

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1902.

Number 240.

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.

Of lessons of the elections there may be as many and of as great variety as there were local campaigns; but considered as a whole, these elections teach one lesson of transcendent importance and national significance. This is the lesson that within the Democratic party there are two parties, distinguishably different and absolutely irreconcilable, which must be formally separated before the plutocratic leadership of the Republican party can be overthrown in American politics.

One of these parties within the Democratic party is as plutocratic as the Republican organization itself. It has no political principles which are not acceptable to the commercial combines. Grover Cleveland is the best type of its leadership. He spoke for it at Morristown, N. J., last week when he boasted of New Jersey's traditional Democracy—a Democracy that is identified emphatically with nothing but the pro-slavery cause and the "copperheadism" of the sixties. On the only live issue of the present time he dared go no further along democratic lines than the Republican party in the West has gone. He advocated a kind of tariff reform which would deprive the working classes and the small business classes of the protection they think they are getting under Republican rule, but would not give them the manifest benefits of free trade. The other of the two parties within the party assumed distinguishable form in 1896, when Bryan sprang to the front in its leadership. Conservative and radical are the characteristic quali-

ties and tendencies respectively of these two factions; and swinging from one to the other as it seems stronger or weaker, are the mere place hunters in politics whose typical leader is David B. Hill.

That these two wings of the Democratic party cannot act together has now been fully demonstrated. When the radical or democratic wing secured control of the party in 1896, the conservative or plutocratic wing abandoned it, and an election that could have been carried by the united party was lost. The plutocratic forces of the party played in the same role in 1900 and with the same result. This year they have done the same thing in States where the democratic Democrats controlled the party organization, and not unnaturally the latter have played the return game where the conservative wing was in control. As the elections of 1896 and 1900 proved that the plutocratic wing of the Democratic party will not support the party when the other wing controls, so those of this week prove that the democratic wing of the party will not fall in behind the plutocratic element.

In Wisconsin, for instance, as well as Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania and most of the States other than Ohio, the conservatives boasted too freely that they were back again in the saddle, and the democratic rank and file of the party refused to support them. Thus elections were lost which the plutocratic Democrats were sure of winning if only they were entrusted with leadership. Even in the Congressional district of New Jersey, where ex-President Cleveland made his only speech, and where the Democratic candidate had been so loyal to the plutocratic wing of his party that

he supported McKinley, the Republican, in preference to Bryan, the democratic Democrat,—even in that fully "reorganized" district, the Republicans carried the election. So Pattison, of Pennsylvania, with peculiar advantages, is defeated by the malodorous Quay. With greater or less majority, but with significant uniformity, the "reorganizers" of the Democratic party have everywhere been repulsed at the polls. Their reduction of pluralities counts for nothing. The vital fact is that there were enough radical democrats to ensure their defeat. Conversely, the plutocratic elements of the party threw their influence effectively against Johnson in Ohio and Bryan in Nebraska.

The emphatic lesson of it all is that these two wings of the party must separate. Until they do, the rank and file of each will be to the death against the leadership of the other. Nor is that the worst thing about this anomalous affiliation of two such discordant elements in one party organization. So long as plutocratic Democrats are prominently identified with the Democratic party, democratic Republicans will distrust it. This puts democratic Democrats at an extraordinary disadvantage. Whenever they make a radical move they lose the conservative support of their own party without attracting the democratic elements from the republican party. The latter will not believe in the good faith of an organization whose sincerity as an organization they have learned—and rightly learned—to discredit, so long as its plutocratic leaders are in good standing in its counsels. Final separation of the two hostile wings is the only remedy.

This does not signify the necessity of a third party, but it does require

a fight instead of a false truce within the old party. The method is simple and can be made effective. Let the democratic Democrats organize everywhere within the party, between now and the next national convention, with a determination to carry that convention. Not for a man, but for radical democratic principles. In doing so, let them adopt a policy with reference to their principles, which will be too democratic for the conservative element even to pretend that they accept it, and stand or fall by that policy. Should democratic Democrats succeed in defeating the plutocratic wing of the party at the next convention, upon a platform genuinely and radically democratic, the defeated wing would soon be driven out of control everywhere. They would either disintegrate and join the Hanna Republicans, or make a party of their own and bid against the Republicans for Wall street support. In either case the renovated Democracy would soon command the confidence of all democrats. If, on the other hand, the plutocratic wing should defeat them in the convention, then let them organize a distinct Democratic party, based upon democratic principles and the best democratic traditions. They would not win that year, but they would assure the defeat of the old organization under circumstances that would make resurrection impossible; and at the ensuing elections the new Democracy would have the democratic field to itself and inspire the democrats in all parties with confidence. That can never be done while this drama of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde is annually played in the Democratic party. The fast forming issue in this country is between democracy and plutocracy, and parties as well as voters must align themselves accordingly.

Bigelow's defeat in Ohio and its temporary check upon Tom L. Johnson's campaign for home rule and just taxation was caused by the anomalous association of conflicting

elements in the same party organization to which we have already referred. These two men, genuine democrats both, were opposed by all the plutocratic influences of both parties; yet, being nominally associated with the plutocrats of their own party, they could not secure the confidence in large degree of Republicans whose political principles are essentially democratic. It is only as Johnson comes to be recognized for what he is, as the foe of economic privilege and political rascality in both parties, that the movement he leads can cut its way through the barricades of the party "bosses" of the State.

But let no one imagine that this repulse which Johnson has met in Ohio is equivalent to defeat. As the civil war was not won at Bull Run nor the Revolution at Bunker Hill, neither could Johnson be expected to win the State of Ohio in his first fight against the plutocrats of the two parties. But he has planted the seeds of popular confidence, which will sprout and grow as the befooled and befuddled people of the State begin to realize that in voting against his wing of the Democratic party they were voting with the plutocratic wing of the same party as well as with the commercial combines and political rings of the Republican machine. Neither he nor Bigelow could have more than hoped for victory in the first battle. Both of them know that the forces which oppose democracy never have been weak, for both have long taken their democracy from Henry George, who wrote:

Let us not disguise it. Over and over again has the standard of Truth and Justice been raised in this world. Over and over again has it been trampled down oftentimes in blood. If they are weak forces that are opposed to Truth, how should Error so long prevail? If Justice has but to raise her head to have Injustice flee before her, how should the wail of the oppressed so long go up?

Both of these men, resting now under the shadow of disappointed hopes, not for themselves but for mankind, have pinned their faith to the doctrine that Truth and Justice, though

they often lose battles, never lose a war; and no sooner shall the reports of the contest of Tuesday be fully in, than both will be preparing for the municipal contests of next Spring, which in turn will be but the prelude to more important ones later on.

One especially gratifying fact about the Ohio election is the discovery that the heavy plurality against Bigelow was due altogether to the combination of the bi-partisan "bosses" of Cincinnati. The Republican "boss," Cox, cooperating with Bernard, the lieutenant of the Democratic "boss," McLean, and thereby controlling all the election machinery of both parties, was able to make Hamilton county appear to have cast a plurality of 30,000 against Bigelow. So it appears in the count. This is at least 30,000 more than a normal Republican plurality, and it more than accounts for Bigelow's loss in the State as a whole. He falls less than 20,000 in the State behind the Democratic plurality of last year, the plurality against him being less than 90,000, while that against Kilbourne last year was almost 70,000. Outside of Hamilton county, therefore, Bigelow made gains. What is more important, he carried Senator Hanna's own county, Cuyahoga, which is normally Republican, and where Hanna did his strongest campaigning, by 2,500 plurality, and Hanna's Republican city of Cleveland by 5,000. Upon these facts it is to be reasonably expected that the Cox-Bernard-McLean "combine" of Cincinnati will be read out of the Democratic party of Ohio at the next State convention, and that a thorough canvass of the State will elect a democratic Democrat for governor next year.

The most satisfactory election result in Illinois, with reference to candidates, is the brilliant victory of Clarence S. Darrow, the counsel for the coal miners before the arbitration commission, who has been elected as an independent to the Illinois

legislature by over 11,000 votes, about double the vote of either of the other two successful candidates in his senatorial district. He will thus have an opportunity to force upon the attention of the legislature at its approaching session the overwhelming vote of the people of Chicago last Spring for municipal ownership of public utilities and the equally overwhelming vote of the State this fall for an enforceable initiative and referendum for the cities and for the State. A local labor party is now forming in Chicago with a view to making Darrow the next mayor of Chicago. This movement will be encouraged by a large proportion of the Democratic party.

Another extraordinary outcome of the election will be especially gratifying to single tax men. It is the triumph of ex-Senator Lucius F. C. Garvin, who was elected governor of Rhode Island on the Democratic ticket by 6,000 majority. Gov. Garvin has for years been the leading single tax man of New England. His election is a triumph for home rule, and an indication of what is in store for the Republicans of Ohio when the people of that State realize the significance of the board rule code bill which Hanna, Foraker and Cox have just enacted. The Republicans of Rhode Island had presumed upon their power to undertake to govern Democratic cities by the "board" and "boss" system, and the result is a complete reversal of the politics of the State, with a single tax leader like Johnson at the head of the poll.

One other triumph for democratic Democracy is the election of Robert Baker to Congress from a New York district. Mr. Baker has long been known in New York State as a single tax man and this was made the principal ground of opposition to him. He was elected by 500 plurality. Another single tax man who made a brilliant campaign was Franklin K. Lane, of California. He is defeated in that strong Republican State by less than 2,000. Still another is Western Starr, who reduced the ma-

jority of the notorious Humphrey for Senator from the Seventh Illinois district from 7,000 to 250.

Still another election victory for a democratic Democrat must be noted. We refer to the election of William R. Hearst for Congress from a New York district. What makes his election notable is not the fact that he has been elected, for his district is normally Democratic by 5,000. The notable thing about it is that Mr. Hearst multiplied this plurality by three. He was elected by a plurality of 15,000.

A satisfactory explanation of the defeat of the Liberals at the English election in the Liberal constituency of Devonport (p. 471) has been furnished. The defeated Liberal turns out to have been a Liberal of the Rosebery brand. Rosebery Liberals in England and Cleveland Democrats in the United States are much alike. As the Cleveland Democrat supports Republican candidates against democratic Democrats, so the Rosebery Liberal supports Tory candidates against democratic Liberals; and as the democratic Democrats are learning to return the compliment here, so the democratic Liberals are learning to return it there. Just as in the United States there are enough thoroughgoing democrats in the Democratic party to defeat Democratic candidates of the Cleveland type, those who are Republicans in all but name, so there are enough thoroughgoing democrats in the Liberal party of England to defeat a Rosebery candidate when he gets hold of the party nomination. That is what happened at the Devonport election.

