

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1903.

Number 297.

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.

President Roosevelt's message is described by his partisans as a "master work." All presidential messages have been "master works" in the estimation of the partisans of their authors. Then why not Roosevelt's? Let it go at that. Selah.

In this "master work" of his, President Roosevelt says one thing that his more sensitive countrymen might wish he had left unsaid, or, saying it, had said it differently. It is about the Filipinos. "No one people," writes the President, "ever benefited another people more than we have benefited the Filipinos by taking possession of their islands." This is crude. It is obtrusively suggestive of looting. President McKinley's "benevolent assimilation" was much better.

But it is the Panama question to which President Roosevelt devotes the "hardest licks" of his "master work." With this part of his message Republican leaders in Congress are reported to be particularly delighted. And, indeed, it is a marvelous production—one that should make of the fortunate pen with which the President signed the message, a dime museum favorite for all time. Beginning upon this subject with a recital of the primary and the alternative provisions of the Isthmian canal law, Mr. Roosevelt proceeds to show that it was not necessary for him to consider the execution of the alternative provision when the primary provision failed, because a third consideration afterwards arose of which

Congress had wotted not. If we read between the lines we shall see with tolerable clearness that Mr. Roosevelt does not object to being credited by history with having himself providentially created the unexpected circumstances; which are, of course, the secession of Panama from Colombia.

To appreciate President Roosevelt's masterful skill in dealing with this providential concatenation of circumstances, his order of statement must be somewhat altered, so as to secure a truer perspective. In the first place, then, (we quote from the message):

By the act of June 28, 1902, the Congress authorized the President to enter into treaty with Colombia for the building of the canal across the Isthmus of Panama, it being provided that in the event of failure to secure such treaty after a lapse of a reasonable time recourse should be had to building a canal through Nicaragua.

In the second place, after a canal treaty with Colombia had been negotiated and ratified by the United States—

the government of Colombia not merely repudiated the treaty, but repudiated it in such manner as to make it evident by the time the Colombian Congress adjourned that not the scantiest hope remained of ever getting a satisfactory treaty from them.

In the third place, such being the circumstances, what would naturally come in due legal order? The "event of failure" to secure a Panama canal treaty with Colombia had occurred. Not merely had there been "a lapse of a reasonable time," but the treaty had been rejected by Colombia under circumstances which left "not the scantiest hope" of ever getting a "satisfactory treaty" from that government. Was it not President Roosevelt's sworn duty, therefore, he being of the executive and not the legislative branch of the government, to obey the act of

Congress which commanded that in such circumstances "recourse should be had to building a canal through Nicaragua"?

But Mr. Roosevelt could entertain no such view of his legal duty. Great financial interests in Wall street—very powerful in a presidential year—have \$40,000,000 in cash at stake on the Panama route, and only Satan himself knows how much more in prospective land values along that route. Moreover, the potent continental railroad interests—especially potent in a presidential year—prefer the Panama route because its completion is farther off and its competitive influence would be less than the route across Nicaragua. So Mr. Roosevelt turns his attention to the possibility of securing the Panama route in a manner not contemplated by Congress, in total disregard of the command of Congress, and in defiance of international obligations. Instead of obeying the law, and, upon the hopeless failure to get a treaty from Colombia, proceeding with negotiations for a Nicaragua canal—the alternative solemnly prescribed by Congress—he concluded, as the third step, that it was not necessary to consider that alternative at all. His amazing reason is that he had found a way of avoiding the decree of Congress by making a treaty with a hitherto non-existent and even now only de facto sovereignty, for the Panama route.

