and leave the Britishers to fight it out among themselves.

AN HONEST MILLION.

In the last few years, during which the industrial question has assumed such great importance in our country, my mind has often gone back to those scenes in Galilee. I have thought of the principal actor, not as a teacher, but as a workingman—the Carpenter of Galilee. Millionaires and multi-millionaires have become numerous in our country, bringing in their wake an army of unemployed, many of whom, by force of conditions, degenerate into tramps and vagabonds. Both these classes, the millionaires and tramps, are a detriment to the best interests of our country. I have made a calculation bearing upon the honesty of these millions in private coffers, and to help us to realize what a sum a million dollars is, and what it is to actually earn a million dollars. All will agree that when a workingman can save one dollar every working day in the year he is doing well.

Our era begins with the birth of this Carpenter of Galilee. Let us suppose that he was able to begin work on the day of his birth, and that each working day he was able to save one dollar above his living expenses. Let us suppose that he never loses a day by sickness or bad weather, and that his life and health and strength are miraculously prolonged until he shall earn one million dollars by saving one dollar for every working day.

Then we will be able to realize what an honest million is.

We will trace our workman who began work on the day of his birth. At the historic time of his death, at the age of 33, what would he be worth? The calculation is easy; 365 days minus 52 Sundays equals 313 working days in each year. Multiply that by 33 years and we have 10,329 days; but we must add eight days for eight leap years. This would make 10,337—and one dollar per day saved would equal as many dollars—\$10,337. Far from a million, yet labor began at birth and never a holiday nor a day lost by sickness! Let us suppose that he had lived the allotted 70 years; then how would the account stand? Only \$21,927! Our workman has a long and weary task before him to earn so large an amount as a million dollars. Our hero must trudge along through summer's heat and winter's storms. Years and decades come and go, until they grow into centuries, and still he works on, for his task is only begun. He sees kingdoms and empires rise and fall, but still he labors on, for the greater part of his task is still before him.

Christians are persecuted in various countries, the Roman empire disappears, the dark ages come, and still he labors on, his task not yet completed. The crusades are fought, America is discovered, modern science awakens the world from its shroud of darkness, and still he labors on. The stirring events of modern history transpire and bring us down to the present moment, and—would you believe it?—Our Carpenter is still laboring on, not yet having saved a million dollars, yet not having missed a single working day from sickness or any other cause in all these centuries. Let us see how his task would stand at this time. We are not counting interest, but purely the earnings of labor. We have seen that his savings would be \$313 per year; this would be \$31,300 per century, but adding 25 days for 25 leap years per century, it would be \$31,325 per century. To determine how this account would stand at the beginning of the present century multiply \$31,325 by 18, and the result is \$561,850, and add \$30,048 for the 96 years of the present century, and the amount is \$591,898. So the task at the present time would be only a little more than half done. Let us in imagination bring him before us. Here he comes, time-scarred, storm-scarred, labor-scarred. We ask him questions. He tells us interesting stories of how he worked on the

Colosseum, the Alhambra and St. Peter's. He mentions familiarly such masters as Michael Angelo. He praises his good fortune in having steady employment during all these centuries, and that his wages are always promptly paid, and that he was allowed to make up the time lost by going from one job to another by night work—but suddenly he says: "I must not tarry. I am the drudge of the ages, with the task of earning a million dollars. I must get it honestly, therefore I must earn it. My task will require many, many years, even centuries yet, so adieu." With this he leaves us. But does he not leave many reflections concerning our millionaires and their millions? What shall we say to those who obtain not only one million, but many millions in the few years of the adult period of a single life?

It is plain that no man can earn a million dollars in a brief human life, however hard he may work. But many have become millionaires, and while it is impossible to do so honestly, in a strictly ethical sense, we will admit that some have done so legally. This shows that these men have been enabled to do this only by the many advantages of the institutions of this country, and aided by the protection of the law.—Dr. C. F. Taylor, in the Medical World.