President Butler, of Columbia university, makes an excellent distinction when he contrasts collectivism with anarchy, condemning both, and seeks for middle ground. But one might question the middle ground which he describes as "institutionalism." As reported, at any rate, he does not make it very clear. To say that institutionalism "stands for freedom of speech, a free press, pro-

tection of private property, respect for individual rights, and liberty for all," as President Butler does, hardly distinguishes it from either anarchy (individualism) or collectivism. The crucial question with reference to private property still remains open, namely, What is private property? As far as individualists insist upon the sanctity of private property in what is justly individual property they are right; so far as the collectivists insist upon public property in what is justly common property they are right. But in so far as the one ignores public rights in common property and the other denies private rights in individual property they are both wrong. The principle of property yet to be learned and enforced is this, that titles must rest in justice and not merely in institutions. That is the principle that is being worked out, and which will be the issue of the future. The quicker collectivism progresses the sooner will it measure strength with the principle of moral righteousness in public matters. The faster those men advance in political power who would abolish the idea of "mine and thine" in favor of "ours," the earlier will they come into decisive conflict not with those who cling to "mine and thine," but to those who stand for "mine, thine and ours."

The Federal judges sitting in the United States court of appeals at Chicago, with Judge Grosscup in the lead, have been manufacturing more law. It goes almost without saying that they have done it for the protection of one of the great interests. To use the language of the opinion of Judge Grosscup, it is to protect the "great news agencies," the "great newspapers" and the "great telegraph and cable lines." Such little interests as those of authors have long appealed to the courts for similar protection; but they have appealed in vain. The courts have told them that they must go to the legislature for their relief, for the precedents do not

permit the courts to create property rights in things which are not recognized by custom or legislation as property. But now that a "great" interest makes this appeal it does not make it in vain. If there is no legislation the courts must legislate, if there is no precedent the courts must make one—where great corporations instead of little authors seek protection.

In the case in question the court sustains an injunction forbidding the republication by one concern of news gathered and published by another. This is in the face of the established legal principle that after publication of anything printable, the right to republish is a common right, unless prevented by legislation in the nature of copyright laws. It was conceded by the judges that there was no legislative protection in this case, and that there was no judicial precedent to warrant interference; but the judges chose, to report their own language, "to make a precedent," and they did so. In other words they abandoned the judicial function of interpreting and applying existing law and assumed the legislative function of making new law.

That the news gatherer should be protected against the piracy of republication by people who have done none of the work and incurred none of the expense, and who would therefore reap where they have not sown, may well be true. That the courts should protect him, if they can find in existing laws a recognition of private property rights in his publication, is certainly true. But if there is no such recognition in existing laws, then the news gatherer should be sent to the legislature for relief, and judges who undertake to give it by "making a precedent," usurp legislative power and would be impeached for judicial crime if the people were at all jealous of their liberties or solicitous for the integrity of their form of government. When courts usurp authority to make these precedents for the protection of what Judge Grosscup describes as "great"

interests, similar protection having been uniformly denied to what we may in contradistinction describe as "little" interests, the administration of justice is rightly brought into contempt.

Bankers on both sides of the Atlantic are busily speculating upon the possibilities of paying off the "American indebtedness to Europe." Will it be done with merchandise to be exported from the United States, or must we export gold? That is the speculative question. But there is to the American people a deeper question yet. Why should there be an indebtedness from America to Europe? Have not the Republican leaders boasted these several years that our excess of exports, our "favorable balances of trade," are up in the hundreds upon hundreds of millions? And did not the lamented Mr. McKinley himself assure the people that all this would come back to us "in pure gold?" Then how happens it that our "favorable exporting" has got us into debt?

The census authorities, whose misleading tables H. L. Bliss recently exposed, express surprise that they should be criticised for tabulating comparisons of wages notwithstanding that they say in their text that accurate comparisons are impossible because the figures are incomparable. But they did not make that statement until close upon the election, and they do not now explain why they tabulated incomparable figures. This explanation was left apparently to the Republican spellbinders and newspapers that have been quoting the tabulated comparisons while ignoring the discrediting statements in the text. Census tables of this misleading character are "good enough Morgans" until after election, which is probably the reason they are made.

Some years ago the United States imported a statistician of the name of Porter, who proved to be of great use to our plutocratic interests. Recently he was reexported, and the London Times undertook to utilize

him for the purpose of checking the tide that is setting in in Great Britain in favor of municipal ownership of municipal property. His menu of figures pleased the London Times immensely. But investigation by more reliable investigators discloses a different situation from what the Times has set forth as the "unprofitable results" of what it calls "municipal socialism." Says the London correspondent of the Chicago Tribune:

A municipal journal which has been taking a serious view of the criticisms of the London Times of the administration of English and Scotch cities and resenting Robert P. Porter's comparisons with American electric undertakings publishes detailed figures respecting the results of municipal operation in general and street railway ownership by corporations in particular. The results disclose a larger municipal profit than has been heretofore claimed, Darlington, Birmingham, Bolton, Manchester, Leeds and Nottingham being conspicuous examples of the remunerative enterprise. Advocates of municipal socialism assert that the street railway business as managed by town councils is profitable enough to float another electrical trust, and do not hesitate to attribute interested motives to all critics and opponents of municipal enterprises.

The usefulness of queens consort was demonstrated in London on the 1st. King Edward's consort was reported in a half column cable dispatch to have eaten an eight-course dinner in 16 minutes! Judged by the newspaper space given to the affair, this is the most important act of her life; but that reflects less upon her, perhaps, than upon the snobbish people on either side of the water who delight in that kind of news.

MR. ROOSEVELT'S STRIKE COMMISSION.

For political purposes during the recent campaign, much was made by Republican speakers and papers of the action of the President in settling the coal strike. Much more will doubtless be made of the same incident as we advance toward the presidential election. It is important, therefore, to emphasize the fact that the President, as president, has done nothing whatever to settle the

strike. This is necessary, lest we fall into the habit of regarding what would be a usurpation of power as a proper official act.

It was not the President, but Theodore Roosevelt, as a distinguished citizen and only so, that appointed the arbitrators who are now considering the merits of this strike. The President has no such power as Mr. Roosevelt has exercised. That Mr. Roosevelt himself recognizes this is evident from his omission of his official title from the documents he has signed in connection with the matter.

Parties to a dispute always have the privilege of referring their quarrel to arbitrators. No legal authority is necessary. It is their right. Likewise they may agree upon a man to select arbitrators for them, and he may accept the trust. Whether he holds a public office at the time makes no difference, be he president or constable; but it is not as president or constable that he can be chosen or can act. It is only as a common friend.

This is the capacity in which Mr. Roosevelt has acted. The arbitrators he has appointed do not in reality constitute a presidential commission. They are not commissioners at all in any legal sense, but only in the sense that a newspaper reporter is a "commissioner" when the editor so describes him. He would as truly be a "tycoon" if the editor preferred that title.

As some one has said, the only analogy to Mr. Roosevelt's strike commission is the old paradox of "the bat that was not a bat, which sat on a stump that was not a stump, and was knocked off by a man that was not a man, with a stone that was not a stone." In no legal sense is it a commission at all. Yet there is danger of its coming to be regarded as a legalized body, through neglect to distinguish in connection with it the difference between Theodore Roosevelt, the simple citizen, and President Roosevelt, the chief servant of the republic.

If this action of Mr. Roosevelt's should come to be regarded as official, and be followed in the future as a precedent, the Federal constitution might very easily be once more dis-

torted, and the president come to acquire a power it was never intended he should exercise. If it is as president that Roosevelt has appointed the strike "commission" he has usurped both legislative and judicial functions. He has appointed a commission without authority from Congress, and invested it with functions which the constitution reserves to the judiciary.

In all probability Congress will be called upon to provide for paying the expenses of this body. Should that be done great care should be observed to make the appropriation in such manner as definitely to disclaim the authority of the President as president to have made the appointments. Otherwise a precedent will have been acknowledged of which presidents may easily take advantage to play in the role that Napoleon played in when he passed from First Consul to Emperor. Inconsiderate precedents are dangerous things in a free country.

NEWS

With a few individual exceptions not enough to give Democratic color to the general result, the elections all over the United States are pronouncedly in favor of the Republicans.

Returns have come in so slowly that only approximate figures can be given at this time (Nov. 6th), and a trustworthy comparison of results with previous elections as well as reports upon the votes of side parties must be postponed at least until next week. The returns so far disclosed indicate results on leading State candidates about as follows:

| | Rep. | Dem. |
|---------------|--------|--------|
| Alabama | | 25,000 |
| California | 2,000 | |
| Colorado | 2,000 | |
| Connecticut | 15,000 | |
| Florida | | 12,000 |
| Georgia | | 40,000 |
| Idaho | 6,000 | |
| Illinois | 54,000 | |
| Indiana | 30,000 | |
| Iowa | 65,000 | |
| Kansas | 20,000 | |
| Kentucky | | 20,000 |
| Massachusetts | 37,084 | |
| Michigan | 36,864 | |
| Minnesota | 40,000 | |
| Missouri | | 25,000 |
| Montana | 10,000 | |
| Nebraska | 3,000 | |
| Nevada | 1,700 | |
| New Jersey | | |
| New Hampshire | 9,000 | |
| New York | 10,000 | |
| North Dakota | 6,000 | |

| | Rep. | Dem. |
|----------------|---------|---------|
| Ohio | 87,443 | |
| Pennsylvania | 140,000 | |
| Rhode Island | | 6,350 |
| South Carolina | | 3,500 |
| South Dakota | 20,000 | |
| Tennessee | | 37,830 |
| Texas | | 130,000 |
| Utah | 2,500 | |
| Virginia | | 30,000 |
| West Virginia | 12,500 | |
| Wisconsin | 55,334 | |
| Wyoming | 4,000 | |

In consequence of the Congressional elections, the lower House of the next Congress will be divided between the two parties as follows:

| | Next Congress. | | Present Congress. | |
|----------------|----------------|------|-------------------|------|
| | Rep. | Dem. | Rep. | Dem. |
| Alabama | 1 | 3 | 0 | 9 |
| Arkansas | 0 | 7 | 0 | 6 |
| California | 6 | 2 | 7 | 0 |
| Colorado | 1 | 2 | 0 | *2 |
| Connecticut | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Delaware | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Florida | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| Georgia | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| Idaho | 1 | 0 | 0 | *1 |
| Illinois | 17 | 8 | 11 | 11 |
| Indiana | 9 | 4 | 9 | 4 |
| Iowa | 10 | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| Kansas | 8 | 10 | 7 | 9 |
| Kentucky | 1 | 10 | 2 | 6 |
| Louisiana | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| Maine | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Maryland | 4 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| Massachusetts | 10 | 4 | 10 | 3 |
| Michigan | 11 | 1 | 12 | 0 |
| Minnesota | 8 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| Mississippi | 0 | 8 | 0 | 7 |
| Missouri | 1 | 15 | 2 | 13 |
| Montana | 1 | 0 | 0 | *1 |
| Nebraska | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Nevada | 1 | 0 | 0 | *3 |
| New Hampshire | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| New Jersey | 7 | 3 | 6 | 2 |
| New York | 20 | 17 | 21 | 13 |
| North Carolina | 0 | 10 | 2 | 7 |
| North Dakota | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Ohio | 17 | 4 | 17 | 4 |
| Oregon | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania | 25 | 7 | 26 | 4 |
| Rhode Island | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| South Dakota | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Tennessee | 2 | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| Texas | 0 | 15 | 0 | 13 |
| Utah | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Vermont | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Virginia | 1 | 9 | 0 | 10 |
| Washington | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| West Virginia | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| Wisconsin | 10 | 1 | 10 | 0 |
| Wyoming | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

205 181 197 152
Peo., 6
Silv., 3

* People's. ** Silver.