This leads Mr. Roosevelt to a defense of his high-handed use of the American navy to prevent Colombia from resisting the secession of his "hand-me-down" republic of Panama. And what a defense! "Master work" is all too weak for adequate characterization. He quotes Secretary Seward's declaration of 1865 that the

purpose of the neutrality stipulation in the treaty with Colombia "was to guarantee the Isthmus against seizure or invasion by a foreign power only," and Attorney General Speed's opinion of the same year to the same effect—quotes both to justify his interference with Colombia's forcible assertion of sovereignty. Think of it! Because we are under treaty obligation with Colombia to protect the Isthmian part of her territory from foreign invasion, therefore we are empowered by Colombia to exclude Colombia herself from that territory! This is Rooseveltian—masterfully so; but it is neither logic nor law.

Most amazing of all this amazing "master work," however, is the President's calm statement of his reasons for precipitately recognizing Panama as an independent nation. In view of the established policy of this nation with reference to recognizing new nations, Mr. Roosevelt's position is absolutely revolutionary. Note his words, and note them carefully. He quotes his instructions to the American representative at Panama for what he himself describes as "the recognition of the de facto government of Panama," as follows:

The people of Panama have, by apparently unanimous movement, dissolved their political connection with the Republic of Colombia and resumed their independence. When you are satisfied that a de facto government, republican in form and without substantial opposition from its own people, has been established in the State of Panama, you will enter into relations with it as the responsible government of the territory and look to it for all due action to protect the persons and property of citizens of the United States, . . .

Consider those words in the light of our long neglect of Cuba after the people of Cuba had "by apparently unanimous movement, dissolved their political connection" with Spain, and in which there had been established "a de facto government, republican in form and without substantial opposition from its own people." Consider them again in the light of the history of our own invasion

of the Philippines (by authority of a purchase from Spain after Spain's actual expulsion), notwithstanding that the people of the Philippines had "by apparently unanimous movement dissolved their political connection" with Spain, and notwithstanding that there had been established in the Philippines "a de facto government, republican in form and without substantial opposition from its own people." Consider those words again in the light of the history of our civil war of the 60's. We had protested against any foreign recognition of the Confederate States, and our protest was heeded. Yet the people of those States had "by apparently unanimous movement, dissolved their political connection with the United States and resumed their independence," and in and for each of them there had been established "a de facto government, republican in form and without substantial opposition from its own people."

To appreciate the revolutionary character of Roosevelt's Panama policy, one has only to recall the attitude of the Federal government toward the Confederate government, and then to paraphrase President Roosevelt, only slightly and with no essential change, in the form of a letter of instructions from Great Britain to a British consul at Charleston in the Winter or early Spring of 1861. Thus:

The people of South Carolina and [certain other States, naming them] have, by apparently unanimous movement, dissolved their political connection with the United States of America and resumed their independence. When you are satisfied that a de facto government, in form a republic or a limited monarchy, and without substantial opposition from its own people, has been established in the State of South Carolina and her seceding associates, you will enter into relations with it as the responsible government of the territory and look to it for all due action, etc., etc., etc.

And suppose that Great Britain had capped that climax of international impudence and arrogance, with this dispatch to her minister at Washington (a mere

paraphrase of President Roosevelt's dispatch to our minister at Bogota which he quotes with satisfaction in his message):

The people of South Carolina and [certain other States, naming them] having by an apparently unanimous movement dissolved their political connection with the United States of America and resumed their independence, and having adopted a government of their own, named the Confederate States of America, with which the government of Great Britain has entered into relations, the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, in accordance with the ties of friendship which have so long and so happily existed between the respective nations, most earnestly commends to the governments of the United States of America and of the Confederate States of America the peaceful and equitable settlement of all questions at issue between them. She holds that she is bound by the interests of civilization to see that the peaceful traffic of the world along the Atlantic coast of North America shall not be disturbed by an unnecessary and wasteful civil war.

"Masterful," indeed, is President Roosevelt's work. But so was the bull's in the china shop. With what apprehension must sober Americans contemplate the fame of their country after impartial history shall have dealt with recent events and explained their manifest inconsistency? How can anything but shame result from the inevitable disclosure of the sordid influences that dictated yesterday the destruction of an Asiatic republic trying to work out its democratic destiny, and today the habilitation of a speculative junta with valuable privileges for sale.

