

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 1, 1903.

Number 278.

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.

A double confusion of ideas produced an editorial statement in these columns last week which, although not misleading in substance, was grossly and inexcusably erroneous in detail.

We stated (p. 241) that the employes of the steel trust had been generously offered stock of that corporation, by its managers, at "the marvelously low rate of 80-odd cents to the dollar," and that now "the stock of the steel trust is down to 23 cents to the dollar." The error consisted in the assumption that it was the stock now selling at 23 which had been offered at 80-odd.

The facts about the matter are that the steel trust offered its preferred stock, not its common stock, to its employes (vol. v, p. 627); that it offered them this preferred stock at 82½ cents to the dollar; that this stock had fallen last week to 70 (p. 250) and is now quoted at 72½; and that the common stock which fell to 23 (p. 250) has never sold as high as 80.

What the trust generously offered at 82½ to its good employes, therefore, had fallen to 70 instead of 23—a fall of only 12 instead of 60. There is a vast difference here, in degree, and we wish to make the most complete correction possible; but even a fall of 12 from the price of a profit-sharing investment generously unloaded upon confiding employes, has certain elements of discouragement.

Having got a monopoly on glass

manufacture in Germany, through the German protective tariff, the Cologne glass trust has borrowed a trick from the American tariff barons. It breaks into foreign markets, where it has no protection, with cut-throat prices; and it evens up in the German market, where it is protected, with balloon prices. The Germans, being patriotic, probably rejoice at this opportunity to supply foreigners with German glass at enormously lower prices than they can buy it at themselves. If so they must import their patriotism from the United States where this kind is overproduced.

A great strike of textile workers is in progress in Philadelphia. Hosts of the strikers are ill-paid women and little children. They sent a small committee to Oyster Bay this week to confer with President Roosevelt. The committee made respectful application at the President's business office for an interview; but, according to the Chicago Inter Ocean, an administration paper, they were politely "turned down." To this in itself no criticism would be proper. It is not the President's duty to adjust strikes, even though in a spectacular instance he did once assume that function. But suppose this committee, instead of coming from the poor strikers, had come from their employers! Does anyone imagine that a committee of employers, representing "the great textile industries of Philadelphia," would have been "turned down" without an interview had such a committee sought one with the President? That supposition would, indeed, be something new under the sun, and its realization something newer. Yet "we must never forget, dear children and fellow citizens, that in this country there are no classes"!

Whoever would know the inspiration for the recent revival of Grover Clevelandism has only to consider the character of the principal newspapers of both parties that are struggling with a "heave-oh and altogether now" to push him again to the front in the Democratic party? Every one of them gets its inspiration and etceteras directly or indirectly from Wall street, where the reliable Mr. Cleveland has been deliberately chosen for plutocratic champion in place of the erratic Mr. Roosevelt.

Nor does that baleful influence find expression through the plutocratic press alone. On the 13th of October next Mr. Cleveland is to be wined and dined and exhibited through the Associated Press by the Chicago Commercial club, the membership of which comprises as delectable a collection of bi-partisan plutocrats as could be found within a thousand miles or so of a Wall street luncheon club. Some of them are sometimes Democrats in Democratic politics, while the rest are most of the time Republicans in Republican politics; but the whole privilege-bagging combine is all the time, one and inseparable, solid and indivisible, in plutocratic politics. It is officially announced, of course, that the function is to be non-partisan. But watch it! We miss a shrewd guess if the enthusiasm with which these bi-partisan thimble riggers receive Mr. Cleveland's sonorous platitudes is not ventriloquized by their confederates in the East into a vociferous Western demand for "four years more of Grover."

It is to be regretted that the Denver conference has recommended the organization of a new national party immediately. Nothing can be gained by this procedure, and much may be

lost. If it did no more, its tendency, so far as it may succeed in organizing the common people against the plutocracy must be to weaken the strength within the Democratic party, both in numbers and influence, of the democratic Democrats who are now in the thick of a fight for the maintenance of their supremacy in that organization.

But the success of this new national party is not likely to be great enough to do much damage of that kind. The greatest damage from such premature and artificial procedure would arise if the occasion for a political revolt should naturally occur. To illustrate let us suppose a case. Let us suppose that the Republican convention should besotransparently plutocratic next year as to make the democratic Republicans of the country ripe for revolt. Let us suppose, further, that plutocratic influence should succeed in swinging the Democratic party back into the control of the remorganizers, thus exciting the masses of democratic Democrats also to revolt. Then let us suppose that spontaneously and naturally out of this situation a third party should spring into existence. It is only under similar circumstances that successful third parties ever do appear. Those were the circumstances that gave birth to the Republican party in the national politics of the fifties, and to the Populist party in the Western and Southern politics of the nineties. Suppose, then, that these things should happen, what part would the paper organization prematurely projected at Denver play? It is not difficult to predict with an almost absolute certainty of verification.

The paper organization would welcome the revolters, saying, "Come along with us," "We are the original Jacobs," "We date back to the Omaha platform," etc., etc., "Don't set up for yourselves, but join us." But the revolters would not join them—not unless they happened to be very different from all the political revolt-

ers of the past under similar circumstances. They would not take the paper organization seriously, and instead of joining it they would rush into the formation of an entirely new party. This might be very inconsiderate on their part, but it is what they would do; and it would be the natural thing to do, if the wave of revolt were really produced by an upheaval of sentiment among the common people. Then what? Would the paper organization dissolve and go into the new and spontaneous movement? Most of the rank and file would, perhaps, and so would such of its leaders as were at once intelligent and disinterested. But the paper organization would be kept up, on plutocratic money, by grafters and their dupes; its remnant of managers and managees would raise a hue and cry for loyalty to the brave organization that had stood up for righteousness in the discouraging days of small things; and, mere skeleton though it would be, it would be utilized by the old parties as a club with which to demoralize and beat back their really dangerous enemy. This prophecy of future possibilities is based upon the evidence of past experience.

Under no circumstances can the Denver organization rise above the grade of a side party; and a real fight between democracy and plutocracy furnishes opportunity for the designing and more astute among the leaders of side parties to put them into the service of plutocracy as guerrillas to make confusion among the commons. It would have been the part of wisdom had the Denver conference adopted a different policy. It would have served its cause better by recommending a suspension of organized action, and fostering among those it represented that virtue of patience, in which reformers are extraordinarily deficient, but which is as necessary in political warfare as the virtue of perseverance with which they are abundantly supplied.

A decision in a case of constructive

contempt of court, made on the 22d of July by the Supreme Court of Missouri against a newspaper editor, brings once more to public attention the growing danger to free institutions of this instrument of autocratic power. The danger is not minimized by the fact that there are at least superficial indications that the arrogant action of the Missouri court in the case in question was inspired by corrupt railroad interests.

These contempt proceedings were based upon a newspaper editorial published in the Warrensburg (Mo.) Standard-Herald on the 19th of last June. It referred to a law suit brought by Reuben H. Oglesby against the Missouri Pacific railway for personal injuries, regarding which it made substantially the following statements of fact: That Oglesby had won a verdict against the railroad at the first trial; that the case was appealed to the Supreme Court, and able lawyers pronounced it the best damage suit against a corporation ever taken to that tribunal; that the Supreme Court sustained the judgment of the lower court by 6 judges out of the 7; that subsequently the railroad's motions for a rehearing were three times granted and the decision of the lower court three times reaffirmed; that meantime, at each election, the railroad company had been busy with nominating conventions, with a view to thrusting railroad lawyers upon the Supreme Court bench; that when it had thus succeeded in packing the court to its satisfaction, it obtained another rehearing of the Oglesby case, and this time secured a reversal of the judgment and an order for a new trial; that at the new trial Oglesby again won a verdict; that the case went again to the Supreme Court, to the bench of which an additional railroad attorney had meanwhile ascended; and that upon this appeal, the Supreme Court reversed the judgment and refused a new trial.

Commenting upon the case after this final disposition of it, the War-

Warrensburg Standard-Herald referred to the well-known corruption in high places in Missouri which District Attorney Folk of St. Louis has uncovered, and then discussed the action of the Supreme Court in the Oglesby case, saying (we omit repetition of the facts except where they are coupled with comment):

And now, as the cap sheaf of all this corruption in high places, the Supreme Court has, at the whip-crack of the Missouri Pacific railroad, sold its soul to the corporations and allowed Rube Oglesby to drag his wrecked frame through this life without even the pitiful remuneration of a few paltry dollars. . . . The legal department of this great corporation was not the only department which was busy in accomplishing the defeat of the Oglesby case. The political department was very, very busy. Each election has seen the hoisting of a railroad attorney to the Supreme bench, and when that body was to the satisfaction of the Missouri Pacific the onslaught to kill the Oglesby case began. A motion for a rehearing was granted, and at the hearing of the case it was reversed on an error in the record of the trial court, which sent it back for retrial. . . . Again the jury rendered judgment in favor of Oglesby for \$15,000 and again the case was appealed to the Supreme Court. An election was coming, and the railroad needed yet another man to beat the Oglesby case. The Democratic nominating convention was kind and furnished him in the person of Fox. The railroad, backed by four judges on the bench, allowed the case to come up for final hearing, and Monday the decision was handed down, reversed and not remanded for retrial. The victory of the railroad has been complete, and the corruption of the Supreme Court has been thorough. It has reversed and stultified itself in this case until no sane man can have any other opinion but that the judges who concurred in the opinion dismissing the Oglesby case have been bought in the interest of the railroad. What hope have the ordinary citizens of Missouri for justice and equitable laws in bodies where such open venality is practiced? And how long will they stand it? The corporations have long owned the legislature; now they own the Supreme Court, and the citizen who applies to either for justice against the corporation gets nothing. Rube Oglesby and his attorney, Mr. O. L. Houts, have made a strong fight for justice. They have not got it. The quivering limb that Rube left beneath the rotten freight car on Independence Hill, and his blood that stained the right of way of the soulless corporation, have been buried beneath the wise legal verbiage of a venal court, and the

wheels of the juggernaut will continue to grind out men's lives, and a crooked court will continue to refuse them and their relatives damages, until the time comes when the Missourians, irrespective of politics, rise up in their might and slay at the ballot box the corporation-bought lawmakers of the State.