With this reduction of the Republican plurality from 32 to 24 in the lower House, the Senate will probably stand at about 54 Republicans to 36 Democrats, a majority of 18. In the present Congress the Republican majority in the Senate is 27.

The vote in Ohio has attracted widespread attention, owing to the contest there between Senator Hanna and Mayor Johnson. Full returns are not yet in, but the Republicans claim the State by a plurality of 87,000 over Herbert S. Bigelow, the Democratic candidate for secretary of state. This would be an increase of 18,000 over the Republican plurality of last year. It is made up almost altogether of Democratic losses in Hamilton county, where the Republican plurality is increased 21,000.

In 19 counties in the north, where Johnson and Bigelow carried on their tent campaign, the Democratic gain is about 10,000. There are slight Democratic gains in other northern counties. In Cuyahoga, normally Republican and Senator Hanna's and Mayor Johnson's own county, Bigelow raised the Democratic plurality from 115 last year to 2,500; while in the city of Cleveland, of which Johnson is mayor and where Senator Hanna lives and did his principal campaigning, Bigelow gets a plurality of 5,000. The Democratic county ticket, with a few exceptions, was elected. Among those elected are Charles P. Salen, Johnson's director of public works. He is elected county clerk. Another important local victory was the election of Charles W. Stage, the leader of the Cuyahoga delegation in the legislature and one of Johnson's best lieutenants.

Writing of the result in Ohio Mayor Johnson says:

We are encouraged by the large Democratic gains in Cuyahoga county, in spite of the fact that a larger vote was polled and greater interest aroused on the part of the Republicans. The majority of the county ticket was elected, and in the cases where we lost it was due solely to personal preferences and involved no political principle. But probably the most encouraging sign is the fact that where Mr. Bigelow made his campaign outside of Hamilton county, satisfactory gains were almost universal. The time was too short to expose the viciousness of the Municipal Code and the Cincinnati Franchise Grab. The result in Hamilton county was due to dishonest election methods rather than lack of interest. Cox and McLean controlled the entire election machinery. There was nothing to prevent either dishonest voting or counting. We have already begun next year's State campaign. This is but the first skirmish. Truth loses some battles, but no wars.

In Chicago, the Republicans elected their county ticket, with the exception of the candidate for sheriff. The Socialist party polled for the head of their State ticket in the city 9,745 votes, while the Socialist-Labor party polled about 4,937, making a total socialist vote of 14,682. This is the largest distinctively socialist vote ever polled in Chicago and exceeds that of last spring by about 8,000. But in the county of Cook outside of Chicago the total was small in comparison, being only 523—97 for the Socialist-Labor party

and 426 for the Socialist party. The total socialist vote for the whole of Cook county, 15,205, is 5 1-3 per cent. of the total vote cast. The local Single Tax party cast a vote of 998 in the whole county for sheriff,—about half the vote of last Spring.

Elsewhere the vote of the Socialist party was unexpectedly large; as in Massachusetts, where it ran up to 32,985—an increase of 300 per cent. over last year. To this must be added 2,000 polled by the Socialist-Labor party, making the total socialist vote in Massachusetts more than 35,000.

Three subjects of general importance were voted upon at these elections—the initiative and referendum question in Illinois and the eight-hour law and the Australasian tax system in Colorado. Full returns are not yet available. The Illinois referendum question was voted upon under the advisory law of the State (pp. 346, 373; also see vol. 10, p. 821). Three questions were submitted, namely, (1) that the legislature provide for a constitutional amendment establishing the initiative and referendum for State purposes; (2) that it establish it by legislation for local purposes; and (3) that it take steps looking to the amendment of the Federal constitution so as to require the election of Federal Senators by popular vote. All these questions were carried by large proportional votes and overwhelming majorities. As unofficially reported, the vote in Cook county (remainder of the State not yet heard from) was as follows:

| | Yes. | No. | Majority. |
|----------------------|---------|--------|-----------|
| State referendum.... | 162,686 | 35,888 | 126,802 |
| Local referendum.... | 156,227 | 24,667 | 131,560 |
| Senatorial | 161,941 | 24,917 | 137,024 |

The principal Colorado referendum raised the question of amending the State constitution so as to enable any county to levy its taxes exclusively upon land values if it should so decide (p. 391). Our best advice at present (Nov. 6) are that the amendment was fairly carried, but that the Republican and Democratic election officers (both parties having opposed the amendment) are conniving to defeat it by a false count. But few official returns have yet been made.

When the arbitration proceedings in the anthracite coal strike were last reported in these columns (pp. 470-71), the arbitrators had decided to hold their next meeting in Wilkes-

barre on the 30th for the purpose of personally inspecting the coal mines and their surroundings. Their first inspection was made on the 30th in the region of Scranton. Here they studied every step in the process of coal mining from the blasting of the coal in the bowels of the earth to its shipment to market. They have since made similar inspections elsewhere in the region and have questioned mine workers. In their inspection tours they have been accompanied by representatives both of the employers and the miners.

On the 31st Clarence S. Darrow, of Chicago, formerly the partner of the late John P. Altgeld, was in consultation at Scranton with the leaders of the miners, whom he had been retained to represent. He was also in conference with the arbitrators with reference to the course of procedure in the arbitration. The statement of the miners was soon afterward filed with the arbitrators, and on the 4th was made public. It formulates four demands and embodies several reasons for each, setting them forth at length. Following are the demands:

- 1 An increase of 20 per cent. upon the prices paid during the year 1901 to employes performing contract or piece work.
2. A reduction of 20 per cent. in hours of labor, without any reduction of earnings, for all employes paid by the hour, day or week.
3. The adoption of a system by which coal shall be weighed and paid for by weight when practicable; the minimum rate per ton to be 60 cents for a legal ton of 2,240 pounds, the differential now existing at the various mines to be maintained.
4. The incorporation in an agreement between the United Mine Workers of America and the anthracite coal companies of the wages which shall be paid and the conditions of employment which shall obtain, together with satisfactory methods for the adjustment of grievances which may arise from time to time, to the end that strikes and lockouts may be unnecessary.

If the Venezuelan authorities correctly represent the military situation in their country, the civil war in Venezuela (p. 455) has come to an end. A report to this effect was published on the 5th, over the signature of the secretary to President Castro and under date of the 3d. It stated that the revolution had been "totally crushed by final victory," and that Matos, the insurgent commander, was a fugitive.

NEWS NOTES.

—Gen. Miles arrived at Manila on the 3d.

—Ex-Gov. Boles was defeated for Congress in the Speaker Henderson district of Iowa by about 5,000.

—William Redmond, the Irish member of the British parliament, has been imprisoned for making an "incendiary" speech at Wexford.

—Mayor Low of New York has announced the restoration of the ordinance, suspended during the coal strike, which forbids the burning of soft coal within the city.

—Hale Johnson, the noted Prohibition leader of Illinois, who was the vice presidential candidate of his party in 1896, was shot and killed on the 4th during a quarrel over an unpaid bill.

—At the Glasgow (Scotland) election on the 5th the party headed by the lord provost, Chisholm, which is identified with the extension of municipal operation into private industrial fields, was defeated.

—A British telegraphic cable between Brisbane, Australia, and Vancouver, Canada, was completed on the 3d. The first message went through on the 31st, the actual time for transmission being less than five minutes.

—The contest between the Republican and the Federalist parties of Porto Rico on the 5th resulted in a victory for the Republicans. They will have 25 members of the colonial legislature while the Federalists will have but 10. The commissioner-elect to the United States is also a Republican.

—A commission appointed last May by Mayor Harrison of Chicago, reported on the 1st very strongly in favor of municipal ownership of municipal utilities for Chicago. The commission consisted of Aldermen Finn, Beilfuss, Herrman, Dunn and Dougherty, and Gen. Herman Lieb, A. M. Lawrence, Edward Osgood Brown, D. L. Cruice and Judge E. F. Dunne.

MISCELLANY

OLD AMERICA IN THE HANDS OF HIS FRIENDS.

For The Public.

Persons Represented:

OLD AMERICA, the Republic.

YOUNG AMERICA, his son.

TWO DOCTORS.

A JUSTICE.

MR. MONOPOLY.

SERVANTS.

(Scene: At the Capitol.)

OLD AMERICA (reading at his desk).

I lead them all. This genealogy Of nations holds no further knowledge forth.

Beyond this boundary where now I stand

No foot has trod, no traveler has passed,
That is recorded in the written years.
Over my shoulder only can I see
My breathless rivals; by the way I came
The empires and the lordly monarchies
That held their state in earth, now passed
away,

Lie strewn in dust. Alone I triumph here.
(Enter Young America.)

YOUNG AMERICA.
Morning, Governor.

OLD AMERICA.
Come here, my son. I wish to talk with you.

YOUNG AMERICA.
Some other time. I'm in a hurry now.
And I say, Governor, I'd like a draft
For a few millions on the treasury.
I hear it's filled with money pouring in
From the tax levied to support the war
That isn't yet repealed.

OLD AMERICA.
Well, you shall have it. I will write it for you.

But now remember, use the money well
And weigh expenses in your scale of means.
Cut your coat shorter if you must—
that's all.

YOUNG AMERICA.
Oh, that's all right. There'll be enough
of it.

