

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 5, 1901.

Number 144.

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 London Speaker naively reminds Lord Roberts that the war in South Africa is [still] over.

The American counterpart of the Philippines to the British in the Transvaal, phrases our plight somewhat differently. Recent dispatches from the Philippines assure the folks at home that "the bottom of the insurrection is dropping out, but an early reduction of the army would be fatal"!

By releasing himself from his street railroad responsibilities in Detroit, ex-Congressman Tom L. Johnson makes a further advance toward the realization of his long-cherished intention of wholly devoting his energies to undermining the fundamental causes of poverty in this era of great productive power.

The treasury officials at Washington express their gratification over the rapid refunding of the national debt. They announce a saving of interest in the refunding so far made of \$10,000,000. No boast is offered of success in perpetuating the debt. Yet that is the principal object of the refunding policy, and its success is promising.

Reluctant advocates of the theory that women are inferior creatures will be glad to learn that out of 62 applicants for licenses as registered pharmacists under the New York law, Mrs. Marietta Harmon, of Syracuse, one of the inferior creatures, has received the highest rating. It is not

only higher than that of any of her 61 competitors, but the highest ever given. The New York state board of pharmacy rated her examination as perfect.

One of the vice president elect's contributions to the gaiety of nations at the close of the nineteenth century was a remark, in his speech on "The Prospects of Young Men in the Twentieth Century," to the young men of the continent gathered at various Y. M. C. A. halls. "Woe to us as a nation," he said, "if we ever follow the lead of men who seek not to smother but to inflame the wild-beast qualities of the human heart." Next to the emperor of Germany, the man who in our generation has done most to "inflame the wild beast qualities of the human heart," and been boastfully proud of his inflammatory distinction, is this same Theodore Roosevelt.

Maj. John R. Lynch, of Memphis, who is said to enjoy the distinction of being the only negro paymaster in the army, is evidently a shrewd observer. Having been in Cuba, he says that nine-tenths of the people want independence; and that nobody wants annexation but the foreigners and a few land-holding Cubans. Yet they hardly dare express themselves, he concludes, so overwhelming is the sentiment the other way. Maj. Lynch regards this as ungrateful on the part of the Cubans. He thinks apparently that as "the United States drove out the Spanish tyrants," it ought to be welcomed in their place. It does not occur to him that independence is a sentiment which possibly other people than black and white Americans may cherish. And he forgets that when the United States drove out the Spanish it did so under a pledge to recognize Cuban independence. By the

way, there is significance in the fact that Cuban landowners want annexation. When we remember the simple, not to say obvious, truth, that landowners benefit at the expense of land users, much as slave owners benefit at the expense of slaves, it is possible to infer that the Cuban landowners expect the United States to be less particular about the rights of land users than the privileges of landowners.

Since ex-President Cleveland has emerged from his political hibernation upon hearing of Bryan's second defeat, he has kept the linotype machines active. One piece of advice he gives has reference to the length of the presidential term. He would extend it. In support of this proposition he advances two arguments. In the first place, business and other important interests would be less frequently "disturbed and disquieted by the turmoil and heat of a presidential election;" and in the second, "a substantial extension of the executive tenure would pave the way for establishing the ineligibility of an incumbent to succeed himself." What length of tenure he would personally prefer, Mr. Cleveland does not say; but that which would best meet his expressed objections to the four-year term would be a tenure for life. Short of the abolition of popular elections altogether, that would be most effective in lessening the frequency of "the turmoil and heat of a presidential election;" and it would completely establish "the ineligibility of an incumbent to succeed himself."

Great Britain begins the new century with an exasperating and apparently irrepressible war upon her hands, in which the outlook is gloomier to her than it was a year ago.

This war is in a double sense one of her own making. She forced it upon the Boers in the first place, by pressing forward a policy that was obviously intended to culminate in the abrogation of Boer independence in South Africa. And when she had achieved a victory, she forced the Boers into the adoption of guerrilla tactics by the relentless terms of peace she demanded. The Boers offered to negotiate. Lord Salisbury refused to listen. He demanded unconditional surrender, and clearly indicated his purpose of totally wiping out Boer independence. The Boers appealed to other nations to intercede for peace. The United States gingerly transmitted the appeal to Lord Salisbury, and he responded with a curt refusal to tolerate intercession of any sort. Annexation and nothing short of that would satisfy British honor. So annexation was proclaimed. A British military government was set up. And naturally enough the Boers began a system of guerrilla warfare. It was their only recourse. The British commanders retaliated by making war upon women and children. They imitated the reconcentrado policy of Weyler, and even outdid Weyler's cruelty by burning farm houses over large districts. So indefensible was their policy in this respect, that after the world began to learn of it, when it had been in operation for half a year, Lord Roberts himself was obliged to order its modification. But the modification came too late. Every possible disposition to submit had been beaten out of the Boers; death had become preferable to submission. And now, spurred on by Lord Salisbury's relentless policy of subjugation and Kitchener's merciless policy of destruction, they have not only revived the war, but have carried the seat of active operations over the Orange river and far down into British territory. Nor have they abandoned the fight at home. Over a field 500 miles long from south to north, and from 50 to 200 from east to west, they are making the British respect their valor

as soldiers and their devotion to the cause of their independence. This revival of their war in South Africa is the penalty the British people have to suffer for Salisbury's arrogance. Whatever may have been the merits of the war originally, there is no room to deny that its destructive revival has been forced by Salisbury's policy of unconditional submission and unqualified subjugation.

Arthur Saiter, the son of a well-known citizen of Vincennes, Ind., who has just returned from military scenes in the Philippines, bringing back an honorable discharge and one leg, gives a report of the situation in the Philippines which does credit to the good sense of himself and his comrades. He declares that the soldiers who have seen active service are generally of one opinion. They regard it as a waste of time, labor, money and lives to hold Luzon. They believe that we shall not get back one-tenth of what we spend on Luzon if we keep the island a thousand years. But they are sure that the only way to "quiet the insurrection is either to exterminate the natives or withdraw the troops." But Mr. Saiter and his comrades have evidently not given full weight to the possibilities of that rich Luzon mine a mile high, the report of which so profoundly impressed Mr. McKinley; nor to the chances for lumber speculation in Luzon, in which the chairman of the house military committee is so deeply interested.

Among the new century greetings to the Red Cross society in response to its invitations, were four messages which we should like to see preserved for the enlightenment of posterity. One was in these words:

I bring you the stately matron named Christendom, returning bedraggled, besmirched and dishonored from pirate raids in Kiao-Chou, Manchuria, South Africa and the Philippines, with her soul full of meanness, her pocket full of boodle and her mouth full of pious hypocrisies. Give

her soap and towel, but hide the looking glass.

In this generation that message will be recognized as the work of Mark Twain. It could have come from no other pen. Let it serve to remind future generations of the greatest humorist of his time, whose humor seldom failed to rise above mere fun into the realms of Christian philosophy. The three other messages are as follows:

During this century we have on a whole moved upward; I hope we shall continue so to move, but whether we do or not will ultimately depend upon whether on the average the individual man shows courage, honesty, common sense and a knowledge of duty alike to himself and to others.

I send cordial greetings to the American National Red Cross on its auspicious entrance upon the enlarged fields of usefulness with the new century.

During the century just closing the Red Cross society has done much to alleviate the sufferings of the battlefield. Let us greet the twentieth century with the hope that a higher regard for the inalienable rights of man and a broader recognition of the people as the source of power will hasten the coming of the day when nations will have war no more.

The first two would not be worth preserving but for the important official stations of their authors. One is commonplace, and the only principle it suggests is that principle out of which all tyrannies grow—the principle of courage in the performance of self-assumed duties toward one's self and others without reference to the rights of either. Its author needs to learn that duties and rights are correlative. The second is a pompous piece nothingness. Need it be explained that Vice President-elect Roosevelt wrote the first and President McKinley the second? The third is worth preserving for its own sake. Relating 'rights and duties reciprocally, it makes an eloquent call to the higher levels of patriotism. Its author is a simple citizen, but one whose fame this message alone should preserve long after the men who wrote the other two are remembered only

because the offices that honor them survive. It is a contribution to the democracy of the new century from William J. Bryan.

We have no disposition to criticize either the motives or the methods of people who, seeing want and suffering all around them, try to relieve it. But there is something extremely offensive about some of the "wood-yard" methods of charity. Lying before us as we write is an appeal from one of these charities—the "Chicago Relief and Aid Society Wood Yard." It is an appeal for patronage. One of the points it makes against encouraging beggary touches the core of the matter—but, oh, in such pharisaical spirit! To aid beggars at one's home, it says, "does each man a great injury by showing him the possibility of living without work." That is doubtless true. It would be true, rather, had not each man already seen "the possibility of living without work." He has seen it by observing the very classes who support wood yard tests for him. They themselves, in their lives of ease and unearned comfort and luxury, exemplify "the possibility of living without work." The beggar knows this; and if he is intelligent he relates, more or less vaguely in his mind, the success in doing that, which they achieve, to the circumstances that have driven him to beggary. If, also, there is any spirit of manhood in him, he will decline the wood yard test. Not because it is honest work, but because it is make believe work. When legitimate wood yards make a demand for men to saw wood, it will be time to condemn beggars who refuse the job. To refuse to saw wood for which there is no legitimate demand, as a test to demonstrate one's worthiness to get a breakfast, is no test of industry. An hour on the treadmill would be as fair.