OPPORTUNITY.

For The Public.

It has been said that Opportunity is master of human destinies and knocks but once at every gate; and, although this is a very pretty figure of speech, it unfortunately contains but a germ of truth in a flood of fatalism.

Opportunities are neither few nor far between, but may be found all around us, like "a cloud of witnesses," and are constantly knocking, knocking at every sensitive heart and brain, with the cry: "Open, open, open unto us, for we are Angels of Light, commissioned to make bright and pleasant the pathway of weary mortals!"

It is not the lack of opportunities, but the lack of power to see what Nature has in store for man, if he would but work in harmony with the Divine purpose. The eye of Genius is required to note the mental, moral and material potentialities of our environment; the wisdom of the Sage is required to sift the chaff from the wheat, and executive ability of no common order is required to so marshal these forces that each shall rec-

ognize and take its proper place in the progressive march. This, the possible side, is bright and beautiful; the actual side is submerged in stygian darkness.

Of old it was recorded that "Man is prone to do evil," and modern civilization has furnished available opportunities for the Moral Bankrupt, no less baleful and conspicuous than those of his ancient brethren. There is a wide difference between the opportunity to "make" and the opportunity to "take." The first implies genius, skill, wisdom and constructive and progressive desire; the latter, power, greed and Moral Imbecility.

Many years ago a man named Blackstone wrote two essays—one entitled "The Rights of Persons," the other, "The Rights of Things," in which he placed the rights of Persons above the rights of Things, and this was, for a time, held as a sound rule of action in civil life. To-day that soulless Thing called Capital is elevated above the collective personality of the people. When it is "Dollars versus The People," which is to "be damned"—the man or the thing? For answer look to the numerous court decisions rendered within the last decade.

State law has given the opportunity for the organization of monster corporations, the sole purpose of which is the monopoly of some special industry, under the plea of economy of production.

The fictitious values placed upon the several properties which have been united in these corporations, have given the country a very large amount of "paper capital," which is claimed as evidence of prosperity, but would be more correctly described as "fraudulent inflation."

The promoters of these monopolistic schemes announce themselves as "Great Captains of Industry," and issue stocks and bonds which tempt the great mass of conservative investors, because they are based on opportunities to take criminal advantage of public necessities. For it has been estimated that the corner on coal a few years ago, by which \$125,000,000 was filched from the poorer classes of the United States, was the direct cause of more deaths than Napoleon's retreat from Moscow.

The promoters become suddenly rich by "scooping" conservative capital. They elect themselves to office and salaries, proportioned to the nominal capital of the organization. Inflated capital and inflated salaries

demand inflated prices for products, and schedules are fixed with due regard to prospective dividends. The Robin Hood-Monopoly-Tewksbury plan is that "They should takē who have the power."

Is it not clear that opportunities to "take," solely by "right of might" and unrestrained greed, are coming dangerously near plutocratic anarchy?

Plutocracy is not "an original sin." Its prodromic symptoms did not appear in Adam. It is preeminently a product of inflated civilization. As a social disease it has substituted notoriety for refinement. In politics it is faithful to the venal side. In religion its vision is limited to the halo around the Almighty Dollar. In business it represents inflation, and, like nebulae, condensation necessarily precedes utilization. It exists because of the opportunities given it by productive energy, which has neglected to establish a just and economic system of distribution for its own protection.

The right of eminent domain is that inherent right of the public in public utilities, which it never releases and which courts cannot annul—therefore, subject to public convenience, equitable compensation being implied.

Land titles might be classified as follows:

- 1st. Rights of the people, collectively, under the National organization.
- 2d. Rights of the people under State organization.
- 3d. Rights of the people under City and Township organizations.
- 4th. Individual rights.
- 5th. Franchises.

