

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1902.

Number 239.

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 page.

The most important of all the elections of next week is not the Congressional elections, important as those are, but the local election in the State of Ohio.

This is so because the question of local municipal government is distinctly at stake in Ohio, and that is a question which touches the rights and interests of every locality in the United States and is everywhere fast becoming a burning question in American politics. It makes Congressional changes, short of a complete change in control, of secondary importance.

What is most needed in Congress at this time is not a majority of Democratic partisans, but a strong minority of able and courageous devotees of radical democracy. Such a minority could combat and expose the imperialistic tendencies of the party in power, without being in the least degree less effective in securing democratic legislation. But a Democratic majority in the lower House just now would probably prove to be much more harmful to the democratic movement than to imperialism and protectionism. It might even strengthen those twin principles of political decay. The most it could do for the movement it would represent would be to pass bills for the President to oppose and the Senate to reject or pigeon hole, thereby exciting all the prejudice without reaping for the public any of the benefits of legislation hostile to the policy of the party in power.

Suppose, for instance, that the

Democrats, having come into control of the lower House in the next Congress, were to pass a bill reforming the tariff in the direction of free trade. It would be denounced everywhere by the protected trusts and their hired men in the Republican party and their subsidized newspapers of all kinds, as a "prosperity destroyer." This tremendous pro-trust clique would "beg to remind" the people that "prosperity" is a timid thing, and that when you shy a brick at it it doesn't wait to be smashed, but dodges at once. And so, when the periodical hard times which protectionism inevitably produces came upon us, we should be told that they were caused by the free trade brick which the Democratic party in the lower House had shied at "prosperity." The very measure which if enacted would promote wholesome business conditions, in place of the alternating "booms" and "busts" which protectionism fosters, would thus be falsely made to appear to have been inimical to prosperity; and, in consequence, the barren Congressional victory of this year would serve two years hence to prevent a victory that could be turned to good account.

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not mean that democratic Democrats should vote against their principles in the Congressional elections, or refrain from voting for them, or in any other way try to prevent the return of the largest possible Democratic majority to the lower House of the next Congress. No man can see far enough into the future to vote with tact; the best that any of us can do is to vote with sincerity. The true policy of the good citizen this year is, therefore, to vote for that Congressional candidate who, being really a candidate and not merely

playing at politics, most nearly represents his political principles. This being done, responsibility for ultimate results rests elsewhere. But all that considered, let no one be too anxious for a Congressional victory which would almost certainly check the democratic tide that is now setting in.

It is different with the nominally local but really national contest that Johnson and Bigelow and their associates are making in Ohio. In that contest a moral effect may be secured of far reaching and long enduring value. For the cynical "bosses" of the Republican party in Ohio have boldly foisted upon the municipalities of the State a plan of local government which subjects them to the party in power in the State. It utterly abolishes home rule in home affairs. Not only may the governor remove any mayor whom the people have elected, but he may appoint the important officials of every city whose council does not confirm the mayor's appointments by an almost impossible two-thirds vote. The Ohio "bosses" have, therefore, raised the home rule issue squarely, and if their candidate for secretary of state should be elected by a normal Republican majority, his election would be regarded and would be in fact a popular endorsement of the policy of depriving municipalities of home rule. But should the vote for Herbert S. Bigelow, the Democratic candidate, be large enough to notably diminish the normal Republican majority, it would be a condemnation of that policy. Better yet, if Mr. Bigelow were elected, the condemnation would be so emphatic as to arouse the home rule sentiment and strengthen the home rule policy all over the United States. It is for this reason that we regard Big-

elow's Ohio contest as the most important of the year.

Next in importance to the contest in Ohio over the office of secretary of state is that in Colorado over the Bucklin constitutional amendment, and for similar reasons. If Colorado were equal in influence upon general public sentiment with Ohio, the Colorado contest might well be considered the more important of the two. For upon the fate of Bucklin's amendment depends the question of whether Colorado counties shall regulate their own taxing methods or be controlled by the party in power in the State.

If the amendment carries, every county will be at liberty once in four years to decide whether it will discourage improvements and production by taxing them or will discourage landforestalling by taxing that. A bitter fight against the amendment is being made by the land grant railroads, the Denver real estate speculators, and the large land grabbers generally. They realize that under it their ill-gotten gains would be swept away. It may be that they have deceived the working farmer of Colorado into supposing that land monopoly is a good thing because he monopolizes a little; but if the farmers of Colorado are as intelligent as they are represented to be, they will see through that "bunco" game, and by voting for Bucklin's amendment let the land rings understand that farmers know that they flourish not by land grabbing but by land using. Such a class cannot be hurt by a system of taxation which exempts the profits of land using and taxes only the profits of land grabbing.

Still, farmers are notoriously easy game for the "bunco" man, and those of Colorado may fall into the trap which the "bunco" steerers of the land grant railroads and the Denver speculators have set for them. It would be a pity should that prove to be the case, and for other reasons than the condemnation of an ideal

tax system. For after all, the issue really at stake in Colorado is not whether this system of taxation shall be adopted, but whether the counties shall decide it for themselves or be governed in their local tax affairs from the State capitol. It is sincerely to be hoped that Colorado will prove her devotion to the essentials of Jeffersonian democracy by deciding this issue in favor of home rule.

In Illinois, the question of home rule is presented in another form. Under the advisory referendum, the people are to advise the legislature by referendum vote whether they want the right to decide local questions by the popular vote of localities and State questions by the popular vote of the State. Whatever may be the result, it will not bind the legislature. But it is exceedingly important that a heavy vote be cast in favor of the proposed change. If the referendum were adopted the day of the political boss would be at an end; for then every piece of legislation would be subject to submission to popular vote, and all the work of the "boss" and of the lobby would go for nothing. Take the new Ohio charter law, for illustration. Though "Boss" Cox and Senator Foraker and Senator Hanna had fixed it up for "boss" purposes as nicely as they have done, yet if a reasonable percentage of the people could demand its submission to popular vote the expensive work of the "bosses" would be rejected; and this very fact would have prevented their cooking up such an infamous charter in the first place. It is because the referendum would enable the people to keep their hands on the legislative lever all the time, that "bosses" and franchise mongers object to it. The people of the whole country will welcome gladly a large vote in Illinois next week in favor of the referendum.

Democratic papers of the Whig variety are sadly outraged because Tom L. Johnson, when he spoke in Cincin-

nati last week, called John R. McLean and his henchmen to account. McLean runs a Republican side show in Cincinnati under Democratic banners. Between him and the Republican "boss," Cox, there exists a perfect understanding. Like an honorable political pirate, Cox divides the spoils of office with the McLean gang. Consequently the two gangs work together to despoil the people of Cincinnati, to whom it has for that reason made no difference which ticket they vote. If they vote Republican they get Cox and McLean; if they vote Democratic they get McLean and Cox. It is to Johnson's honor, therefore, that he refuses to affiliate politically with McLean. It ought to be to his credit that he exposes and defies the McLean kind of politics. In doing this Johnson shows the difference between the mere partisan and the high minded political leader. It is in entire accord with his attacks upon the tax auditors, Democrats as well as Republicans, who have sold themselves to the railroads. He thereby proves himself to be the kind of political leader whom so many good people think they want—before he appears. Now that their ideal of a leader has appeared, it remains for that class of people in Ohio to demonstrate their sincerity.

While the Cleveland Plain Dealer is accounted a Democratic paper, this reputation is quite traditional. Its news columns have, indeed, given fair reports of Johnson's meetings in the Bigelow campaign, as they have of Hanna's meetings; but the only candidate of importance whom it has editorially indorsed with any vigor at all is the Republican Congressman, Theodore Burton, who is running for reelection in the Cleveland district. We note these facts, not for purposes of criticism, but to bring out the great significance of the following editorial comment in the Plain Dealer of the 27th:

The unseemly exhibitions of Senator M. A. Hanna upon the stump in this campaign, culminating in a new

set of oral absurdities at the meeting held Saturday evening in Newburg, is absolutely a menace to Mr. Theodore Burton's return to Congress. As a newspaper firmly established in the belief that it is a public duty to indorse and support Mr. Burton in his candidacy, the Plain Dealer enters earnest protest against the Hanna forms of canvassing votes so far as the Twenty-first district is concerned.

The knowledge that Senator Hanna was one of the strongest factors behind the detested scheme of board rule to supplant the federal system in Cleveland was in itself sufficient provocation for his rebuke at the polls next week as a leader of his party in this State. When Mr. Hanna takes the stump in Cleveland to defend his iniquitous legislation, and when he adds to that error a systematic course of personal abuse, he insults the intelligence of the voter, independent, Republican or Democrat, who hears or reads of his performances.

The public might overlook the strenuous business features of his campaign, his frequent and gratuitous promises that his street railway will "give the public a fair deal" when it goes about it to get a new franchise. Such remarks appear arrogant to a degree, but we suppose they are evidences of Mr. Hanna's determination to "separate business from politics." Not so, however, when he indulges in the folly of supplanting argument with abuse, which supporters of Mr. Burton must realize can only have an injurious effect in that gentleman's district, where already the fear is daily and hourly expressed that he may be a victim to the popular and proper feeling of indignation against boss rule as exemplified by the Cox-Hanna legislature.

Is it in the power of any committee to reform Mr. Hanna's stump methods, or at least to keep him busy outside of Mr. Burton's district?

It would appear from the Plain Dealer's manifest concern for its Republican candidate for Congress, that Edmund G. Vail, the blacksmith candidate, may very likely displace the scholarly dispenser of river and harbor "pork," as Congressman from Cleveland.

As time goes by, knowledge of the means that were resorted to to defeat Bryan begins to leak out. Here for instance is a dispatch from Iowa, a special to the Chicago Chronicle, which professes to be a Democratic paper but which opposed the election of Bryan in 1896, was treacherous in 1900, and is all the time as

good a party organ for the Republicans as they could ask for. The Chronicle published this dispatch on the 25th. It tells its own story:

The Republican State central committee has been notified the railroads will not allow free transportation to students of the colleges of the State who desire to go home to vote. The railroad officials say they began the practice in 1896, when, under strong pressure to prevent the election of Bryan, they aided the Republican campaign management as much as possible. Now they hold there is no necessity for it.