Yet it is to set up a sort of treadmill test that this Chicago wood yard charity seems to exist. On its letter-

head is the full-length picture of a spiritless fellow with a bucksaw in his hand. He has not unnaturally the air of a fresh convict. The saw stands out like a badge of useless servitude instead of an emblem of honorable labor. And opposite the picture is a statement of the objects of the wood yard. Each man who applies for a night's lodging is given it after he has earned it by sawing wood; each must perform a given stint for every meal, and the "rule of the yard is the apostolic maxim: 'If any man shall not work, neither shall he eat.'" But, we do not condemn this charity. It undoubtedly gives individual relief. We do not condemn its treadmill test. Circumstances make tests necessary when degrading charity has a place in our social life. We should have more confidence, though, in the intelligence and sincerity of the promoters of the charity if they showed any disposition to extend their favorite apostolic maxim beyond the confines of their wood yard.

It is so much easier to be charitable than to be just. It is easier even to wish to be charitable than to wish to be just. A corroborative instance is furnished in a recent speech by Abram S. Hewitt, once mayor of New York. Asserting that our national wealth since 1840 has increased five times as fast as our population, he reminded his audience that the conditions which have brought this increased wealth have made it impossible for some people to live decent lives. That sounds like saying that an increase in the supply of water has made it unfavorable for some people to quench their thirst. Yet Mr. Hewitt seemed to be quite oblivious to the manifest fact that this impoverishment must be due not to the great increase of wealth, but to the spoliation by some classes of the share of others. Throughout his speech there was not one note of justice. Its theme was simply charity, paternal, patronizing charity. The rich seem to him to fail in their duty not be-

cause they are indifferent to the systematic spoliation of which they are beneficiaries, but because they "are not giving" as much as he thinks they ought to. Charity! charity! With all the injustice that has raised up a class of idle rich growing richer, and produced a class of working poor growing poorer, this perpetual cry of charity on the part of the beneficiaries of that awful injustice makes the brain weary and the heart sick.

Bishop Potter is another pleader for amelioration. He not merely ignores considerations of justice; he casts them aside with contempt. The bishop wishes that "a company of men and women of recognized social leadership" would "bind themselves together" for the purpose among other things of discouraging lavish expenditures and excessive accumulations and of promoting donations. None of his suggested purposes have to do with reforming the social structure. He simply encores the same old farce of charitable self-sacrifice. What a lame and impotent reform it is that he proposes. A band of social leaders to discourage lavish expenditures and excessive accumulation! One that will give! give! give! Let him try to get a band of social leaders to agree to spend only what they earn. Then he will have turned his face in the right direction, though he fail utterly in getting recruits for that band, as he will for the one he does propose.

We are in receipt of a letter of friendly criticism upon our approval of the Crumpacker bill, from L. W. Washington, president of the Waiters' Royal Benefit Progressive league, of Chicago. Writing from what he regards as the proper point of view of his race, Mr. Washington complains that this bill "sanctions an open violation of the constitution" in the southern states that disfranchise negroes under cover of an educational qualification, "and places the power of the majority in the hands of the

minority." "What the negroes want," hesays, "is not a penalty in the way of reduced congressional representation for the states that disfranchise negroes, but "the right to live as American citizens in any part of the union." And he asks congress "to advise the president, by a good majority, to carry out his pledges to uphold and defend the constitution by enforcing the laws that make effective the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth amendments." With Mr. Washington's sentiment we are in hearty accord. We believe that the constitutional provisions as to citizenship should be enforced. But unfortunately for that view, there is no way of enforcing them against any state legislation which the supreme court holds to be constitutional. Consequently the Crumpacker bill proposes the only method of reaching the case. Its enactment would at least show a disposition on the part of congress and the president to enforce the constitutional guarantees. It would, moreover, produce a good local effect, by admonishing states that they cannot disfranchise citizens without losing congressional representation in consequence. This would have a greater tendency than might be supposed in the direction of discouraging disfranchisement.

In an article in the December Century, Mr. Jerome Dowd, a southerner, makes some "practical suggestions" regarding the negro. He declares, as most southerners do, when discussing this question, that "the southern people understand the negro." This assumption we venture, with all good feeling and respect for those who adopt it, to most seriously doubt. Both upon the general principles of human association and from personal observation, we are quite sure that the southern people do not understand the negro. This is not to say that the northern people understand him. They do not. Though their understanding of him differs essentially from that of the southern people, there is no real understanding in

either case. In the nature of things there cannot be. No man can understand another, no race can understand another, unless they associate upon terms of perfect equality. Rich northerners for example, do not understand the working classes of their own color and race, among whom they live and from whose ranks many of them have sprung. How much less, then, should the southern people understand the negro. That they understand him as masters understand slaves, is doubtless true. That they understand him as superiors understand inferiors is also true. That they understand him as people of one caste understand those of another is likewise true. But they do not understand him as a man. They do not understand him as members of his own race do. They do not understand him as they understand their own white associates.

We could ask for no better proof of this than the Century article by Mr. Dowd, an article which is both intelligent and generous. Mr. Dowd complains of the negro's clan spirit, and seems to regard this as evidence of race inferiority. It is a familiar ground of complaint in the south. Yet in the very next paragraph Mr. Dowd ingenuously recognizes that spirit as eminently human—as human, at least, for white men; or, at any rate, for southern white men. For he says: "It should be well understood by this time that no foreign race inhabiting this country and acting together politically can dominate the native whites." What is that if not an exhibition of clan spirit? Can it be doubted that the negro's clanishness has its root in the same human nature that develops the doctrine of white supremacy? Yet southerners whose views agree with Mr. Dowd's, claim to understand the negro. All through his article Mr. Dowd reveals the conviction he holds in common with his sectional compatriots, and which prevails also in the north, that the negro's characteristics are those of an inferior race. Yet he

shows as clearly, and all unconsciously, as he describes the negro's environment, that those characteristics are due not to inferior race qualities but to inferior social opportunities. One illustration will serve. Mr. Dowd points out in allusion to the negro that "all their tastes lie in the realm of the objective and the concrete." They cannot generalize. Their enjoyment is in the spectacular. So much so that "factories employing negroes generally find it necessary to suspend operations on "circus day!" But this does not describe a race of necessarily inferior intellectual qualities. The inability, as white men suppose, of wild races to think except in the objective and concrete, is fully accounted for by the fact that their environment is too primitive to stimulate abstract thought. It does not prove inherent lack of capacity. And when so-called inferior races living in civilized surroundings also exhibit defective powers of abstract reasoning, the all-sufficient explanation is that they are held down to lower intellectual levels by the spirit of caste. Though they come in contact with the advanced race, it is only casually and in a subordinate manner. Their thought life is lived in their own primitive and repressive environment. Though they are admitted up at the house, it is only to serve; their real life is among their absolute equals. What Mr. Dowd attributes to inferior race capacity, are plainly only the phenomena of hardened distinction of caste.

The same results would follow the same conditions of caste if the negro were white and Anglo-Saxon. De Tocqueville gives us a simple illustration of the principle in his "Democracy in America" (vol. 2, page 66, third edition), where he says:

In France very few pleasures are exclusively reserved for the higher classes; the poor are admitted wherever the rich are received; and they consequently behave with propriety, and respect whatever contributes to the enjoyments in which they themselves participate. In Eng-

land, where wealth has a monopoly of amusement as well as of power, complaints are made that whenever the poor happen to steal into the inclosures which are reserved for the pleasures of the rich they commit acts of wanton mischief. . . .

No doubt the wealthy English found an explanation of this rudeness in a theory of hereditary inferiority; whereas it was truly, as De Tocqueville implies, an outgrowth of caste. Where caste exists, no theories of racial or hereditary inferiority are admissible. Where caste exists, the superior caste can make no well-founded claims to knowledge of the inferior. They may know their external peculiarities, but nothing more. An inferior caste never reveals itself, its real self, to the superior. That the little white children of the south understand the little black children as well as they understand one another, we have no manner of doubt. But from the day that each discovers the impassable social barrier, from that moment their lives diverge. Thereafter each may know the other as master and slave do, as high caste and low caste do; but no longer as friend knows friend.

The annual convention of the American Economic association, which is serio-comic to the last degree of pathetic humor, closed its sessions at Detroit last week. Most of the members take themselves and one another seriously, which is part of the humor. But the seriousness of Prof. Veblen of Chicago, is open to doubt, as well in his performances in this association as in his admirable book on the leisure classes. Back of his intense seriousness there seems to be a good-natured disposition to make solemn fun of his solemn associates. It was not so, however, with Prof. Frank A. Fetter, of the Leland Stanford Junior university, who read a paper at Detroit on the same day that Prof. Veblen did. Prof. Fetter was genuinely solemn when he led his audience through the mazes of the mystification theory of political econ-

omy. It is little wonder that university students of political economy reason about the subject as if its phenomena belonged to some fourth dimension of space, when they have to work their way through such woolly-edge analyses and tanglefoot logic as professors of the Fetter type spread out before them in the name of "science." The old monkish gymnastics in mystical theology were models of good sense and sound reasoning, by comparison. It is due to Prof. Fetter to say, however, that the muddle which he gives out, he has taken on faith from other muddlers. Since "economics," the abstruse science of fortune getting by individuals, has been substituted in our universities for "political economy," the simple science of wealth getting and wealth sharing by communal aggregates—an idea somewhat roughly indicated by Adam Smith when he called his great book "The Wealth of Nations,"—one can hardly tell whether to be indignant at the fraud whereby predatory economic institutions are thus sought to be justified, or amused at the absurdity of the performance and the childish solemnity of the performers. Perhaps the better course for some purposes is the cynically good-humored one that Prof. Veblen seems to have adopted.

THE NEW CENTURY.

I.

The Monday that ended the nineteenth century and the Tuesday that began the twentieth were not separated by any natural boundary different from what has distinguished Tuesdays from Mondays since those names first came into use. Just as all Tuesdays differ from all Mondays, so and only so did last Tuesday differ from last Monday. Everybody knows this. Yet special significance is attached very generally to the meeting of these two days, because it marked the death of one century and the birth of another.