None of these rights can be fully enjoyed without the common highway, which is the most democratic institution on the face of the earth, because it is a public necessity—an inherent right of the people—and a conspicuous example of the right of eminent domain, which forbids that it be sold or farmed out as a monopoly. It is obvious that the question is one of use, and not of distance between terminals. The greater the distance, the greater the need. Being a public utility the construction and care, very properly, becomes a public charge. Therefore, the public have a direct interest in its economic construction and maintenance. The extent and character of the use must be taken into consideration, and the road adapted to the traffic. The steel rail is never used except where it is

found to be the most economical. When this fact is established, it is not only the privilege, but the emphatic duty of those in charge of the construction of these highways, to use the steel rail.

Here we come to the parting of the ways between public and private ownership of highways. By public ownership, conditions are adapted to the use, and all benefits are secured at cost. The Monopolist, however, sees his opportunity, demands a franchise, and gauges his profits according to the needs of the people.

One generation ago the man who thrust himself between the producer and his legitimate opportunities was called a "middleman." To-day that middleman has grown into the "monopolist," who has found in the "franchise" a golden opportunity for levying a plutocratic tax on both the consumer and the producer.

The Courts have told us that—

A franchise is in the nature of a vested right of property, granted by the Government, subject, in some cases, to the performance of conditions and duties on the part of the grantees. It is exclusive in its character and, so long as the grantee fulfills the conditions and duties imposed upon him by the grant, his rights cannot be impaired or taken away by the Government any more than any other property.

Applied to railways, the Franchise, according to the above, is—

- 1st. A grant of an exclusive privilege, under some legislative act.
- 2d. This grant or privilege is a vested right of property.

The argument for a railway franchise, reduced to the fewest words, would read substantially as follows:

Private greed (which is an unknown and unknowable quantity) is less dangerous than political corruption (which may be checked by the votes of the people).

We know that ethical rules are not always observed by legislative bodies, and very objectionable franchises have been given simply because the people have not become thoroughly aroused to the dangers of monopolistic greed. Entrenched behind the Court decisions, the grantees of franchises talk loudly of vested rights of property which cannot be impaired or taken away. But the decision goes further than this, and adds the words, "any more than any other property." The right of eminent domain still exists, and, as we have already seen, is inherent in the general public, and not subject to the caprice of legislative bodies, nor the law relating to "property." The public good is its only rule of action, and

its power can be evoked in no more just cause than in annulling charters which have been violated, and taking "property" (giving equitable compensation), which has been obtained unjustly, and used obstructively.

The word "Monopoly" covers a multitude of class privileges, under which the thing called "Capital" has fattened at the expense of productive industries. The complaints of both the producer and the consumer have been unheeded because the Monopolist feels that he is securely entrenched. The history of civilization teaches that the age must be prepared before any radical change can be made that will benefit the masses, and the only hope is in agitation. Line upon line and precept upon precept will be required to arouse the people to a full sense of those class privileges which bleed the people at every pore.

The real heroes of the century are not those who are blood-stained, but those who possess brain, heart and moral courage; men who evade no duty, however onerous. The man who dares to defend the people against the conspiracies of the privileged few finds himself marked for destruction. But the battle is now on and must be fought to the finish. Delay is dangerous. Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, has given the people their long-sought opportunity to reassert their sovereignty, and woe be to those who absent themselves at the roll call of duty.

The moment of duty is the moment of need. Then away with that sham, the convenience creed!

When billows are high in tempestuous roll,
'Tis the man of the bravest, most heroic soul,

That stands firm at his post, at the helm,
'mid the storm,

And though wild tempests rage, falls not
till the calm,

To stem angry blasts with courage and
deed—

The moment of duty is the moment of need.

To-day all eyes are centered upon Tom Johnson, of Cleveland. Not because he is mayor—the city has had many mayors that did not attract attention from beyond its suburbs—but because he represents a principle. He is making a square fight against political corruption and privilege. Incidentally, he advocates that which he, with many others, believes to be the only equitable method of taxation. No one doubts his ability or integrity, but having dared to espouse the cause of truth and justice, he will be fought with all the power which Wall street has at its command, and has used with such effect in the last two presidential campaigns.