That is strong language. But if the accusation of judicial venality is just, the language errs on the side of moderation. No collocation of words can make verbal denunciation of venal judges too strong. The article was either a deserved castigation of dangerous rascals, a necessary first step toward driving them in disgrace from the judicial bench, or else it was a criminal assault upon their character as men and their usefulness as public officials, an assault for which the author and publisher should be severely punished. There is no other alternative. One or the other of these conclusions is true; and it is to be regretted, if the true one is the latter, that the judges themselves have adopted a course which strongly tends to confirm the former.

Upon the assumption that it is the editor who ought to be punished, and not the judges who ought to be exposed, this editorial attack should have been made the subject of indictment and a criminal trial. Through that procedure the facts could have been investigated and the innocence of the judges established, while the criminal editor could have been adequately punished. Under these circumstances public opinion would have been held in suspense pending the inquiry, and at its conclusion public respect for the court would have been assured. But the incriminated judges appear to have shrunk from a hearing before an impartial tribunal. They preferred to pass upon the question of their own turpitude themselves. They have done so, and have decided it in their own favor. But public respect for them does not appear to have been thereby in any wise exalted.

Instead of instituting regular

judicial proceedings against J. M. Shepherd, the editor of the offending paper, the accused judges arbitrarily haled him before themselves upon proceedings for contempt, and, fining him \$500 and costs, committed him to jail until payment should be made. In imposing this fine, the judges explained that it was their duty to punish for contempt "any person who does anything to beat down the respect of the people for the court." Its effect in reviving popular respect for this tribunal may be inferred from the fact that the people of all parties in Mr. Shepherd's own community promptly met in mass meeting and raised the money necessary to pay his fine. Two hours after it had been imposed, they telegraphed him to draw for the amount needed. It is not likely that this mass meeting was inspired by any profound respect for the court. On the contrary it is probable, from all the circumstances, that the contempt for it that Mr. Shepherd's denunciatory editorial might have excited among them had been strengthened by its suspicious mode of dealing with his accusations.

There is such a thing, to be sure, as legitimate proceedings by courts for summarily punishing conduct calculated to influence or obstruct their functions. In such proceedings the court itself must of necessity protect itself, and out of this necessity we have the proceeding known as contempt of court. But that proceeding is for the protection of the tribunal from interference with the performance of its functions, and not for personal use. For judges to use it for the redress of their own personal grievances is to abuse it. Now in the case in question, the editor of the Warrensburg Standard-Herald had done nothing to interfere with the functions of the court. What he had done was to accuse its judges of corruption. In doing that he either rendered a valuable public service, or he grossly libeled the individual judges whose decision he denounced and whose illicit connection with the Mis-

souri Railroad company he alleged and proclaimed. So far from being an interference with the functions of the tribunal, this was an offense against them personally—if it was any offense at all; and when they instituted contempt proceedings, so as to enable them to sit in judgment against him in their own case, they were guilty of an unpardonable abuse of those proceedings.

But the full scope of the autocratic power those judges assumed is yet to be stated. Not only did they wrest the contempt remedy from its legitimate uses for the purpose of enabling themselves to redress their own individual grievances, but in doing so they defied an explicit law of the State. Their excuse for that is that the Supreme Court is established by the Constitution of the State, that the power to punish for contempt is inherent in judicial tribunals, and that therefore their power to punish for constructive contempt cannot be modified by the legislature. It would seem, if the people of Missouri can get out of the hands of their spoils politicians and the corporations, sufficiently to seat a representative legislature, that there ought to be good material in this contempt case for an impeachment investigation. Those Missouri judges appear to be open to the double charge of having (1) defied a constitutional law defining and regulating contempt proceedings, and (2) of having been publicly and plausibly accused of being judicial tools of the Missouri Pacific railway.

The kind of procedure resorted to by the Missouri court, as a shield from newspaper charges of corruption against its judges, is adopted by other officials for their protection in China. Several Chinese editors have been arrested at Shanghai for advocating reforms in government. Evidently the authorities there are as firmly determined to punish "any person who does anything to beat down the respect of the peo-

ple," not only for judges, but for other sacrosanct officials as well. The Chinese punishment is likely to be more severe and exemplary than that of the Missouri court, to be sure, and the proceeding is more comprehensive; but neither punishment nor proceeding is more arbitrary. In both respects the principle in Missouri and in China is identical.

An instance of judicial autocracy of another kind is reported from New York City. It seems that a judge there had sentenced a convicted burglar to four years' imprisonment. The prisoner thereupon made an impudent remark, in an undertone which the judge did not hear. But an officer heard it and reported it to the judge, who resented it by adding two years to the sentence, making it six years. Being now removed from the court, the prisoner attempted to break away and incidentally expressed more emphatically his low opinion of the judge. For that he was taken back into court, where the judge added three years more to his sentence for burglary, making it nine. As the New York Times well says:

Presumably the first sentence represented the judge's view of the gravity of the offense of which the prisoner had been convicted. By the successive outbreaks of temper of the prisoner that sentence was more than doubled. That is to say, he got four years for burglary and five years for impudence. Impudence is not a legal offense.

Of course burglars are entitled to no sympathy. Whether they are imprisoned four years or nine is not of the slightest consequence under a system in which the criminal law is revengeful rather than protective or even corrective. But we are making no plea for the burglar. Let his criminality and his impudence be atoned for in prison at the ratio of 4 to 5. But what is to be done about the growing criminality of judges? That is a serious question, and it concerns everybody.

Congressman Baker of Brooklyn has done a public service in openly rejecting the petty free pass bribe with

which the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad company is getting the new Congress into a good humor. On the point of whether this was intended as a bribe or not, it is to be observed that it came from the law department of the railroad company. Why from the law department? What has the law department to do with legitimate transportation? Where is the passenger department? Is there any conceivable reason for acting through the law department in handing out passenger passes to Congressmen, other than that it is the law department which asks favors of Congressmen and therefore it is the law department that should give favors in return—or in advance.

According to this lawyer of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Co., passes are dealt out to members of Congress by a regular system. Are votes given as systematically in return? If not, how does the railroad recoup itself? Furthermore, if the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad company systematically supplies free transportation to all members of Congress who accept the wretched bribe, is it not a fair inference that other railroads do the same, and that in return Congressmen are as generous to them with their votes as they may reasonably be presumed to be toward the Baltimore and Ohio? Again, if Congressmen are supplied with passes in this wholesale way, what about members of the legislatures of States within the companies' territory, of city councils where terminal favors are important, of taxing boards where valuations are to be made, of party conventions where candidates are to be nominated, and of the judiciary which decides controversies? Is it even necessary to guess? Wherever the cover has been lifted, as Mayor Johnson has lifted it in Ohio, and Congressman Baker has lifted it in the congressional territory of the Baltimore and Ohio company, this system of petty bribery prevails to an alarming extent.

Mr Baker has done right in ex-

posing the Baltimore and Ohio company. He should follow it up on the floor of the House by exposing his fellow Congressmen who accept the railroad bribes. Progress in the fight against special privileges is impeded from all directions by this species of bribery alone. The time has come when the exposure should be merciless. No one should be allowed to escape. The weak excuse that inasmuch as the railroads give out passes anyhow, there is no harm in taking one, should receive no consideration. It should be understood and constantly emphasized that pass bribery is corrupt, even if it is petty and mean, and that railroad officials who give passes or public officials who take passes are contaminated with corruption. When a legislator votes, or a tax official assesses, or a delegate acts in a party convention, or a judge decides, the people have a right to know that he is wholly free from railroad influences and railroad obligations. They do not know it now. On the contrary, from presidents to judges, from congressmen to convention delegates, a public suspicion is naturally aroused as to the impartiality of all official action favorable to railroads by officials who take railroad favors.

If President Roosevelt is still bent upon "shackling cunning," when it accomplishes its nefarious objects by forming trusts, he will find that the constitutional objection to his plans which he feared, have been recently removed. This has been done by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Champion against Ames. The case is reported in full by the Lawyers' Cooperative Publishing Co., of Rochester, N. Y.

Champion had been charged with sending lottery tickets by express from one State to another, contrary to an act of Congress forbidding inter-State commerce in lottery tickets. He brought the question of the constitutionality of that act before the Supreme Court, and in February,

1903, that supreme tribunal decided (5 to 4) that the act is constitutional. The principle of the decision, as stated by Mr. Justice Harlan, is so broad (and that was necessary, if the constitutionality of the act was to be sustained) as to recognize in Congress full power to prohibit inter-State commerce in any kind of merchandise which is not expressly protected by the Constitution. The clause for securing freedom of the press would probably nullify any act of Congress aiming to prohibit inter-State commerce in newspapers, pamphlets, books, and the like. But there is no clause to prevent prohibition or other regulation of inter-State commerce in steel or coal.

Justice Harlan's language on this point, in writing the prevailing opinion, is quite explicit, "The power of Congress to regulate commerce among the States," he says, "although plenary, cannot be deemed to be arbitrary, since it is subject to such limitations or restrictions as are prescribed by the Constitution." He then proceeds to argue that, therefore this power—

may not be exercised so as to infringe rights secured or protected by that instrument. It would not be difficult to imagine legislation that would be justly liable to such an objection as that stated, and be hostile to the objects for the accomplishment of which Congress was invested with the general power to regulate commerce among the several States. . . . But if what Congress does is within the limits of its power, and is simply unwise or injurious, the remedy is in the discretion of Congress.

Thus the way is broadly opened for prohibiting by mere act of Congress any transmission from one State to another of any merchandise whatever, the commerce in which is not protected from hostile legislation by affirmative provisions of the Constitution. Not only may inter-State commerce in lottery tickets, fraudulent merchandise, and intoxicating beverages, be prohibited by Congress, but so may such commerce in the products of trusts. The question, therefore, of trust suppression by the

national government, is now "up to" the legislative branch, of which President Roosevelt is adviser, and a "trust-shackling" message is in order.

STRENUOUS CIVILIZATION.