Railroads are not excusable for giving free transportation to serve a political purpose. They are public servants, whose right of way has been secured for them by the sovereign power of the State for a public purpose, and they have no more right than any other public servant to discriminate against persons or classes. Yet it was by means of such discrimination not only that Republican college students were carried long distances to vote, but that crowds were carried to Canton to hear McKinley speak, and that the party of plutocracy was otherwise aided. But a day of wrath is coming fast, and against that day things like these will be treasured up.

The impudence of the railroad-coal trust was manifested in a new way at the first meeting of the arbitration commission, when one of its representatives took occasion to insist that this must not be an arbitration, but only an investigation. It was impudent because the very proposal the trust had made and the miners had accepted was that the "questions at issue between the respective companies and their own employes" should be referred to the commission, and that the "decision of that commission shall be accepted by" the trust. If that is not a proposal to arbitrate, it would be impossible to frame one.

The anthracite arbitration commission, appointed by President Roosevelt, have refused the offer made by the railroad and coal trust

of a special train gratis on their trip through the anthracite coal regions. There was nothing else for them to do. It is inconceivable that some of the men on that commission should for an instant harbor the thought of accepting such a favor in such circumstances; and entirely aside from moral sensitiveness, an acceptance by the commission would have been scandalous. But think of what the offer reveals. These "courtesies" have been so common of late years, that this one was extended as a matter of course. And, indeed, if Senators, and judges, and tax commissioners, and even Presidents may be the favored guests of railroad magnates when great railroad interests are before those officials for adjudication of some sort, why not the arbitration commission?

In a leading editorial in its issue of Oct. 21, the New York Journal of Commerce has some impressive words on certain "Aspects of the Times." Coming as they do from so conservative a source, they will carry weight with a class of readers who rate statements and judgments according to where they find them rather than according to inherent merit and truth. The writer says:

The founders of our government flattered themselves that they had devised a system of rights and liberties so wisely adjusted and guarded as to unite all classes in reciprocal bonds of interest and maintain equal access to the virgin resources of our vast domain. At the end of our first century, however, we find broad and powerful tendencies wholly incompatible with these foundation theories and we seem to be gradually drifting into a very unassuring reconstruction of our political and economic institutions.

The words, "maintain equal access to the virgin resources of our vast domain," are not alluded to again in the editorial except under the general condemnation of the growth of monopolistic power; but it is a good sign of the times that such a journal should specifically mention the maintenance of "equal access to the virgin resources of our vast domain" as an

industrial factor, the lack of which is to be lamented.

The writer then proceeds to show the evils that followed in the wake of the civil war: "government by power, with all its undemocratic accompaniments", "full-fledged paternalism", and "so-called protection". Speaking of the governmental interference with the natural relations of trade, he shows how the system reacts:

This false dependence of industry upon the government has begotten a vicious dependence of government upon industrial capital. The industries look to the government for special privileges conferred at the cost of the tax-paying public and for the restraint of competition; the governing classes in turn draw on the purse of industry for personal bribes to legislators and for contributions to election funds to perpetuate party dominance. Such has been the course of our nation building for nearly half a century.

Then follows a very clear exposition of the purpose and effect of trusts, and of their corresponding accompaniment, the great trades unions. Both movements the writer holds to be manifestations of the "current monopolistic invasion," retrogressive in tendency and hostile to American ideals of liberty and right. All in all, no saner, calmer, and at the same time more earnest warnings have been uttered in recent times than are to be found in that editorial. Its appearance goes far to strengthen the belief that there are substantial, legitimate, business interests which are prepared to welcome a "change of government." Will these same interests be willing to curb monopolies by adopting genuine measures for maintaining "equal access to the virgin resources of our vast domain"? That is the question.

It may border upon the impious to object to so strenuous and warlike a game as football; yet a protest springs to the pen-point, as it were, when one reads such accounts of football games as the following news

report of a game at Danville, Ill., on the 19th:

The Central University football team returned home to-day from Nashville, where they played Vanderbilt yesterday. The team was so badly crippled by the game that it was compelled to cancel the game with Sewanee, which was to have been played Monday, and lay up for repairs. Cheek, halfback, has a broken ankle; Hugely, halfback, has a broken collar bone; Wilson, fullback, was hit on the head and rendered unconscious by the blow; Tarkington, end, sustained a fractured bone in the hand, while other members were more or less seriously battered up.

If this sort of thing is to become characteristic of our universities, what place can they be regarded as holding in the education of youth? Has our civilization fallen so completely under the dominion of the devilish spirit of "success" and the evolution of the "strenuous life," that humane ideals are being supplanted in our universities by such savage games as that described above? We boast of our progressive civilization, but can that be a progressive civilization in which success in brutal sports rather than intellectual and moral culture distinguishes our university life?

The latest autocratic interference by the post office department at Washington with private mail matter, is in the case of the "League of Educators" of Chicago. This concern does a business which we believe to rest upon unsound business principles. Probably most men would come to the same conclusion upon examining into it. But it is not fraudulent. There is no trick or deception about it. There are no secret springs in it. What it does is open even to the most casual examination. Nothing is concealed. On the contrary all facts are exploited. Should it turn out in the end to have been ill-advised, the losers will have lost through their own judgment and not through the trick and device of swindlers. There is, therefore, no excuse whatever for interference with this business by the law in any of its branches or in any manner, ex-

cept the plea that government ought to paternally protect investors against the results of their own mistaken judgment. But if this plea is allowable, every kind of investment should be subject to government censorship, and that is absurd. Yet a bureau in the post office department at Washington reaches out with its long and strong arm and forbids the delivery of mail matter addressed to this business concern. In other words, it stops its business. To do such a thing on no better basis than that the avowed business principle of the concern is unsound would be bad enough under any circumstances. It is infinitely worse when, as in this case, the interference is made arbitrarily and peremptorily, without court or jury, without any opportunity to the house to be heard, but upon the mere ipse dixit of a department clerk. If such things can be done in one case they can be done in others, and every new business may easily come to depend upon the will of the department clerk unless Congress or some court intervenes and takes away from his department the extraordinary power it now exercises so freely of stopping men's letters and depriving them of remittances without due process of law.

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON.

The life of this noble woman, which has just come to an end, is part of the most enduring history of her country, and indeed of modern civilization. Not only did she live during the period when the equality of womanhood with manhood came into recognition, but she as much or more than any other one person brought about the change.

In Mrs. Stanton's younger days, even while she was in middle life, married women had no individual standing before the law on its civil side. Their property belonged to the husband and their individuality was altogether merged in his. Though his right to flog his wife had become obsolete, his governing authority remained intact. As the social idea of woman was as a vine clinging tenderly to her stalwart

oak of a husband, so the legal idea of her was as an absolute nonentity. That condition has not been wholly altered, but it has been altered in great degree.

Married women now own and control their own property, if they want to. In the law, the relationship that subsists between them is more analogous to partnership and less to serfdom than in former days; while in some States women are even invested with the ballot, as they are destined yet to be in all.

Throughout this whole movement Elizabeth Cady Stanton was conspicuous and influential. It was natural, perhaps, fighting as she was for the withheld rights of one sex, that the struggle should have assumed the appearance to her of a sex conflict, just as the anti-slavery struggle seemed to so many of its leaders a race conflict. But Mrs. Stanton lived long enough to see her cause rise to the higher plane of a conflict not of sex against sex but of men and women who believe in equal human rights against men and women who do not.

Her own daughter, Mrs. Blatch, truly characterized this conflict when in a speech at Cooper Union a few years ago she recited all the objections ever made to woman suffrage, both those that have been abandoned and those that are still urged, and declared that every one was essentially neither more nor less than an objection to democracy.

Probably the most perfect characterization of Mrs. Stanton is that of her coadjutor for so many years—Susan B. Anthony. Miss Anthony has called her “the statesman of the woman suffrage movement,” and that was really her relation to it. From her speech before the legislature of New York in 1848 in support of the married woman’s property bill to the latter days of her life, she did the kind of work for the movement that falls to statesmen to do, and she did it with singular ability. She was a statesman of the first order.

Of course, Mrs. Stanton suffered the jibes and jeers of thoughtless and vicious adversaries. That is something which no one can escape who enlists in the service of his kind. Of course, also, these jibes and jeers came from the upper mob even more

freely than from the lower. It is the upper mob, always sensitive to such weapons when turned against themselves, that uses them with greatest freedom against others. But the day has passed when the jeers of the thoughtless or the slanders of the vicious can have any influence upon the cause to which Mrs. Stanton devoted her long life. She lived to see it successful in many particulars and its success assured in all. And as to herself, she has left a name that will be honored as long as the story of woman’s emancipation shall be told.

THE TRUE ISSUE IN THE COAL STRIKE.

He must be a confiding soul who believes that the Presidential arbitration can settle the anthracite coal strike.

The arbitration commission does serve an excellent purpose in allaying excitement and making opportunity for calm reflection. It will doubtless make an adjustment of terms of employment which may keep the peace for a little while. It may recommend palliatives to Congress and State legislatures. In a flight of optimistic imagination, one might almost prophesy its securing better treatment for the miners, as a similar commission might possibly have secured 50 years ago better treatment for Negro slaves in the District of Columbia.

But the true issue will go unnoticed by the arbitration board. The relation of mining serf to feudal lord will remain undisturbed and unmenaced. The essential right and wrong of the matter will be passed over. The irrepressible conflict will be minimized. Like the issue of chattel slavery, which was allowed to gather momentum until it plunged our nation into the throes of a bloody civil war, this issue of economic slavery will, so far as the President’s arbitration board affects it, be left to develop its own kind of cataclasm.

The comparison of that issue with the slavery issue of our fathers is something more than an analogy. The two issues are but different expressions of the same thing. Under chattel slavery, the master drove his slave to work and appropriated the

proceeds of his labor. Under economic slavery, the coal baron appropriates mining opportunities and thereby forces the disinherited miner to work upon his grinding terms or starve in idleness. In both forms of slavery the worker must work for a master. Whether he cringes under a lash and to save his body from bruises consents to work, or cringes under fear of starvation and to save his life begs for work, makes no difference. So long as his will in that respect is controlled by another, so long as his earnings over and above his bare “keep” are appropriated by another, he is a slave—even though he have a vote.

One need only to know the surroundings of the anthracite coal mines to realize that the miners are slaves. Even the well paid ones average hardly a dollar a day in wages. This is not because they cannot or will not earn more, but because they are not allowed to earn more.