So subject are men to superstition that great phenomena are often re-

lated to that point in time, as effect to cause. It seems as if there were in some sort a closing and balancing of the books of Fate with the outgoing century, and an opening of a new set as its successor appears. We think of the old century as of something dead and gone, dying it may be in social convulsions which its own dissolution produces, and of the new one as an infant coming peacefully among us to live its life and die amid similar convulsions in regular turn. We think of it much as we thought of old years and new years, but with the circumstances immensely magnified. The French "fin de siècle" was vital with that superstition.

But it requires only the thought of a moment to comprehend that when we speak of old centuries and new, we are naming no point of change in Time's monotonous whirl, but only a point in our own arbitrary devices for measuring his movement by relating events to events. The beginning of a new century, the beginning of a new year, the beginning of a new week, the beginning of a new day, are but the passing of the midnight hour we have marked upon our clocks and calendars.

Yet there is that about the passage of time over one of our points of greater measurement which reminds us of the imperfections of so much of life as has gone before and admonishes us of the possibilities of what is to come. This is a familiar idea in connection with the passing years of individual lives. The first day of the new year is traditionally an individual locus penitentiae—a place for regrets over the past and for good resolutions for the future. Then why not make the early days of the new century a locus penitentiae for the race?

II.

Since the nineteenth century is dead, let it have the benefit as far as possible of the maxim that nothing may be said of the dead but good. But let nobody carry that rule so far as to ignore such of its faults as may be useful monitors to its successor. One may be more generous to the dead by recalling the evils they have done, if for the purpose of guarding against repetitions of such evils, than by flat-

tering their memories with indiscriminate praise.

And though the faults of the nineteenth century be recalled, this need not be for lack of opportunities to praise its record. In most directions the old century has left a legacy of progress, and to that progress in one of its phases attention may be directed here. It has been most proudly and eloquently discussed elsewhere. We refer to the progress that must ever precede and always underlie progress of every other kind—to progress in the arts that tend to diminish the difficulties of satisfying material wants.

Man's life is first of all that of the animal. His primary wants are animal wants. He must be fed and clothed and housed before his nobler qualities can develop. As his soul has material embodiment, so his soul's aspirations and growth must, while that embodiment continues, spring out of and be nurtured through material satisfactions. The plane of material progress, therefore, is to man the plane of primary consideration; and the century that progresses far upon it is one to which future generations will turn with gratitude. Such a century was the nineteenth. It was more distinctly than any other of historical times the century of material development—the century of progress in wealth production.

Only with an effort is it possible now to realize how comparatively impotent as wealth producers were our fathers who lived when the nineteenth century came in.

By wealth we mean, of course, those tangible things which human art fashions for human consumption. We do not mean money; that is a trading convenience, not an object of consumption. We do not mean bonds, nor mortgages, nor corporation stocks, nor book accounts, nor deeds to land, nor public franchises, nor any other mere evidence of title or token of power. The production of those things, also, was vastly facilitated during the nineteenth century; but they are not matters of primary consideration. What we do refer to is food and clothing and shelter, in the infinite variety of forms—from

that of the simplest utility to those that excel in convenience, luxury and beauty—which these three necessities of life assume. The ability to produce such things is so much greater to-day, both as to abundance and perfection, than a hundred years ago, that one may wonder how life at the beginning of the now departed century could have been tolerable.

Labor saving invention, consisting partly in more minute subdivision and partly in more comprehensive association of labor, has in a myriad ways enhanced the power of the human muscle and widened the field of the human brain. Whether we turn to agriculture or to mechanics, we find men now not only producing in marvelous quantities what then could be produced only in a small way, but producing also what then could not be produced at all. Attempts to enumerate the differences in productive methods and effects can hardly result in anything more interesting than a catalogue of industrial innovations. But this whole drama of progress pictures itself to the imagination when, reflecting upon the part that steam and electricity play in modern industry, we remember that at the beginning of the nineteenth century the known uses of steam were the most primitive possible, while electricity had not got beyond the stage of a curious scientific plaything. In consequence of the enormous strides of the century in productive power, it would be easily possible now, were productive energies devoted to providing necessities of life, to furnish forth food and clothing and shelter in superfluous quantity and finest quality, for every living person.

So far, then, as concerns production, the nineteenth ranks as the prodigy of the centuries. Though much in the way of productive possibilities remains still to be discovered, and much in the way of those possibilities which have been discovered is not yet realized, the progress has been truly prodigious.

III.

With reference to the sharing of products, however, there has been no progress at all. Despite its wonderful contributions to the improvement of wealth production, the nineteenth

century has contributed nothing to the improvement of wealth distribution. The products of human labor are shared more inequitably, more unrighteously, more unjustly now than they were before steam and electricity had multiplied labor power.

The abolition of slavery, one of the great events of the century, may be cited to the contrary. But the citation is inapplicable. The abolition of slavery has not improved wealth distribution. Those apologists for slavery who say that the southern field hand was better off in the slavery regime than now, are not far wrong. The field hand's share of annual wealth production is little if any greater now as an absolute quantity—and it is distinctly smaller as a proportion of product—than that of the nineteenth century slave.

Splendid philanthropy is another great fact which may be urged against the idea that the nineteenth century contributed nothing to the reform of wealth distribution. But this objection also fails. Philanthropic distribution is not just distribution. In fact, large benefactions are possible only when and where distribution is unjust. If philanthropists had to produce the wealth they give away, they would have but little to give. And if they had but little to give there would be few to need their gifts; for philanthropy and unjust wealth distribution are closely related as parts of one system. The rectification of the latter would abolish not only the possibility of the former but all occasion for it. So far, then, from testifying to progress in equitable wealth distribution, extraordinary charities indicate rather that equity in wealth distribution has receded. Nor is munificent philanthropy peculiar to the nineteenth century. The people of ancient Rome were so familiar with the ostentatious generosity of the privileged classes, and came so well to understand its malign significance, that their phrase, "bread and the circus," grew into a term of reproach. Modern philanthropy is only a modern form of "bread and the circus."

We have also seen trades unionism rise through the century from the status of criminal conspiracy to that

of a well-nigh recognized industrial institution. But to reform in wealth distribution trade unionism contributes nothing. At best it is only a class organization for defensive purposes. It does not, and in the nature of things cannot, include within its protection more than a small fraction of labor interests. Hired men alone come within its scheme. That great mass of struggling business men in a small way, many of whom work harder and get less than many union-protected hired men, are of necessity excluded from such benefits as trades unionism has to offer. It is, therefore, only as the proportion of hired laborers increases relatively to the laborers in the aggregate—in other words, only as injustice in distribution intensifies—that trades unionism becomes effective. And even within its limited sphere it is exceedingly inefficient. It can keep wages in the protected employments only slightly above the point to which jug-handle competition in the labor market depresses them. Whenever that point falls, the slightly higher point of union wages must fall also.

Cooperative societies have sprung up here and there, usually to live out a brief and fitful existence. But cooperative societies, though they may promote just distribution between their own members, and might serve as object lessons if they were ever notably successful, do not promote just distribution in general. They are essentially nothing but partnerships. And, like individuals, partnerships either benefit or suffer from unjust distribution so long as it prevails in the community at large.

Many economic reforms were agitated during the nineteenth century. Some of them have secured the public ear and made genuine progress. But even the most successful are still in the agitation stage. No reform has so far crystallized that the nineteenth century may be credited with initiating a system of just wealth distribution.

The influences that determine distribution are the same as before. The same principle of indirect taxation, for example, which commended itself to the courtiers of the eighteenth century because it enabled their royal

masters so to pluck the tax-paying geese as to get the most feathers with the least squawking, has been handed down to the twentieth century not only unimpaired but perfected in its pernicious power. In spite of the warning of Pitt that indirect taxation enables governments to take the last rag from the back and the last morsel from the mouth of the poor without their knowing what impoverishes them, nineteenth century statesmen of the American republic have held it up for the adoration of the deluded masses, who worship it now as the fetish of protectionism. Prevailing throughout the world, protection is one of the great agencies whereby the producer's share of wealth is diminished in order to enlarge that of the privileged leisure and exploiting classes. It tends not only to create those classes, but to fortify them.

Nor is that the whole indictment against the nineteenth century. With reference to land tenures, it has drifted farther away than the century preceding, from the theory that private possession of land is a privilege conditioned upon continuing obligations to the public. That was the germ of justice in the feudal system. Unjust as that system was in many ways, and crude as were its methods even in this respect, it did embody the great economic principle of social justice that possessors of land must bear the public burdens. For this beneficent principle the older allodial doctrine of absolute and irresponsible ownership has been revived and substituted. Thus the right of the people to that increment of value which attaches to land with the advance in productive power of the community as a whole, has been so placed that in the forum of the public conscience it may be the more plausibly questioned. By contributing to that consummation, the nineteenth century obstructed the way of fundamental reform in wealth distribution.

In these circumstances the wonderful productive advances for which mankind is indebted to the nineteenth century have done nothing to benefit those people whose labor is essential to all production. The worthy poor are still with us, though

productive power is great enough to abolish all poverty. And the poverty of the worthy poor is the more appalling for the piles of heaped up wealth in the midst of which poverty festers.

We do not mean by this that those who work do not share in products which even the wealthy could not enjoy when the nineteenth century was young. He must be very poor indeed, who to-day cannot possess, for illustration, that luxury of the rich of a hundred years ago—a watch. What we do mean is that relatively to the greater product which their labor yields, all workers are worse off in point of wealth at the opening of this new century than at the opening of the last. We mean, furthermore, that there is now a large and growing class whose members are often not only relatively but absolutely poorer in point of wealth than were the poorest, outside the jail or almshouse, a century ago. There was then no great unemployed class, no class constituting a never dwindling army of men vainly seeking opportunities to work. But today, so large and hopeless is that army; so constant, though its units are always changing; and so pertinacious are its efforts to shove its own desperate members into the places of the men who have employment which most of them hold by a fragile tenure—so extreme are these conditions that no other possible calamity haunts the average man like the ever-present danger of losing his job.