That splendid organ of militant Christianity, the Outlook, of New York, had the other week a convincing argument in defense of the armies and navies of civilization and the uses to which they have in recent years been put. These armaments, says the Outlook, are the house wreckers of civilization, its simile being suggested by a sign advertising the firm engaged in tearing down a building opposite the editorial sanctum. They tear down the old and useless and unsanitary structures of the world, clear the ground of rubbish, and make an open field for the house builders who follow them. The regrettable incidents that accompany their work are but the dust and dirt and temporary inconvenience caused by the process of demolition. These are not to be weighed against the advantages of the new and ornamental structures that will soon rise on the sites of what perhaps were eyesores or rookeries.

Such, in substance, is the argument, which is bolstered by the examples of France in Madagascar, England in the Transvaal, and America in Porto Rico and the Philippines, where, the wrecking process having been nearly or quite accomplished, the Outlook sees foundations laid for noble monuments to civilization and religion.

What a pity that all weak-brained sentimentalists and idealists and doctrinaires cannot read the Outlook and profit by its wisdom? Could they thus be cured of their mental obliquity they would cease to mouth their futile shibboleths of inherent rights and political freedom. For why should not a native government be destroyed to open the way for business enterprise and religious propaganda? Why scruple to decimate one generation to benefit the next? From evil will come forth good. On this field of carnage will rise a

church; on that road where prisoners of war were shot and tortured will run a trolley line; in yonder wood where boys of ten were hunted down will spring up a schoolhouse; and on the site of many a ruined village tenement houses with accommodation for a score of families each, and factories where the children can be employed, will supplant the primitive cabins that the hand of war in blessing smote.

There is, however, one thing lacking to the Outlook's thesis. It should follow up its brilliant analogy between the tearing down of a building and the conquest of a nation by insisting that military methods be applied to the reconstruction of our cities. At present this process of rebuilding is a very slow and expensive one. Before a structure can be destroyed its owner must consent and be compensated for his property. This absurd provision of our laws simply paralyzes all well-considered and far-reaching improvement. How easily it could be altered!

Let there be organized in every city an army of house wreckers of whom the mayor shall be commander-in-chief. Let war be declared on all mean and shabby buildings, and let all owners and occupiers of such buildings be called upon in the name of civilization and Christianity to surrender and turn their domiciles over to the army for destruction. There would be resistance at first, but well drilled regiments and Gatling guns would make short work of it. Those who defended their dwellings would be shot down or dynamited up. Their personal possessions would be seized to help defray the cost of the army. Prisoners would be compelled to aid in the work of demolition. Women and children, if they escaped the bombardment, would be sent to the charitable institutions of the city.

Following this destructive army, just as in the case of national conquest, would come another one—an army of construction. Captains of industry, to whom the confiscated sites would be apportioned freely, would rear fine structures on every street, and from every quarter of the town the capable and energetic would

pour in to occupy them. In a few months' time whole slums could be wiped out, old fashioned architecture everywhere be forced to give place to new, and a city such as artists and poets have dreamed of rise on the ruins of a backward and chaotic town.

What an opening for deeds of municipal heroism! Imagine, for instance, a company of rough-riding house wreckers charging up the stoop of a resisting dwelling, at their head a future mayor, waving a strenuous arm above his head as he shouts, "Give them hell, boys!" or adding to the glorious carnage by planting "bullets with unerring aim in the backs of fleeing inmates. And think of the triumphant consummation when, the battle a thing of the past and a marble structure lifting a proud front where weather-beaten boards had affronted the eye, bishops and religious editors dedicate the building to civilization and unveil tablets to those of the assaulting army who fell that it might rise.

To be sure, effeminate and impracticable souls might grieve over those who had fallen in defense of their roof-trees and their household gods or become homeless wanderers in the city's outskirts. But a businesslike and unsentimental administration would entertain no such weakling's sorrow. The dead insurgents could bury their dead; and as to the living vagrants, those who would surrender unconditionally could receive employment as servants in the new buildings. The others—wilful ladrones—would be treated with the severity that would be their due. W.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, July 30.

The political reform conference called by J. A. Edgerton, secretary of the national committee of the Peoples party (p. 232), met at Denver on the 27th and remained in session two days. Mr. Edgerton was made permanent chairman, and W. N. Allen of Nebraska, a former United States senator from that state, is reported to have delivered the key note speech. The first important business done was the selection of a committee to

undertake the work of organizing into a new party the various reform elements of the country. This committee was composed of Senator Allen, J. S. Felter, J. M. Mallett, Dr. R. H. Reemelin, A. Poynter, and Frank W. Owens. It recommended an address which, as reported by the Associated Press, is as follows:

The manifest unrest which everywhere appears in the nation demonstrates the dissatisfaction of the American people with the present management of government, and argues the necessity of the reform forces coming together in united action at the ballot box to obtain proper legislation whereby the right of the people to self-government may be had for themselves and their posterity. Therefore we, the Populists of the United States, having this day at the city of Denver united forces with the distinct understanding that all past differences as to policy shall be and now are permanently settled, and experience having demonstrated the futility of any attempt to secure the enactment of our truth either through the Republican or the Democratic party, we believe the time is now at hand when the United People's party should declare itself emphatically opposed to any affiliation with either of these parties and unqualifiedly in favor of national political action. Our fundamental principles are known to all Populists, and are nowhere better stated than in that immortal document enunciated at Omaha, July 4, 1892. However, for the benefit of the uninformed, we declare our unyielding adherence to the demand for (a) a money, whether stamped on gold, silver or paper, to be coined and issued exclusively by the government and made a full legal tender for all debts, both public and private; (b) a system of transportation and the transmission of intelligence owned by the public and operated by the government at the cost of service; (c) land for use rather than for speculation, and abolition of alien ownership of land; (d) American ships for American foreign commerce, without a cent of subsidy. And as an open door for all economic reforms we urge the rule of the people through the optional referendum and initiative and the recall of derelict officials. Confident in the justice of the principles here set forth, firmly confident that their triumph in government would be for the best interests of the people, we call upon the patriotic citizens of this country to join with us in bringing about their enactment into law. With these principles firmly established, equal justice would prevail, special privileges would be eliminated, and ours would be, as patriots everywhere desire, a government of the people, for the people, by the people.

This address was adopted by the conference, and approved by the party

committees of both factions of the People's party (p. 232) in session at the same time and place.

Another political event of importance is the public exposure, by Congressman Robert Baker, of Brooklyn, N. Y., of the methods of the officials of one of the great railroads in bribing Congressmen with railway passes. The annual pass which was proffered Mr. Baker he refused to receive. The correspondence appeared in some of the newspapers this week; it was suppressed by others.

Following is the text of the letter to Congressman Baker from the railroad company's lawyer:

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company. George E. Hamilton, Division Counsel, Century Building, Washington, D. C., July 21, 1903.—Hon. Robert H. Baker, Brooklyn, N. Y.—Dear Sir: Heretofore, under the regulations of the company, annual passes have not been issued to members-elect until the Congress to which they were elected had convened. I am glad to inform you that this regulation has been modified, and from now on annuals will be sent to members residing in company's territory the first day of July following their election. I am accordingly pleased to forward to you under this cover a card of travel good for 1903. Yours very truly, George E. Hamilton, Division Counsel.

To that communication Congressmen Baker made the following reply, returning the pass:

544 Carlton Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., July 28, 1903.—George E. Hamilton, Esq., Division Counsel Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Century Building, Washington, D. C.—Dear Sir: On my return to the city I find yours of the 21st inst. inclosing an annual pass and announcing officially the policy of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company in supplying passes to members of Congress. In returning the pass sent me I desire to say that I am unable to understand on what grounds a pass is tendered, if it be not with the expectation that its use will influence me so to act in my official capacity as to conserve what your company regards as its "rights," regardless of the rights of the people, or even to aid in securing for the company further privileges. There is, I am aware, another possible construction to be put upon this tender of a pass, and that is that if a pass be not given, then, in my official acts in matters affecting the B. and O. R. R. Co. the company assumes that I will be guided, not by a determination to deal justly both with the American people and your company, but will act to harass and annoy, if not

to cause it pecuniary loss. I am no more disposed to accept this as an excuse for the company's action than to believe that it assumed that the pass would induce me to look with a lenient eye on legislation designed to confer extensions of its existing privileges. Either view would constitute a reflection on the integrity of my actions, which I reject. As the language of your letter unmistakably implies not only that the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company has presented passes to members of previous Congresses "residing in company's territory," but that the pass sent me is simply one of many tendered to members of the Fifty-eighth Congress, and as the language used precludes the possibility of your action being regarded as being personal to myself alone, I regard it as a duty to give the widest publicity to the matter, and shall therefore send a copy of this and of your letter to the press, feeling that my constituents are entitled to know that a great railroad corporation has in effect openly—certainly without concealment or evasion—done that which if not resented would lay my actions in all matters affecting railroad legislation open to the suspicion of having been corruptly influenced. In view of your language, "under the regulations of the company * * * this regulation has been modified, and from now on annuals will be sent," etc., I conclude that a number of its high officials, presumably its board of directors, have directed that these passes be sent to members of Congress. As it must be assumed that these officials are acting for what they regard as the interests of the stockholders, and as, so far as I am aware, no report of the company has ever disclosed the approximate cost to the company in thus furnishing free transportation to members of Congress, both the stockholders and the public generally—who in the last analysis pay for these free rides in higher rates—are entitled to know that so great a temptation is being put before the people's representatives. It is frequently asserted that railroad and other "special privilege" corporations are forced to comply with demands from legislators for these and other pecuniary favors, and that were it not for such blackmail—as the companies term it—the companies would not bribe officials. In view of this official action of your company in tendering through you these passes without solicitation and apparently—judging from your language—on a wholesale scale, else why are "regulations" "modified," those who have heretofore regarded your company as possibly a victim will probably now reverse their opinion and regard it as an instigator of official misconduct. Yours respectfully, Robert Baker.