Against this power the people must present a solid front. The city of Cleveland is now driving the entering wedge which is destined to break the power of privilege and corruption, not only in Cleveland, but in every city and hamlet in the country. In this battle for human rights all should be interested, and every man who knows a voter in that city should write him and urge him to do all in his power to sustain the measures of reform which the mayor is trying to establish, remembering that success in Cleveland means success in other places.

FRANCIS LEANDER KING.
Worcester, Mass.

THE TREATMENT OF SUBJECT RACES.

Extracts from an article with the above title, by Mary A. M. Marks, of London, published in the International Journal of Ethics for July, 1900.

There is no nation in the world so much concerned in this question as the British, for no nation in the world governs so many subject races. But, alas, we forget that we do govern them, or only remember it to reckon up the millions of square miles over which the flag of England floats supreme. We delegate our enormous power to a handful of men over whom we exercise practically no control whatever. There is a startling sentence in one of Hume's essays to the effect that free people make the most oppressive governors of dependencies. I fear that Hume's saying has a great deal of truth in it in our case. The very fact of our being a free people makes it almost impossible for us to believe that we can ever do wrong in matters of government. We imagine that we have a divine right to govern and that there is something unpatriotic—if not impious—in the barest suggestion that Englishmen can govern wrong. Oddly enough, this national self-confidence often deserts us, just when it might be most useful; for no sooner are we invited to condemn any action of our countrymen in foreign parts, than we profess an edifying humility, very far removed from our usual somewhat aggressive cocksureness, and claim that "we do not know enough about it to express an opinion; but it is very unlikely that an Englishman would govern wrong. No doubt it is the fault of the people." With a few sentences like these, we wash our hands of the destinies of one-fifth part of the human race. Our sense of responsibility—that "white man's burden," about which we talk so much—be-

comes, in practice, rather a recognition of the duty of keeping up the British empire, than of making that empire what it ought to be, might be, and would be, if we only tried to be what we think we are. In fact our present somewhat obtrusive sense of national responsibility is becoming almost more mischievous than our previous indifference.

It is true that many of us have a sense of responsibility towards non-British races in one particular. We feel it to be our duty to try to impart our religion to them. With this object, we yearly expend considerable sums and a great deal of effort; but the expenditure and the effort do not produce adequate results. I do not in the least depreciate missionary efforts, to which the world has owed so much, but I do say that those efforts are heavily handicapped by the glaring contradiction between our religion and our political administration. Our converts may justly ask us whether we govern them as we would wish to be governed, whether we treat them as "neighbors," not to say as "brethren." If there had been as great and persistent an effort on the part of Englishmen to insure just government in our conquered territories, as there has been to teach the natives of those territories the religion of love and self-sacrifice, our empire would now stand upon an unassailable foundation, and our religion—thus honored by our practice—would have made an impression which it can never hope to do as things are. At present, I fear, we allow our missionary efforts to lull our consciences to sleep in regard to these matters.

I cannot help thinking that before we try to convert a subject people we ought to do them justice. I allude especially to the case of India. We often hear the enemies of missions (who are by no means always the friends of India) point disparagingly to the small results obtained. The only wonder is that these missions produce any results at all. They are too glaringly inconsistent with the political situation. What is a Christian missionary in India to reply, when, after he has read the Sermon on the Mount, his catechumen asks him: "If these things be so, why did you conquer us? Why do your Sahibs, who say they are Christians, treat us, not like brothers, but like a conquered people? Why do even some of you missionaries, when you have been here some

time, begin to copy them, and put a distance between yourselves and us?" I think an honest missionary must sometimes feel uncomfortable, as he reads the New Testament with his converts. But he does not make many, and he must be often sorely in doubt as to the motives of those he does make. For in India, Christianity is the way to worldly advancement. The people of India also suspect our motives, and think that while we profess to be anxious to establish the religion of Christ, we are really trying to strengthen the foundations of the British empire. And I must say that I have heard missionary sermons at home which almost made me think the same thing. . . .