Splendid, then, as is the legacy of productive progress to which we acknowledge indebtedness to the nineteenth century, its legacy of unjust distributive processes imposes a heavy burden of moral responsibility upon the new century into which we have entered.

IV.

By indirect taxation the producer is made to bear the heavy end of public expenditures. Upon indirect taxation a predatory system of so-called protection, nominally for the producer but in the last analysis for the owners of land of peculiar qualities, such, for instance, as ore mines, has been built up. Underlying all, a system of land tenure has been perfected which gives to land owners through advancing land values the pecuniary

benefits of improved productive processes. This in turn has so encouraged speculation in land that for every square foot that is well used hundreds of thousands of square feet, held snugly in private ownership, are either only slightly used or not used at all, though every idle man is indirectly a bidder for the privilege of using them to the full.

Thus not only is distribution made unjust, but the fundamental cause of that injustice produces a condition which checks the application of increased productive power. The use of machinery and the production of machinery, the erection of buildings, the bringing together of industrial forces in the improved modes with which the inventive genius of the nineteenth century has made us familiar, and the production thereby of abundant wealth for all, are discouraged by land monopoly. Productive power, however marvelous, is impotent without appropriate land; and land made abnormally difficult of access or expensive to use is in that degree, for the purposes of production, equivalent to land destroyed.

By such means has the nineteenth century passed down to the twentieth the problem of poverty. Not of poverty where the poor are the idle and useless. Not of poverty where productive power is weak. But of poverty in the midst of wealth, and when wealth producing processes are suggestive of omnipotent possibilities. Of poverty where the workers and not the idlers, the useful and not the useless, are the poor. Of poverty under circumstances which to all observers distinguish poor men as members of the working class. Of poverty which not only pinches and degrades the victims who fall into its grip, but with distracting fears harasses millions upon millions of those whom it threatens with its visitations.

Upon the threshold of this new century, is the hope too optimistic, the prophecy too rash, that when the century closes it will have contributed to succeeding centuries as much of justice to the processes of distribution as the nineteenth contributed of potency to the processes of wealth production?

NEWS

The beginning of the twentieth century was with but little formality celebrated throughout the world. Most marked of all the celebrations was that of the Red Cross society, which received messages from people of prominence in various departments of nineteenth century life; the emperor of Germany, however, refusing to respond because he had celebrated the beginning of the new century at the opening of the year 1900. The Young Men's Christian associations of the United States and Canada listened to an address by the vice president-elect of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt. He delivered it in person at Carnegie hall, New York city, on the 30th. It was read simultaneously at the other association gatherings—some 1,500 in all. Steps were taken at New York for the inauguration of "a Gospel campaign." In the same city at a dinner in Arlington hall a meeting of 400 reformers of various shades, from Bishop Potter to John Swinton, saw the old century out and the new one in. Ernest Crosby presided and Edwin Markham read an original poem. In the city hall square 100,000 people were massed to see a display of fireworks and hear the bands play; and from Trinity steeple a musical programme was rung out by the bells. In Chicago, as in New York, the more formal celebrations were supplemented at midnight with voluntary discords upon fish horns in the streets, and an occasional succession of pistol shots. Public meetings and church exercises were held all over the land. Similar demonstrations were made in Europe, and in Australia the birth of the new commonwealth was celebrated with great display.

We mentioned last week (page 601) the appointment of W. J. Lyne as first prime minister of the Australian commonwealth. But now it appears that either a false report was cabled to this country or that Mr. Lyne must have declined the appointment. The prime minister who has formed a cabinet is Edmund Barton, an eminent protectionist. He will have charge of the department of foreign affairs. His associate ministers are Alfred Deakin, attorney general; W. J. Lyne, home office; Sir George Turner, treasurer;

Sir John Forrest, postmaster general, and John Dickson, minister of defense. The inauguration of the new government took place, as noted above, at the opening of the new century. The earl of Hopetoun was then sworn in at Sydney, New South Wales, as governor general of the federal commonwealth. Preceding the administration of his oath of office a message to him from the British colonial secretary was read, as follows:

The queen commands me to express through you to the people of Australia her majesty's heartfelt interest in the inauguration of the commonwealth and her earnest wish that under divine providence it may insure increased prosperity and well-being to her loyal and beloved subjects in Australia.

And after the oath had been administered the governor general read the following message from the British ministry:

Her majesty's government sends cordial greeting to the commonwealth of Australia. They welcome her to her place among the nations united under her majesty's sovereignty, and confidently anticipate for the new federation a future of ever-increasing prosperity and influence. They recognize in the long desired consummation of the hopes of patriotic Australians a further step in the direction of permanent unity of the British empire, and they are satisfied that the wider powers and responsibilities henceforth secured to Australia will give a fresh opportunity for a display of that generous loyalty and devotion to the throne of the empire which has characterized the action in the past of its several states.

The ceremonial display attending the inauguration exceeded in grandeur any ever before exhibited in Australia.

Display of a different kind celebrated the close of the old century at Peking, where the allied powers caused the execution on the 31st of a Chinese soldier charged with the assassination of the German minister, Von Ketteler. This soldier had been stationed by his superior officers at a point on a street with orders to shoot any foreigner who tried to pass. In obedience to these orders, he killed the German minister. It is admitted by the present German minister at Peking, that no European soldier in a European country would have been punished for a similar act. But, at the instance of the European powers, this man was on the 31st behead-

ed in the street, on the spot where he had shot Von Ketteler. The execution took place in the presence of a great multitude. After the victim had been made to kneel in the street in position for beheading, he was kept half an hour in that position awaiting the arrival of German officers who wished to see the brutal spectacle that followed their appearance.

The only other news of the week from China relates to the "irrevocable conditions" of negotiation, proposed by the allied forces to China and printed at page 600 last week. It comes in a dispatch of the 30th from Peking, stating that on that day Li Hung Chang and Prince Ching, the Chinese commissioners, notified the Spanish minister, who is dean of the diplomatic corps at Peking, that the Chinese government had agreed to the conditions. But later reports indicate that this acceptance was coupled with a request that the allies particularize in respect of some of the conditions a little more definitely, a request that is suspected to have for its object a purpose to get the allies to wrangling among themselves.

Under an agreement with China, Russia has assumed a protectorate over the province of Manchuria. This is independently of the diplomatic maneuvers of the allies. Russia insists that the allies have no concern with Manchuria.

From the Philippines news is scanty. Gen. MacArthur, as governor general, celebrated the incoming of the new century with a somewhat pompous display. The president's commission has completed a tariff bill and sent it to Washington for approval. And there are brief stories of futile military activity.

The American casualties since July 1, 1898, inclusive of the current official reports given out in detail at Washington January 2, 1901, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91	1,847
Killed reported from May 16, 1900, to the date of the presidential election, November 6, 1900.....	100
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period	468
Total deaths to presidential election	2,415

Killed reported since presidential election	17
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period.....	103

Total deaths	2,535
Wounded since July 1, 1898.....	2,373

Total casualties since July, '98...	4,908
Total casualties to last week....	4,881
Total deaths to last week.....	2,508

The close of the last year of the outgoing century was not marked with even the mild business prosperity of which much was made at its beginning. On the contrary it left disturbing indications of a dismal business future. Dun's Review for the last week of the year showed a large increase of failures and liabilities over the opening of the previous year. The press dispatches of the 1st told of a reduction of wages in all the blast furnaces of the Mahoning and Shenango valleys. Those of the 29th reported a 7½ per cent. reduction in wages in the Quinsagmond works of the steel and wire trust at Worcester, Mass., the cut about equaling the increase in the same works made about a year ago. More destitution is reported in Cleveland by the clerk of the infirmary than has been observed there for years. From Baltimore there come reports of a financial flurry caused by the suspension of a savings institution, the Economy savings bank, and two banks, the American national and the Old Town. These were the first bank failures in Baltimore for 65 years. They were accompanied in the reports by news of the failure of C. R. Baird & Co., one of the heaviest iron dealers of Philadelphia, with liabilities mounting up to \$1,500,000 and assets aggregating \$100,000. Even more pronounced rumblings of ill-omen were felt across the Atlantic. The Deutsche Grunschild bank of Berlin suspended its interest payments on the 29th, but the most startling occurrence was the failure of the London and Globe finance corporation, of which Lord Dufferin was at the head. It suspended payment on the 29th, and the failure of 13 brokerage firms in London followed. The finance company had dealt heavily in West Australian mining shares, and owing to a fall in their value was unable to settle its clearing house balances. Its failure evoked from the Investors' Review (London) a confession that—

The symptoms are ominous in many directions. Trade is shrinking and be-

ginning there with the collapse of values, not only for the stock exchange, but for coal, iron and textiles. The effect must be to seriously impugn banking credit. The government is steadily pulling away our means and is still unable to cope with its liabilities. The burden of increased war taxation begins to press severely upon the community, whose incomes already have been curtailed by the derangement of business which the fighting has caused. The position looks decidedly dangerous.