Another outbreak of anti-Negro lawlessness has occurred in Illinois, this time at Danville, the county town of Vermilion county, about 125 miles south of Chicago. As reported, the

outbreak resulted from the attempt of about 600 white men on the 25th to organize a mob to lynch a Negro named James Wilson, who is confined in the county jail upon a charge of assault upon the wife of a white farmer. The news of the proposed lynching leaked out, and a crowd of Negroes gathered to prevent it. One of the latter crowd was J. D. Mayfield, a Negro from Evansville, Ind., where a Negro lynching had recently been attempted and mob assaults upon Negro residents made. Mayfield was among the Negroes who denounced the purpose of the Danville mob; and upon being attacked by some of them he drew a pistol and fired. His bullet killed Henry Gatterman, a young butcher. The white mob thereupon rushed upon Mayfield, severely beating three other Negroes who tried to protect him; but the police appeared and arresting Mayfield took him to the station. The mob followed, and meeting no resistance, the mayor having advised the police not to shoot, secured Mayfield and killed him, after which they mutilated and burned his body. Then the mob attacked the county jail, intending to lynch the Negro prisoner there. In this they were frustrated by the sheriff, who pleaded with them, then threatened them, then had shots fired over their heads, and finally had them fired into; wounding 22 persons. After midnight of the 25th the mob thinned out, and on the 26th the town was patrolled by the militia, a detachment of which is still there. Steps are being taken by the authorities to prosecute the rioters. Several have been arrested and a special session of the grand jury has been called.

Excitement in Wall street has somewhat subsided since last week's report (p. 250), although it rose to a high pitch in the meantime. On the 23d the price of copper trust stock fell nearly 6 points, from 45½ to 40, carrying the general market down with it; and on the 24th two large brokerage firms failed. One of these bankrupted firms was Talbot J. Taylor & Co., with which the name of James R. Keene, the notorious market manipulator, is connected. The other was W. L. Stow & Co. The street was alive on the 25th, Saturday, with disquieting rumors of further failures likely to be announced on the following Monday, the 27th. When Monday came the failure of E. S. Hooley & Co was reported, but

no others of importance, and signs of improvement were noted. Although the excitement has subsided, the market is still weak. In the patter of the street, "the tone is more conservative."

NEWS NOTES.

—The Furniture Association of America began its first annual session at New York on the 23d.

—The national convention of food and dairy commissioners was in session at St. Paul on the 23d.

—The body of Pope Leo XIII. (p. 251) was deposited on the 25th in a temporary tomb in St. Peter's.

—Frederick W. Hollis, the American diplomat, died suddenly at his home in Yonkers, N. Y., on the 23d, of heart failure, at the age of 46.

—The Irish land purchase bill (p. 251) passed the first reading in the British House of Lords on the 23d, and the second reading was set for August 3d.

—King Edward and the Queen (p. 251) left Dublin on the 25th, and, after a visit to the Marquis of Londonderry, arrived in Belfast on the 27th, and were received in Londonderry on the 28th.

—Detailed reports from Caracas are to the effect that at the battle at Bolivar (p. 250) Gen. Nicolas Rolando, the last representative leader of the revolution, was captured, and that the revolution has at last come to an end.

—James H. Todd and Anderson A. Hardy were sentenced to fines of \$1,000 each by the Federal Court at Montgomery, Ala., on the 27th, upon their plea of guilty to an indictment for peonage (p. 251).

—The Hawaiian home rule convention, in session at Honolulu on the 28th, voted down as premature a proposition to memorialize Congress for Hawaiian independence, but adopted a platform denouncing the present government of the islands as oligarchical.

—An explosion on the 29th destroyed the magazine of the United States Cartridge company, located in Tewksbury, Mass., killed probably 25 persons and injured more than 50 others, set fire to a number of buildings in the neighborhood, and caused a general wreck of houses within a radius of half a mile.

PRESS OPINIONS.

NEWSPAPER CONTEMPT OF COURT.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), July 26.—The precedent set by the Missouri court will have little deterrent effect on newspapers that are faithful to their public duty. The courts are not above criticism. It is for the best interests of the nation that the people cherish for the bench a wholesome respect; but the people are supreme in this representative government, and when the courts flagrantly violate their duties and let the ermine shelter corruption, it is fitting and proper that the press

acquaint the people with the facts, that they may divest the judges of the power vested in them. The American press is not cognizant of the source of this compelling majesty of judges; the sanctity which cannot be violated by censure of the people whose servants they are, has no place outside of mausoleums. It is not reasonable to conclude that the bench can be corrupt and that the press or individuals cannot even hint at the condition. If it is right for newspapers to expose corruptionists in official life, why is it not right for the newspapers to expose corruption on the bench? Because it is the bench? "On what meat does this our Caesar feed, that he has grown so great?"

TOM L. JOHNSON.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), July 27.—Tom Johnson frankly takes his constituents into his confidence. He tells them precisely what he wants, and just exactly how he means to get it. And the people have come to understand him, even if the politicians have not—which explains why he wins Democratic victories in a historic Republican stronghold.

Toronto (Ont.) Daily Star (Lib.), July 22.—A reputed millionaire, he is opposed to the plutocracy. He champions the plain people, believes in free trade, single tax and public ownership. He is Mayor of Cleveland, the Democratic leader in Ohio, and is widely talked of as the possible Presidential candidate of his party next year. The best thing about Tom Johnson is the way he keeps at it. Although he is talked of for the Presidency, and must see that his chance of securing the nomination is a fairly good one, he does not deviate in the least from his principles in a search for support. . . . It may be well to watch a man who knows what his views are and proposes to stand by them.

McConnellsville (O.) Democrat (Dem.).—The Republican Ohio State Journal is very much exercised over the prospect that Tom L. Johnson will be the Democratic candidate for governor, and that he will have the support of W. J. Bryan and the friends of Bryan in the Democratic party of Ohio. The Journal says that such a combination means a fight against Mark Hanna's party, such as has not been put up in recent years. The Journal is right. . . . If Tom Johnson has the friendship of Mr. Bryan, and we know he has, it makes him a hundredfold stronger. . . . If the contest narrows to Tom Johnson, who is a friend to Mr. Bryan, and another man equally good, who wishes to discredit Mr. Bryan, the Democrat will not have to think long to know whom it will support. In such a contingency it will support Tom Johnson. Mr. Bryan is not a candidate for anything in Ohio or elsewhere, but those Democrats in Ohio who want to turn the face of the party in some other direction for leadership, can't win in Ohio this year.

THE DENVER REFORM CONFERENCE.

The Kansas Populist (Peo.), July 24.—The call is premature. It is an attempt to force movements that cannot be forced. Should the reactionary element capture the Democratic convention in 1904, there is a very large body of Democrats who will unite with the Populists in organizing a new party; but they are not going to step out now and assume that the very thing will occur that they propose to make the fight of their lives to prevent. There is wisdom in waiting now, but folly in such precipitate action as is proposed by those who have called this conference.

BRYAN'S OFFENSE.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.) July 27.—If there is one thing for which the personality of William J. Bryan, as a citizen and a candidate, has stood for, far beyond and above the talk of free silver or other monetary solutions, it is for elevated pur-

poses in political efforts. It is for his steadfastness in this that he is hated and reviled by the corporationists in all parties, and especially by the small bore, cheap, graft-loving leaders of the chameleon variety in his own party.

POSTAL CENSORSHIP.

St. Paul Herald, July 25.—Though every act of such censorship, though every "fraud order" yet issued were of such a character as a properly constituted and impartial tribunal would hold to be just—yet the possibilities of its arbitrary exercise and abuse, as at present allowed, are so vast and so likely to materialize that it ought to be forthwith abolished. Immediate and permanent divorce between carrying the mails and practicing police powers should be at once decreed and carried into effect.

MISCELLANY

"ISRAEL."

Hear, O Israel, Jehovah the Lord our God is One,
But we, Jehovah, His people, are dual and so undone.

Slaves in eternal Egypts, baking their strawless bricks,
At ease in successive Zions, prating their politics;

Rotting in sunlit Roumania, pigging in Russian Park,
Driving in Pale, Bols and Prater, clinging to Fashion's tail;

Reeling before every rowdy, sore with a hundred stings,
Clothed in fine linen and purple, loved at the courts of kings;

Faithful friends to our foemen, slaves to a scornful clique,
The only Christians in Europe turning the other cheek;

Priests of the household altar, blessing the bread and wine,
Lords of the hells of Gomorrah, licensed keepers of swine;

Coughing o'er clattering treadles, saintly and underpaid,
Ousting the rough from Whitechapel—by learning the hooligan's trade;

Pious, fanatical zealots, throttled by Talmud coil,
Implous lechers and sceptics, cynical stalkers of spoil;

Weeded 'neath Hebrew awning, buried 'neath Hebrew sod,
Between not a dream of duty, never a glimpse of God;

Risking our lives for our countries, loving our nations' flags,
Hounded therefrom in repayment, hugging our bloody rags;

Blarneying, shivering, crawling, taking all colors and none,
Lying a fox in the covert, leaping an ape in the sun.

Tantalus-Proteus of Peoples, security comes from within!
Where is the lion of Judah? wearing an ass's skin!

Hear, O Israel, Jehovah the Lord our God is One,
But we, Jehovah His People, are dual and so undone.

—Zangwill.

WORLD-WIDE FAME.

From The New Age of London.

A correspondent has sent us an interesting object, testifying to the world-wide fame of the colonial secretary. Printed in gold letters on thin paper are the following words: "Joe Chamberlain—Los Valles Oranges. A.I." These words, arranged in a border, diamond-shaped, inclose a portrait of Mr. Chamberlain, recognizable by the inevitable eye-glass. What a tribute to the renown of the great man! But, alas! the oranges sent in these wrappers are "blood" oranges!

THE HILLS.

The other day, Mr. James J. Hill, the father, stated that if merging railways was a crime, he chose to be a criminal, or words to that effect.

And now comes Mr. Louis W. Hill, the son:

The Northern Securities company will not be dissolved, even if the United States supreme court upholds every contention made in the cases that have been brought against the company.

Of course the Hills are not anarchists; they are worth twenty or thirty millions of dollars, besides being thoroughly in favor of the single gold standard.—Life.

A REMEDY FOR WRONGS AGAINST WOMANHOOD.

For The Public.

The United Kingdom and the United States are alike sinners against human justice, in that they agree in teaching (the United Kingdom by the Reform Act of 1832, and the United States by the very Constitution itself)—that women are of an inferior variety of humanity to man, not worthy of the possession of political rights, and incompetent to exercise them. What wonder if, in both countries, that lower type of manhood, whose chief schoolmaster is the law, should have learned from these teachings contempt for, and disdain of womanhood. To a "mere woman" the outrages upon women and defenseless children, of which we hear so much, seem but the natural result of our unjust laws and social customs, and whether the wrongdoer be white or black is here immaterial.