So long, old man. (He turns to go.) And
I say, Governor, (He comes back.)
I'll send the doctor up to look at you.
Upon my honor, you're not looking well.
You bend your back too much and work
too hard.

There's a dark circle underneath your
glims,
And you need medicine. Take my word
for it. (Exit.)

OLD AMERICA.
Well, well, the boy is right. I work too
hard.

I've labored long, worked early and worked
late,
Because in poverty my life began.
But now I can foresee a day of rest,
Less hours of labor, greater share of ease,
Peace, plenty, and the comfort of my home.
(Enter a Servant.)

SERVANT.
A letter, sir, marked "urgent."

OLD AMERICA.
Give it to me. (Exit Servant.) More
urgent, I've no doubt,
To him that sends than any other man.
Some one, perhaps, who's hot to give ad-
vice

That was blown cold a hundred years ago,
Or some one seeking office. Well, what's
this?

(He reads.) Old America: I write this to
inform you that your son is keeping com-
pany with a certain Miss Empire, who
has lately arrived in this country from
abroad. He was introduced to her by Sen-
ator Jingo, and danced with her last night
at the ball. I give you this warning.—A
Democrat.

I'll see to this. That rascal of a boy
Will be my ruin with his deviltry.
Miss Empire, eh? I know the hussy well.
She and her father, Old Monopoly,
For he, by privilege of a creditor,
Comes often to my house, I owing him
On some old notes, or favor that he begs,
Or some such business, or a tax, or trade.

(Enter two doctors.)
Good morning, Doctor.

FIRST DOCTOR.
Good morning, my dear friend.

OLD AMERICA.

And you, good morning. You are welcome
here.

Not that I need your skill. My health is
good.

But there's a business just come to my
hand

Touching my son. The rascal, as you know,
Is full of spirits, as the young will be.

Perhaps I was myself. At any rate
My good old father, the Colonial,
Had work enough and little breath to spare
To start me right and rightly keep me there.
But tell me, what's the reason you exchange
Such glances with each other?

FIRST DOCTOR.
My old friend, you look ill.

OLD AMERICA.
That's my son's nonsense. I was never
better.

I see he sent you here. He's more con-
cerned,

To do him justice, than I am myself
For my own comfort. I'm as well as ever.

FIRST DOCTOR.
Your son was right. In sickness as in love
Men are but guilty judges of themselves.
I think we'd better call your servants in
And get you into bed. It's serious.

OLD AMERICA.
No bed for me. I feel as well as ever.

FIRST DOCTOR.
Ah, but a man not only must feel well,
But look well to be well.

OLD AMERICA.
Nonsense, I say.

FIRST DOCTOR.
Feel his pulse, Doctor.

SECOND DOCTOR.
Too slow!

FIRST DOCTOR.
Ah! a bad symptom. Have you any pain?

OLD AMERICA.
Only such pain as comes to any man
Who works too hard; perhaps a rheuma-
tism,
A stiffness in the morning now and then,
And backache in the evening.

SECOND DOCTOR.
Old man, I'll diagnose your malady.
Your isolation is the cause of it.
You are stagnating in ignoble ease
When you should struggle with a strenu-
ous life.

It's little wonder you have aches and pains,
Curled up in this dark corner of the earth,
Cramped in this little land, America.
Stretch out your legs, old man; take room
enough.

Be the Colossus of the modern world,
And not the weakling; quit ignoble ease—

OLD AMERICA.
Come, come!

SECOND DOCTOR.
Take up your arms, let courage fire your
heart,

Put timid peace aside, and let your thoughts
Be bent on glory, and dare mighty things.

OLD AMERICA.
Young man, what mighty nation do you
wish

That I should crush in war?
SECOND DOCTOR.

Oh no! not that!
The place for glory is the Philippines,
Which you have taken in your war with
Spain,

For they are full of unarmed savages,
Whom we may conquer in a glorious war,
And after that we can supply in trade
With cargoes of that prime necessity,
Bunting for flags and banners ready made.

OLD AMERICA.

No more of this, no more.
I have fought many battles in my time
That shine on history's eternal page.
Behold these volumes ranked upon the
shelves,
As marching to my glory, tell the tale
Of my life's labors and my bloody wars.
I live victorious and my banner floats
Over the fields that tyranny has lost,
And never, while I'm Old America,
Will I oppress the weak of other lands,
Or pawn my soldiers' lives in distant wars,
Whence few of them can ever be redeemed.
I am content to love my freedom well
And to preserve it, which is one step more
Than any people ever climbed before.

FIRST DOCTOR.

And very wise is your benevolence,
And yet a little of this medicine (He opens
his bag.)
I think is well for you. It cures a pain
Like magic, I am told.

OLD AMERICA.

As you say, doctor. (He drinks and falls
back in his chair.)

What's this you've given me?

FIRST DOCTOR.

Only a pleasant tonic.

OLD AMERICA.

It burns me. Tell me the ingredients.

FIRST DOCTOR.

It's thus compounded: Extract of Expansion,
Tincture of Empire and the Oil of Wealth.

OLD AMERICA.

Then I am lost. It's deadly to me.
That pang that well nigh robs me of my
heart
I know is death; my living days are done.

FIRST DOCTOR.

It can't be true.

OLD AMERICA.

Ring for my servants. There's no time to
lose. (He rings.)

(Enter Servants.)

SERVANT.

Did you ring for me?

OLD AMERICA.

Go with all speed; summon my Justice
to me. (Exit Servant.)

And you, sir, hasten to my clergyman
With all dispatch. Tell him a dying man,
For such I am, begs him to come in haste.
(Exit Second Servant.)

FIRST DOCTOR.

I'm sure your fears are false, my good old
friend.

You'll soon be easier. That alternative
Works finely in you. You'll be better soon.

OLD AMERICA.

Never again; my life is running out.
Old forms, old customs, virtues, all must
pass.

This head must fall, this speaking tongue
be still.

(Enter Justice.)

JUSTICE.

You summoned me?

OLD AMERICA.

My wise old Justice, I am near to death,
Almost within hall of the other shore,
In all things unprepared and no will drawn.
Call in three servants. (He calls.)

(Enter Servants.)

Do not question me.

Draw me the form, and let the form be
short.

And, servants, gather round me and attend
To my last mortal will and testament.

JUSTICE.

I am ready, sir.

OLD AMERICA.

Then as I dictate write the items down.
To Young America, my only son,
And to his children who come after him,
I give, devise, bequeath, my native land;
Namely, from the Rio Grande del Norte
All northward to my boundary the Lakes,
And from Atlantic to Pacific west.
Also to them I give my coaling ports
And my possessions in the great Antilles.
The latter subject to the promises
I made their people, but not yet conveyed
In form of treaty nor secured by law.
And all the Philippines which I now hold
In trust to the inhabitants thereof
I hereby give, with all therein, to them.
(Enter a Servant.)

SERVANT.

Here is a letter from the clergyman.

OLD AMERICA.

What! will he not come?

SERVANT.

He said nothing, but sent this.

OLD AMERICA.

Open and read it to me.

SERVANT (reads).

My Dear Old Friend: I regret that I can-
not give you any consolation in your pain-
ful predicament, but other affairs require
my present attention. I shall pray for your
recovery, and if you follow the advice of our
worthy doctors I shall have no doubt of it.
I suspect, my dear friend, that your illness
arises from your stagnation. Rouse your-
self to your duty; cast off your isolation;
rest not content; go forth to conquer; seize
islands and distant lands while yet a few
are left; though the ninety and nine are
safely hurdled together, go forth and
search till the lost lamb shall be found and
brought into the fold to be sheared.

Your friend in prayer.—Rev. I. Imperialist.

OLD AMERICA.

Can this be possible?

SERVANT.

Shall I answer it?

OLD AMERICA.

Tear it in pieces. I'll not send again.

JUSTICE.

What is your pleasure as concerns the will?

OLD AMERICA.

A moment; you will find upon my desk,
Nearest my right hand where I sat at work,
A well-worn volume. Bring it to me.
(A servant brings it.)

This is the Declaration of my Rights
That in my humble early life was drawn.
This I have followed, and in tempting times
Have held up to the mirror of my thoughts
To show me justice. It has served me well.
I leave it for the guidance of my son.
After these doctrines I have used my foes,
After them also let him use his friends,
For justice turns an unchanging face to all.

JUSTICE.

Shall I set that down?

OLD AMERICA.

The light is falling. What do I see?
Strange shades of midday; sure the night
comes fast.

Make haste! the sunlight in my eyes grows
dim.

Give me the pen and witness that I sign.
(They all sign.)

This done—if all is done—when all is done,—
All is well done—with a stout heart I die.
(He dies.)

JUSTICE.

Hold up his head.

SERVANT.

His life is gone, sir, he has breathed his last.

SECOND DOCTOR.

That isolation was the death of him.

FIRST DOCTOR.

It must have been. The medicines I gave
Worked well, but I was called too late to
save him.

(Enter Mr. Monopoly and his servants.)

MR. MONOPOLY.

What's this? Who's dying without my
consent?

FIRST DOCTOR.

He's passed on. Old America is dead.

MR. MONOPOLY.

Then let him die. It's time that he was
gone.

There wasn't room enough for both of us
In this whole country, and sometimes of
late

He jostled me, sometimes I jostled him.

But tell me, Justice, did he leave a will?

JUSTICE.

He summoned me in haste before he died.

I drew a will, and just as he expired

He set his name beneath it.

MR. MONOPOLY.

Is this the last will? Let me look at it.
(He reads:)

To Young America, my only son,
And to his children who come after him,
I give, devise, bequeath my native land,
Namely, from the Rio Grande del Norte
All northward to my boundary the Lakes,
And from Atlantic to Pacific west.

Also to them I give my coaling ports
And my possessions in the great Antilles,
The latter subject to the promises
I made their people, but not yet conveyed
In form of treaty nor secured by law.
And all the Philippines which I now hold
In trust to the inhabitants thereof
I hereby give, with all therein, to them.
To them, your honor.

That is, I take it, to his son and heirs.

JUSTICE.

Oh, no, I think his clear intention was—

MR. MONOPOLY.

Just think again, and then you all can see
The will reads, To my son and heirs—to
them.

JUSTICE.

Why, surely, it might be construed so.

MR. MONOPOLY.

Isn't it plain enough?

JUSTICE.

It seems to be.

FIRST DOCTOR.

Upon my soul, I think it is.

SECOND DOCTOR.

Of course it is.

SERVANTS.

Of course.

MR. MONOPOLY.