The fighting referred to in the foregoing extract is that between Britons and Boers in South Africa. Conditions there, notwithstanding the supposed subjugation of the Boers months ago, are so bad that the Cape Town correspondent of the London Times says of them that "the aspect of affairs is scarcely less gloomy than at the beginning of 1900." Exactly how bad the conditions are cannot yet be told. The British censorship is strictly enforced, and the only news that reaches the outside world comes through Lord Kitchener's official dispatches. As these tell only of Boer success, with the exception of a few trifling affairs, the situation is probably worse rather than better than it appears to be. The Boer invasion of Cape Colony has penetrated farther south than any organized military body of Boers has heretofore advanced; and no success in driving it back has been reported. On the contrary, the Boers have managed to cut Kimberley off from communication. They break up into small bodies and carry on sporadic guerrilla warfare. To repel them the colonial government has called the loyalists of 27 Cape Colony districts to arms. It is believed that Gen. De Wet is trying to force his way down from Thabanchue to the Orange river, but of his whereabouts there really is no certainty. From the north of the Transvaal a Boer victory is reported by Lord Kitchener. It was won on the 31st at Helvetia, a few miles south of Lydenburg and 500 miles or more from the scene of the Cape Colony invasion. Helvetia was occupied by a British garrison, and was regarded by Lord Kitchener as one of his strongest posts; but the Boers under Gen. Botha captured it after a short battle in which the British lost in killed 15 and in wounded 22.

At last the full official returns from the presidential election are available. As given by the New York

Times they are as follows, the vote for the two leading candidates being given in the first table, and that for the principal minor parties in the second:

LEADING CANDIDATES.

	Elec- toral Votes.	McKin- ley (Rep.)	Bryan (Dem.)
Ala	11	53,669	96,368
Ark	8	44,800	81,142
Cal	9	164,755	124,985
Col	4	93,072	122,733
Conn	6	102,572	74,014
Del	3	22,560	18,863
Fla	4	7,499	28,007
Ga	13	35,036	81,700
Idaho	3	27,198	29,414
Ill	24	597,965	503,061
Ind	15	336,063	309,584
Ia	13	307,808	209,265
Kan	10	185,955	162,601
Ky	13	226,801	234,899
La	8	14,233	53,671
Me	6	65,435	36,823
Md	8	136,212	122,271
Mass	15	239,147	157,016
Mich	14	316,269	211,685
Minn	9	190,461	112,901
Miss	9	5,753	51,706
Mo	17	314,093	351,913
Mont	3	25,373	37,146
Neb	8	121,835	114,013
Nev	3	3,849	6,347
N. H.	4	54,798	35,489
N. J.	10	221,707	164,808
N. Y.	36	821,992	678,386
N. C.	11	133,081	157,752
N. D.	3	35,891	20,519
Ohio	23	543,918	474,882
Ore	4	46,526	33,385
Pa	32	712,665	424,232
R. I.	4	33,784	19,812
S. C.	9	3,525	47,283
S. D.	4	54,530	39,544
Tenn	12	123,008	145,250
Tex	15	130,641	267,432
Utah	3	47,089	44,949
Vt	4	42,569	12,849
Va	12	115,865	146,680
Wash	4	57,456	44,833
W. Va.	6	119,851	98,791
Wis	12	265,866	159,285
Wyo	3	14,482	10,164
Total	292	7,217,677	6,357,853

PRINCIPAL MINOR PARTIES.

	Woolley (Proh.)	Barker (People's)	Debs (Soc. Dem.)	Maloney (Soc. Lab.)
Ala	1,407	3,797		
Ark	584	972		
Cal	5,024		7,572	

	Wool.	Bark.	Debs.	Mal.
Col	3,790	389	684	714
Conn	1,617		1,029	908
Del	546		57	
Fla	2,239	1,090	603	
Ga	1,396	4,584		
Idaho	857	213		
Ill	17,626	1,141	9,687	1,373
Ind	13,718	1,438	2,374	663
Ia	9,502	613	2,742	259
Kan	3,605		1,605	
Ky	2,429	2,017	760	289
La				
Me	2,585		878	
Md	4,582		908	391
Mass	6,208		9,716	2,610
Mich	11,859	837	2,826	903
Minn	8,555		3,065	1,329
Miss		1,644		
Mo	5,963	4,244	6,128	1,294
Mont	298		708	116
Neb	3,686	1,104	823	
Nev				
N. H.	1,271		790	
N. J.	7,183	669	4,609	2,074
N. Y.	22,043		12,869	12,622
N. C.	1,009	830		
N. D.	731	110	518	
Ohio	10,203	251	4,847	1,688
Ore	2,536	275	1,494	
Pa	27,908	638	4,831	2,936
R. I.	1,529			1,423
S. C.				
S. D.	1,542	339	169	
Tenn	3,900	1,368	410	
Tex	2,644	20,981	1,846	162
Utah	205		717	106
Vt	383	367		
Va	2,150			
Wash	2,345		1,906	1,066
W. Va.	1,586	279	286	
Wis	10,124		7,095	524
Wyo		2		
Total	207,368	50,192	94,552	33,450

A scattering vote was cast for the national union reform, united Christian, and national parties as follows, as reported by the Times:

Ellis, Union reform: Arkansas, 341; Illinois, 672; Indiana, 254; Maryland, 147, and Ohio, 4,284; total, 5,698.
Leonard, United Christian: Illinois, 352; Iowa, 166; total, 518.
Emerson, National: Massachusetts, 469.

Total vote cast, including 6,685 scattering, 13,967,777.

McKinley's plurality, 859,824; McKinley's majority, 468,056.

Vote in 1896: McKinley (rep.), 7,104,779; Bryan (dem.), 6,502,925; Palmer (national dem.), 133,424; Levering (pro.), 132,007; Matchett (soc. labor), 36,274; Bentley (national), 13,969; total, 13,923,378; McKinley's plurality, 601,854; McKinley's majority, 286,180.

NEWS NOTES.

—Reports from Constantinople indicate that the census of the Turkish empire for 1900 will show a population of 55,000,000.

—The American Economic and His-

torical associations met in Ann Arbor on the 28th under the auspices of the University of Michigan.

—The United States has made a definite offer to Denmark of \$3,200,000 for the Danish West India islands, the most important of which is the island St. Thomas.

—London reports of the 2d announce that the native rebellion in Ashanti, on the African west coast, referred to in these columns on page 233, is finally quelled.

—Hiram S. Maxim, the American-born inventor of the famous Maxim rapid-fire gun, and but recently become a British subject, was honored with the order of knighthood by Queen Victoria in the annual New Year awards.

—Lord William Armstrong, the inventor of the famous Armstrong gun, and the founder of the Armstrong gun and shipbuilding firm at Elswick, England, died at his home at Craigside on the 27th, aged 90 years.

—At the biennial meeting of the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations in New York on the 30th resolutions were adopted petitioning the administration to provide Jewish chaplains in the army and navy, for the soldiers and sailors of their faith.

—The Illinois Teachers' association, in convention at Springfield on the 28th, adopted resolutions in support of the franchise tax fight made by the Chicago Teachers' federation, under the leadership of Miss Margaret Haley, against the franchise corporations of the state.

—Lord Roberts arrived in England on the 2d, disembarking at Cowes, where he was accorded an interview with Queen Victoria, who created him an earl and Knight of the Garter. He entered London on the 3d and was enthusiastically received.

—On the 29th there was launched at the South Chicago yards of the Chicago Shipbuilding company the Northwestern, the first of four sister ships intended for lake and ocean traffic direct between Chicago and Europe. The ships have a length of 242 feet, draught of 14 feet, and tonnage capacity of 3,200 tons each.

—Ignatius Donnelly, a conspicuous figure in political and literary circles for the past generation, died suddenly in Minneapolis on the 2d from an attack of heart failure, aged 70 years. Mr. Donnelly's most famous works were "Atlantis," "Ragnarok" and an attempt in "The Great Cryptogram" to prove Francis Bacon the author of Shakespeare's plays. He had held several public offices, including that of lieutenant governor of Minnesota and congressman from that state, and was the vice presidential candidate of the "middle-of-the-road" populist party at the late presidential election.

MISCELLANY

By an oversight we stated Dec. 22nd that the admirable poem entitled "The Question," by Townsend Allen, was written for The Public. As a matter of fact it had already appeared in the Boston Courier of August 18. We apologize to the Courier and the author.

A CENTURY POEM.

The following poem was read by Edwin Markham at a dinner given on the evening of December 31, 1900, at Arlington hall, New York city, under the auspices of the workmen of New York, as "Labor's Greeting to the Twentieth Century." Ernest H. Crosby was toastmaster. The other speakers were John Swinton, A. J. Boulton, Bishop Potter, George E. McNeill, Henry George, Jr., R. Fulton Cutting, John Ford, Joseph Barondess, Bird S. Coler and M. A. Fitzgerald. Mr. Markham's poem closed the exercises.

We stand here at the end of mighty years,
And a great wonder rushes on the heart.
While cities rose and blossomed into dust,
While shadowy lines of kings were blown
to air—

What was the purpose brooding on the
world,

Through the large leisure of the centuries?
And what the end—failure or victory?

Lo, man has laid his scepter on the stars
And sent his spell upon the continents.
The heavens confess their secrets and the
stones,

Silent as God, publish their mystery.
Man calls the lightnings from their secret
place

To crumble up the spaces of the world
And snatch the jewels from the flying
hours.

The wild, white smoking horses of the sea
Are startled by his thunders. The world
powers

Crowd round to be the lackeys of the king.
His hand has torn the veil of the great law,
The law that was made before the worlds
—before

That far first whisper on the ancient deep;
The law that swings Arcturus on the
north

And hurls the soul of man upon the way.

But what avail, O builders of the world,
Unless ye build a safety for the soul?
Man has put harness on leviathan
And hooks in his incorrigible jaws,
And yet the perils of the street remain.
Out of the whirlwind of the cities rise
Lean Hunger and the Worm of Misery,
The heartbreak and the cry of mortal tears.