Says Henry George, Jr., who is familiar with the region and the subject:

It may be truthfully said that eight railroads, to all intents and purposes, own all the hard coal lands in the United States, for Pennsylvania contains the only anthracite deposits in this country, and commercially, in the world. The Reading railroad, the Erie railroad and the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western railroad own considerably more than half of the hard coal lands, and their policy dominates. . . . They aim to make an artificial scarcity of coal. The scarcity they effect in two ways. First, they do not work the equipped mines as long and as fully as they might be worked. They are deliberately closed down for periods that are not needed to make repairs. Next, they do not attempt to open all the available coal land, but on the contrary keep as much as possible out of use, and deliberately and continually buy and lease workable coal land to prevent it from being worked. By its published annual report current during the coal strike of 1900, the Lehigh Valley railroad was paying a quarter of a million dollars a year in minimum royalties on coal land from which it was not taking a pound of the mineral, but was purposely holding out of use.

In the light of that information it is easy to see not only that the coal barons do reduce the miners to bare subsistence wages, but how they do it. They do it by reducing opportunities for mining to a minimum as

compared with the supply of miners. This forces the miners to compete for work in an overflowing labor market, and thereby to bring down wages to the lowest levels.

But what is it that gives the coal barons that power? Evidently it is not the mining machinery they own. It is not the cars nor the locomotives, nor the railroad buildings. All these things could be easily reproduced. Not only could they be, but they would be if they could be utilized. But they could not be utilized because the barons control all the rail highways and terminal points and all the coal deposits.

In controlling these, they control everything. Though the hills of Pennsylvania had been stored by the Creator with ready-made goods of all kinds, instead of coal, the miners could live no better if this monopoly condition prevailed. They would still be slaves to the forestallers, and no arbitration board could help them, beyond deciding that they ought to have a beggarly increase of pay.

There, then, you have the true issue of the strike. Capital there is in abundance to operate railroad coal trains from the mines to the sea; but the barons monopolize the highways and no one can transport coal without their consent. Capital there is in abundance to work coal deposits; but the barons monopolize the deposits, and no one can open them without their consent. This consent they refuse. Consequently, they make coal abnormally dear, they diminish opportunities for the productive use of capital, and by thus lessening demand for labor they make of miners abject beggars for jobs of work.

Should this be allowed?

No question of interfering with property rights is involved. If the coal barons accomplished their ends through monopoly of things they have a moral right to own, of things they had made or had bought of people who did make them, questions of property rights would arise. But there is no question of property rights here, because highways and coal deposits are no more subject to

legitimate ownership, as you own your hat or your coat, than is a black man's baby.

Then why dawdle over the question of the property claims of the coal barons in these privileges of highways and coal deposits? If any set of men were to obstruct our streets, we should make quick work with them and their "property" rights. If any were to forbid fishing in Lake Michigan we should make quick work with them. Then why not make quick work with the coal barons who obstruct those great arteries of trade known as railroad rights of way, and forbid digging for coal in the coal-stored hills of Pennsylvania?

This is something which we must do sooner or later, not only with reference to coal deposits, but to all other natural opportunities, including the opportunity to build on vacant city lots, that are withheld by forestallers from improvement by labor and capital, though worth hundreds of thousands of dollars to the acre. If it is not done calmly, with good judgment and in good time, we must be prepared to see it done as its kindred reform, the abolition of slavery, was effected,—in the heat of passion and in a storm of blood.

There is no excuse for allowing this giant wrong of land monopoly to develop into a disturber of the peace. Nor is there any necessity for revolutionizing our system of land tenure in order to avert the danger.

With reference, for instance, to the coal question, were we to open the rail highways to common use as public highways, like our streets and roads—something that is perfectly feasible—we should destroy the power of the barons over coal transportation. Were we then simply to encourage the coal mining business by exempting it from taxation, and to discourage the business of locking up coal deposits by taxing them all they are worth in the market, we should destroy the power of the barons over coal mining.

With free competition in coal transportation, and with worked mines profitable owing to exemption of mining from taxation, and unworked deposits unprofitable, owing

to a heavy taxation upon mine monopoly, the demand for labor would exceed the supply. When that is the case neither trade unions nor arbitration boards are of any use. Each miner becomes his own trade union and he and his immediate employer become their own arbitration board.

Any settlement of the present coal strike which ignores the monopoly of highways and coal deposits, may serve a temporary political purpose, but it will utterly fail to relieve us of coal strikes, of coal famines, or of the portentous problem which is to our generation what the slavery problem was to our bewildered and fatuously compromising fathers of half a century ago.

NEWS

Pursuant to President Roosevelt's call (pp. 454-55), the presidential commissioners for the arbitration of the anthracite coal strike appeared at the White House at 10 o'clock on the 24th. When they had assembled, the President read to them the following address of instructions:

At the request both of the operators and of the miners I have appointed you a commission to inquire into, consider, and pass upon the questions in controversy in connection with the strike in the anthracite region and the causes out of which the controversy arose. By the action you recommend, which the parties in interest have in advance consented to abide by, you will endeavor to establish the relations between the employers and the wageworkers in the anthracite fields on a just and permanent basis, and, as far as possible, to do away with any causes for the recurrence of such difficulties as those which you have been called in to settle. I submit to you herewith the published statement of the operators, following which I named you as members of the commission, Mr. Wright being named as recorder; also the letter from Mr. Mitchell. I appoint Mr. Mosely and Mr. Neill as assistants to the recorder.

Mr. Edward A. Mosely is secretary to the Inter-State Commerce commission; Mr. Charles P. Neill is professor of economics at the Catholic University in Washington.

After listening to the President's address, the commission repaired to the office of the bureau of labor, where they formally organized by electing Judge Gray as chairman. If

was decided at this meeting that all sessions of the commission for the taking of evidence should be open to the public. No other definite business was transacted except to direct that a notification be made to both parties that the commission would re-assemble on the 27th for the purpose of arranging with them for the presentation of testimony and arguments. A discussion arose, however, as to whether the recorder, Carroll D. Wright, should have a vote in the deliberations of the commission. President Roosevelt settled this question on the following day by appointing Mr. Wright, with the concurrence of both parties to the arbitration, to the position of a commissioner, thus making the commission a body of seven instead of six.

Upon the reassembling of the commission on the 27th, Mr. Baer did most of the talking for the employers, while Mr. Mitchell represented the strikers. At the suggestion of the employers the commission decided to hold their next meeting at Wilkesbarre on the 30th for the purpose of personally inspecting the coal mines and their surroundings. To facilitate this investigation and save the commissioners expense, the employers offered to furnish a special train for the use of the commission in going through the mining region, but this offer was declined.

The coal strike in France (p. 424), which began on the 9th, came to an end on the 24th in a manner similar to the ending of the anthracite strike in the United States. Reports of serious rioting at Dunkirk (where the dock laborers, who had struck in support of the coal strikers, prevented the landing of foreign coal), and of the consequent establishment of martial law by the French ministry, were cabled on the 23d; but later in the day the premier, M. Combes, announced in the chamber of deputies that the strike had ended and that work would be resumed on the 24th. A vote of confidence—375 to 164—was thereupon given. The premier had evidently been in communication with the strikers, for on the 24th a committee of the miners' federation waited upon him and agreed to submit the demands of the miners to arbitration.

In the British parliament, the disorder over the attempt of the ministry to prevent any discussion of the

Irish question (p. 455) continued daily until the 27th, when the ministry gave way. They were forced to do so because the new rules enabled the Irish members to consume time by repeatedly moving adjournments to consider one question or another. While losing their motions they obstructed legislation to such an extent that in seven days only 11 lines of the special order, the education bill, had been considered. Finally, on the 27th, William O'Brien was allowed to move an adjournment for the purpose of discussing the enforcement of the so-called crimes act in Ireland, in support of which the merits of the Irish question was discussed on both sides. The motion, however, was defeated by 215 to 121. Though this is not regarded by the Irish members as equivalent to granting the day they demand for a discussion of Irish grievances, it has stopped the disorder at least for a time.

To the surprise of everyone familiar with the strong feeling which the ministerial educational bill has stirred up among the opponents of the state church in England, a by-election on the 25th in Devenport, a Liberal constituency for 10 years past, resulted in the return of the Conservative candidate. The contested issues were the educational bill and the Irish question, and the vote stood 3,785 for James Lochie, Conservative, and 3,757 for T. A. Brassy, Liberal.

An innovation in British colonial methods is to be made by Mr. Chamberlain, the colonial secretary, who, it was officially announced on the 27th, is to visit South Africa personally for the purpose of settling the affairs of the conquered colonies. He goes in November and will probably remain through the winter. This undertaking is said to have not only the approval of the ministry but also the sanction of the King, and is regarded in England as indicative of a new policy in colonial administration generally. It will be the first time that a British colonial secretary has visited a colony while in office.

There are, however, special reasons sufficient to account for Mr. Chamberlain's extraordinary visit. The hostility between the Dutch and the British in South Africa, which created the demand by a faction of the latter some months ago (p. 325)

for the abrogation of the Cape Colony constitution, is reported to have become more intense. According to one of the press dispatches, "Transvaal and Free State colors are worn freely in Dutch towns of Cape Colony, and sedition is openly preached," which has so alarmed the British loyalists that the agitation in favor of suspending the colonial constitution is becoming irresistible.

Farther up the eastern coast of South Africa, Great Britain has probably extended her dominions by acquiring part of the Portuguese territory, including Delagoa bay. It was rumored last August that the purchase of this territory would be announced in parliament in October; and now, though no official announcement is made, the fact has been allowed authoritatively to leak out. As the story comes, the transaction is between Great Britain, Portugal and Germany, Portugal relinquishing her sovereign rights and Great Britain acquiring them as far north as the Zambesi river, while Germany acquires the remainder, from the Zambesi to the southern border of German East Africa on the river Rovuma. It is explained that the transaction was made by secret treaty three years ago.

Still farther north, in the regions of the "mad mullah," the British troops under Col. Swayne (p. 455) are reported to have escaped from the trap in which the "mad mullah" had caught them, and to be retreating without molestation to Berbera on the Somaliland coast.