Then let us search for Young America
And tell him the good news. I like the boy,
And I believe I'll let the youngster have
My daughter for a wife. That's a fair trade.
I give a daughter and I get a son,
Who keeps the daughter. I get two for
one.

A. W. SANBORN.

A CRITICISM OF OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

For The Public.

Press dispatches are telling of a
recent address by President Eliot, of
Harvard university, in which he is said
to have "made startling statements"
in criticism of the results obtained

from the past 50 years' work of the public schools. According to the reports of the address, Dr. Eliot finds little satisfaction in the progress we have made in grappling with the social evils which should have been, he thinks, more effectively checked by our half-century of schooling. Gambling, crimes of violence, the purchase by the people of tons of ephemeral reading-matter which is not good in either form or substance, the popular taste for trivial stage spectacles, vulgar vaudeville, extravaganza and melodrama, are some of the evidences of the shortcoming which he charges to American education. By and by we shall all probably become convinced that we have been expecting too much from our system of "intellectualization," as Herbert Spencer calls it.

J. H. DILLARD.

LAND MONOPOLY IN MEXICO.

Mexico's complete development will never be attained as long as the agricultural land of the country is retained in the hands of so few people. Recent statistics show that the haciendas in Mexico number only about 8,000. Many of these great estates count their acres by the millions, and only a small portion of them are cultivated or utilized to anything like the full capacity of production. The growing home markets and the opportunities that better means of transportation and local factories offer for a diversity of crops are facts that are inducing many of these old land owners to put a larger share of their haciendas under cultivation. It is doubtful, however, if they will be voluntarily broken up, as they are retained intact as a matter of family pride and tradition against every effort to buy portions of them. Their division will probably only be accomplished when the government finds it necessary, for the fuller development of the country, to tax the land that a man owns rather than the product that he sells.—"Modern Mexico" for August.

SPORT.

A report in the Richmond Times of a meeting of the Virginia Trap Shooters' association.

On account of the sparrows being cooped up for several days they were very weak and exhausted, and frequently when the trap was opened the bird would not start, and when he did finally start he moved so slowly that his death was a foregone conclusion, and his downfall caused not a little laughter, which

was, of course, directed at the gunner, and not at the little bird.

When the bird failed to leave the trap on its being opened, the score-keeper called "No bird," and when the "nigger" started to open the trap the sly little sparrow, who had refused to budge, would make a desperate dash for freedom, showing, as some declared, that he appreciated fully the situation. One or two of these birds turned and flew directly towards the cages in which his hundreds of companions were confined, and one of the gunners declared that they were trying to warn their followers and give them the secret of immunity from death-dealing shot.

The annual meeting was pronounced by everybody a brilliant success, and the committees who have had the matter in charge have been warmly congratulated on the splendid manner in which they made preparations for the occasion.

THE BLESSINGS OF CIVILIZATION.

We hear much of "the inestimable blessings" of civilization. Especially since the Anglo-Saxon nations have discovered that it is their destiny to civilize inferior peoples, has this expression become a by-word with us. In view of this fact, would it not be well to state what kind of civilization we have in mind when we enlarge upon its "inestimable blessings"? But supposing we dismiss from our consideration all civilizations barring the highest kind, which, I presume, is the Anglo-Saxon brand of the article. What, then, are the inestimable blessings of Anglo-Saxon civilization? What are the great advantages of this civilization which Anglo-Saxon nations believe it to be their destiny to force upon Boer and Filipino? Is vast wealth for a few and poverty for the many an inestimable blessing? Is the right to toil from ten to twelve hours a day, year in and year out, at soul-destroying labor in factories, an inestimable blessing? Are the thieves, the prostitutes and cutthroats which infest our cities inestimable blessings?

No. Clearly these are not blessings, and I doubt if our most strenuous Anglo-Saxons will consider them such.

But what are the blessings? Is the church a blessing? Let us assume that it is. But Boers and Filipinos are Christians and have as many churches as they need. Is education a blessing? No doubt it is, but it is not wanting among Boers and Filipinos, and they probably have as much of it as is necessary for their simple modes of life.

Then there are the arts and the sciences. Surely these are blessings. But if they are so essential to the well-being of humanity why not let our toiling masses enjoy them before endeavoring to forcibly cultivate a taste for them in alien races?

No. Civilization is a mixed blessing to say the least. I know no race which has been made happier by having it forced upon it. To accomplish its object, civilization must be a slow, spontaneous growth, and it is better for a race to acquire it by gradual process, even if it takes a thousand years, than to have it foisted upon it by brute force. Perhaps I ought not admit it, but I really believe that the savage is far happier than the proletarian of any civilized land. The savage is his own master. He needs no wealth, for he knows that a little toil will secure him his daily bread. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof" is his motto, and he does not worry about the morrow with its cares and troubles. He is free in the most complete sense of the word, and he enjoys life because he is free. Is not his lot incomparably more happy than that of the civilized proletarian who toils wearily for six days each week, year in, year out; who is haunted by the awful fear that on the morrow he may not be able to provide for himself and his family; who knows not what it is to be free, and who has no opportunities to enjoy the inspiring beauties of nature?

Civilization may be an inestimable blessing to the wealthy classes, although this is open to argument. But to my mind there is absolutely no doubt that the savage is happier than the civilized proletarian, and inasmuch as the latter constitutes more than one-half of our population, I claim that savage races are happier than civilized ones. When I speak of savage races I mean those which have not yet been tainted by civilization, for the sorriest spectacle before God and man is the savage who has acquired the vices of the white man. For him my heart bleeds, and he is truly the most wretched of mortals.

The most "inestimable blessing" is individual freedom, and a civilization which does not guarantee it will sooner or later have to yield to a better order of things.—The Whim, for July.

"You don't seem, my dear Marius, to be so much disturbed over your affairs as formerly."

"No, my dear Aurelius; I have discovered that it is better to have the thing happen than to worry about it."
—Life.

THE RUSSIFICATION OF FINLAND.

Translated for Public Opinion of June 5, from which we reprint.

The Russification of Finland is progressing with disastrous effects, according to the St. Petersburg correspondent of the Independence Belge. So far it has been next to impossible to secure accurate information concerning the troubles which occurred at Helsingfors and Viborg, on account of the close scrutiny of the censorship. In fact the Russian papers, among them the *Novoe Vremya*, the *Novosti*, and the *Gazette of St. Petersburg*, state editorially, "that the government of St. Petersburg has not only been kept in absolute ignorance of the real state of affairs, but has actually been deceived" by the reports of Gen. Bobrikoff, asserting the "Finnish people had accepted the new military law with entire satisfaction." "It is through such mendacious reports," says the *Novosti*, "that the Russian authorities have been deceived concerning the true situation of the country which they govern against the wishes and against the interest of the people."

The *Gazette of Finland*, semi-official organ of the government, is the only available source of information from which the correspondent of the Independence Belge in St. Petersburg could gather an account of the last revolutionary outbreak in Finland, and, as might be expected, this account is "highly colored for the benefit of the Russian authorities, while the true state of affairs is shown in a more dramatic light in private letters sent from Helsingfors to St. Petersburg." The government being under the impression that the application of the new military law, which provides for the oath of allegiance to Russia, would hasten the Russification of Poland, ordered the recruiting to proceed. At Helsingfors 857 men were called for, and 57 only answered; riots occurred, and the Cossacks were compelled to charge the populace, which threatened to burn the barracks. Without the intervention of Mr. Mourén, the Lutheran pastor who addressed the rioters, the loss of life would have proved very large, as the First regiment of Finnish sharpshooters was ready to fire, when he interfered and begged the officers to allow him to speak. This incident started the revolutionary movement, which spread all over the duchy with lightning rapidity. Martial law is expected at any moment. The Russian government then issued an "imperial re-

script," notifying the Finns that "disobedience to the military law would be a convincing proof of the insufficiency of the administrative system inaugurated last century to guarantee the peaceful conduct of public affairs and submission to the authorities."

The Finns consider this "rescript" as a practical proclamation of martial law, inasmuch as many "communes" (districts) have refused to obey the existing law. The governors have imposed very heavy fines on those "communes." Hammerford paid 35,000 marks, Helsingfors 30,000, and six other cities from 15,000 to 20,000 marks. These fines greatly exasperated the people. In some places the boards of medical examiners refused to assist in a system of recruiting which they consider unlawful. As usual, the Cossacks were on hand to handle the refractory recruits. At Viborg 150 young men were called by the military authorities; 32 only came. At Nikarleby a single man presented himself; he was crippled. Besides, not a single recruit would take the oath. The measures of repression were in keeping with Russian methods. At Helsingfors the Cossacks rode into the Protestant church, chasing everybody. They broke also into private houses, flogging the inhabitants, sparing neither women nor children. Convalescents were whipped in the hospitals, and a school teacher who attempted to protect a young girl was beaten to insensibility by an officer. The opposition to the military law is universal. According to the "official" reports published in the *Gazette of Finland*, those who took part in the riots almost exclusively belong to the best classes of society. So far the opposition has been so successful that the period of enlistment has been extended to the end of June.

Commenting editorially upon these events, the Independence Belge says: "The Finns will not be brought to terms by the Cossacks; any kind of brutal action will do nothing but exasperate this prudent and wise nation, which would never have rebelled openly, but which protests against the illegal acts already committed with a dignity and self-respect worthy of the greatest praise. The government at St. Petersburg could formerly rely on the loyalty of the Finn; through its stupidity it has made of them a rebellious people, the resistance of which will prove unconquerable. What reliance can Russia place on the Finnish recruits, incorporated by force? It is good policy to supply internal enemies with weapons, while organizing

an army against the outsiders?" In the opinion of the same paper, if the government at St. Petersburg persists in its "unfortunate policy" in the grand duchy of Finland, the only result will be to give a large impulse to Finnish emigration. At the present time 1,000 Finns leave their country each week, and if this state of affairs keeps up, Finland will be deserted in a very short time.

THE LABOR PROBLEM A RELIGIOUS ONE.

The Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, pastor of the Vine Street Congregational Church, in Cincinnati, and Democratic candidate for Secretary of State of Ohio, in the Cincinnati Post of September 1.

The greatest religious problem of the age is the labor problem, and through a new conception of what religion means I believe the labor problem will be solved. Strikes will not solve the problem. Even to-day the strike is employed, not so much because strikers have faith in it, as because they do not see any better means of enforcing their demands. When men have learned what can be done with the ballot they will turn to it as the sure road, and the only road to emancipation.

There is no real cause for quarrel between labor and capital, and there never was any. There certainly is, though, a bitter conflict at hand; the conflict has already begun. But look beneath the surface and you will see that this conflict is not between labor on the one hand and capital on the other, but between labor and capital both on the one hand and monopoly on the other.