Would not the best remedy be found in the simple acceptance of human justice, the full recognition of woman's human, and therefore her political equality with man, and the immediate establishment of her political enfranchisement? This remedy would certainly be speedier and more efficacious than the recourse to "lynching" cruel-

ties in the United States, and than the application of the "cat", so often clamored for in the United Kingdom, measures which morally degrade those who inflict them, or permit their infliction, whilst the path of justice would lead ever "upward and onward."

ELIZABETH C. WOLSTENHOLME
ELMY.

Congleton, England, July 14, 1903.

A NOTE OF WARNING.

When the bankers sound notes of warning of the near approach of financial trouble and the instability of a large number of banks from land investment and speculation, it is time for the balance of us to look after our own money and to be sure it is in safe hands. The warning has been given from many quarters during the past year, but never more clearly than by Judge John W. Lusk, President of the German American Bank of St. Paul, in an address at the late meeting of the Bankers' Association of Minnesota. He said:

There never was a better time for bankers to look a little out than now. We can see, as others cannot, the ear-marks and signs of financial trouble. When I was in Chicago a short time ago I learned that the country bank balances at that point had decreased \$10,000,000. All the city banks make similar reports of their country correspondents. The banks of Iowa, for example, are treading on dangerous ground. The majority of the country banks in this state are tied up for money, and their balances are fewer than for a long time. Many bankers, carried away by the idea of prosperity, have invested and speculated until they wish they had not done so. Hardly a day passes in this city but we learn of some country bank in trouble. Several have closed their doors in the last three or four months, and others are waking up to the danger of being compelled to close.

These utterances of Judge Lusk were indorsed and the warning repeated by J. W. Wheeler, President of the Bankers' Association.

The financial news of the country is filtered out to the people by the Associated Press, which is dominated and managed by Wall street and Republican influences, and hardly a word has appeared in the newspapers of the withdrawal of deposits, the failure of banks and the general trend toward panicky times that the St. Paul banker tells about Wall street and its business associates; the Republican leaders are prating of prosperity for the double purpose of forcing on the public the undigested and watered stocks and to continue in power the rotten political party that aids and abets the trusts and corporations in robbing the people. Yet they know that a financial cataclysm is imminent. When the crash comes, as it soon will, many depositors will remem-

ber the warning of Banker Lusk, delivered to his brother bankers and not intended for the public ear, and will regret that they did not take advantage of it.—Syndicate Letter.

UNCLE SAM'S LETTER TO JOHN BULL.

Printed from the original manuscript.

Dear John: Been a readin' what my boy, Justice Brewer, says about injunctions. He is unmoved by the clamor about government by injunction—says it's a good thing. "The restrainin' power of a court of equity," says Brewer, "is of far greater importance than the punishing power of a court of criminal law." Sakes alive! Where is the oath he took to support the constitution and the laws? Where's my trial by jury? Where is the law fer puttin' the notion of one judge above a jury of 12 men? It's almighty strange how my Federal judges always get on the King John side of Magna Charta. I believe when I get a good Whig or Democratic administration and Congress in, some day, I'll round up the whole bunch of Federal judges and make 'em sign Magna Charta. Right under "John Rex" I'll have 'em sign, "Brewer, would-be little Rex," and so on to the end of the list. Don't know that it 'ud do any good, as it's in the law, now, that they swore to support. Anyway, that's what Judge Cooley used to say—that Magna Charta was, in some form or 'nother, reenacted into the Federal and every one of the State constitutions—almost. Don't think he was sure about Louisiana, fer she got some notions from the Code Napoleon.

It's the same old question the folks had with King John. The barons got tired of being snaked off to jail on the order of a judge without any jury trial, and they called the old boy down. They says, the barons did: "See here, partner, you must set your mark to some new rules—trial by jury and a few other little things!" "Won't do it," says John. "Then," sez the barons, "you get no more money to go off and play Sunday golf, see?" And King John saw, and signed. But it didn't do him much good for awhile. You used to have to make him sign over again every week or two. It keeps it kind of fresh in a king's memory to tell him of it. It's good for a king—any kind of a king—to rub this into him frequent: "Twelve men are bigger than you."

Oh, little judge of the law,

Many fine things you can do—

Bottles and birdlets; but pshaw!

Twelve men are bigger than you!

I've got one of them new poetry machines. Runs like a coffee-grinder. You chuck in your subject, and it grinds

out a close guess on most anything you please—vaudeville, song and dance, "Trovatore," old-time ballad or constitutional law. I put in: "Brewer on Government by Injunction," and this chip flew out:

SONG OF THE JUDGES.

We're believers in the fiat of Injunction,
In corporations, money and the pelf;
Put the dollar o'er the man without com-
punction,
And lay the man himself upon the shelf—
But there's that blamed old charter of King
John says we mustn't.

But suppose luck ran against the Lord's
anointed,
And Democrats and riff-raff should get
in,
Impeach the rank and file of the appointed,
And rob us of our yearly tale of tin—
There's that blamed old charter of King
John 'ud back 'em up in it.

Somethin' the matter with the ma-
chine, I guess—kind o' drags on the
last line. But honest, I'm goin' to con-
sult you further on this injunction busi-
ness. It's a-worryin' me. I wish I
could appoint a man a good lawyer
as easy as I can appoint him a
justice of the Supreme Court of the
United States. Look at the beauty
show I've got there now! Smooth as
eggs, but no earthly good. If they were
chair-makers the chairs they'd turn out
would stand on two legs and tip.
They've got the intellectual rickets.
See what they did with my Constitution
—good straight Constitution, too, backed
by Magna Charta and the old English
common law—said it didn't apply to
Manila! What's the result? Why
now all my foreign territory is a world
of chance, with Taft floatin' around
and tryin' to keep on top and save the wreck-
age. I'm goin' to give the whole Philip-
pine territory back to the Filipinos some
day, and stop the disgrace, expense and
bother. That's what I'm thinkin' of.

UNCLE SAM.

WHO IS A CHRISTIAN?

Extract from a sermon preached in St. James Episcopal church, Greenville, Miss., July 5, 1903, by the Rev. Quincy Ewing.

"To this end I was born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice."

It is easy enough, and always has been, to discover whether or not a man has "confessed Christ;" but thousands have "confessed Christ," and remained at heart followers of some other master, between whom and Christ there was fixed an immense gulf. Paganism, heathenism, barbarism, brutelism, do not become Christian because they spell the name of their Messiah or their God with the letters that spell Christ; names may indicate realities, but realities are painfully often belied

by names. From the beginning until now, there have been thousands of varnished, unregenerated pagans, heathen, barbarians, who have been known as professing Christians—some of them prominent laymen; some, priests; some, bishops; some, archbishops; some, popes;—varnished, unregenerated pagans, heathen, barbarians, who would have to be severely excluded in making up the roll of citizenry of the Kingdom of Christ to save it from confusion with the kingdom of the Devil!

But the difficulty of determining who are Christians, and who are not, is not due to any lack of simplicity or definiteness on the part of the religion of Jesus Christ. There was never anything more simple or definite than that religion, however jumbled and distorted, however padded or starved, the essential elements of it may appear in this wise man's theology, or that infallible church's creed. The test of Christian discipleship is simple enough; the difficulty is in applying it in the face of ancient prejudices and superstitions. But that difficulty is greatly minimized when, fully accepting the test, we resolve honestly and fearlessly that it ought to be applied.

If we are able to feel that Christianity has to do primarily with realities rather than with names or forms—realities of the heart, mind, soul—then in applying the test of Christian discipleship, we should be bold enough to ask concerning any man, not, Is he a church member? not, Has he "confessed" Christ? but, rather, Does he in the most real thought and purpose of his life reverence those truths that Jesus held supreme? Does he in his inmost heart accept it as the eternal aim and destiny of his being to obey the will of the Father-God, to serve the brother-man?

These are the test questions; and he of whom they are affirmatively answered must be included in the spiritual Kingdom of Jesus Christ, no matter what he is called, no matter what he calls himself. He may be dwelling in a land where churches are many, and the name of Christ a familiar sound; and he may not be called by his fellowmen, or call himself, either a churchman or a Christian. He may be dwelling in some land where no church has ever yet been built, and the name Christ has never yet been heard; but, wherever he may be, and whatever he call himself, or be called by others, the man who strives to worship by obedience the unseen God who made him, to help and uplift the hu-

man brother who needs him—such a man has heard the redemptive Voice, and cannot be rightfully excluded from the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ, without ignoring the very vital heart of His religion, without dispiritualizing it, without making it form first and substance afterwards!

The spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ may exist without any visible church or formal creed, however valuable church and creed may be in witnessing to its truth and power; but the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ does not anywhere exist, and cannot, save as human souls claim for their own the spiritual attitude of the Christ Himself toward the invisible Father in Heaven, and the struggling brother on earth.

GOD AND LIBERTY.

In Cincinnati, July 19, Herbert S. Bigelow spoke on the above subject, at the Vine Street Congregational Church.

It is told of Voltaire that when an old man a friend brought to him his son for a blessing. Voltaire put his hands on the lad's head and said: "My son, God and Liberty — remember these words."

Are they not indeed the greatest words in the vocabulary of man? God and Liberty. The dark hours in the history of the race have been the times when these words were forgotten.

These words mean nothing apart from each other. They are but different sides of the one mighty thought.

I have heard men argue that there is no God. I have attended some of these "anti-God" meetings, and have read the literature of unbelief. They think they are fighting the idea of God. In reality it is only some caricature of God. The essence of the idea is seldom questioned even by professed atheists. They are fighting the God of theology and not the living God.

I should say that every man believes in God who believes in liberty. He has in him the essence of faith in God who believes that liberty is always and at all times practicable.

Faith in God means faith in this universe. It means faith in the rationality of this universe. It means faith in the morality of this universe. It means that such is the nature of the universe that truth must prevail here, that right must triumph. It means faith in the eternal harmonies. It means a boundless hope for the future. It means confidence in the destiny of the race; that unconquerable spirit of optimism which inspired the words of Whittier:

But life shall on and upward go;
Th' eternal step of progress beats

To that great anthem, calm and low,
Which God repeats.