Back into Europe and we are confronted with a compilation, the first in 50 years, of the prohibitions imposed by the Russian government upon the Russian press. The compilation has been sent to the Russian newspapers in the form of a confidential circular, the following clauses of which are cabled:

1. Ministerial reports to the czar may not be published without the consent of the ministry of the interior; likewise rumors about the same; likewise acts and expressions of the czar.
2. Matters emanating from the higher governmental circles, such as documents and decisions, may not be referred to without the consent of the authority concerned.
3. Circulars of governmental departments may not be referred to without the special permission of the department concerned.

4. Information relating to the empire's defensive position, mobilization or dislocation of the army or navy, credits for war purposes, construction of strategic roads or warships, etc., may be taken only from the "Russki Invalid."

5. News or articles concerning the maintenance of the Chinese Eastern railroad and its guard are forbidden.

6. News about the commanding of agents of the finance ministry into Persia and the results of their work is forbidden.

7. News about or articles on school disorders or the last university regulations are forbidden, likewise petitions of the students, blackboard notices, etc., furthermore, no information can be printed about the internal life of any schools without the consent of the proper authorities.

8. Articles on or news about political arrests or crimes or criminals, except what are printed in the Official Messenger or other official organs about executions and those who perform them, are prohibited.

9. Factory disorders and other public disorders cannot be mentioned without the consent of the higher police.

10. Pestilence in Russia and neighboring countries cannot be mentioned without the decision of the medical department of the ministry of the interior.

11. No allusions can be made to the personnel or the work of the secret police.

12. No calls for money contributions can be issued without special permission.

13. Suicides cannot be mentioned without the written consent of the nearest relatives, or, in case of their absence, of the local chief of police.

14. Mention of contemporaneous measures against religious dissenters or of the holy synod's action against Tolstoi is forbidden.

15. "Curb" quotations are forbidden.

16. Articles of a strictly scientific nature not suited for the masses are forbidden when bad results might ensue.

Again have the hopes of the advocates, both in Denmark and the United States, for the sale of the Danish West Indies by the former to the latter, been disappointed. The folkething, or lower house of the Danish parliament, voted last spring to ratify the treaty of cession (p. 107), but the landthing, or upper house, inserted a referendum clause requiring the question to be submitted to a vote of the property owners of the islands. The lower house insisted that the referendum should

require no property qualification, and while the two houses were thus at a deadlock the time for ratification, June 24, expired. But the United States agreed to extend the time, and it was hoped that the elections for the new Danish parliament, to be held in September, would change the political complexion of that body sufficiently to guarantee ratification without any referendum clause, which is what the American government requires. When the official results of the elections were given out, September 19, it seemed certain that this hope would be realized, for the ministerialists had carried 37 seats and the opposition only 29. But the ministerialists were unable to hold their majority. The ratification measure passed its first reading in the new landthing on the 15th of October, after a discussion in which the premier declared that there were two alternatives, either the cession of the islands or an increase of the already heavy expenditure necessary for their maintenance and development. He added that he had received the written promise of the United States government that after the cession free imports from the islands into the United States would be granted. This, however, was as far as the measure got. It failed to pass its second reading, on the 22d, by a tie vote—32 to 32.

Another of the West Indies, Santo Domingo, immediate neighbor to Hayti, whose civil war ended several days ago (p. 455), has just passed through an insurrection which began on the 11th and ended on the 22d. It began with a revolt by Gen. Navarro, the deposed governor of the district of Monte Christi, at the northwestern extremity of the republic. Gen. Navarro took possession of the town of Monte Christi on the night of the 11th, and imprisoned all the government officials except the new governor, who escaped. The whole district came to his support at first; but early in the morning of the 22d his followers were scattered by government troops, after a severe battle in the streets of Monte Christi, and the town fort was wrested from him. Gen. Navarro himself was taken prisoner.

The revolutionists in Colombia (p. 409) are reported to have suffered a crushing disaster near Santa Marta, in the department of Magdalena.

Gen. Marjarres, of the government troops, attacked at Santa Marta a revolutionary army under Gen. Uribe-Uribe and Gen. Castillo, on the 26th; and on the 28th news reached Panama direct from Gen. Marjarres that Gens. Uribe-Uribe and Castillo had surrendered with a large quantity of weapons and ammunition. Uribe-Uribe was the military leader of the revolution. No details were given, but there were rumors of heavy casualties on both sides. This disaster to the revolutionists, so the Colombian government claims, perfects government control in the departments of Bolivar and Magdalena and confines revolutionary activities to the Isthmus.

Regarding the Panama canal, which is to be cut through Colombian territory (p. 187), Attorney General Knox, who has just returned from a special trip to Paris to investigate the title of the French company, whose rights are to be purchased by the United States, reports the title good. But now a new difficulty arises. The action of the American authorities with reference to the Isthmus (p. 409) in interfering with the military operations of the Colombian government, has aroused strong opposition in Colombia to the whole canal scheme. So strong is this feeling against the possible assumption of American sovereignty over the Isthmus, that the Colombian government now declines to proceed with treaty negotiations for the construction of the canal until the treaty of 1846, under which the United States is obligated to preserve to the world the commerce and open transit of the Isthmus, is revised and Colombian sovereignty made supreme.

The excitement of the election campaigns in the United States has continued to the end at the highest in Ohio (p. 456), where Mayor Johnson and Senator Hanna are fighting vigorously over the issue of "home rule and just taxation," which is Johnson's slogan. At the opening of the campaign Mr. Hanna refused to discuss anything but national questions, but as the campaign has gone on and the Republican legislature has adopted a municipal code which overturns the principle of home rule for municipalities, but little attention is paid by either party to any but the local issues which Johnson has raised. One of the peculiarities of Johnson's method of

campaign is that, although a party leader, he makes no distinction between Democratic and Republican politicians who put party loyalty or private interests above the rights of the public. This policy has been notably prominent in his campaign against the county auditors, irrespective of party, who favor railroads in the matter of taxation. It became even more noteworthy when at his speeches in Cincinnati he attacked the Democratic ring as vigorously as the Republican ring.

His first Cincinnati speech was delivered before an immense and applauding audience gathered in his tent on the 23d. Referring to the Democratic ring of Cincinnati Mr. Johnson said:

I despise the Cincinnati Enquirer and Mr. McLean. I do not desire their friendship and I heartily invite their hostility. There is no room in the Democracy for such men as Mr. McLean, and such newspapers as the Enquirer. I want the men who love true Democracy and who labor for the rights of the people and not for personal and selfish ends to come together under the standard of the new Democracy. There is no longer any place for these Democrats who are Democrats only for selfish ends, and the sooner the day that Mr. McLean and the Enquirer are openly attached to the Republican party the better it will be for the Democracy, though it will be a sad day for the Republicans. As a matter of fact, McLean has been constantly allied with "Boss" Cox, and it is partly through the efforts of these men who disgrace the name of Democrats that Cox has become so strongly entrenched in your city.

With this challenge Mr. Johnson proceeded to detail the affiliations of the Democratic and the Republican rings, and then offered to meet the men against whom he preferred these charges, either in his own tent or elsewhere before a Cincinnati audience, and give them full opportunity to reply.

In explaining his reasons for exposing the rings of his own party, Mr. Johnson said at the same meeting:

My friends, this is not a partisan movement. We intend to expel from our own ranks the men who have no right to be there enlisted, and we desire to awaken the Republicans to the necessity of similar action. I will be with you in the tent for this campaign and the next and the next, un-

til the victory is won which is above party lines, which places politics upon a higher plane, and which achieves equal justice and complete freedom for all the people of the State. And in this victory we can all rejoice regardless of former political affiliations.

It was in the same spirit that Herbert S. Bigelow, the candidate for secretary of state, spoke at the same meeting. Said he:

I have heard reports recently to the effect that I had greatly endangered the success of the local Democratic ticket on account of the attacks which I have made upon one man, Mr. Bernard. Personally, I wish him well. Politically, I abominate everything which Mr. Bernard stands for; and I do not wish to be elected to any office, if it means that I cannot express my opinion of the political principles of such a man. I wish to say also, that of all the unfair, petty, lying newspapers of this city, not one so arouses my antagonism as the underhanded, traitorous, cowardly Cincinnati Enquirer. I respect a frank foe, such as a Republican paper may be supposed to be, but I abominate a traitor, and it would be far better for the Democracy if this paper should to-morrow come out openly for the Republican party. We cannot ask the people to go back on the Republican party and bring them over to a boss-ridden Democratic party. We must first clean our own house and get rid of our own boss. Too long have the politics of both parties been in the control of men absolutely without moral purpose.

After three days in Cincinnati and vicinity, Mayor Johnson returned to Cleveland, where both he and Senator Hanna are leading the local campaign for their respective parties.

While the Democrats of Ohio under Johnson's leadership are trying to carry the State, both sides will regard a reduction of the Republican plurality as a victory for Johnson. Senator Hanna says as much in his speeches, and Johnson has spoken to the same effect. The vote of the State in the past will be a consideration, therefore, in estimating the result next week. In 1901, the Republican candidate for governor had a plurality of 67,567 in a total vote of 827,566, his percentage being 52½; in 1900, the Republican candidate for President had a plurality of 69,036 in a total of 1,040,073, his percentage being 52 1-3; and in the same year the Republican candidate for

secretary of state had a plurality of 69,311 in a total of 1,038,454, his percentage being 52 1-3.

NEWS NOTES.

—Elizabeth Cady Stanton died at New York on the 26th at the age of 87.

—The coal trust has raised the wholesale price of anthracite coal 50 cents a ton, to recoup its losses in the strike.

—The sixth anniversary of the organization of the Volunteers of America was celebrated on the 27th by a national meeting at Chicago.

—Wu Ting Fang, late Chinese minister to the United States, has been ordered to return to China, to take the post of minister of commerce.

—Through the Philippine commission President Roosevelt has authorized an extension of the coasting trade in the Philippines to the vessels of all nations.

—A convention of delegates from civic and municipal organizations met at Chicago on the 28th to consider the question of altering the constitution of Illinois. It decided in favor of revision by amendment.

—The 29th was celebrated in the anthracite coal region as "Mitchell day," in honor of John Mitchell, the labor leader. Mr. Mitchell spoke at Wilkesbarre in acknowledgment of a magnificent demonstration.

—A dissenting Catholic church in the Philippines was inaugurated at Manila on the 27th, with Father Aglipay, a native excommunicated Roman Catholic priest, as bishop. Aguinaldo has given the movement his approval.