By monopoly we mean a special privilege secured by unjust legislation, the practical effect of which is to give some men an unfair advantage over others. Take, for instance, the late Rogers law. Having secured the exclusive privilege of the use of the streets of Cincinnati for a certain purpose, the Consolidated Street Railway company believed it would be able to demand a five-cent fare of its passengers for the next 50 years, and it capitalized that prospect, and has declared dividends on a capital stock of \$20,000,000, where the actual capital invested is probably not one-fifth of that amount.

The monopoly which enables the street railroad company to demand a five-cent fare for service which it could well afford for three cents is based on a special privilege; that

special privilege is the exclusive use of the streets for all street railroad purposes under a franchise that authorizes a five-cent fare; and the law that conferred that special privilege was an unjust law, for it conferred upon the street railroad company an unfair advantage over its patrons.

The only way any monopoly can be destroyed is the way the monopoly of the streets of Cincinnati was destroyed; namely, by repealing the law upon which that monopoly is based. It will be a great day for labor when the masses clearly see this point; that their real enemy is Privilege, created by law. Then they will use their votes, and not to express class hatred nor to threaten property rights, nor to try revolutionary experiments, but to repeal by conservative steps the laws out of which manifold monopolies have grown. Thus they will throw open to competition opportunities and enterprises that have been monopolized. This is the only salvation of labor; it is the only salvation of capital. Such a programme no man can intelligently oppose, unless he is a holder of some monopoly privilege. And upon the high moral ground that the welfare of the individual cannot conflict with the welfare of society, the monopolist himself ought to see that it would be for his interest also if he were shorn of his privileges.

Another striking example of the unfair advantages enjoyed by the street railway monopolies is the exemption from their fair share of taxation which the law allows them. The laws of Ohio, as interpreted by the courts, forbid the taxation of the franchise value of these corporations. And so it comes about that we see the owners of street railway franchises drawing dividends on \$20,000,000 while paying taxes on less than \$3,000,000. As a general proposition, it is safe to say that the average street railway is capitalized for five times its actual cost. Yet it is obliged to pay taxes only on one-fifth of its actual value.

Now note how different it is with other forms of property. Take real estate values in Cincinnati. Here is an example: A private dwelling in one of the best sections of the city was sold for \$13,000 nine years ago.

The other day it was sold again for \$5,000. This depreciation was not due to any change in the character of the neighborhood. There were several causes for it, but the chief cause was the fact that the property had been outrageously taxed. Nine years ago, when it was sold for \$13,000, it was list-

ed on the tax duplicate for \$7,000. The other day, when it was sold for \$5,000, it was on the tax duplicate for \$5,800. That is, private property is taxed at 116 per cent. of its actual value, while the street railroad is taxed on a valuation of \$2,800,000, or 14 per cent of its actual value.

The distribution of the burden of taxation is a problem most important for labor to consider and solve.

To adjust the burdens of taxation so that monopoly shall bear more of them, and shall be discouraged; so that labor and capital shall bear less of them and labor shall no longer be robbed and investment of capital shall no longer be checked by unnecessary and unjust taxation, and so that the opportunities for employment, which are under the control of monopoly, shall be thrown open to enterprise, is to encourage labor and capital alike and make friends of them, as they ought to be. For, on the one hand, it will increase the demand for labor and advance wages, and, on the other hand, while it will infallibly diminish the dividends of monopoly on watered stock, it will insure larger and steadier returns to honest capital.

This subject may not be an inviting one for the orator, but the statesmanship of the future will be turned toward the overthrow of monopoly, to lighten the burdens of industry and to establish equality of opportunity between man and man.

WHAT IS PRIVATE PROPERTY?

A letter from the Rev. Charles F. Dole, of Jamaica Plain, Mass., to the Boston Herald of October 9.

The discussion which is now going on in regard to the situation in the anthracite coal region raises the very practical question: "What justly constitutes private property?" Many indications make it probable that society is being irresistibly urged to undertake a new definition of this term. We have an obvious historical precedent in favor of the likelihood, as well as the righteousness, of a more restricted definition of private property than we have hitherto been accustomed to make. It is a short period since political power, offices and titles were commonly regarded as the property of individuals—lords and princes. A sovereign could give or sell a dukedom; his oldest son, however unfit to rule, was regarded as having the right to succeed his father in his titles, revenues and crown lands. We, in America, have

altered and limited this meaning of property. Even the senatorial claim of a right to dispose of the patronage of a state rests upon what is styled "courtesy." We have become so accustomed to our narrower definition of property that we hardly reflect how destructive it once seemed and still seems in the eyes of a hereditary nobility. We ought to be ready to ask further questions as to what property justly is.

Everyone agrees that what a man actually makes or earns, or what represents his toil, or skill, or service, is his rightful property. If Mr. Carnegie or Mr. Morgan has benefited mankind to the extent of his present fortune, so far no one grudges him a dollar of its value. If out of this grand fortune he chooses to give \$100,000 to a friend or relative, we make no complaint. The gift may be foolish. This depends upon how the friend uses it. The gift of \$10,000 a year may pauperize the man or woman who lives an idle life as fatally as alms given at the street corner. We are disposed, however, to let a great benefactor have his way with his gifts, at least as long as he lives.

How long now, after a great benefactor of mankind has died, ought society to suffer his "dead hand" to rest upon it? Forever? We give no such lease of life to the most useful patents and copyrights. Suppose the millionaire "founds a family," as in the case of the Astors and Vanderbilts. An income of even \$40,000 a year represents the entire labor of a force of 60 average men. Is it not an enormous extension and exaggeration of the definition of property that a man may claim the right for his heirs through successive generations to appropriate to themselves this vast share of the product of labor? Is this equitable? Is it not rather a wholly artificial arrangement? Why shall we not some time look upon the claim to the hereditary holding of an industrial dukedom, as we all now look upon the claims of an arrogant medieval prince?

This view becomes clearer when we begin to ask how far the rich man's acquisitions (in the case of Mr. Morgan, for example) really represent toil or skill or useful service. Would he dare himself to urge that he deserved all his millions? Must he not see that anomalous industrial conditions, and often peculiar laws, and possibly peculiar financial transac-

tions, have enabled him and his groups of managers to set their own price, as it were, upon their services? Who can say that it is a just price? It may be true that these men have shown large constructive ability in organizing industrial enterprises. But this constitutes no reason why they should be paid inordinately more than we pay a President Lincoln or a Gen. Grant. Much less is any just reason to be seen why they should be allowed to make their princely incomes a perpetual lien upon people unborn.

Grant, if you will, that the drops of water on the crest of the wave are bigger and whiter than the drops of water beneath them; yet they owe their superior position largely to the vast bulk of the wave—possibly to the fact that a storm is on, lifting the waves higher than in ordinary times. So the makers of great fortunes obviously owe their position to all sorts of subtle forces, not of their own creation; often to the labors and inventions of unthanked men; often, again, to the monopoly of coal lands and oil wells and other gifts of nature, which ought never to have been granted to private persons "to have and to hold" as their own. Have we the right, through any system of laws, so to define property as to put a mortgage on the shoulders of the men of the next century—not now for useful services honestly rendered, but for the mere fact that certain individuals have possessed themselves of immensely lucrative monopolies?

I do not prescribe what to do. We must do what is just, which may or may not be what has been accounted legal. Slavery was legal, but it was just to abolish it. We must keep promises actually made. But I cannot see how, except by a legal fiction, we can bind to our promises, or make promises to, people who are not yet born. If society in the twenty-first century, for example, finds individuals in possession of railroad leases which we have drawn for 1,000 years, it must, doubtless, be fair and generous in its treatment of the leaseholders as long as they live, but I cannot think that it will see any sacredness in our ill-advised lease. . . .

At any rate, if it is right, as it looks to me, to limit our present excessive extension of the idea of private property, and to restrict it more closely in the direction of that which a man has actually done, or the

value which he has contributed by his services to society, ought we not, then, to urge upon everyone who spends money the fundamental questions of justice, namely: "Where did the money that I am spending come from?" and "Whose labor does it represent?" No one has yet received a liberal education who has not learned to ask these questions.

"LOBSTERS" I HAVE MET.

A TRAVELING MAN OF THE STRENUOUS TYPE.

For The Public.

Usually it is a monotonous journey from Elmwood to Buda. The surrounding country is good for farming, but to the average traveler there is nothing of interest.

On the particular morning to which this story relates I was in the smoking car of the morning train bound for Buda. The car was divided into two compartments, one for baggage, etc., and the other for the accommodation of smokers. There were probably 15 passengers in the car, mostly traveling men. I was seated near the center of the compartment quietly smoking a cigar I had purchased of the train boy. It was a typical train boy cigar, one that had been made to sell. Opposite me sat a big fellow who had bought one of the same sort.

"These cigars must have grown near Elmwood," I said, addressing him.

"I don't believe the cabbages around here are as bad as this," returned the big fellow, grimly.

"It's a Democratic cigar," said another.

"Not on your life," I retorted; "no Democrat is so mean as to make a cigar like that."

"Oh, I don't know," returned the other, "they made the hard times; seems to me they will do anything if they get a chance."

Everybody looked my way, expecting me to make good. It was in the fall of '93, when Grover Cleveland was "all the eggs" at Washington.

"Well, now here, old man," I said, "I voted for Cleveland. and I accept my share of the responsibility for the condition we are in, so far as he and the Democratic party, are to blame for it, but I think we should have had this state of affairs no matter who had been elected."

"It's all right for you to say that, but you know we had good times till the Democrats came in; then everything went to H'l."

"Everything except Cleveland," chimed in another.

"Too bad he didn't go," yawned some one else.

"The whole thing goes to show this country can't get along without protection," said the big fellow opposite me.

"Protection from what?" I asked.

"From the pauper labor of Europe," he replied, forcibly, while several others chorused: "That's right!"

"What are they doing, that we should need protection from them?" I asked.

"What are they doing?" he cried, angrily; "they are getting ready to dump their stuff onto our shores."

"Do you think they will dump it and run?"

"What do you mean?"

"Do you think they will dump their stuff and run away without waiting for anything in return?"

"No, they'll take our gold, I suppose."

"Who'll give it to them?"

"Why, whoever buys their stuff, of course."

"Just so; they won't bring their stuff here, unless our people order it, will they?"

"No, I presume not," he replied, in a much calmer tone.

"Then what you want is to have the government prohibit people buying goods where they please?"

"Well, no, not exactly; but I object to people buying goods abroad."