Now is it not apparent that faith in Liberty is but a corollary of this faith in God?

Suppose one believes that the foundations of the universe have been laid in equity and truth; that error needs but to be known to be discredited; that truth needs but to be tried to be proven. Suppose one has the faith that in this world of truth falsehood must stumble at every step, while reason and experience must continually admonish us of the righteous way. He who has this faith in the weakness of error and the might of truth will have faith in liberty. He will prize liberty as the guarantee of progress, the salvation of the world.

Among the greatest words of Scripture are those of Gamaliel, who advised against the persecution of the disciples of Jesus, because he believed that if they had the truth, opposition would be hopeless; and if they did not have it, it would be needless. Gamaliel had faith in the universe, therefore he had faith in Liberty.

Recently I saw a book which had been blue-pencilled by the censor of a certain ecclesiastical institution. I do not mention the name of the church, because bigotry is not the fault of one church more than another. This was a book on social problems written by an earnest and thoughtful man. But it taught a "strange doctrine" and was considered "unsafe." Its publication was prohibited, save the expurgated edition which I saw. The ugly blotches seemed to me like the shadows of the dark ages projected across the pathway of the twentieth century. Out of those mutilated pages there seemed to rise the image of truth, with blood-smeared face, and wounds which told of the assassin's cowardly work. As I turned the leaves of that book I marveled at the pygmy faith of the man who fancies that God's universe needs to be defended by his blue pencil.

Faith in God involves the faith that whatever is just must be accomplished in due time. Here, for instance, is a test of faith. We know now what the mere land is worth on which Boston stands. We know what it was worth 15 years ago. We know that in the last 15 years land values in that city have risen \$245,000,000, an average of over \$16,000,000 a year. We know that the average tax in Boston for the same length of time has been less than \$13,500,000.

This is to say that if Boston in the last 15 years had raised all her public revenue by means of a land value tax,

she would have exempted her industries from the burden of taxation, and she would have taken from the landlords only that unearned increment of land value due to the growth of the population and industry of the city.

That would take a great weight from the back of labor. It would take nothing from the landlords which properly belongs to them. The Springfield Republican, in commenting on these facts, seems to recognize the equity of this plan of raising public revenue. Then this journal, which on most public questions has shown so much faith in the right, calmly states that "apart from a question of right and justice" this plan can never be carried out because the selfishness of the landlord will oppose it. That is what I call an example of practical atheism. To concede that a thing is right, and then to give up all hope of bringing it about because there are evil forces which oppose it, that is faith in the devil; it is faith in the power of evil. It is not faith in the sovereign truth.

Faith in God implies faith in man. The tendency of the race is upward. Let unbelieving men repeal their meddling laws. Give the world a chance. Liberty is the only safety. Try to make good men, and you will only make them weak. Give them freedom, and the good in them will assert itself. Trust freedom as you trust God. Love freedom as you love men. If ever the words of a prophet were inspired it was when Isaiah boldly stated that to worship God truly is to serve the cause of Liberty, "to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke."

HON. THOS. E. WATSON ON CHILD LABOR.

The legislature of Georgia has been considering a bill to prohibit the employment of children under 12 years of age in the mills and factories of that State. On the evening of July 6 a meeting was held in the capitol building at Atlanta in the interest of the bill. The special correspondent of the Augusta Weekly Chronicle states that it "was one of the greatest demonstrations ever seen in the hall of the house of representatives. The capitol was a blaze of light, and the audience was packed to the ceiling. The aisles were so jammed with people, both on the floor and in the galleries, that those who got into the push could not go in or out. Hundreds were turned away and the corridors were filled with people. They kept coming and trying to gain admission to the hall long after nine o'clock." The Hon. Thomas E. Watson was the chief speaker of the evening. We reproduce a portion of Mr. Watson's speech from the columns of the Augusta Chronicle of July 8.

THE BILL.

What does the Houston bill seek to

do, and what are the arguments in its favor?

(1) It proposes to have the sovereign State give its protection to those who sorely need protection and who otherwise are helpless.

If child bondage be wrong, it is obvious that unless the State acts, the bondage will continue. The same conditions which caused it will perpetuate it unless the higher power steps in.

(2) It proposes that modern commercialism shall be told in language it must obey that our twentieth century civilization will not allow the children of the land to be thrown into its hopper and ground out into dividends.

It proposes to declare that modern religious sentiment and the enlightened convictions of leading men and women will not allow built up amongst us a system whereby our Christian civilization, like Saturn of old, devours its own children.

(3) It proposes to rectify and make safe the foundations upon which our future civilization depends. The children of to-day are those in whose hands will be borne the standards of our future progress. To the extent that we enslave and stunt and debase the child of to-day we damn in advance the civilization of to-morrow.

(4) It proposes to restore the order of nature—declared everywhere by the God of nature—a law to which all brute creation conforms, that the parent shall support the tender-aged offspring and not the tender-aged support the parent.

To allow idle, dissipated, unnatural parents to live in ease at the expense of little children of tender age is to reverse the order of nature and set at naught the law of God. Who objects to the Houston bill, and upon what grounds?

ITS OPPONENTS.

The associated cotton mills, through their Republican representative, H. C. Hanson, appear before the Georgia legislature. And at the very outset he exposes the weakness of his cause by abusing his opponents. In effect, he classes the advocates of the bill under the three heads of Fools, Fanatics and Demagogues.

This was a fine display of insolence made by a Republican to the Democratic legislature of Georgia!

In whose behalf did Hanson appear?

In that of capital? Oh, no. Associated capital never asks anything for itself.

Wearing the same old hypocritical

mask which protected capital has worn for a hundred years, Hanson came up here to speak in behalf of labor!

Hanson would have us down right in calling us fools if we were capable of believing that in fighting the Houston bill the motive of the associated manufacturers is to protect labor.

Away with the silly subterfuge! Hanson was here in the interest of dividends, not children, and he ought to have been brave enough and honest enough to say it.

What objections are made by Hanson to the Houston bill?

He says it would be class legislation!

My God, think of that! The associated factory owners send Hanson here to implore the legislature of Georgia not to be guilty of the crime of enacting class legislation!

Of all the impudence that ever I saw in all my life, this caps the climax.

It not only beats Bob-tail who beats the devil, but takes the rag off the bush and the bush up by the roots.

Who was it that went to the very first congress which ever convened, and demanded class legislation in his own behalf?

The manufacturer.

Who is it that for 100 years has never let a single congress meet and adjourn without demanding and getting something more in his favor as class legislation?

The manufacturer.

Who is it that now declares through his national organization that the American market belongs to him and he must be protected in his monopoly of it?

The manufacturer.

And yet Hanson, the handsome Hanson, the wealthy Hanson, the Republican mill-owner Hanson, dares to exhibit an unblushing front to the Georgia legislature and to protest against legislation in favor of the helpless children of Georgia, on the ground that such law would be class legislation.

Confound his infernal impudence!

OBJECTIONS URGED.

What other objections does he urge? He says that it would be an interference with private business.

The answer is short, sharp and final.

Whenever the management of private business results in a public injury the sovereign power of the State must, in the interest of the public, redress that wrong.

No man, rich or poor, has got a vested right to so conduct his business as to inflict permanent injury upon the society in which he lives.

What else?

They say that farm laborers are having a harder time than factory laborers.

If that be true it does not prove that reformers have gone too far—it would prove, rather, that they had not gone far enough.

Hanson says that the farming class in Georgia are so pitifully poor that they flee to factory serfdom to escape the harsher slavery of the farm.

Is that true?

If so, it were high time that the Georgia legislature and other legislative bodies were directing their attention to the farms as well as to the factories.

I am not here to discuss the agricultural system and situation myself. I will take what the agent of the mill-owners says of it. Their Republican spokesman, Hanson, says that the farming population is reduced to a pitiable condition of hardship and suffering.

If this situation be a general one, there must be some deep-rooted general cause.

What is the cause?

Is it laziness, as Hanson would seem to indicate?

Surely laziness is not general in Georgia, else we should never have so marvelously increased our crops and our wealth.

What, then, is the cause?

May it not be the class legislation of our Federal government which for a hundred years has been building up manufactures at the expense of commerce and agriculture?

May it not be the system which protects our manufacturer from foreign competition while it compels our farmers and wage-earners to compete with all the world?

May it not be that system of Federal taxation which puts the taxes mainly on the necessities of life, and thus compels a one-horse tenant of the farm, or the common day laborer in the city, to pay as much Federal tax as Carnegie, or Rockefeller, or Morgan, or Vanderbilt, or Gould?

May it not be that system of class legislation which compels the poorest wage-earner in the republic to pay Federal taxes upon his food and clothing, his household furnishings, his tools and implements of work, when the vastly wealthy insurance companies, express companies, telegraph companies, national banking companies, railroad companies pay practically no Federal tax at all?

If our farmers and wage earners are in such pitiable plight, may it not be

on account of this very protective system which the manufacturers have for a hundred years been building up—a system under which the American manufacturer will now sell his products to foreign people cheaper than our homefolks can get them? A system under which competition has been destroyed by the trust; a system in which the cost of living on every farm and in every wage earner's hut depends absolutely upon the greedy demands of the managers of the despotic trusts?

CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY.

My own convictions are clear. I repeat what I have so often said in years-gone by—this building up of one man's industry at the expense of another is a crime against humanity and a menace to the true prosperity of the republic. Believing that the protective system has brought us to this pass, I would, if I could, reform the entire situation, as Great Britain reformed it—by removing every tariff on luxuries and establish free trade.

Manufacturers should not be permitted to take advantage of their own wrong. They have impoverished the farm—for God's sake let them spare the little children of the farm. They have blighted the prosperity of the farmer—don't allow them to blight the youth of the farmer's child.

But while I admit the hardship of farm life, I deny that it is, or ever can be, as hurtful to the child as life in the mill.

Even when children under 12 work on the farm, they can only labor for a part of the year. As a rule the child works in the spring, summer and fall. There are healthy, expansive surroundings. There is much rest and recreation. The weather and the crop-conditions do not admit of constant drudgery. There is no deadly grind of tread-mill even at its worst. And I will prove the nature of the tree by the fruit it has borne.

Where are your great and good men whose tender years were spent in the factory?