—On the 25th the Supreme Court of Illinois made a decision in a Chicago street car case, the effect of which is to compel street car companies to allow transfers over the full length of the lines owned or leased by any one company, and to recognize the right of the city to reduce fares. The decision appears to be one of far-reaching effect and general importance.

—The secretary of the treasury has decided to accept as security for government deposits in banks, the bonds of municipalities whose bonded debt is less than seven per cent. of their assessed values for taxation. This is upon condition that the United States bonds released in consequence be used as a basis for increasing the note circulation of the banks making the change.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE OHIO MUNICIPAL CODE.

Buffalo Times (Dem.), Oct. 26.—Ohio cities have been deprived of the last vestige of local self-government by Hanna and Foraker to save the street car franchises

in Cleveland and Cincinnati owned by these "business" statesmen.

Columbus (O.) Press (Dem.), Oct. 22.—In response to the universal demand for home rule, the people have had saddled upon them a vicious and iniquitous system of board rule that will so diversify official responsibilities as to breed discord and consequent disaster to local government.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), Oct. 28.—Regarding the complex system as a whole, executive responsibility is so divided up among the boards that it can never be easily located. The principle of home rule, by bringing the governor in, is violated as badly as the principle of executive responsibility, by depriving the mayor of needed powers to secure effective administration.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), Oct. 22.—The municipal code as passed is designed to take the government of the larger cities of Ohio out of the hands of the people and vest it in the Republican State machine, which is subservient to the public-service corporations, Hanna being the largest owner of street railways in the State.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Oct. 27.—Now we have Ohio playing leading lady to that great star in ripper legislation, Pennsylvania. What ripper legislation means can be seen in Philadelphia and Pittsburg politics. What the regulation of municipal affairs from a State capitol means can be seen in Chicago's west park board. Experience and reason, facts and theories, the record of the past and the spirit of the present, all cry aloud for home rule for great cities. Does the new Ohio code conform to this cry? It not only does not conform to it, it violently disregards and flouts it.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Oct. 25.—Study any part of it, and the trail of the time-serving and spoils-seeking politician becomes visible. The welfare and interests of the communities affected were deliberately disregarded; the vital and generally recognized principle of home rule has been trampled under foot, and the claims of honest and disinterested citizens have been cynically repudiated. The code vests the executive powers not in the mayor, but in "boards." As well might the power of the chief executive of the State or the nation be transferred to a lot of "boards." Concentration of responsibility is a condition of efficiency and popular control; only grafters, franchise grabbers, boodlers and spoliemen are benefited by division of executive power and responsibility.

MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), Oct. 27.—Municipal ownership is making greater progress in Great Britain than in the United States. According to statistics in Cassier's Magazine, there are now in Great Britain 931 municipalities owning waterworks, 99 owning the tramways, 200 owning the gas works, and 181 supplying electricity. Most of these are in England. Municipalities were not allowed to work the tramways until 1896.

WHAT IT IS TO VOTE.

Cole County (Mo.) Daily Democrat (Dem.), Oct. 26.—Behind every political question there is a moral question. Truth is truth, whether in politics or religion. You must stand with truth or against it. When you approach the polls to cast a freeman's ballot, a voice is calling to you: "Choose ye this day whom you will serve." And you must choose. No political party may be wholly right in all things, but some political parties are allied with the forces that make for righteousness and justice, while others are not.

It would be just like science rudely to discover, one of these days, that a cucumber is no cooler than a potato.—Puck.

MISCELLANY

IF YE BE SLAVES.

For The Public.

If ye be slaves and may not rule,
I count him fool who sits and sighs.
Down, dog! and at the tyrant's stool
Learn to be servile to the wise.

But if ye stand as freeborn men,
Strike, in God's name! Usurpers hold
Your country's land. Take back again
The birthright that your fathers sold.
GERTRUDE COLLES.

THE SACRED TARIFF.

For The Public.

To the Editor: In common with my friends the Morgans, the Gates, and the Rockefellers, I have been considerably alarmed during the last three months by the din and clamor over the coal strike.

The perilous advance in the price of coal at the beginning of the inclement season inflamed the minds of the people to such an extent that some of them began to question the righteousness of our title to the coal fields.

Of course the cool-headed and well-instructed citizen would remember the many, many hard days of back-breaking labor, which we put forth to acquire the title to these coal lands, and gazing on our horny hands, and weather-beaten countenances, would recognize the truth, that the property we earned by such painful exertion could not be touched by a righteous government, even though all the rest of the people froze to death.

The beneficent Creator, they would admit, put the coal deposits there for the purpose of rewarding our spine-dislocating exertions, and of assuaging the pains of the blisters on our brawny hands, but in times of excitement even the well-disposed forget the equities, and the alarm among our circles was very great.

We do not object to the epithets. Coal Baron may be a sought-for title some day. But we do object to any disturbances which may unsettle the titles to the substantial thing upon which the Baronies must rest when things get settled down, and the common people get reconciled to those conditions in which Providence has been pleased to place them.

We were truly very much alarmed prior to the settlement of the coal strike, and yet there was one rock upon which it seemed to me we could found our faith that we should come through the storm unscathed, and I pointed that out to my friend Morgan.

The effect upon him was so pronounced that he smiled in the midst

of his dyspeptic pangs and loaned me five dollars without security.

The rock which I pointed out as our sure foundation was the abiding faith of the people in a tariff. I insisted, and I think I was right, that as long as the people look upon the tariff systems of the world with such respect and veneration, our hard-earned property will be safe. I pointed out to him the fact that you may call a man a burglar, a thief or a swindler, and still he would retain his standing among a portion of the community. Some of the people would think he was a smart man and hardly dealt with. But if you call a man a free trader, his reputation is irrevocably ruined. People may speak to him, but they look upon him as a poor, miserable, fallen creature, whose thinking apparatus is loose in its joints, and his influence in the community is very much less than that of a boodle alderman.

I insisted that as long as the people believed that the tariff was not a tax, the Christian gentlemen to whose care God has consigned the property of the country, could rest secure in their jobs.

Morgan saw the point at once, and went out to help them settle the coal strike. Yours respectfully,

JACKSON BIGGLES.

VISIONS OF WEALTH IN MANUFACTURING WIRE AND WIRE NAILS.

THE WISE GUYS OF KOKOMO VS. THE BILLION DOLLAR STEEL GIANT.

The Guys Are Knocked Out in Two Short Rounds—They Lost All Their Money and Are Wondering Where They Are At.

We are "up against it"—"it" being, of course, the trusts which are charging exorbitant prices for their products and will not permit us to purchase goods outside of their dominion. We cannot beat them. They are the "whole push" while their party—that is, the Republican party—is in power.

Some wise Guys in Indiana thought they could beat the tariff trust combination. They figured out the great profits to be made by manufacturing and selling wire, wire nails, etc. at present prices. They saw visions of great wealth right in front of them. They built a mill at Kokomo, Ind., which cost them nearly \$1,000,000. They got ready a few weeks ago to manufacture—that is, they thought they were ready. They then discovered that there is in this country

an organization called the United States Steel corporation, and that it is in business and politics on its own account, and runs a few hundred mills and customs houses, and, through its coal and ore mines, assists the Almighty in running the universe. Incidentally it controls the output of steel billets, and will not sell them except at exorbitant prices. But these Hoosier Guys were not easy marks. They did more figuring and investigating, and concluded that they could buy steel billets in Belgium or Germany, pay the duty and freight on them, and lay them down at their mill for two dollars per ton less than the price demanded by the steel trust. Proud of their resourcefulness and independence of the steel octopus, they parted with more of their good money.

Pride goeth before a fall.

They bought 20,000 tons of billets at \$18 per ton. They expected to pay a duty of \$6.72 per ton, or \$134,000 on the lot. They expected this lot of billets would last them three months. At this rate they figured their tariff charges on billets at \$537,000 a year. But they were not politicians, and they expected to get this amount, and more too, back from the people who would buy wire and nails. They raised \$134,000 and had it ready to pay the duty on the billets, when they reached the custom house at Philadelphia. Alas, it was not enough. They were foiled again by the steel trust. The collector had gotten some tips from "it"—that is, his master—and he had made a "new ruling." He said that the rate of duty on steel billets valued above one cent per pound (\$22.40 per ton) was \$5.96, instead of \$6.72.

"But," said the wise Guys from Kokomo, as a new ray of hope lighted up their blank features, "we only paid \$18 a ton for these billets."

Whereat the steel trust customs official smiled and said: "Yes, yes; but the law permits us to fix the duty on the actual market value of the billets in the markets of the country from which the same have been imported. The German manufacturers who, like ours, are highly protected, have, as you should have known, two prices for their billets—one for their domestic customers and a very much lower price for export. We have been told to disregard the export price, which you paid, and to collect duty on the German domestic price, which is about \$24 per ton.

Cough up \$178,200 if you want your billets!"

The would-be manufacturers of Kokomo were dazed. Their vision of wealth was fast vanishing. They appealed from the decision of the collector to the board of general appraisers. This board is collecting testimony, and may announce its decision in a few months.

The Iron Age of October 16 tells us that "the difficulties over the duty on steel billets have stopped all negotiations for foreign steel for the present." It gives this additional explanation:

Probably the most serious feature of the matter from the standpoint of the importers and of the rolling mills who have purchased foreign billets, is the penalty for alleged undervaluations, which in some cases would reach a very large sum as compared with the advance in the rate of duty. In itself in certain territory the higher rate of duty on billets would not cut off importations.

The penalty is "an additional duty of one per cent. of the total appraised value thereof for each one per cent. that such appraised value exceeds the value declared in the entry." This means that if the appraised value is raised from \$18 to \$24 per ton the importers must pay a penalty of eight dollars per ton in addition to the duty of \$8.96. Thus their billets will cost them \$34.96 a ton, plus about six dollars freight, or a total of over \$40.

In view of the above circumstances some steel mill property in Kokomo is for sale cheap and some blooming chumps, who are poorer and sadder if not wiser, are talking less about prosperity and more about trust despotism and anarchy.

Brothers Hanna, Shaw and Beveridge will now tell us of the blessings of protection and the economies of industrial combinations.

BYRON W. HOLT.

WHY COAL MINERS STRIKE.