Many years ago, in his book on "Representative Government," John Stuart Mill uttered some of the weightiest words he ever spoke, words which must commend themselves to all thoughtful persons, as at least worthy of long and careful consideration. They are to be found in the chapter entitled: "Government of Dependencies by a Free State."

The government of a people by itself, has a meaning and a reality; but such a thing as government of one people by another does not and cannot exist. One people may keep another as a warren or preserve for its own use, a place to make money in, a human cattle-farm to be worked for the profit of its own inhabitants. But if the good of the governed is the proper business of a government, it is utterly impossible that a people should directly attend to it. The utmost they can do is to give some of their best men a commission to look after it. . . . Let any one consider how the English themselves would be governed, if they knew and cared no more about their own affairs, than they know and care about the affairs of the Hindoos. Even this comparison gives no adequate idea of the state of the case; for a people thus indifferent to politics altogether, would probably be simply acquiescent, and let the government alone; whereas in the case of India, a politically active people like the English, amidst habitual acquiescence, are every now and then interfering, and almost always in the wrong place. . . . Now, if there be a fact to which all experience testifies, it is that when a country holds another in subjection, the individuals of the ruling people who resort to the foreign country to make their fortunes, are of all others those who most need to be held under powerful restraint. . . . Wherever the demoralizing effect of the situation is not in a most remarkable degree corrected by the personal character of the individual, they think the people of the country are dirt under their feet; it seems to them monstrous that any rights of the natives should stand in the way of their smallest pretensions. . . . The government itself, free from this spirit, is never able sufficiently to keep it down. . . .

The settlers, not the natives, have the ear of the public at home.

These are the words of a man who knew what he was talking about. Mill's father, as well as Mill himself, had a close official knowledge of the government of India. Mill was not theorizing, he was speaking of that which he had seen and heard. And it is all as true to-day as when the words were written. I have heard intelligent young Indians, who had never seen this book, making the very same statements out of their own experience. I particularly wish to insist upon that expression, "the demoralizing effect of the situation," because it is the key to the whole problem, and yet is a consideration we entirely ignore. If we did not ignore it, we could never be so easily persuaded that all is sure to be well in a dependency governed by Englishmen. We should know that it is in the nature of things most unlikely that all should be well—that it is pretty certain the whole situation is demoralizing alike for governors and governed.

The relation of conqueror to conquered is an odious one. It closely resembles that of master and slave. It inevitably makes the one overbearing, arrogant and unscrupulous, and the other deceitful and time-serving. It is, like all injustice, doubly cursed. It implies a radically false position, the assumption of a superiority which is not moral—for, if it were moral, there would be no need to hedge it about with insulting distinctions and unfair privileges. No man can bear to be constantly reminded of his inferiority, but neither can any man bear to be constantly reminded of his superiority. A habit of insolent contempt is formed which in the good-natured is often no worse than a passive ignoring of the existence of the despised. Whether it is active or only passive depends on the temperament and character of the individual Englishman. But there is always the invidious distinction; the conquered are always made to feel the presence of the intruder, of the conqueror. . . .