Where are they?

If life at the loom is so good a thing for the boy of 10 and 11 and 12, where are some of the ripened products? What products would you expect from labor, day in and day out in the narrow limits of the building, in an atmosphere heavy with the germs of disease and death, in a deafening roar of machinery all day long, and under conditions which stunt the child's development, physically, mentally and, perhaps, morally?

No, farm life is not like that. If your tree of child labor be so good a tree, show me some of the fruits!

You cannot do it, and you know you can't.

Now look to the farm. Look upon that tree, and gaze upon its fruits. Who built up Atlanta and made it the pride of the South?

Boys who had slaved in the factories at ten years of age? No! a thousand times no. The men who have crowned themselves kings of success, and have made Atlanta's name a synonym of pluck and strength and victory, drank in the health and the inspiration and the courage which made them great, at the pure fountain of farm life.

I instance also: Ben Hill, Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Andrew Jackson.

What would have become of Alex. Stephens had he been placed at ten years in the poisoned atmosphere of a factory?

ALL ARGUED BEFORE.

Every argument urged against the bill was urged in 1833 in England, when the reformers first interfered in behalf of the men, the women and the children of the coal mines and the factories.

Human greed made the same plea in its own defense that it makes now. The arguments which Hanson makes against Houston are precisely the same as those which British capitalists made against Lord Ashley. As those arguments were swept aside then by a parliament dominated to a large extent by hereditary aristocrats, it is to be devoutly hoped that the same arguments will be swept aside now by a Georgia legislature not dominated by corporations or hereditary aristocrats, but actuated solely by the desire to so legislate as to protect the best interests of the commonwealth.

Maj. Hanson stated repeatedly in his speech that the mill owners did not favor child labor as an "original proposition."

Then at some time or other the mill owners must have been opposed to child labor.

When was that time? Was it five years ago, or ten, or twenty, or fifty?

If they were opposed to child labor 20 years ago, what were their reasons?

The question is one of principle and principles do not change.

If the factory owners were opposed to child labor as an "original proposition," in God's name tell us why

a thing that was wrong in principle then is not wrong now.

JUSTICE MUST TRIUMPH.

Maj. Hanson said that the reformers had failed "in his time." Assuming that he must be some 60 or 70 years old, I must remind the Major that the despised reformer has almost changed the face of the world "in his time." To name the victories of the reformer in the nineteenth century is to give the history of human progress. And that march of the people toward higher standards and better conditions has but fairly begun. No Hanson can stop it. No manufacturers' association can stop it. To the extent that its cause is just, its final triumph is assured.

SAVE THE YOUNG.

If it be true that our economic conditions are so bad that we cannot rescue both the young and the old, but must sacrifice one to save the other, I would say:

"Save the young."

In the horrible "Passage of the Beresina" when the wreck of the grand army of Napoleon was madly crowding the bridges to escape the Russian and Cossack horses, when camp-followers and demoralized soldiers were desperately struggling for footing on the bridge, a mother was seen crowded off the bridge, sinking into the freezing waters of the river. In her arms, held on high—as she sank to her death—was her babe, and after she could no longer speak, those motherly arms, holding aloft her infant to the last, made mute appeal:

"Save my child. Let me die if you must, but save my child!"

Noble humanity speaks always and everywhere the same language.

If indeed we have come to such a pass as Hanson says, and cannot rescue both the mother and the child, I am quite certain that every true-hearted mother would do as the dying mother at the Beresina did, hold up her babe in her sinking arms and made the heart thrill at her cry: "Save my child!"

The Czar—You know that I cannot receive that petition.

The President—Why, I have seen nothing but newspaper reports on the subject.

The Czar—But what will you do if you are officially notified that my government cannot admit the petition?

The President—Oh, then we can say that our intention to send it was only a newspaper report.—New York Evening Post.

A CASUAL OBSERVATION.

Dar's nuffin hyar but vanity
An' riches an' insanity;
De dollah seems to be de people's god.
Dar's a heap too many 'Scariots
A-ridin' 'round in charlots,
While de po' man am a-carryin' de hod.

Dar's too much haste an' hurryin',
An' too much wealth at buryin',
An' dis hyar t'ing am gittin' worse an' worse,
Hit takes all ob de rakin's,
De scrimp'n's an' de scrap'n's
To liquidate de 'spenses ob de hearse.

Dar's heaps of care an' worry;
Ebbbody's in a hurry,
An' de few am growin' richer ebbery day;
But de most of us must shovel
For de children in de hovel
An' silently await de judgment day.
—Ben King.

A BIT OF ANCIENT HISTORY.

John Randolph Tucker, of Virginia, related that at a dinner party in Washington, Bancroft stated in conversation that Calhoun was the original secessionist, and responsible for the civil war. To this statement Tucker took exception, and said that in the month of Calhoun's death he was invited to go and see the great statesman. To an inquiry whether anything could be done to save the union, and whether the Missouri compromise could not save it, Calhoun replied: "With my constitutional objections I could not vote for it, but I would acquiesce in it to save the union." He was again asked what he saw in the future of the country, and his reply was: "Dark forebodings, and I should die happy if I could see the union preserved." Bancroft inquired if Tucker had heard this reply of Calhoun, to which Tucker answered: "Yes," and then Bancroft stated: "I will never again repeat the charge I made against Mr. Calhoun here to-night."—Hon. J. L.M. Curry, LL.D.

A LITTLE POLITICAL FABLE.

Once upon a time a man invested \$350,000 in building a 15-story office building in a large city. He fitted up his office rooms in nice style and then went out to secure tenants.

"Where is your elevator?" queried the man who came to inspect the rooms.

"I have no elevator," replied the owner.

"But do you expect us to pay you a fair rent for your rooms and then climb these ladders to get to them?"

"Well I thought you might do it for awhile. Later I will give some man a franchise to operate an elevator in my building."

"But why not put in your own elevator?"

"I am opposed to that sort of thing, gentlemen. I will give away the franchise for the elevator and the corporation that secures it may tax my tenants all the traffic will bear."

Then the men seeking office rooms gave the property owner the merry haha and left him.

Finally the man's friends took him in charge and brought him before the lunatico inquirendo.

"What's the matter with him?" queried the commission.

Upon hearing the story the commission decided unanimously that the man was crazy and he was sent to the insane hospital.

But will some one please explain the difference between running a car up and down within a building and running a car along the streets between buildings?—Will M. Maupin, in *The Commoner*.

The Philadelphia Boodler—I had a bad dream last night.

The Philadelphia Judge—What was it?

The Philadelphia Boodler—I dreamed Philadelphia was St. Louis.

G. T. E.

Gasping for breath the visitor in Kansas City paused to wipe the perspiration from his brow.

"These hills are something awful," he exclaimed.

"My friend," replied the resident who was doing the honors, "I thought as you do up until a few weeks ago. Now I'm prepared to prove that the hollows are what menace our city's future."—*The Commoner*.

The Reporter—Do you think the Democrats could elect Gorman?

The Ninety-sixer—No, but the Republicans could.

G. T. E.

Little Sister—Puttin' us out of the room just—boo-hoo—'cause there's company!

Little Brother—But maybe they won't eat all the cake.

Little Sister—Oh, you can't trust—boo-hoo!—company with cake!—Puck.

"It is pretty hard to shut up a newspaper man."

"Not if he is in the Philippines."

G. T. E.

I read that the Mad Mullah has wiped out a British force in Somaliland. Who is the Mad Mullah? A sincere and patriotic religious reformer, who wishes

to rid his land of foreign invaders and exploiters, and Somaliland is his country. If England were overrun by Somalis and the archbishop of Canterbury started a crusade to drive them out, I suppose they might call him a "Mad Mullah" too.—*The Whim*.

The Imperialist—But even Secretary Root is not entirely without fault.

The Corbinit—Nonsense, man!

The Imperialist—Nonsense? Has he ordered the punishment of those soldiers who withheld their fire when they were commanded to shoot prisoners?

G. T. E.

"No," said Woodby, "I don't see Wiseman at all any more. He has dropped out of our social set."

"He tells a different story," remarked Sinnickson.

"Indeed!"

"Yes; he claims he has climbed out."—*Catholic Standard and Times*.

Mr. Fairley—Then you say that the Negro is not so good as you are?

Mr. Prejuly—Most assuredly, I do.

Mr. Fairley—Necessarily, then, your judgment of the black man is extremely severe.

G. T. E.

BOOKS

THE MYSTERY OF SLEEP.

It is not often that one comes across a book so original as this work of a former American minister to France (*The Mystery of Sleep*, by John Bigelow, LL. D., Harpers, \$1.50). And yet, strange to say, one of the strong points of the book lies in its proof that its central thought is not original, but has been in the world almost from the beginning. The author shows the Bible to be full of it, and he quotes from numerous classical authors to the same effect. It is truly remarkable how much testimony he is able to bring forward, and it may be said that the great originality of the book consists after all in thus bringing together one of the world's scattered thoughts, and concentrating attention upon it.

Does man develop entirely, exclusively, by living out in the world, by contact with people either personally or through their books, or is there also a spiritual world which influences him, the same with which he can put himself in conscious touch by the act of prayer? In other words, is this phenomenal world, so far as man's present life is concerned, the whole thing to him, or is there a

spiritual world, hidden to his physical senses, which is ever, if we may use the expression, reaching down to him? Whoever believes the latter will find this a wonderfully suggestive and inspiring book. To those who would confine life to the physical plane it will appear foolishness.

One of the most striking quotations in the book, and one which goes to the heart of the author's theme, is taken from the philosopher, Iamblichus. Iamblichus belonged to the school of Neo-Platonic philosophy, and was living at the end of the third century A. D. The quotation is in part as follows:

"The soul has a twofold life, a lower and a higher. In sleep the soul is freed from the constraint of the body, and enters, as one emancipated, on its divine life of intelligence. . . . The nobler part of the soul is thus united by abstraction to higher natures. . . . The night-time of the body is the day-time of the soul."