The following article, written by H. Gibson Gardner, appeared first in the Chicago Journal of September 28, 1900. It is so well adapted to illustrate the situation we are now confronting, that the fact that it was written more than two years ago gives it even greater weight. Mr. Markle has always been known as one of the most benevolent and easy of the coal operators.

The real causes of the strike in the anthracite fields are not to be found in the small disputes over the price of blasting powder or the number of hours which shall make up a day's work for a mule driver. The reasons lie deeper. A little fair-minded investigation shows that the movement

is a revolt against the system, which is an almost exact reproduction of the old English feudal system, with its lord of the manor and the serfs who are attached to the soil and render service to the hereditary lord.

There is no better illustration of the coal baron than the much-talked-about John Markle, of the W. G. Markle company. This company is no worse than the others; but the fact that it is independent of the railroad combination which makes up the coal trust has directed attention particularly to it.

John Markle himself is a well-meaning man, a nervous, earnest gentleman about 50 years of age, who was born to his present station, and naturally believes that the existing order of things is right. His father came into possession of the acres and square miles of rugged hilly country which have developed into collieries, villages, and the town, and this original Markle, by his energy and business ability, built up a great and prosperous mining business.

The father died, and John became by inheritance the hereditary lord of the Markle mines. To occupy this position means to live in a great stone house on top of a beautiful hill overlooking the valley. The immediate surroundings of the ancestral house are most elegant—there is a lawn and the park and the drives like an English estate. Clustering about, but a little lower down the slope, are the business offices of the company and the less pretentious houses of the employes who work in the offices and company stores. Then come the machine shops and the various accessories which are necessary to the mines.

About half a mile further on is the bed of the valley once covered with a scrubby growth of pines and dwarf oak, but now heaped and piled with unending acres of black coal dust and great mounds of the coarse, black slate rock, the refuse of the diggings.

In the midst rises a lofty structure of weather-darkened wood, a 10 or 15-story tower, precipitous on one side and on the opposite side slanting away to the ground on a network of props. With its hooded top it suggests a huge grasshopper, a relic of prehistoric times. This is a "breaker," and it marks the aperture from which the mine discharges its products. From the Markle hill half a dozen may be seen in various directions, each surrounded by its layers and heaps of refuse.

Railroad tracks skirt the diggings, and near them a dusty, unpaved road, bordered by the houses of the miners. The latter are tumble-down shanties, innocent of paint, and blackened with the sun and storms of 40 years. They are all alike, and were evidently built at the same time and by one contractor. Each has its little corral, which by courtesy is called a yard, the fences being extemporized by the use of stakes driven in the ground and patched up with stray sticks and boards picked up where they were to be had and fastened together with the ingenuity of shiftlessness.

There are two floors and a front and back room on each floor; but there are no division of quarters among the occupants. All rooms are bedrooms and nurseries and dining-rooms and kitchen. Old and young swarm together, and the pigs and chickens and goats share the same quarters. Many of the women are barefooted, and the children are squalid and thin faced. These are Markle's tenantry.

The houses occupied by the miners are owned by the Markle company. The whole valley is owned by the company, or by Mr. Markle, for he is the company. The real estate is rented but never sold. John Markle owns the mines, the street railroad, the brewery, the bank, and the coffin factory. The mines are situated in a section called Jeddo, and there are a whole series of small villages with pretty names stretching from the Markle palace to the town of Hazleton. They are practically all under the jurisdiction of John Markle. If a miner should get or save enough money to buy a house he must go outside the district comprising the Markle estates before he can become the owner of a home. Then, if he still works for the mines, he will pay tribute to Markle by riding on his trolley lines.

John Markle has been very much worried by the present strike. From his point of view it is all very silly and wrong.

"I can't understand why my men should act so," said he. "They are well fed and well clothed, and are treated with every consideration. Why, it is one of my wife's particular charities to look after the families of the miners and to relieve any cases of sickness or destitution. And the men can't win. They have no money at all. What can they strike on? They had their experience in

1885. I had just got out of college and had been put in here to manage the mines. They struck and were out for nine months. They were the stubbornest lot you ever saw.

"But it came along winter and cold weather, and I was compelled to resort to eviction. They had not paid any rent, and I evicted 157 families. That brought them to their senses. They came around voluntarily and asked for some arrangement by which the trouble could be fixed up. It was then that we got up the agreement under which the men are working now. It provided that the men should not belong to any union or labor organization, and that all disputes and grievances should be submitted to arbitration. The arbitrators to be selected one by the company, another by the men, and a third to be satisfactory to both. Every man who works for our company has signed this agreement."

A few days ago John Markle and President John Mitchell, of the Miners' union, addressed the employes of the Markle mines from the same platform, and Markle appealed to the men to live up to the conditions of this contract. Mitchell urged in reply that the contract was made under compulsion, and was not binding upon the men legally or morally. This seemed to be the opinion of the majority of the employes.

One of Markle's men, an intelligent Irishman about 20 years of age, had this to say in reply to a question as to whether he intended to join in the strike.

"Yes, I'll strike. I'll go out with the rest. But it won't do any good. The whole thing is wrong somehow. Strikin' don't do any good; but I don't know what will. But I know it ain't right as things is. Now, my old man has been working in the mines for 30 years. I began workin' in the breaker as soon as I was big enough to pick slate. Now the old man is too old and weak to work in the mine, and they have put him in the breaker along with the little kids.

"We've got no money; haven't been able to save anything or do any more than live and pay the rent. And now the old man has to go back where he began 30 years ago. And when he gets so his hands are stiff and he can't pick the slate fast enough he will be laid off, and we'll have to feed him until he is ready to go under the hill for good. It don't seem right."

Amid the conflicting testimony of interested parties as to whether the miners are sufficiently well paid, the testimony of Father Phillips is of value. The priest has worked among the miners for the better part of 30 years, and knows them all by name.

"In the old days," he said, "it was possible for a miner to make and save money; and there are a few isolated cases where miners have been very thrifty and have been able to save a little money and even buy a little house or a bit of land. But these are the rare cases. They are not the rule.

"With the combination among the mine owners wages have been kept down, and it has come to pass that a miner can do no more than make a bare living. He earns enough just to buy the necessities of life and can get together nothing for a reserve against hard times or his old age."

Meantime John Markle is perfectly sincere in thinking himself a much abused man and his men very unreasonable.

Hazleton, Pa., Sept. 29, 1900.

THE SUFFERINGS AND NEEDS OF THE BOERS.

APPEAL OF THE BOER GENERALS TO THE CIVILIZED WORLD.

It is still fresh in the memory of the world how the Boers, after a terrible struggle lasting more than two and a half years, were at last obliged to accept through their representatives at Vereeniging the terms of peace submitted to them by the government of King Edward VII. At the same time the representatives commissioned us to proceed to England in order, in the first place, to appeal to the new government to allay the immense distress everywhere devastating the new colonies. If we did not succeed we were to appeal to the humanity of the civilized world for charitable contributions.

As we have not succeeded up to the present in inducing the British government to grant further assistance to our people in their indescribable distress, it only remains for us to address ourselves to the peoples of Europe and America. During the critical days which we have passed through, it was sweet for us and ours to receive constant marks of sympathy from all countries. The financial and other assistance given to our women and children in the concentration camps, and to the prisoners of war in all parts of the earth, contributed infinitely to mitigate the lot of those poor sufferers, and we take advantage

of this opportunity to express, in the name of the people of the late republics, our fervent thanks to all those who have charitably assisted us in the past. The small Boer nation can never forget the help it received in its dark hours of suffering.

The people of the republics were ready to sacrifice everything for their independence, and now the struggle is over, and our people are completely ruined. Although we had not the opportunity of drawing up an exact inventory of the destruction done we have the conviction, based on personal experience, that at least 30,000 houses on Boer farms and a number of villages were burned or destroyed by the British during the war. Our homes, with their furniture, were burned or destroyed, our orchards were ruined, all our agricultural implements broken, our mills were destroyed, every living animal was carried off or killed. Nothing, alas! remained to us. The country is laid waste. The war demanded many victims, and the land was bathed in tears. Our orphans and widows have been abandoned. Besides, it is needless to recall the fact how much will be needed in the future for the education of the children of the burghers who are in great distress.

We address ourselves to the world, with the prayer to help us by charitable contributions for our widows and orphans, for the maimed and other needy ones, and for the satisfactory education of our children.

We allude to the terrible results of the war in order to bring to the knowledge of the world our urgent needs, by no means to inflame people's minds. The sword is now sheathed, and all differences are silent in presence of such great misery.

The ruin caused by the war is indescribable, so that the small amount which Great Britain is to give us, in accordance with the terms of surrender, even were it multiplied tenfold, would be wholly insufficient even to cover the war losses alone. The widows, orphans, maimed, needy and children, on whose behalf alone we appeal, will receive little of this sum, and in most cases nothing.

All contributions will be assigned to a fund to be called "General Fund of Help for the Boers," which will be devoted solely to supplying the wants of those for whom we are collecting and to provide for their future. We solicit the hearty cooperation of the committees existing in the various countries of Europe and in America. We are now on the point of visiting

these countries in succession, with the object of establishing a satisfactory organization.

(Signed) BOTHA,
DE WET,
DE LA REY.

EDITORIAL COMMENT FROM THE SPEAKER.

Opening paragraph of an editorial in the London Speaker of September 27.

The document published by Gens. Botha, DeWet, and Delarey on Wednesday is a simple and manly appeal to the world from men who know that they have won its respect, and that the dignity of their heroism and the unparalleled sufferings of their people loses nothing in addressing itself to the common sympathies of Christendom. Their country is in such ruin as Louis XIV. left to the Palatinate more than 200 years ago, branded by a great and patriotic French historian as an infamy to France. Their women and children have died at four times the rate of the combatants in the field; they are threatened with expatriation; they are surrounded by the moneylenders of the most unscrupulous and the most dangerous class in the world, and they have on their hands thousands of widows and orphans in a population which was not larger at the beginning of the war than that of an English borough. These facts are known to those who followed the accounts of the war in our newspapers and read the dispatches of Lord Kitchener and Lord Milner. The Boer generals had to state them in any appeal which was based on the necessities of their countrymen, and, on the other hand, they were evidently studiously anxious not to make these awful facts—facts which are commonplaces amongst our soldiers—the occasion of violent re-creminations against the country whose rule they have been driven to accept. That problem is satisfactorily solved in a manifesto which is at once honest in tone and perfectly consistent with Gen. Botha's declaration of loyalty to the understandings of the peace.