This contempt of the natives is not a mere matter of "sentiment;" it translates itself at every moment into hard fact. It affects our whole method of government, in which we persistently ignore national character and tradition. The present situation in India is a glaring instance of this. In former times a kind of sliding scale taxed the farmer according

to the goodness or badness of the crops. In a good year he paid a larger percentage than in a bad. The tax was not taken until the crop was reaped, and in years when the crop was entirely lost no tax at all was taken. This was the Law of Manu, and its justice and wisdom are obvious. But we thought we knew a better way—or, at any rate, a way more convenient for our officials. So we struck an average of the crop which each field may be expected to yield, and were mightily proud of our calculations as being far superior to the rough and ready native way. It was nothing to us that our system meant demanding every few years a tax upon crops which had never come above ground. Far from this, we have been so in love with our plan that we make a new settlement every few years, each time getting down lower and lower in the scale, not of payment but of payer, making the meshes of the great fiscal net smaller and smaller, to take in the gudgeons and the minnows, until now we are taxing the rag which the wretched peasant wraps about his loins, and enforcing a salt tax at a rate of 4,000 per cent. We excuse ourselves by saying that he has nothing else which we can tax, and the British taxpayer hears this without a qualm—the same taxpayer who clamors for his own "free breakfast table"—and whose average taxable margin is £4 3s. 2d. yearly, while the average yearly taxable margin of the Indian is two-pence, half-penny! This is the sort of thing that Mill meant when he said that the despotism exercised by a free country over a conquered state can easily become the worst of all, because it is exercised from a distance and is ignorant of the facts of the case.

There is perhaps no Indian matter which the British public understands so imperfectly as Indian famine, and those that think that the Englishman can do no wrong ask triumphantly if we are to blame for the failure of the rains of heaven. It is not

*Sir William Wedderburn, in an article on "The Starving Rayat," in India, for March, 1896, says: "The Rayat cannot be brought to see the justice of making a demand upon him when he has not even food for himself and his family. He says: 'In former days there were rajas that were good, and others that were bad; the good ones took a small share of our crops, and the bad a large share; but heaven never before sent us a government which takes from us when we have no crop at all.'"

our fault that the rains do not fall; but it is our fault that their failure produces such terrible consequences. In temperate climates famine is something abnormal, it comes as a surprise, we are astonished at it; but in India, famine is periodical; once in every five years at least the rainfall is more or less insufficient, the result being a famine of more or less severity. Famine in India is a contingency to be provided against, as in England we provide against frost, although it does not come every year. Famine in India is a fact to be reckoned with, and we have reckoned with it—but how? By taking care that land “settlements” shall be so arranged, that though the rain may fail, the taxes shall not. I refer to the system of “averages,” which, at first sight, may appear fair, but which does not and which never will appear so to the Indian cultivator. There is another point about Indian famines which the British public never takes into account. In England a bad “harvest” means that grain is a failure; the root crops may be good, the grass may be good, everything is not necessarily lost. But in tropical India, little rain means a bad crop all round; no rain means no crop at all. The Indian cultivator, with his long memory of famine years, thinks that the only fair arrangement is that he shall pay a percentage on the crops actually growing in his fields, which of course would mean that if there was no crop he would pay nothing, and this would embarrass the Indian exchequer.

We have, therefore, adopted the system of averages, the effect of which is that even in the worst of years the tax must be found. The above statement as to the margin of two-pence, half-penny will show how impossible it is for the ryot to have saved enough from the good year to pay for the bad; even in the good years he is taxed above that which he is able to bear. In the bad year he must borrow, and the usurer is always ready. As security he must pledge whatever he has; his plow, oxen, and the surplus of next year's crops. That next year may, perhaps, be so good that it may pay a part of its lean predecessor, but then little is left for himself. At the best, he is a fortunate man if he can work himself out of debt during the good years which separate one scarcity from another. Can that be a good government, can that be a just taxation, which makes this

state of things perennial? No wonder that the ryot lives upon one meal a day, not of rice, as his British fellow subjects fondly imagine—rice is much too dear—but of some even less wholesome mess of cheap grain. He has his one meal and if he is still hungry, he tightens his dhooly (waist cloth), upon which he has paid a tax.