But hark, the bugles blowing on the peaks;
And 'hark, a murmur as of many feet,
The cry of captains, the divine alarm;
Look, the last son of Time comes hurrying
on,

The strong young Titan of democracy;
With swinging step he takes the open road,
In love with the winds that beat his hairy
breaat,

Baring his sunburnt strength to all the
world,

He casts his eyes around with Jovian
glance—

Searches the tracks of old tradition; scans
With rebel heart the books of pedigree;
Peers into the face of Privilege and cries,

"Why are you halting in the path of man?
Is it your shoulder bears the human load?
Do you draw down the rains of the sweet
heaven

And keep the green things growing? Back
to hell!"

We know at last the future is secure;
God is descending from eternity,
And all things, good and evil, build the road.
Yes, down in the thick of things, the men
of greed

Are thumping the inhospitable clay.
By wondrous toils the men without the
dream,

Led onward by a something unawares,
Are laying the foundation of the dream,
The kingdom of fraternity foretold.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY MUST
REMAIN RADICAL.

To say nothing of the absurdity of two great parties, both doing homage to the God-of-Things-as-They-Are, it must be evident that the only reason for the existence of a democratic party at this time is the urgent necessity for an organized movement that shall sweep away the outworn wrongs and abuses that, in the very nature of things, attach to the continuance under any system or laws for more than 30 years. Note that I say "laws," not political administrations. It is true that since 1860 we have had eight years of an alleged democratic president, and democratic fourth-class postmasters, but the web and woof of our institutions have been republican.

In his "Physics and Politics" Walter Bagehot points out the inevitable tendency of human society to form a crust of conventional forms, opinions, codes, laws and systems, which stifles healthy growth, and prevents the free development of social activities into a complete and harmonious whole. And it is to this conflict between the ever-growing, ever-changing spirit of progress and advancement, and the reactionary forces that ask only to be let alone, now that society has been molded into forms that work for their aggrandizement at the expense of the less favored, that the democratic party owes its vital force to-day.

Mr. Bryan's statement of the central issue of the recent campaign, made in a speech delivered a few days before the election: "We assert that the workers who produce the wealth of this country do not get their fair share of the wealth they create, and that some men who do no work get an unfair share of the wealth produced by the workers," is an absolute and unquestionable truth. Under this sign the democracy can conquer.—Whidden Graham, in St. Louis Mirror.

Jimmy—What time do yer have ter get ter work?

Johnny—Oh, any time I like as long as I ain't later than seven o'clock.—Harper's Bazar.

CURRENT POLITICS IN AUSTRALIA.

For The Public.

In this colony of South Australia we have just succeeded in getting through the legislative council (corresponding to your senate or the English house of lords) a bill, which has been blocked by a single vote for three years, which gives municipalities the power to levy all rates from unimproved land values. The measure has yet to receive the sanction of the lower house, but it has passed there again and again, and is perfectly safe in their hands.

This means a great victory for us.

We have also beaten an attempt made by the Westinghouse company to get control of our street tramways. The single taxers stood practically alone, against all the municipal authorities and great, powerful vested interests. They stirred up the people, held meetings in the leading suburbs, filled the Adelaide town hall to overflowing by a great enthusiastic meeting, and compelled attention from the political trimmers. That the government will now nationalize the lines is practically assured.

The issue of our first federal elections, which occur about March next, turns upon the tariff. In America you can hardly credit the strength of the free trade movement in Australia, and the weakness of protection. The Rt. Hon. G. H. Reid, former premier of New South Wales, delivered a magnificent address in Melbourne (the stronghold of protectionism) last week, and worked up his audience to such a pitch of enthusiasm that only two hands were held up in favor of protection.

He also spoke here in Adelaide. The town hall was packed and the greatest enthusiasm prevailed. Of course we shall have to fight, but the victory is, I think, absolutely beyond question for free trade. We will send in a majority of free trade representatives; so will New South Wales, Tasmania and West Australia. Queensland is doubtful, but the labor party are mostly with us there. Victoria is said to be strongly protectionist. Calculating on these lines, we have a substantial majority for free trade. Of course it isn't real free trade; but it isn't protection, and we can knock out the revenue tariff afterwards.

Reid, of course, is a democrat, and favors a mild dose of land value taxation. Barton, the leader of the protectionists, is an admitted conservative. Barton will probably be sent for

to form the first government, but Reid will probably oust him when the tariff comes up for final adjustment.

Adelaide, S. A., Nov. 8, 1900.
CRAWFORD VAUGHAN.

WHAT WAS NOT SETTLED AT THE LAST ELECTION.

You cannot vote down the Decalogue. No moral question was ever settled until it was settled right. None ever will be. That is the only way to kill it off as an issue. Every man in America might vote that two and two make five; but the multiplication table would outlast them all, and be just the same as though they had never lived. For the truth is eternal, whereas man is a snippy and ephemeral little ex-monkey who has done as many wrong and foolish things as he could, by himself. His only salvation is that having nothing else to tie to, and being much more "wobbly" than any other animal, he finally drifts to the unvarying truth.

Men who are still young can remember when the United States voted overwhelmingly to maintain human slavery. Men who are only middle-aged can remember when the few Americans who stood up for the abolition of slavery were alone and despised and even mobbed. But even the election of Buchanan did not prove slavery right, nor yet "settle the question" in politics. The very next campaign brought Abraham Lincoln and the downfall of slavery. The election of 50 Buchanans would not have made slavery right—it would not even have proved that the American people deemed it right. All men that God has made have conscience; the Americans, we trust, as much as the next. That is the reason why whoopings-up, and torch-light processions, and tin badges and full dinner pails never settle a question. An American votes for president one minute in four years; but his mind and his conscience he has to sit up with all the time. Not only that. Truth never fails of sons; and the sons of truth never say die. Every real cause begets men to fight for it; and they always win. It was only a few men, at first, who overcame the colonial Tories and defied the king. Only a schoolboy thinks that even in 1776 the colonies were unanimous. And '76 was the outcome of a long uphill campaign. Only a few men were they who, in time, overturned the slave-holding south and the slave consenting north. But they were right. And it was then, as it shall still be, that "One man on God's side is a majority." It seems incredible to us to-day that Americans ever cringed under the brutal rule of

George III.—but they did. We can hardly realize that for more than four-score years this nation defended and practiced human slavery. Even to the elderly men who used to own 500 "niggers" in the United States, it seems a dream. But it was no dream. And men now living will see the time when our present comparable policy of subject races will seem as unreal. I myself, who am no chicken, expect to see this bad dream forgotten in our waking.—Chas. F. Lummis, in *Land of Sunshine*.

THE LONDON TIMES UP AGAINST AMERICAN HUMOR.

An editorial note in the number for November 17 of *Literature*, published weekly by the *London Times*, runs as follows:

The popularization of history can, of course, be carried to excess. Chicago university is gaining a reputation for "fads," and this seems to be one of them. Here is a literal report of part of a lecture by Prof. Thatcher on Charles I.:

Charles was a good many different kinds of a chump. He couldn't play a square game, and made ducks and drakes of everything he got his hooks on. He had a first-class show at the king business, but he slipped his trolley every time he undertook to touch the democratic bosses. He tried a lot of monkey business with parliament, but it landed him in the soup; and when he tried to tackle old Pym, who was a tough proposition, he found himself up against it to beat the band. Pym took a fall out of him every round. He had no more chance to win out than a pair of deuces against a straight flush, and though he put up a first-class bluff it didn't go. It took him a good while to drop to it that the old gag of divine right was well enough when playing to the gallery, but that the orchestra and boxes were on to it, and that it was played out anyway. Cromwell and Ireton were too fly to be scooped by any such tommyrot. Charles had always been a high roller, and when his gang got scrapping with the Roundheads he was dead broke and had to pull the leg of all the dead-easy tenderfeet in the kingdom. The ante was too much for him. Cromwell finally sized him up and got the district attorney to press the indictment of his royal nibs for everything that was out. Charles worked his pull for all it was worth, but he got the razzle-dazzle just where the chicken got the ax. They waltzed him off to the bone-yard p. d. q., and Cromwell had the innings. See?

The professor's study of the American language and its resources would seem to be more profound than his study of English history.

In *Literature* of December 15 appeared the following editorial note, supplementary to the first:

We seem to have done some injustice to Prof. Thatcher, of Chicago, in a note which we recently published on a lecture he was supposed to have deliv-

ered on Charles I. Mr. Edward Osgood Brown, counsellor-at-law, writes to us from Chicago to assure us that the professor's "worst offense in the way of 'slang' was an instance or two of colloquial expressions, in his teaching work, which would have passed entirely unnoticed if uttered from any chair in England; but which the 'priggishness,' so to speak, of certain of his female auditors made a subject of criticism which accidentally reached the newspapers." The quotation which we gave was, as Mr. Brown supposes, "taken from some American newspaper, where it was jocosely credited to Prof. Thatcher." This, says our correspondent, is "a very common form of American humor." The jocosity of the newspaper which gave the extract had, we fully admit, escaped us. For us in the old country the true inwardness of the Chicago humorist is somewhat subtle; we have hardly yet risen to what may be called "the higher jocosity." But we are much obliged to Mr. Brown; and the more so because he assures us that "those of us in America who have most attachment to the 'old home' and its people are often obliged to defend your fellow-countrymen from the charge that they have a very poor sense of humor, and find it difficult to take a joke."

THE POWER OF THE TAFT COMMISSION IN THE PHILIPPINES.

For The Public.

We are told by the news dispatches that the Philippine commission has enacted legislation for the establishment of provincial civil government under American sovereignty in the Philippines. I find, also, upon reference to the report of the secretary of war for 1900, page 83, that a decree of the commission assumes to be a civil enactment. It begins with these words: "By authority of the president of the United States, be it enacted by the United States Philippine commission, that—" etc.

Now, I do not understand how that commission can legislate, i. e., make laws as a civil power. It is merely a branch of the military rule enforced by the president. The executive order appointing it instructed it to report to the secretary of war.