"Yes, I quite understand. You don't object to people buying where they please, so long as they don't please to buy abroad. It's as clear as mud. How about drinking, do you oppose the use of liquor?"

"No, not if it is used in moderation."

"That is to say, you want the government to hire a policeman to see that you don't drink to excess?"

This brought out a laugh from the crowd.

"No, I don't think I need it."

"Well, then, you would have a policeman to see that I don't drink to excess?"

More laughter from the crowd, in which the big fellow joined.

I continued: "How about theaters? Would you have the law determine when they should be open and when closed? It's only a few steps from the last proposition to this."

"No, I think I'd let the theaters alone. I'm no Puritan."

"I'm glad to hear that. Now, tell me why you object to people buying goods abroad?"

"Because every dollar's worth of goods bought abroad leaves that much

less work to be done here," he answered, as if he had me going.

"According to that, if we bought all our goods abroad, we wouldn't have to do any work here?"

"Oh, well, we would have to give gold for what we got."

"Just so. Now you figure out how we would get the gold, and you'll have a new idea."

The crowd again joined the big fellow in a hearty laugh, after which he said: "Well, anyway, you will have to admit that there are more men than jobs."

"Yes," I replied, "the way things are going that is the way it seems, at least."

"Well, I'll tell you what would fix it."

"What?"

"A war. I think we ought to have a war about once in ten years."

"What under the sun do you want a war for?"

"To kill off our surplus population," he replied, looking as if he was sorry he couldn't have the idea patented.

"Oh, I see. You think there are too many people?"

"Indeed I do, and I think an occasional war would be a God-send."

"So far as the object is concerned I am inclined to agree with you, but I think the end would be accomplished by more satisfactory means."

"What would you suggest?" he asked, as if puzzled by my remark.

"Before I answer that, permit me to state my objection to the method you have proposed. You see, a war would call out some of the most desirable men we have, the brainiest and strongest. Besides, the work would be awkwardly done—the killing I mean. Some men would only get their eyes shot out, or legs or arms taken off, with the result that we would have a lot of helpless cripples about for years afterwards. See? Now I propose that a public butcher be appointed in each town, with authority to chop the heads off such people as might be selected."

"That would be too cold blooded."

"Cold blooded? Why, man, that would be philanthropy itself compared with the plan you propose. Every one beheaded would cash in in a hurry. There would be no suffering in hospitals for months before the end came; and, besides, think of the advantage of choosing the victims!"

"I am willing to grant it does seem as if it would be more humane, but it don't sound so. How would you select your victims?"

"Oh, that would be easy enough," I went on. "We could take, first, the

people who are physically weak—the invalids and cripples, you know. Then we could kill the people who are deformed—those with curved spines. And after that we could take those with curved intellects. And say, my friend," I asked, looking him squarely in the eye, "where would you come in in a game like that?"

Perhaps he didn't answer the question—at least I didn't hear it; the engine whistled for the crossing at Buda, and I got off.

M. J. FOYER.

THE TIGER'S STRIPES.

By Ernest Crosby, in *Whim*, for August; reprinted from *Whim* by especial permission from the editors. *Whim* is "a periodical without a tendency," published at Newark, N. J.

When I was in the South last spring I put up one afternoon for a few hours in a tiny hotel in a remote village, and a room was assigned to me which had been vacated in haste for my benefit by some more permanent resident. It bore all the marks of a sitting room as well as a bed-room and on the table were lying, one on the other, a couple of books which had evidently been recently laid aside and each of them contained a book mark. The under volume was a large Bagster bible; the upper was a big book bearing on its upturned cover the exaggerated face of a negro in gilt, made to look as much like an ape as possible, with the title in gilt letters above and below it, "The Negro a Beast, or In the Image of God." Two negro servants were coming in and out of the room, making the fire and preparing for my comfort, and I could not but wonder at the strange lack of delicacy of the bible reader who had left this hideous volume to stare them in the face, and this too in the chivalrous South! I picked up the book in curiosity after the servants had left. The title page was adorned by a series of sub-titles, of which I copied one as a sample. It read as follows:

The Negro a Beast, but Created with Articulate Speech & Hands, that he may be of Service to his Master, the White Man.

Here was indeed a rich relic of the ancient South of slavery, a South that has passed away forever! I looked down at the date and rubbed my eyes in astonishment. There must be some mistake. The book was printed in the year of our Lord 1900! And in one of the greatest cities of the South, too! And what do you suppose is the name of the publishing company which issues this precious work? It is called the "American Book and Bible House!"

I turned over the pages of the book. It was an illiterate medley of folly and superstition—an attempt to prove by Scripture that the negro was not the descendant of Ham, and to show that the serpent in the garden of Eden was a black man! It was just such a book as, if it had been produced by a negro, would almost have justified despair for his race. It is not remarkable perhaps that a single lunatic should have written such a book—but that a publisher should have been found for it, that commercial success should have been expected from it, that people should buy it and lay it on their bibles and leave it on their tables to insult the black men who saw it and astound the white—all that was incredible.

It so happens that I was reading a book written by a negro at the same time and I took it from my portmanteau and laid it beside the other volume. My book was Booker Washington's "Up From Slavery"—a book which I had some difficulty in getting in a great southern city, and which proved conclusively that its author was one of the best and ablest men in this country, black or white, and it made me blush for my white race as I thought of these two authors together.

And now I have been reading a third negro book, which occupies the middle ground between these two, but which unfortunately resembles the white man's folly more than the black man's wisdom. It is "The Leopard's Spots," by Rev. Thomas Dixon, a shining light in the Southern Baptist Church, and it tempts me to retort, "Thou tiger, first wash the stripes out of thine own hide, and then shalt thou see clearly to wash out the spots out of thy brother's hide;" for it is in the spirit of the tiger rather than in that of the Christian minister that Mr. Dixon treats the delicate issues of the race question which is the subject of his novel. The point which he seeks to make is that the negro must be kept by force, if necessary, in the place of an inferior, and that he should not be educated above it. Again and again he reiterates the statement which I give in his own words, for it seems to me to be lacking in clearness, to say the least, that "in a democracy you cannot build a nation inside of a nation of two antagonistic races, and therefore the future American must be either an Anglo-Saxon or a mulatto." This mixing up of the marriage relation with other social relations runs through the whole book, and it seems

to me to be illogical. I have dined on social equality with thousands of white women whom it would have been repugnant to me to marry. I fail to see that the one idea involves the other. I believe it is natural and best that people should intermarry within their own race. We received Li Hung Chang with complete social equality, and yet most of us would not be willing to marry his daughter, and probably he fully reciprocated the feeling. In the absence of all inherited artificial feeling and tradition, I should think that a negro would prefer to marry one of his own color. The wrens and orioles are now singing out of my window. They do not intermarry, but I do not see why that should prevent them from treating each other with entire courtesy up to the point of social equality. The danger of a nation of mulattos, if it is a danger, does not lie in the direction of intermarriage, as we all know, but of the illicit intercourse which has already produced millions of them and which shows how far the white man can overcome his distaste for the negro. Flout the fact as we may, a large part of the colored population of the south are our own cousins.

The matter of the "unusual crime" committed by negroes is a frightful one and it will have to be faced, but it is very clear that it has not been faced in the right way. Lynchings, burnings at the stake—and Mr. Dixon depicts one for us—have failed to decrease the number of them. And let us remember that every civilized nation contains solitary brutes who assault and murder women but that only white Americans still burn at the stake—and that, too, in multitudes. Savagery will not cure savagery and the tiger cannot tame the leopard. Mr. Dixon seems to see this when he speaks of the mob as a thousand-legged beast and anticipates with dread the time when there will be a black beast of the kind to set off against the white beast. He thinks that the permanent display of force by the whites is the best remedy, and forgets, Christian minister though he be, that the efficacy of sympathy and brotherly interest has scarcely been tried. The race question is no simple matter to be settled at a thousand miles' distance by academic theories, but it is safe to say that it will only be solved by the spirit of love, and that Booker Washington shows far more of this than the author of "The Leopard's Spots." Mr. Dixon may not know it, but he seems to believe in a gospel of hate.

One of the heroes of the book, an ex-confederate common soldier, admits that he hates the very sight of a negro, and this before the period of reconstruction had set in and when the negro had done nothing but work and suffer. There is a total lack of measure, too, in the punishments meted to the black man in this novel. One of them asks a white woman to kiss him. He makes no effort to force her to comply, but he is speedily hanged. "His thick lips had been split with a sharp knife and from his teeth hung this placard: 'The answer of the Anglo-Saxon race to negro lips that dare pollute with words the womanhood of the south.'"

There is no hint in the story that this penalty was slightly excessive, nor that a gentleman need hesitate in taking part in such an execution. In another place a negro trooper refuses to make room on a sidewalk for a lady and her male escort. He is at once beaten to death. Surely this is the spirit of the tiger.

Mr. Dixon's ideal negro is the old plantation servant who despises his own race. He draws the picture of one of them and then holds him up to admiration. When the whites overthrow the negro government, old Nelse cries, "Dar now! Ain't I done told you no kinky-headed niggers gwine ter run dis gov'ment!" I humbly submit that such a man is really a disgrace to any race. It is on the lines of self-respect that the negro must do his part in solving the race question. He must learn his own worth, not in the spirit of boastfulness nor of imitation, but in the spirit of self-improvement and honor. He must put down himself the crimes against women which are his shame, and I have faith that men like Booker Washington can set such a movement on foot. The white clergy of the South have a tremendous responsibility. They have an influence far transcending that of their colleagues in the North. Will they use it like Mr. Dixon and the ministers he creates in his book, to foment misunderstandings and distrust, or to infuse the spirit of Christ into the problem? We all admit now that the policy of "reconstruction" was a sad mistake and that northern interference can do little, but it is still possible to begin a new work of reconstruction based upon human sympathy. If the South will undertake this task, it will escape the battle of the "beasts" which is otherwise inevitable.

It is to be hoped that there is some truth in the theory of reincarnation,

for it affords such grand opportunities for poetic justice. If there is anything in it, the author of "The Negro Beast" should make his next appearance as a full-blooded Congo black; the author of "Leopard's Spots" would figure among the mulattos from whom he wishes to save us; and the author of "Up From Slavery,"—well—if any man has earned a right to the whitest of skins (if he would like to have one) it is Booker Washington. And if these three gentlemen came on the stage again together, I am confident that we should find the last of the three exerting his powers for the benefit of the other two in a spirit of love to which they are total strangers.

Mr. Dixon's book teaches one good lesson which he did not have in mind, and that is the folly of sowing seeds of other race questions. Is not one enough on our hands? Why should we be preparing the way for other hatreds and other lynchings for centuries to come in the East and West Indies?