In a fit of remorse and shame at the consequence of our own neglect of warnings, before the terrible famine which must always be a painful page in the history of Lord Lawrence's administration, we promised to set aside a “famine fund,” but we allowed this fund to be drawn upon to pay for the useless and mischievous expedition to Chitral. The serious famine of 1896, regarded by Indians as the worst of the century, overtook us with this deficit still to be made up. No greater proof could be given of our entire ignorance of the true situation than the admiration we expressed at our own generosity in subscribing so large a sum to the Indian famine fund of 1896. We appeared quite oblivious of the truth that we were first draining India of her money, and then returning her, by way of charity, a little of her own. But though we thus impose on ourselves we do not impose on our neighbors. Foreign nations believe that these famines are the result of our taxation, and even allege that famine is a symptom of British rule. . . .

The idea of innate superiority is an essentially immoral idea. Of course, there are enormous actual inequalities; it would be absurd to pretend that the Hottentot is not in many important respects “inferior” to any of the races of Europe. But it makes all the difference in the world to us whether we regard this “inferiority” as temporary or as permanent. An infant is certainly “inferior” to a full-grown man; but suppose it possible that in some imaginary state, the population consisted entirely of adults, who for some unknown cause had entirely forgotten that they themselves had once been children. If one of them found an infant by the roadside, he would certainly consider it a very “inferior” creature; he might even think it hardly worth preserving. If he thought it could never improve, never grow any stronger and more intelligent than it was when he happened to find it, an inarticulate infant, hardly able to find the way to its own mouth, he would assuredly not think it was worth much to the commonwealth.

Now the case of the less-developed

nations is analogous to the state of infancy, or of childhood, in an ordinary “civilized” human being. Give the man and the nation time and favorable conditions, and they will grow to satisfactory manhood and nationhood. Refuse them these conditions, and time will do about as much for them as it does for a child left to grow up as it can, without education or training. In the case of our own children, we have long known that we must not leave them to “nature,” as some of the philosophers of the last century proposed. Very few of them had any children of their own, or knew anything about children, or they would have known that children left to “nature” would grow up incapable of human speech and would eat like pigs, and that it would require many generations of such training as these “children of nature” could give their children, before they reached the level of Hottentots. The beginnings of civilization are very slow, when “nature” is left to herself and not aided by civilization from without.

But, alas, civilization from without usually approaches “barbarians” in the shape of robbery and murder. The first lesson it teaches the “savage” is how to kill his enemies with greater certainty, and greater safety to himself—not the noblest lesson in the world. And if the savage pupil survives this first lesson, the next thing he learns is how to forget his woes in bad brandy. Moreover, civilization invents for him sins he never knew before. For he has been used to the open veldt, or the primeval forest, where every man might take what he wanted for himself; but presently he finds himself shut out from his old haunts; all the common property has become the peculiar private property of the white man, and if the savage wants anything now, he has to steal it. He began by carefully carrying a broken pipe for six weeks, till he met a white man to whom to restore it; but when the white man has disinherited him, what wonder if the “savage” recoups himself with a little pilfering?

The deterioration which usually fol-

The Public

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

ON TRIAL

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

SIX WEEKS FOR TEN CENTS.

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

lows intercourse with the white man is to the reproach of the white man, not of the black.

FATHERLAND.

Native land, earth so fair,
Babbling brooks and balmy air,
Songs of nature tuned to bliss,
Is there land so fair as this?

Land for which our fathers fought,
Land that with their blood was bought,
Not to hold 'neath tyrant's rod,
But by law of nature's God.

In trust for all; (God writ the deed)
Every nation, tongue and creed,
Not in fee to will away,
But for tenants of to-day.

Men have dared this law repeal,
Law of God: "Thou shalt not steal."
Plutus throned upon the earth,
Overrules our right of birth.

Tho' we love thy rocks and rills,
We have neither woods nor hills.
Greed that grovels in the mud,
Holds by deed our fathers' blood.

Mother earth, dost hear our sigh?
Wilt thou, when we come to die,
Hide us where the cactus bloom—
Lest they oust us from the tomb?
—Dr. D. W. Bartlett, in Weekly Times of
Houston, Tex.