As the good McKinley has frequently told us, we all know that until congress acts, the military arm of the government is supreme in the archipelago. Congress has not acted, because the Spooner bill, which was to authorize a civil authority, was withdrawn by the administration for fear that its enactment would make more

trouble in the middle west, like that which the Puerto Rican act had aroused. When the commission was appointed, its members were promised that their authority would be supplied by the Spooner bill, which was withdrawn while they were on their way to Manila. The censor permitted us to know from the Manila dispatches how the chairman of the commission anxiously asked on arriving at Manila: "Has the Spooner bill passed?" We have learned many things in the past two years of what a president may do in defiance of the law and his official oath, but I do not think he can legislate either directly or vicariously. He no doubt may try to do so, and his deputies may go through all the motions. If necessary to accomplish his ends, he would probably also assume to have, and would try to exercise, judicial powers, but the validity of his judgments would be as doubtful as is, in my opinion, the legality of his legislation through the commission. As commander in chief of the army he is the ruler of the Philippines, and can delegate his military power to Gen. MacArthur or anyone else. And if this commission has any authority, it seems to me it is only as a part of the president's military authority.

The president announced when he appointed the commission that beginning with September 1 they should have authority to establish a civil government in the Philippines. We had understood that Gen. MacArthur was the commanding officer in the Philippines. The authority given to the commission may mean that so much of the government of the archipelago is taken from the hands of the commanding officer; or it possibly means that the commissioners are his staff or advisers on civil matters, and very good advisers on such matters they no doubt are; but when they advise him or his superior officers, this cannot accurately be called legislation, nor, I submit, is any civil law enacted when their advice is taken and promulgated.

The measures which the commissioners adopt or suggest for enforcement by the military power, which is the only American power in that unhappy land, are, when approved by the commanding officer and shorn of the McKinley verbiage, merely military edicts or decrees. I suppose these orders should appear in that officer's official record and report as "General Order No. —." On the other hand, if the commanding offi-

cer has nothing to do with the matters which are delegated by his chief to the commissioners, then, notwithstanding the McKinleyesque use of misleading terms importing civil authority, the alleged laws enacted by the commission are, I submit, none the less merely military edicts or decrees.

If I am wrong about all this I should be glad to be informed. My error, if one, arises from some old-time notions as to the nature of our system of government, and I am not unprepared to hear that these primitive ideas of mine are obsolete.

CHARLES B. WILBY.
Cincinnati, Dec. 22, 1900.

THE SCHOOLS DO NOT TEACH OF SOCIAL RELATIONS.

An extract from a paper on "The Duty of the Schools to Society," read by Prof. Charles Lischer, of New Athens, Ill., before the meeting of the St. Clair County Teachers' Institute at Belleville, Ill., Dec. 8.

It is important that teachers should inquire whether the schools are in any degree responsible for the [present] unfortunate [social] conditions. I am compelled to acknowledge that I think they are, though other agencies are also responsible. The responsibility of the schools is not a blame-worthy responsibility, for the forces of no other agency have been guided with purer motives. Hence, there is no room for condemnation. The relation of the schools to society, however, is so intimate, and their influences are so potent in their formative effects, that it would be folly to claim that they are entirely free from responsibility in this grave matter. Even if the schools have not contributed directly or purposely to it, they have not studied how to prevent it. They have cultivated, unintentionally, of course, those characteristics which have produced it, and have failed to cultivate, except incidentally, those better characteristics which must correct it. Throughout the whole course of the development of our public schools, their relation to the child as an individual with personal ends in life to be attained has been an all-determining factor, while their relation to the child as a member of society has never been sufficiently emphasized. The effort, therefore, on the part of the schools has uniformly been to enable the child, when grown to manhood, to successfully guard his personal interests and secure his personal ends. There is no general or continued effort to so train and develop him that he will contribute to

the welfare of society. Why has the child been taught to read, to write, to cipher? Primarily, because a knowledge of these has seemed to be absolutely essential in securing his so-called rights among his fellows. His ethical side is now demanding cultivation more loudly than ever. So far as education is purely intellectual, it only trains him for a fiercer part in the great struggle for personal ends, and tends to diminish the severity of that struggle in such degree only as purely intellectual culture indirectly contributes to the ethical, through attention to subjects related to the ethical.

Back of all social discontent, and back of all forms in which it appears, we find the primary cause of social disorders in the presence of erroneous ideas among men, particularly the presence of erroneous notions concerning the relations which exist among men. There are certain fundamental ideas upon which the social edifice is built. In each of these a thousand others germinate, and the thousand are wrong if the one is wrong. Thus, in treating of the natural rights and duties of the individual, we should impress the ethical relations between individuals which arise from the fact of birth. All are in the world through no fault or merit of their own, hence no blame or credit attaches to the fact of being here in any case. No man brought anything with him which every other man did not bring; hence, all are by nature endowed with equal rights and equal opportunities. This opens up an immense field of thought in the direction of modifying the existing conditions of unequal rights and unequal opportunities, which all students of social questions recognize with serious misgivings. . . .

Nothing is more important for our children and youth to understand than the nature and character of human relations; but these are ignored as if there were no such relations, lest the existing abnormal ones be disturbed. Here, in my judgment, is the most serious defect of our schools, and not in the lack of proper correlation of studies.

To correct it we must form more comprehensive standards of patriotism, call it patriotism, religion, sympathy, the enthusiasm for humanity or the love of God—give it what name you will; there is yet a force in human nature which may overcome the powers of darkness; a chemical force, if you please, which melts, and fuses

and overwhelms; to which nothing seems impossible.

For a hundred years Bunker Hill has been presented to the schools as a type of patriotism in the concrete. We were taught that a patriot is a man who loves his country and is ready to die for it—Lincoln and Grant in the north, and, with precisely the same sentiment, Lee and Jackson in the south. Since the civil war new names have been added to the list. All our patriotic literature has the same ring: America is a sweet land of liberty, land where our fathers died; Columbia's heroes fought and bled in freedom's cause; in the rocket's red glare, and with bombs bursting in air, the star-spangled banner waves o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave. As a stimulus to this emotion, we have put the flag over our schoolhouses, and have taught children to salute it. Not content with chanting the praises of the country's heroes, men and women everywhere are glorying in descent from them. The Sons and Daughters of the Revolution form an exclusive and select society.

What does it mean, and what is to be the outcome of it all, is the question for us to consider. This sentiment has the weakness of the old theology which aimed to teach men how to die. Shall the patriotism of the twentieth century explode itself in after-dinner speeches on battle, anniversaries, in building monuments to patriots of the past? Shall it pride itself chiefly in a patriotic ancestry, or shall its energy be transmuted into useful work? We surely see that a great and independent nation like ours will not have to fight over the old battles or to meet again the old foes. Our work, therefore, in the education of the young for citizenship, will be threefold. We shall need, first, to get beneath the manifestations of patriotic emotions in the past to the essential, underlying principle; from the deeds to the spirit. Next, we shall need to show what are the peculiar perils of our country today; to discover the real enemies. And third, we must teach how these enemies are to be met and conquered; in other words, how the old spirit must manifest itself under the new conditions.

We know too well, and it will be our business to teach, that our foes are of our own household; dangers not to be met by cruisers and torpedo boats, nor by coast fortifications, nor by a standing army. And we may show that in comparison with these enemies, the bombardment of a city by a foreign fleet would be a light affliction. Are

we teachers willing to sink partisan prejudice and to unite in an alliance, offensive and defensive, arming ourselves with twentieth century weapons, for twentieth century conflict?

Then may we sing with Frances Brown:

The days of the nation bear no trace
Of all the sunshine so far foretold;
The cannon speaks in the teacher's place—
The age is weary with work and gold;
And high hopes wither, and memories wane;
On hearths and altars the fires are dead;
But that brave faith hath not lived in vain—
And this is all that our watcher said.

THE BEST METHOD OF TAXATION AND ASSESSMENT IN MUNICIPALITIES.

An abridgement of a paper read by Lawson Purdy, secretary of the New York Tax Reform association, before the convention of the League of American Municipalities in session at Charleston, S. C., December 14.

Although the subject under discussion is city taxation, it is impossible to consider the city apart from its relation to state government. It would not be difficult to devise a system of city taxation if the city stood alone, but unfortunately our cities are bound by constitutional limitations and systems of taxation which require uniformity throughout the state in which the cities are situated. It would be useless, therefore, to suggest reforms in city taxation without pointing out the obstacles that must be removed before the reforms can be adopted.

The most serious obstacle to reform is to be found in the constitutions of the states, which, as a rule, require the uniform and equal taxation of all property save such as is specifically exempted by the constitution itself. Such a provision exists in the constitutions of 25 states, and strange as it may seem those constitutions which most offend against the true standard of constitution building are those which have been most recently adopted. The constitutions of eight states only are at all satisfactory in respect to the provisions regarding taxation, and with one exception these states are among the original 13. Those who framed these constitutions did not deem it necessary to bind their legislatures and subsequent generations to an inflexible system, but permitted their sons to increase in wisdom as in wealth and change their methods of taxation as conditions changed and learning grew. These eight states deserve to be placed on record to furnish an example for the rest of the union. They are as follows: Ala-

bama, Connecticut, Delaware, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont.

I think it is too obvious to require argument that the legislatures of our states should be as free to adopt new methods of taxation as that manufacturers should be free to adopt new machinery. Constitutions in which are embodied a mass of statute law are as bad an example of the exercise of despotic power as the edict of an emperor or the ukase of the czar. Emerson, or some other great man, has said that "There is no law to prevent a man from growing wise," but the constitutions of 37 states decree that the voters of those states shall remain in primitive ignorance. To achieve improvement we must have power to change, and the first step which must be made in these 37 states is to remove the constitutional restrictions upon the power of the legislature to adopt improved methods of taxation.