THE DEVASTATION IN SOUTH AFRICA.

An editorial in the London Speaker of October 4.

The most astonishing thing about the comments of the Imperialist press on the Boer generals' manifesto is its simulated indignation over the Boer account of the extent of the devastation. When liberals and liberal newspapers protested against that devastation they were told they were encouraging the enemy, and that

these methods were really the most humane, because they shortened the war. When the Boers recall the facts these same newspapers furiously deny them. Yet it is not the Boers who made them public, but our own correspondents. Let us set out first the Boer statement, and then the corroborating statements printed in our imperialist press.

The small Boer nation can never forget the help it received in its dark hours of suffering. The people of the republics were ready to sacrifice everything for their independence, and now the struggle is over, and our people are completely ruined.

Although we had not the opportunity of drawing up an exact inventory of the destruction done, we have the conviction, based on personal experience, that at least 30,000 houses on Boer farms and a number of villages were burnt or destroyed by the British during the war. Our homes with their furniture were burned or destroyed, our orchards were ruined, all our agricultural implements broken, our mills were destroyed, every living animal was carried off or killed. Nothing, alas! remained to us! The country is laid waste. The war demanded many victims, and the land was bathed in tears. Our orphans and widows have been abandoned.

We give now a series of extracts from the Times for one month only out of the very many months during which the war was carried on only by means of devastating columns. (The italics throughout are, of course, our own.)

The three central columns now returned to the railway line. Gen. Walter Kitchener reached Klipspruit on May 4, but then turned westward in the direction of the confluence of the Wilge and Oliphants rivers, while Gen. Beatson stayed a few days longer to clear the country north of Balmoral. Col. Park continued to operate in the Lydenburg district. The total number of captures and surrenders, excluding those of Gen. Beatson's columns, whose returns are not yet at hand, amounted to 1,080, with 10,000 head of cattle and seven guns. Several thousand women and children were brought into the refugee camps.

The operations of these three weeks have been eminently successful. The manner of clearing the country adopted by Gen. Blood proved far more thorough than any previous method, and it must now be regarded as an axiom that, when the Boers refuse to fight, instead of hurrying after their retreating commandos, we should move slowly, but in numerous independent columns capable of combined action if necessary, and thoroughly clear each district before proceeding to the next.—The Times, June 3, 1901.

The Boers have driven a large amount of stock and hidden it in the nullahs of this mountainous country. It will entail arduous labor on the part of our troops to hunt it out.—The Times, June 1, 1901.

Harrismith, June 10.

Gen. Rundle, with Gen. Campbell's and Col. Harley's columns, returned here yesterday, after traversing the mountainous district situated in the triangle between Ficksburg, Bethlehem and Witzles Hoek during the past seven weeks. The follow-

ing are some of the results of their operations during that period:

Fifty-three Boers were killed or wounded; 7,000 tons of grain or forage were taken or destroyed; 228 wagons and carts, 1,400 head of cattle, 7,100 sheep, and 1,450 horses were brought in; all the mills in the district were blown up, ovens, ploughs, and other implements for the preparation of foodstuffs being broken; 8,300 rounds of rifle ammunition, 101 shells, and 25 rifles were taken, and 26 women and children were brought in.

Our total casualties were five officers and eight men killed, 40 wounded and five missing. The district traversed by the columns is one of the great grain-producing and milling centers of the colony. During their march the columns met with continual opposition from Prinsloo's, Rautenhach's and other commandos, who pursued their usual guerilla tactics.—The Times, June 12, 1901.

Roodeheuvcl, via Karee Siding, June 16.

On its return march from Vaal Bank Malcolm's force visited several Boer depots, the enemy fleeing in every instance. Quantities of malies, corn and forage were found, and everything that could not be carried off was burned. Towards dusk the Boers attacked the rearguard, attempting to seize the captured cattle, but they were driven off, losing three men severely wounded.—The Times, June 18, 1901.

Merino, June 17.

Malcolm's column returned to camp this evening from Roodeheuvcl. Forty burgher police made a dash back to Vlakfontein, while the main column marched to Karee. The police soon came into contact with a body of 60 Boers, and, after several hours' hot fighting, the enemy were driven back and chased for some distance. The Boers lost three men wounded and five horses killed. We lost only one horse. The enemy occupied a strong position. The column was away for four days, and the expedition proved a thorough success. The troops returned with two prisoners, 600 horses, 1,200 cattle, 20,000 sheep, 25 carts and wagons, a number of saddles and sets of harness, and a quantity of grain.—The Times, June 26, 1901.

Harrismith, June 25.

Col. Harley's brigade, which left here on the 14th inst., returned here this afternoon. It has been cooperating with Gen. Campbell's column under Gen. Rundle, as far as Bethlehem. Col. Harley traversed the old post road, while Gen. Campbell went via Elands River Drift, Kasteel and Spitzkop. Between the two columns all places in the district traversed were cleared out. On the way to Bethlehem the two brigades secured altogether 48 wagons, 182,140 pounds of forage, 598,900 pounds of grain and flour, as a lot of farming implements while a watermill and a steam engine were destroyed. A quantity of ammunition was captured, and the animals seized included 2,650 horses, 2,300 cattle, and 221,063 sheep. As the columns were returning 37 more loads of forage were taken just round Bethlehem.—The Times, June 27, 1901.

That the work of the columns included the destruction of mills, agricultural implements, crops, and animals, and that "clearing" the country meant laying it waste is evident enough from this one month's record. But some critics think the number given of houses burnt or destroyed is an exaggeration, and the

Times actually printed on Tuesday a letter which argued that the Boer generals were convicted of a falsehood because they said 30,000 houses had been destroyed, and our prime minister told us only 664 had been destroyed. How such a statement could find its way into print in the Times it is impossible to conceive. The truth is, of course, that even the official return gave 634 houses as burnt or destroyed up to January, 1901, that is before the sweeping tactics had been generally applied at all. We give now a few extracts from the articles sent home to the Daily Chronicle by its special correspondent during the last few months:

A Deserted Village.—All these newly surrendered burghers belong to the Ermelo commando, which came in, 400 strong, last Monday and gave up their arms to Bruce Hamilton. They were among the very best fighters in the Boer force, as Nicholson's Nek, Colenso and Spion Kop can tell, and, together with Carolina, they formed the command of Gen. Hans Grobler, who has now gone back to his farm at Bank Kop, about 25 miles away. Ermelo sent about 700 to the first muster. Many are now in Ceylon, some have surrendered, but the 400 held out to the end. As I said, *bravery costs its price, and after this little town had been occupied and vacated many times it was at last completely destroyed last September, that it may shelter the enemy no longer.* Of its two or three hundred houses only one now has a roof. It was spared because the old woman in it was too sick to be moved, and she lives there still with her daughters, fed with army rations. The church, too, has kept its roof, but all the flooring, seats, galleries, windows and doors have been cleaned out, probably for firewood (and I only wish I had some of it as I write, with brain and fingers numb with the cold). Of the rest of the houses only the fragments of the burnt and crumbling walls remain, piled round with a wreckage of corrugated iron. Bank, hotel, post office, stores and the homes of what was once a pretty little town, all stand there ruined and gutted. Even the solid stone gaol has been blown to wreck, and the stuccoed courthouse, which had pretensions to classic beauty, stands there with its bastard columns like a burlesque imitation of Pompeii.—The Daily Chronicle, July 15, 1902.

Where Carolina Was.—But to return to our trek; from Ermelo the blockhouse line runs along a high ridge of veldt, and is now held by the Royal Irish Fusiliers, happily old friends of mine, and always ready with an Irish welcome. On each side of the ridge at long intervals lie rich farms, now, of course, in ruins, but still marked by little clumps of trees, for the country has not been swept so entirely bare for firewood here as in other places, chiefly because there are coal mines here and there which can be worked from the surface. At one farm called Mooifontein, or Beautiful Spring, from its clear flow of water, the owner came to-day and sat for an hour upon the little heap of loose stones which marked where his house had stood, and then rode away without a word.

Kaffirs have occupied some of the larger ruins, and built their own wretched shelters inside the former rooms. In this district alone 1,200 houses have been destroyed by the war. The average cost of building a Dutch farm is £450 to £500, which does not seem much, but still the Government grant of £3,000,000 will not go far towards rebuilding and re-stocking, and the worst of all is that at present there is no building material of any kind to be had. Of course, in time the windows and doors and timber will be imported. There is plenty of building stone here for the quarrying. Mud bricks will be baked, and the repatriation committee in Pretoria has determined to start stores of its own, where burghers can buy all materials free of customs duty; but all this takes time, and here we have a whole population longing to get home. Even though the war is over, there are plenty of difficulties before us still, and the treasury must remember that even if they granted £3,000,000 more it would not come to the cost of three weeks' war.

As to this little town of Carolina here, standing near the headwaters of the Komati, its destruction has been, if anything, even more complete than Ermelo's. I mean there is rather less of the walls left standing. Its ruins are scattered over the slope of a hill, and there is hardly a wall high enough to shelter one from the wind. The church alone has its roof, and though the windows and doors are gone and the inside is stripped, as at Ermelo, I found about a score of Boers glad to get even that amount of shelter. Using their saddles for pillows, they lie at night between the lines of brick which supported the floor, and this morning I found them sunning themselves against the transept outside, quite content with creation, and ready to chaff without limit, at the number of shots they had probably had at me in earlier days.

Sticking to the wagon because there was nowhere else to sleep, we have since then moved from point to point westward through Dalmanuka, Belfast and Wonderfontein, the chief interest of the route being the battlefields, like Bergendal, which are already growing old. The little towns along the line have had the fortune to be occupied by our troops and so have escaped destruction, but that, of course, has not saved the outlying farms.—The Daily Chronicle, July 16, 1902.

A large number of families have also been discovered since the peace living on the veldt or in caves, as I have before described. Last Sunday I saw a ruined farm just across the Vaal from Venterskroon, where four or five women had dwelt quietly through the war, many disappearing into the bush when "the khakis" came in sight.—The Daily Chronicle, August 5, 1902.