"SEARCH ME."

The people by thousands were crowded about

And the president spoke, with intent to give out

His position on trusts—and the things that he said

Caused every old codger to doddle his head

And remark:

"Well, whar does he stand? D'ye see?"

And I said:

"Search me!"

The newspaper fellows were writing like smoke,

Shorthand every darn'd word that he spoke,

But when all the pothooks and curves were unspun

I heard each a-asking the next other one

This remark:

"Where did he land? Could you see?"

And he said:

"Search me!"

The folks read the papers, all anxious to see

How dead right on trusts our Teddy must be,

But when they had scanned all thorough and clean

Each turned to his neighbor with questioning mien

And remarked:

"Well, whar in this d--d trust business is he?"

But t'other un said:

"Search me!"

—Atlanta Constitution.

Indifferent correspondents will sympathize with the lad who, after he had been at a boarding-school for a week without writing to his parents, penned the following letter: "Dear people—I am afraid I shall not be able to write often to you, because, you see, when any-

thing is happening I haven't time to write, and when nothing is happening there's nothing to write about. So now, good-by, from your Georgie."—Chicago Chronicle.

The certain assurance that with the first approach of the foe every man would spring to arms troubled those in authority.

"For," reflected these, looking beyond the immediate exigency, "if everybody springs to arms, who will there be to pay the pensions after the war is over?"

It was decided to deal candidly with the situation, and accordingly the public schools were notified to inculcate patriotism only twice a week, henceforth, instead of daily, as hitherto.—Puck.

"It's the chance of my life to win military renown," said the soldier in the field, inaugurating hostilities.

"We must stand by our man," said the administration at home, voting lives and treasure.

"We must stand by the administration," said the nation, paying the freight.

Moreover, as transpired later, the war extended the blessings of liberty, to say nothing of the new markets it opened.—Life.

"Father," said a Harlem school boy, "what is 'call money' that the newspapers are saying so much about?"

"It is that money, my son," was the answer, "that the banks loan to a man; and that they want back immediately if he needs it, and don't want back if he don't need it."—Red Wing Argus.

Alfred was skylarking and "tackling" me this evening, when, seeing a policeman across the street, I threatened him with arrest. "Huh," he said, "there's no law against fighting, or how could they have armies?"—Extract from a Private Letter.

"Georgie," said his father, "I will not whip you this time if after this you promise to be a good little boy like Willie Jones."

"Papa," said Georgie, earnestly, "whip me, please."—Punch.

Teacher—What is a blotter, Tommy?

Tommy—It's something to hunt while the ink gets dry.—Los Angeles Herald.

BOOK NOTICES.

In "The Collapse of Plutocracy" (Chicago and New York: The Henneberry Co.), Mr. Henry Boothman reminds one of a man who has wandered up and down, hither and yon, through a thick forest, now stumbling over a fallen tree and again plunging into a bog, but has at last, by sheer accident, come out into the open and is dazzled by the unaccustomed sunlight. The social reform he proposes is, first, the gradual absorption by the community of all trusts; and, secondly, the assertion of the public right to unearned property by levying a tax of 100 per cent. on the profits of all capital, including land in that term. To tax all profits, instead of land values, and to propose public ownership of all trusts instead of trusts that operate public grants of power, is certainly evidence of a dazed state of mind. But this proposition is almost startling in its sanity when considered as the outcome of the preceding argument. What Mr. Boothman is evidently trying to do, is to improve upon Henry George and find a common ground for the single tax and his own conception of socialism, by proposing as a compromise the appropriation to public use of both the rent of land and the interest of capital. He therefore begins by leaving land, as a distinctive factor, out of the problem. This is something like the college student who wanted to solve the problem of the tides by leaving the moon out, but whose professor told him that while he might leave the moon out, God didn't. Mr. Boothman obliterates all distinction between land, the natural tool of industry, and capital, the artificial tool, by lumping them together as "capital"—as if natural things and artificial things were the same. Of course he then lumps their respective incomes, rent and interest, together as "profits," and in this convenient way makes it quite feasible, in a book, to turn both rent and interest into the public treasury without wronging producers. To do so he would have the state declare all real property transferable at any time at the cost of reproducing the improvements. Thus, as he argues, we should take all profits, leaving to the owner the value of his labor.

Mr. Boothman gives several interesting examples, but a ripened harvest is not one of them. Suppose a field sowed with grain in the Fall at a certain expenditure of labor. Without further labor it will be ripe for harvest the next summer. Now, if Mr. Boothman compels the farmer to sell that crop for its labor cost, the farmer gets only the value of a crop just planted, which is not what he worked for nor what he is justly entitled to; but if the buyer is compelled to pay the value of a ripened crop, then the farmer will get interest, for the ripened crop would be worth more than the labor of planting it. This is only one illustration of a whole vast class of cases of which Mr. Boothman makes no account, but which go to show that legitimate capital should be classified with labor rather than with land, and legitimate interest with wages rather than with rent.

Quite aside from the confusions in Mr. Boothman's argument, growing out of his attempt to submerge land in capital, and from the crudeness of his remedy for social injustice, are the practical difficulties which the remedy offers. It would be as easy to establish socialism in full perfection as this queer compromise of socialism and the single tax. If the public were convinced, with the socialists, that all business property is justly common property, Mr. Boothman's hybrid plan would cut no figure. Yet, until they were so convinced, they would not accept it. It would be even easier, very much easier, to establish the single tax in its perfection than to establish the Boothman plan, for that requires the conviction not that all business prop-

erty, but only the earth upon which we live, is common property, labor products being regarded by single taxers as inviolable private property, whether they yield interest or not. Let the public mind accept this doctrine and it would welcome the single tax while still condemning Mr. Boothman's hybrid reform.

"Faith Built on Reason" (Boston: James H. West Co. Price 50 cents), is the title of a little book by F. L. Abbot, which is based on the philosophical work of his father, Dr. Francis Ellingwood Abbot. It aims to outline the simple reasoning which leads to a rational, as distinguished from a traditional, belief in God—a belief grounded in human intelligence and resting upon the known facts of this world. Applying the scientific method to his subject, Mr. Abbot declares evolution to be a universal law and thereupon demonstrates that the evolutionary force is both intelligent and beneficent. He accounts for evil as an inevitable possibility of that freedom of choice with which it was necessary to endow man to avoid making him a mere puppet. Though the book is in the form of question and answer, it is singularly interesting, and doubtless more compact than it could have been made in any other form without detracting from its interest.

Without offering an example of how to live, J. William Lloyd gives an instance in "The Natural Man" (Newark, N. J.: Benedict Prieth) of how one man lived, intending thereby to suggest that everyone should fearlessly and gladly live his own life as this man and his friends lived theirs. Following his example, borrowed from Thoreau, they live in make-believe simplicity and perfect freedom, dressing as they please, doing as they please, working and playing as they please.

"The Origin of Anarchism" (Chicago: A. Isaak) is told by C. L. James in a brief pamphlet which would astonish people whose understanding of this philosophy is derived from ignorant politicians and coarse cartoons. The core of anarchism, as Mr. James describes it, is unrestricted competition, and so far from being foreign, is distinctly American in its origin.

A translation, by Ernest Untermyer, of Frederick Engel's monograph, "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State," has been brought out by Charles H. Kerr & Co., the socialist publishing house of Chicago. The price is 50 cents. It presents the materialistic view of social development, as represented by Karl Marx, and with especial reference to family relationships.

"God and Man in the Bible" (Orange, N. J.: The New Church Educational Association. Price one cent, postpaid), by the Rev. Charles H. Mann, is a contribution to religious thought which will be appreciated alike by the orthodox and the heterodox. It is an explanation of biblical inspiration upon rational principles.

PERIODICALS.

—The autumn number of The Single Tax Review (New York) makes a feature of single tax clergymen. The frontispiece contains the portraits of the Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, the Rev. Thomas E. Cox, the Rev. Dr. R. L. Burtzell, the Rev. Thomas

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.



A "BOSS" TRIUMPH.

"The State sometimes sees things as your Uncle Mark looks at 'em!"
BUT—"though truth loses battles it wins wars."

McLaughlin, the Rev. S. H. Spencer and Rabbi J. L. Stern. The issue contains articles from some of these men and from other clergymen, and James Love contributes one of his simple but cutting satires.

—The annual report of the St. Louis Public Library contains some interesting statements, especially in reference to the supplementary reading in the public schools, which, says the report, "has proved a cumulative and unqualified success wherever the teachers have taken an interest in it and realized its power of helpfulness in the regular school work." When we consider that a majority of children leave school before they reach the Seventh grade, it is evident what immense responsibility rests upon teachers of the lower grades in this matter of begetting in young children some taste for good reading. Those schools may indeed count themselves blessed in any community in which they can have the intelligent cooperation of the public library.—J. H. D.

—The Engineering News (New York) in its issue of October 16, speaking of the coal strike, says: "The most dangerous man in organized society is not the extremist, who is clamoring for government ownership of coal mines or railroads. It is the ultra-conservative who refuses to recognize the rapid changes that the years have brought and who fights every attempt to bring the great monopolies of the present day under wholesome restriction. It is men of this latter class who are doing most to bring about the state socialism which they so much decry." Such assertions as this are common enough nowadays, even in the most conservative journals; but none of them take pains to define what "wholesome restriction" means, or to say how they propose to go about it.—J. H. D.

—In a recent copy of the London Daily News Mr. C. F. G. Masterman has an important letter on Irish affairs. "Every hour," he says, "spent in Ireland deepens the conviction that the land system is the root of disturbance. No hope of economic security in Ireland is possible till the land question receives a final settlement. Everywhere I have visited, north, south and west, I have been confronted with the same facts." Mr. Masterman seems to advocate as the most feasible solution the "compulsory purchase at a fair valuation of the landlords' rights;" and yet he speaks of "the land once wrested from their fathers." He knows, as all know, that "once wrested" means once stolen, and that the landlords have been paid for this stolen property over and over in rent. It is indeed strange that one who sees as much as he does cannot see that the true solution

of the Irish question is the taxation of land values.—J. H. D.

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..... | \$2.00 |
| 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 PHILOSOPHY OF TOYS (10c.) One of the "Kingdom of Heaven" booklets, published to tell the plain truth about motherhood and childhood. **Straight Edge Press,** 1 Seventh Ave., New York. Ask about the "Play-Work School."

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 Subscription | .50 |
| Trial Subscription (4 weeks) | .10 |
| Single Copies | .05 |

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.,
90 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 1858 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012
NEW YORK.