The second obstacle which must be removed before we can amend municipal taxation is the method at present in vogue in the great majority of the states for raising state revenue. Assessment and taxation are uniform throughout these states, and a tax is levied for state purposes on all property throughout the state on the assessment made in each tax district by local officials.

Not only is this system bad in itself, but it binds every tax district in the state to a uniform system which is almost as serious a bar to progress as restrictions imposed by a constitution.

All the states raise money by specific taxes; many have inheritance taxes, many have taxes on corporations. Some have special taxes, for the use of the state, imposed upon railroads, among these being the state of Connecticut, which has a model system of railroad taxation. Some of these taxes are extremely bad, and some few are good, but we can well afford to leave them all undisturbed for the present and devote our attention to the consideration of a really good system of raising so much revenue for state purposes as the state may need, over and above what it now derives from these fixed taxes. Such a system has been devised, and was for the first time proposed in the state of New York a year ago. The plan is simple, flexible, and has a tendency to fix responsibility and check extravagance. It is really the application to political divisions of

the principle of income taxation without the inquisitorial features of the tax upon private incomes, which render it obnoxious to many. This method is simply to apportion the state tax to the several counties of the state in accordance with local revenue. For example, if a state requires \$1,000,000, and the total of local revenue is \$10,000,000, each county is required to pay to the state ten per cent. as much as its own local revenue; if a county and the towns within it are extravagant it will pay more state tax than if it is economical. The board which apportions the state tax will have merely ministerial functions, and the apportionment will be based upon a sum in proportion. There is no more opportunity for friction, and, to a certain extent, any locality can determine whether its share of state taxes shall be large or small.

With the adoption of this plan the way is open for every city to adopt its own system without disturbing the system of the state, and when every city can experiment and profit by the experience of other cities, improvement would be certain and rapid. If change is made possible it is then worth while to consider what change will be profitable.

The chief source of revenue is now and must of necessity remain the taxation of real property, and the first essential is equality of burden. To secure equality assessments must be made annually by a sufficient number of well paid assessors. Land and improvement must be separately assessed, and assessments should be published. Boston is an example for most of the cities of the country in this respect.

Much must be learned also from the method successfully adopted in St. Paul in 1896, which was devised by Mr. W. A. Somers, for ascertaining the value of land.

Licenses may produce some revenue, but it should be as little as possible, and this subject belongs rather to a discussion of the police power.

Franchise taxation raises the question of municipal ownership, which is outside my subject.

The fourth source from which revenue can be derived is the taxation of personal property, but the efforts of 2,000 years, and perhaps many thousand more, have failed to result in any method of assessment which has ever proved satisfactory. If I should denounce the attempts to tax personal property as they deserve, I should be considered prejudiced, but the reports

of tax commissions in many states condemn the taxation of personal property as unworthy of a civilized country; and you can examine these reports for yourselves.

If so-called practical men were really practical, the taxation of personal property would have been abandoned long ago. The difficulty is that many of them are wedded to the theory that, in order to be equal, taxation must be equally imposed on all property. Never was theory more unjust in its application or more absurd in its foundation. It probably grew out of another theory that taxation should be proportioned to ability to pay, for which poor Adam Smith is often held responsible, although what he really said was that ability to pay was the most convenient test of the amount of benefit received from taxation, which is the true basis for its imposition. The theory that equality demands the equal taxation of all property is grounded in absolute ignorance of the laws of incidence and presupposes that the man who pays the tax collector is inevitably the man who bears the burden of the tax. Nothing could be further from the truth, as everyone must admit who considers the operation of any tax, save that upon monopoly.

In conclusion I would briefly sum up what seems to me ought to be done, nay, must be done to improve the condition of our cities.

Abolish all constitutional restrictions upon the power of the legislature to regulate taxation. Do away with the necessity of uniform state taxation by apportioning state and county taxes in proportion to city and town revenue. Give every city the right to formulate its own system of taxation. Assess real estate annually, stating the value of land and improvements separately and publish the assessments. Abolish all taxation of personal property.

When this is done I do not say that perfection will be attained, but the way will be cleared for such further reforms of state and municipal taxation as experience will have then proven to be wise and prudent. Every city will be an object lesson to every other city, and with the possibility of improvement improvement will be sure. We shall set a limit to the perfection that may be attained, when taxation is a vital issue at every local election and every city is a debating society.

The Lion—Man can't roar, he's an awfully slow runner, he can't fight without a gun—

The Cub—Dear me! He must be an inferior animal!—Puck.

"WHERE IS THY BROTHER?"

"I was my brother's keeper, and because I strove to take his land, as brothers may—Else what's the use of brotherhood?—he died

Defending it. He lies beneath its sod—
A bayonet thrust—I wiped away the blood—
His blood—from off the surface of the steel

Lest it should rust its polish. It is gone;
Gone from my hands as well, and from my soul;

For, as I hope to enter heaven, I swear
I did it for his good. I slaughtered him
For his own good. He wished to rule himself—

To govern his own land in his own way—
He called it liberty, and he has won
His freedom now—the freedom of the grave—

His soul is free, although his body rots—
Dead for his good—I killed him for his good."

"Thou hypocrite!
The souls that thou hast freed
Have gone to God to call for justice there.
Down on thy knees! Ask pardon in the dust!

The stamp of Cain is set upon thy brow.
Repent, and make what poor amends thou canst.

Restore what thou with violence hast stol'n.

Remember thou Christ's awful words: 'If thou

The world and all its riches shouldst attain,
And lose thy soul—what shall it profit thee?'"

—Bertrand Shadwell.

While Chicago and New York have always aspired to be great rather than good, Boston has aimed at quality rather than quantity—goodness and culture rather than mere size. So when the recent census was taken and Boston found herself numerically great there was no sigh of satisfaction, no sign of joy.

As a writer in the Transcript expressed it:

The really serious significance of Boston's census returns is not mathematical. It is social and moral. We are incontestably more numerous than we were—delightfully, amazingly, multitudinously more numerous, but has quality kept pace with quantity? Has the average standard of human existence gone up or down?

—Chicago Chronicle.

Customer—Haven't you a restaurant in the building?

Floor Walker—Yes, madam—sixth floor, front. Regular dinner 49 cents, marked down from a dollar.—Puck.

We must remember that the British armed force in South Africa far outnumbered the whole white population of the South African republic, against which alone war was originally made. We must bear in mind also that all the recent news has shown that the British garrisons are numerically too weak. A concentration of Boer com-

mandos on what in our service would be called "two company" or "three company" posts has resulted in a series of small disasters. These go to show that, although the Transvaal has now no armies in the field, yet after much more than a year of fighting which has taxed the resources of the British empire, the numerically insignificant farmers of the Transvaal are still, in some degree, making good that defiance of the British empire which, when it was issued, seemed to the great majority of Englishmen, as it did to Lord Salisbury, simply an impudent insult.—New York Times.

"And when did you first see the light of day?"

"When I was nine years old," said the Chicago person, "and my parents took me on an excursion to St. Joseph, Mich."—Puck.

"Organized relief" may be a necessary function of to-day, but "organized charity" seems somewhat of a misnomer. Evolution and scientific advance from a like point of view might reasonably announce "organized love" in the near future to be followed shortly by "organized faith" and "organized hope."—John J. Crowley, Pres. Ill. Charitable Relief Corps of Chicago.

Boy—Grandpa, I wish you'd buy me a pony.

Grandpa (a philanthropist)—My son, think of the poor boys who can't even get bread to eat.

Boy—I was thinking of them—the poor little boys whose papas have ponies to sell that nobody will buy.—Gaiety.

We understand on high authority that as regards the Filipinos we cannot have peace with honor. That is, very sad. It would seem to the unthinking, however, that peace with honor was always possible to a big man who was hammering a little one.—Life.

"You've got an ear-trumpet, I see. That's what I've been telling you to do for the last two years."

"Oh! Is that what you've been telling me for the last two years?"—Puck.

BOOK NOTICES.

"Under Western Skies" (New Whatcom, Wash.: Blade Publishing Co. Price, 50 cents), is a collection of verses of sentiment by Frank Carleton Teck.

Though the presidential election is over and the democratic party again defeated, so good an outline history of the party as "The American Democracy" (Shelby, O.: The Shelby Publishing Co.; price, cloth, \$1.00), by S. S. Bloom, is not obsolete. Mr.

Bloom is a journalist who has for over 30 years been active in Ohio politics. His book tells the story of the democratic party from its rise during John Adams's administration to the present time. Its 213 pages of readable matter picture vividly the development of democracy in party politics and serve also for handy reference.

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

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES A. BUTLER,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Suite 616, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.
Telephone, Main 711.

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

NELLIE CARLIN,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
1203 Ashland Block, Chicago.
Telephone Central 926.

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, 1363 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.
NEW YORK.

For any Book on Earth
Old or New Write to
H. H. TIMBY,
Book Hunter,
Conneaut, Ohio.
ATALOGUES FREE.

IF you have been up against it, by
buying cigars indiscriminately,

Try those
out of boxes

BEARING OUR NAME,
and get your money's worth.

J. & B. MOOS,

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

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 687, Chicago.

The Public

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

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

Single copies, five cents each.

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

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



The Best Flour is
H. R. Eagle & Co.'s BEST

Made from the finest
Minnesota Hard Wheat
by the Most Improved
Process. TRY IT.

H. R. EAGLE & CO., 76 and 78 Wabash Ave.,
CHICAGO, ILL.

HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION.

LECTURES GIVEN AT
HANDEL HALL,
40 East Randolph Street, Second Floor,
EVERY SUNDAY AFTERNOON
At 3 o'clock sharp.

Program for Sunday, Jan. 6th, 1901.

MISS MARGARET HALEY
and **JOHN Z. WHITE,**

"Taxation in Cook County."

ADMISSION FREE!