An extract from Gen. Lukas Meyer's answers to the correspondent's questions:

As to terms again, three millions is nothing to our loss. It wouldn't cover the cost of the cattle. I myself have had seven farms ruined, and about 30,000 houses have been destroyed altogether. But still the terms are good enough, if we had to give up independence. The future of the country depends on yourselves—how you administer it now that you have the power.—The Daily Chronicle, June 30, 1902.

It is worth while, perhaps, to reproduce a notice issued by Maj. Gen.

Bruce Hamilton on November 1, 1900. By means of the persistent efforts of a few liberals in parliament Mr. Brodrick was reluctantly obliged to admit that the commander in chief had insisted on the withdrawing of Maj. Gen. Bruce Hamilton's barbarous notice and that "care had been taken that the women and children should not be abandoned to starvation," a fact which would never have been known if liberals had been as careless as Mr. Brodrick of the honor of the army. But the withdrawal of the notice does not affect the fact of the destruction.

Notice.—The town of Ventersburg has been cleared of supplies and partly burnt, and the farms in the vicinity destroyed, on account of the frequent attacks on the railway line in the neighborhood. The Boer women and children who are left behind should apply to the Boer commandants for food, who will supply them unless they wish to see them starve. No supplies will be sent from the railway to the town.

BRUCE HAMILTON, Major General.
November 1, 1900.

The facts of the devastation can scarcely be surprising to anyone who has read the imperialist papers during the last three years. It is worth while now to set out a few of the articles of The Hague convention, establishing the customs and restraints to be observed in civilized warfare. In the devastation described in the Times in June, 1901, there is no pretense that the devastation was a penal measure; it was purely a military operation.

On Military Authority Over Hostile Territory.—Article 42.—Territory is considered occupied when it is actually placed under the authority of the hostile army. The occupation applies only to the territory when such authority is established and in a position to assert itself.

Article 45.—Any pressure on the population of occupied territory to take the oath to the hostile power is prohibited.

Article 46.—Family honors and rights, individual lives and private property, as well as religious convictions and liberty must be respected. *Private property can not be confiscated.*

Article 47.—Pillage is formally prohibited.

Article 50.—No general penalty, pecuniary or otherwise, can be inflicted on the population on account of the acts of individuals for which it cannot be regarded as collectively responsible.

The British government declared its adherence to these laws three years ago. The nation is now face to face with the results of breaking them.

Nor did these fortunate persons seek to evade the responsibilities which wealth brings.

No sooner had it transpired that the evil of the times was the sweatshop,

than ten trillionaires united in giving a million each for the foundation of laboratories, where should be conducted, regardless of expense, experiments looking to the production of a serum or other convenient agency for the suppression of sensible perspiration.

It was a noble charity, and a charity, mark you, impossible except as great fortunes were possible.—Life.

No sensible man ought to object to an industrial system which allows a man by his genius and industry to make all the money he can. But if I dig so near my neighbor's foundations in order to build my house that I endanger his, the law says: "Quit that outrage!"

The masses of our people are restless, not so much because they cannot join the noisy procession of extravagance, but because they are beginning to feel that when one man owns a score of mansions, while tens of thousands have no roof to shelter them, that when few are lords of endless acres while the millions have not a burial place, that this is a privilege inconsistent with a form of government where the will of the people in the form of laws is supposed to be enforced. We must not only resist abuses, we must insist on our rights.—Rev. Dr. Macdon C. Peters.

"What can I do for my little boy," asked mamma, "so that he won't want to eat between meals?"

"Have the meals ficker together," replied the young hopeful.—Tit-Bits.

The new suburban resident stopped the lawn mower and mopped his brow.

"I have seen the sign 'Keep Off the Grass' thousands of times," he murmured, "but never had any idea it would be so hard to do."—Indianapolis News.

BOOK NOTICES.

One of the most useful books, for the purposes of American citizenship, that has recently come from the press is "Nominating Systems" (Madison, Wis.: Published by the Author), by Ernst Christopher Meyer. Mr. Meyer has given the readers of this book a full and interesting history of the nominating systems of the United States, together with proposed innovations down to 1902. One part, containing six chapters, is devoted to the caucus and convention system, from its origin in colonial times. The second part, with 11 chapters, deals with legislation for direct primaries, which found their first legislative recognition in 1866 in California. An analysis of the main arguments for and against direct primaries takes up the third part; while the relation of the direct primary to other reforms, such as civil service, the popular election of senators and the referendum, makes the subject for the fourth and last part. The chapter on the referendum in the United States has peculiar value at this time. Altogether the book is calculated to interest every intelligent citizen, and is one which political

speakers and writers cannot afford to be ignorant of. It is a compact and very readable political history of the States, with especial reference to their development along republican lines.

PERIODICALS.

—The Church of England Sunday School Magazine quotes from the Daily Express (London) some comments of a colonist upon social conditions in England. What the writer says of drunkenness goes to the root of the evil in a more straightforward way than the preachments of most of those who write on this subject. "Your country," he says, "is drink-sodden because drink gives the hope that is missing under your social system and your vested rights. . . . The temperance societies and the churches are doing a splendid work, but they are trying to deal with evils that are the result of hopelessness. They work at the wrong end. He then goes on to urge the workers in the churches and the societies to see that the remedy lies in the abolition of vested interests. This is the fact which Miss Frances Willard was beginning more and more to see in her temperance work in this country.—J. H. D.

—In The Arena (New York, London and Melbourne) for November Mr. Flower devotes a large proportion of his editorial space to Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, whom he describes as "a new champion of the people's cause," typical, as Lincoln was, of "robust, sincere, manly and rugged Americanism." Prof. Parsons contributes a criticism of the President's policy regarding trusts; Booker T. Washington, in urging Negroes to become farmers and land owners, mixes into some good ad-

READERS—

of this paper who like it will do us a favor by promptly sending us the names and addresses of persons they know who might also be interested in it. Address:

PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.,

Box 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

"Economic Tangles"

by Judson Grenell: deals in popular yet practical way with industrial problems. Cloth, postpaid, \$1.

OTHER ECONOMIC LITERATURE BY HENRY GEORGE:

Progress and Poverty.....	.50
Social Problems.....	.50
Land Question.....	.50
Protection vs. Free Trade.....	.50
A Perplexed Philosopher.....	.50
Condition of Labor.....	.10
Property in Land.....	.10
Compensation.....	.05
Science of Political Economy.....	\$2.00
Moses.....	.05
The Single Tax; what it is and why we urge it.....	.05
Study of Political Economy.....	.05
Story of My Dictatorship.....	.10
Socialism, Rev. W. Poland.....	.10
Life of Henry George, Henry George, Jr.....	1.50
Natural Taxation, Thos. C. Shearman.....	.50
Shortest Road to the Single Tax.....	.10
The Single Tax, Louis F. Post.....	.25
The Case Plainly Stated.....	.05
Six Centuries of Work and Wages, Rogers.....	.25
Economic Principles, Twitchell.....	.10
Report of the Revenue Commission of Colorado.....	.05
Success in Life, Louis F. Post.....	.05
The Single Tax and Direct Legislation.....	.10
Single Tax Catechism.....	.05

PURDY PUBLISHING CO.,

McVicker Bldg., 74-84 Madison St., CHICAGO.



SOWING THE SEED.

Shade of Henry George—Go on, Baer; you have been doing more for the Single Tax than I was able to do!

vice to his race a little of that essence of plutocracy which discolors most of his teaching; and Elitweed Pomeroy writes on direct legislation.

A NEW BOOK BY BISHOP SPALDING

Is always an event of interest to a wide circle of readers, but his latest book will appeal to a much larger number than usual because of its timely subject,

SOCIALISM AND LABOR

The volume contains some of his most characteristic utterances.

Ready November 10 80 cts. net

OTHER BOOKS BY BISHOP SPALDING

Opportunity and Other Essays
Education and the Higher Life
Things of the Mind
Means and Ends of Education
Thoughts and Theories of Life and Education

Each, \$1.00

Religion, Agnosticism, and Education
Aphorisms and Reflections

Each, 80 cents net

Of Booksellers Generally, or of the Publishers
A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago

1903

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS TO THE PUBLIC

From persons not already annual subscribers, will run from date of receipt of subscription until January 1, 1904. Such persons subscribing now, will therefore receive the paper for 14 months for a 12 months' subscription.

REGULAR RATES:

Annually.....	\$3.00
Semi Annually.....	1.00
Quarterly.....	.50

CLUBS OF THREE:

To extend the circulation of The Public among new readers, and at the same time to relieve of expense such regular readers, or others, as take the trouble to procure new subscriptions we will supply three subscriptions for the price of two, on the following terms:

A Club of Three Annual Subscriptions (at least two of them new) ..	\$4.00
A Club of Three Semi-Annual Subscriptions (at least two of them new) ..	2.00
A Club of Three Quarterly Subscriptions (at least two of them new) ..	1.00

Any person soliciting new subscribers will be allowed the same terms. For every two new subscriptions for which he forwards us cash at regular rates we will honor his order for a third subscription free.

All annual club subscriptions procured before January 1, 1903, will begin at once and continue until January 1, 1904.

Make all Checks, Money Orders, etc., payable to

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.,
Box 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE LION AND THE EAGLE

And their benevolent assimilation of weaker beasts and birds. A fable by Avery Queerens. Ask for this and other "Squibs and Things" from "The Straight Edge" (17th Ave., N. Y.). Enclose 10c if you happen to have it.

The Public

Is a weekly review which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value. It reads the daily papers and tells its readers what they say. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of radical democracy, 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.

TERMS.

Annual Subscription	\$2.00
Semi-Annual Subscription	1.00
Quarterly Subscription50
Trial Subscription (4 weeks)10
Single Copies05

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY

1641 UNITY BUILDING
CHICAGO, ILL.

All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.

Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to and including the first issue of the month printed on the wrapper. The figures following the month, refer to the year in which the subscription expires.

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

POST OFFICE ADDRESS:

THE PUBLIC, BOX 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

CHAS. F. CAMP WALTER S. LEVIN ALEX. GREGORY
Pres't and Mgr. Supt. Sec'y and Treas.

Camp Electric Construction Co.

41 West 24th Street, New York.

Telephone, No. 79 Madison Sq.

PRIVATE HOUSE WORK A SPECIALTY.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES H. ROBERTS,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,

613 Roanoke Building, Chicago

Houston.

EWING & RING,

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
HOUSTON, TEXAS.

Presley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.

99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 1353 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012
NEW YORK.