This last sentence, which the author puts on a front page, is the key to the book. Sleep, according to the argument, is not primarily a refreshment from the fatigues of the labors of the day, or a repairing of the waste of bodily tissue. It does not, says the author, "represent or imply rest in the sense of inactivity or idleness, psychical or physical." No, the author argues, sleep has a far higher purpose: sleep is an essential condition for our spiritual development. "A work is being wrought in us, a process is going on in us, during those hours, which is not and cannot be wrought so effectually, if at all, at any other time; we are spiritually growing, developing, ripening more continuously, while thus shielded from the distracting influences of the phenomenal world."

It is impossible for us to give here the author's full line of reasoning, or to cite the numerous authorities to whom he appeals. It must be said, however, that it is wonderful how much direct support he finds. Take this, for example, from Sir Thomas Brower, the famous English writer of the seventeenth century: "We are somewhat more than ourselves in our sleep, and the slumber of the body seems to be but the waking of the soul."

It is strange that Dr. Bigelow missed in his researches one famous passage in Greek literature. In the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus, about line 180 (I have not the text at hand) occurs the following notable passage:

"In the calm hour of sleep
Conscience, the sad remembrancer,
will creep
To the inmost heart, and there enforce

On the reluctant spirit the wisdom of remorse."

The above is Milman's translation, which is not entirely happy: the idea simply is that the process of beneficent repentance may go on during the hours of sleep.

But, as I have said, there will be found abundance of quotations in the book. There is one other of these, the most striking of all, which has perhaps already occurred to the reader, and must be repeated in any account of this book. It is the famous passage from the Book of Job: "In a dream, in a vision of the night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, in slumberings upon the bed, then He openeth the ears of men."

There are many interesting features of the book—the discussion, for example, of dreams and such abnormal states as idiocy—which must be passed over. Enough has been said, I trust, to show that Dr. Bigelow has done well to expand his former treatise into this interesting and important volume.

The style of the book is in the main simple and clear; but there are occasional evidences of oversight. On p. 37 the sentence beginning "While pursuing" is bad English. On p. 109 there is nothing to show who "the same prophet" is; in fact, from the express mention of Isaiah in the succeeding paragraph, one might think Isaiah is not meant. On p. 143, the adjective "violent" seems hardly a felicitous choice. On p. 159, "help" in the second paragraph should, of course, be "helps," and in a Latin quotation on the same page there is a misprint of meus for mens. But a more important defect than these verbal lapses is the lack of an index. J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—Biennial Report of the Attorney General of the State of Illinois. Howard J. Hamlin, December, 1902. Springfield, Ill.

PERIODICALS.

Whether the city of the near future will be governed on collectivist or individualist principles is the question that Victor S. Yarros discusses in the Chautauquan for August, which is devoted to civic problems.

The Lincoln (Neb.) Independent, the Populist paper which recently issued a Henry George edition, has now issued a Karl Marx edition. The Marx biography is ably written by the assistant editor, Charles Q. DeFrance, no follower of Marx having volunteered to furnish one. Other articles are by H. S. Aley, W. H. Stuart, H. M. Hyndman, Prof. Thomas E. Will, Max Brodkey, S. P. Gibson and A. M. Simons, the article of the latter being on "Populism Against Socialism."

Mrs. Margaret Bisland contributes to the North American Review for July an article entitled the "Curse of Eve." "As a nation," she writes, "we now stand most in need of a re-elevation and re-juvenescence of the precious and powerful motherhood ideal." She finds two dangerous tendencies to decay in the diminution of the family and in the weakening of the marriage tie. These tendencies she attributes to woman's "alienation from the true aims of her sex"

and in her ambition to "grasp at the estates and prerogatives of men." It seems to be true that there is a marked falling-off in the families of the old American stock, and it is also true that there has been a marked increase in the number of divorces, but it does not seem to occur to Mrs. Bisland that these results may be attributed to quite other causes than those which she finds responsible. The rapid growth of inequality in wealth—which characterized the Roman epoch to which she refers, just as it characterizes the past half century with us—is a cause of social decay which cannot be left out of account. A society of extreme wealth constantly tends to irritate itself to exaggerations of lustful license, and its middle-class followers are constantly tempted to avoid any burdens that may hamper their ambitious advance. J. H. D.

The Literary Digest of July 11 has a brief article with the caption "A New Peril for the Scandinavian Peninsula," the new peril being Russian aggression. Translations are given from Stockholm papers lamenting the extinction of Finland as a sort of buffer state, and going so far as to say that Norway and Sweden are in peril from a power that is so unscrupulous. That such comments have become rarer and more moderate since the more complete extinction of Finland is a sign that emphasizes the real existence of the fear. J. H. D.

There are two articles in the Independent of July 16 that will be of unusual interest to readers of The Public. One is Fairhope, the Home of the Single Tax and the Referendum, by Ernest B. Gaston, secretary of the Fairhope Industrial Association. It is full of most interesting information and is profusely illustrated. The other article is Ernest Crosby's Wanted, a New Patriotism, which is written in his effective style, and contains a lesson about that much-abused word, patriotism, which we may hope to learn some time. "The association," says Mr. Crosby, "of love of country with soldiers and brass bands and armed cruisers and contempt for foreigners is a relic of savagery." J. H. D.

In the Independent of July 9, Mr. W. J. Ghent, author of "Our Benevolent Feudalism," has an amusing and interesting hit at "The Chaos of Criticism," comparing the various comments upon his now famous book. In the same number there is striking confirmation of a recent editorial in The Public on modern forms of insincerity. Not only does the leading editorial bear somewhat on the same subject, but we have comments on Gov. Cummins, who has proved himself a shining example. Any one can see that the Iowa Republican platform is a sorry backdown from the "Iowa Idea," for which Cummins has stood; and yet, with a straight face, he can say that the platform is a recognition



So great a position has not been won by any work on Economic Science since the appearance of "The Wealth of Nations."

—The Athenaeum.



NOW READY

The Second American Edition of

CAPITAL

A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production

By KARL MARX

Translated from the German by
SAMUEL MOORE and
EDWARD AVELING

Edited by
FREDERICK ENGELS

This great work known as the "Bible of the Working-man" is the Product of American Labor, being free from the Typographical Errors of the English Edition. New and Large Type, bound in Extra Cloth.

Price, including Postage, \$1.75

Twentieth Century Press
17 E. 16th St., NEW YORK



The great merit of Marx, therefore, lies in the work he has done as a scientific inquirer into the economic movement of modern times, as the philosophic historian of the capitalistic era.—Encyclopædia Britannica.





"AWAY WITH HER! AWAY WITH HER!"

of his tariff views and a warrant for his course! J. H. D.

As the organ of a movement the Single Tax Review (quarterly, New York) for the present Summer surpasses all previous issues. The news stories of a Montreal department store and the successful experiment with city lighting in Detroit, together with those on the state of the single tax movement in Toronto, and in Denmark, Holland, Switzerland and Scotland, are more than suggestive of the useful service which such a magazine can render. Besides these news contributions there is a comprehensive discussion by Congressman Baker, of the solution for the recurring anthracite coal problem; a characteristic criticism by James Love, of Prof. Clarke's economics; a paper by Jane Dearborn Mills on the kindergarten method; and a biography of Judge Edward Osgood Brown, of Chicago, whose portrait furnishes the frontispiece.

Speaking of the indiscriminate praise that has been heaped upon John Wesley at this two-hundredth-anniversary time, the Nation of July 9 well says that Wesley did not pose as a savior of society, but that he was primarily and essentially a preacher of righteousness to individuals. "The truth seems to be," says the writer, "that we are grown too squeamish nowadays to proclaim aloud that real essential good may spring from bringing multitudes of individuals to reflect soberly each upon his duty to his Maker, and his fellow-men." The reason that Wesley's preaching to individuals had such far-reaching social effects as to make him appear the direct originator of the latter, lies in the fact of his personal sacrifice and suffering. Preachers of to-day who hold that their exclusive province is to preach righteousness to individuals, will do their full duty towards social regeneration, if they will but exhibit the readiness to submit their bodies and their reputations to such sacrifices as John Wesley was willing to make.

J. H. D.

In the New Orleans Playune of July 12 Rev. G. L. Tucker gives a most interesting description of Fairhope, the single tax colony on Mobile Bay. "Nine years ago," writes Mr. Tucker, "what is now Fairhope was virgin pine forest. To-day it is a thriving industrial center, a model town and a synonym for industry, self-reliance and progressiveness in all that part of the country. They have a public wharf, a steamboat that they built and own themselves, an hotel, public baths, several stores (not including a single saloon), water works, a

sawmill, ricemill, a schoolhouse, which is also the public library and the Town Hall, a church and the best streets and roads in Baldwin county. They have a newspaper, the Fairhope Courier, a bi-weekly publication, and they are putting in a local telephone exchange. They have been able to accomplish this not only because they are active and enterprising, but they trace their success directly to the single tax, by which they have been able to use for the common good what has been created by common exertions. Under the ordinary system by which new towns are started, all this would have gone into the pockets of a few land speculators." J. H. D.

CONTRACTORS.

G. H. ATKINSON & CO., CONTRACTORS, JERSEY CITY, N. J.

Electric Light, Telephone and Municipal Work. Trolley Roads Built and Financed.

Trade

The National Tea Bank Mark

130-132 Water Street
NEW YORK

Since 1874 we have been supplying Banks, Institutions and families in all parts of the Union with

Finest Teas and Coffees

We can supply YOU. Samples sent on application. Write for booklet, "What You Should Know About Coffee."

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 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 cents; Trial Subscription (4 weeks), 10 cents; Single Copies, 5 cents. Free of postage in United States, Canada, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING Co. Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

Published weekly by THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1641 Unity Building, Chicago, Ill. Post office address, THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

ATTORNEYS.

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

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER, COUNSELOR AT LAW, BENNETT BLDG., 99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan, Tel. Call, 4094 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015. NEW YORK.

Do you know of Any democratic-Democrat Anywhere

who does not subscribe for The Public?

If you do . . .

Please send his or her name and address to The Public Publishing Co., Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

Books by CLARENCE S. DARROW

- Realism in Literature and Art, . . . 5c
- In Memory of John P. Altgeld, . . . 5c
- Crimes and Criminals, 10c
- The Rights and Wrongs of Ireland, 10c
- Resist Not Evil, Cloth, 75c

Any of these mailed on receipt of price, or all for one dollar.

CHAS. H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers, 56 Fifth Ave., Chicago.