The British officers in the Transvaal, who are inclined to enjoy a joke, whatever the reaction, are delighted with an anecdote relating to an interview between Kitchener and the Boer general, Botha.

At the conclusion of the fruitless conference to arrange terms of peace, Botha said:

"Well, I must be gone."

"Don't be in a hurry," said Kitchener, hospitably. "You haven't got to catch a train."

"But that's just what I have got to do," answered Botha, as he took his leave.

And so he had, for two days later he caught and looted a train on the Delagoa line not far from the place of meeting.—Youth's Companion.

The Tory—If it hadn't been for Gladstone's weak policy we would not be having this trouble with the Boers.

The Liberal—But what if that policy had not been changed?

G. T. E.

Gov. Taft, who has been set up as ruler over those islands with practically unlimited authority, has directed that the judicial officers of the United States in that far-off possession shall not take an oath to support the constitution of the government which has appointed them, but for the usual form of oath shall be substituted one binding them to obey "the supreme authority." A parallel to this procedure has never been

furnished in the history of republican government.—Atlanta Journal.

If the Cubans had a taste for metaphysics they might take up the old question of free will and necessity.—Puck.

Wife—Here's an advertisement in the paper that you'd better look into. It says a man is wanted, and he won't be worked to death, and he'll get paid enough to live on.

Husband—Says he won't be worked to death, eh?

Wife—Yes; and they promise pay enough to live on.

Husband—Some catch about that!—London Fun.

"Papa, what does it mean to be blase?"

"My boy, it is getting tired of all the things that are not worth living for."—Life.

MAGAZINES.

—Of the morbid tendency to discover superior human qualities in "blood and breeding," which is making rapid headway in American social life, the opening story in Harper's Magazine is an illustration. A touch or two more would make it a satire. It is not intended, however, to satirize, but rather to apotheosize, and the writer is too good an artist to over color his picture. He has drawn it exactly to the taste of lovers of "good blood." An antidote may be found in the Cosmopolitan for July—an equally serious and professedly true story, by Katrina Trask, entitled "Constance Weatherell and Bridget Brady."

—The Century for August contains an historical paper of unusual interest and extraordinary value. It is by William Trant, who writes of "The Paris Commune, Thirty Years After." Mr. Trant corrects the respectably vulgar notion that the Paris commune was an uprising of communists. He explains clearly what well informed persons have all along understood, that the uprising was not communistic, but municipalistic, or, as we should say, an uprising in support of local self-government. The misapprehension has arisen from a confusion in English thought of the French "communists," meaning municipalists, with the English "communists," meaning almost anything atrocious that ignorance associates it with. Mr. Trant also testifies strongly that the charges of atrocity made against the communists are unfounded. He is evidently not a partisan of either side, but his testimony goes to show that the Thiers party was quite as brutal as the communists, and with less to excuse them. The paper is all the more valuable because it is followed by an article hostile to the communists, by Archibald Forbes, to which Mr. Trant effectively though judiciously replies.

Volume III of The Public

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

Bound Volumes Now Ready.
Price, \$2.00. Express charges to be paid by consignee. Address,
PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

For any Book on Earth
Old or New

CATALOGUES FREE.

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

The Public

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY,
1501 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

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

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES A. BUTLER,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Suite 420, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.
Long Distance Telephone, Central 3261.

HARRIS F. WILLIAMS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
806 Chamber of Commerce Building,
CHICAGO.

WALTER A. LANTZ, T. G. McELLIOTT
Telephone Central 2264.

LANTZ & McELLIOTT,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
1025-1030 Unity Building, 79 Dearborn St., Chicago.

CHARLES H. ROBERTS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,
614 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Houston.

EWING & RING,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
HOUSTON, TEXAS.
Presley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.,
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.
Tel. Call, 1338 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.
NEW YORK.

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

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

tf