Mr. James N. Tyner, the assistant postmaster general of the post office department, has just grounds of complaint against President Roosevelt and he states them in a dignified way. Mr. Tyner is under indictment for fraud in connection with his official position. He is entitled, as are all men under indictment, to a fair trial. No official, no newspaper, no citizen has any right to prejudice public sentiment against him. When an indictment comes into court public attack upon the accused should cease. This is only

decent among fair-minded men. But President Roosevelt takes advantage of his high position to gain the ear of every possible juror with an assertion of his belief in Tyner's guilt. To this unwarranted mode of influencing juries in criminal cases, Mr. Tyner very properly responds with a searching question. "Has it occurred to you," he asks the President, "that pending the trial of the three indictments against me, based on the allegations of the report, and without having heard one word from me in my defense, your premature and unwarranted announcement of my assumed guilt and your call to the court and jury to indorse the same, is, to say the least, extraordinary and dangerous?"

Every man accused of crime is entitled to certain rights. Not to condone his crime if he is guilty, but to shield him from injustice if he is innocent or excusable. One of those rights is that the jury must regard him as innocent until his guilt is affirmatively proved beyond reasonable doubt. Of this right, President Roosevelt has done much to deprive Mr. Tyner. With the President's denunciation in mind, many a juror would go into the box convinced of the defendant's guilt. So Mr. Tyner would have to prove his innocence instead of challenging the prosecution to prove him guilty. Courts sometimes punish newspapers for doing what President Roosevelt has done in this case.

"We are suspicious of these traction companies," said Margaret Haley in her argument before the traction committee of the Chicago city council; "and we insist that there be no further negotiations with them until after the Mueller law is voted on by the people." Those words define the present traction issue in Chicago. A volume could express them no better. There has been much reason to be suspicious of the traction companies. There has been some for suspecting the city council and the council committee. There

will be ample reason for suspicion of anybody concerned in the matter, if any traction franchise is granted before the people vote next April on the Mueller law—on the question of municipal ownership. An intimation and justification of this suspicion was pointedly but considerately and respectfully made by John Z. White in his argument before the council committee, when he said:

Suppose you were personally seized of these municipal rights, and, like the people of Chicago, were obliged to act through agents; and suppose your agents should make terms with a third party, immensely favorable to him, but not favorable to you, wouldn't you look upon your agent with suspicion?

An immense and impressive meeting was held at Cooper Union, New York, on the 4th, to protest against the arbitrary proceedings against John Turner (p. 514), the English labor organizer, who is now under Federal arrest in close custody, awaiting deportation by authority of the "anarchist" act because he disbelieves in organized government. John S. Crosby presided, and Ernest Crosby and ex-Congressman John DeWitt Warner were the principal speakers. The comprehensive wickedness of the law was indicated by Mr. Warner, who, after quoting one of its sections, said:

In other words, thousands upon thousands of voters in western States, thousands of peaceable citizens, married here, acquiring homes and building up the country, are at the mercy of reptile informers, inspired by official zeal, paid by personal enemies, or subsidized by foreign governments to counteract the immigration of their citizens, and they may at any time be taken from their work, their friends, and their families, and, if condemned in secret trial, deported thousands of miles to the country they left.

Among those who contributed to the success of the Turner meeting was Edward M. Shepard, whose admirable letter we give in another column. The list of the vice presidents, men who defy the malice of designing frauds and respectable fools by consenting to the use of their names, is very encouraging. We find in the list

such names as Felix Adler, William H. Baldwin, Jr., Horace E. Deming, Franklin H. Giddings, Rev. Thomas C. Hall, William Jay Schiefflin, Carl Schurz, Charles Sprague Smith, Oswald G. Villard, George F. Seward and Horace White. The resolutions are excellent for their outspoken democracy and conservative tone. They are as follows:

Whereas history shows that whatever evils accompany freedom of speech and of opinion, permanence of popular government can only be maintained by their exercise, and that no error need be feared where truth is free to combat it; and whereas, our constitutions secure freedom of thought and speech to us and their spirit should assure the same rights to aliens; and whereas, Russia, which excludes political opponents and represses free thought and free speech at home, has suffered more than any other Christian nation from violence and assassination, while England, which for 60 years has received and protected all kinds of political exiles, repealing or permitting to grow obsolete her own repressive laws, has alone maintained complete internal peace (except in the case of Ireland, where repression was used), and has been free from revolutionary agitation; and whereas, these examples demonstrate that repression tends to encourage and freedom prevents bloodshed and violence, therefore, resolved, that we, citizens of New York, protest against so much of the immigration law as authorizes the exclusion and deportation of an alien solely because of his opinions, believing that this provision of law is illiberal, unjust and contrary to the spirit of the constitution, and that it tends to the creation and encouragement of the evils it is intended to prevent; resolved, that we recommend that petitions be addressed to Congress asking that the portions of the law against which we protest be repealed.

And whereas, John Turner, a citizen of England, is imprisoned under this act solely for his opinions, and is denied the right of private consultation with counsel, and permission to see friends, and is guarded and confined as though convicted of a crime, although he is staying voluntarily in order to test the law; resolved, that we protest against such treatment and against the "administrative process" by which Turner was arrested and is detained; resolved, that we believe such arbitrary imprisonments to be against the will of our people, and that in the end the United States will not yield to England in the jealousy with which she guards freedom of thought and speech.

The Republican favorites for

Democratic candidate for president are Judge Parker, Judge Gray and Senator Gorman. Of the political opinions of the first the people know nothing; of those of the second they only know that he changed them in Paris to suit President McKinley, and became a Federal judge in consequence; and of those of the third they are well informed.

Advocates of the whipping post may derive wisdom at the expense of gratification from an address before the New Century club at Wilmington, Del., by A. S. Messerve, who has applied the lash in all the whippings at the Wilmington workhouse. Mr. Messerve clearly does not believe that these whippings lessen crime. Referring to prison statistics for corroboration he declared that the prison population in whipping-post Delaware is higher than that of States which do not resort to this degrading punishment.

Secretary Root takes occasion to urge, in his annual report, the importance of teaching the young men of this country to shoot straight. Mr. Root should visit the Chicago jail. He might there look upon four young men who are exceedingly efficient in the deadly accomplishment he recommends. They will probably be hanged for it.

DISAGREEMENT AND VITUPERATION.

The free use of certain words and phrases during the recent municipal campaign in New York has suggested some reflections upon a classification of the words of our language, with a consideration of the use of some of them at all for the purposes that have brought them into existence.

At the base of these reflections lies the question of the purpose of language.

Take any group of human beings with a friendly disposition toward each other—and, in our family, club, civic and national life, each of us is a member of such a group—good as this friendly dis-

position is, it is not so good as the deeper and broader friendship relation of a developed mutual understanding. But the friendship relation of a developed mutual understanding is dependent for its existence upon a common medium of exchange for thought—a common language properly used. It is the purpose of language to promote this relation.

Every language, however, has a large number of words that have more than one meaning; and it frequently becomes necessary, in order to be fully understood, to say, when using one of these words: "I use it in such and such a sense."

Every language has also a large number of words that mean but one thing, or stand for but one idea; and these it is necessary to use with the exactness for which they stand. To arbitrarily ignore that exact meaning, or to refuse to accept it, would be capricious, and foster confusion rather than good understanding.

But, further than this, the tendency of the developing of friendship relation toward mutual understanding must also be a tendency toward substantial agreement; and this substantial agreement lies within the range of the possible, and not, as many suppose, of the impossible. For there cannot be two Rights that are opposites, or rather two opposites both of which are Right. To be opposed, therefore, is to be unfriendly, and to find the common ground of accord—the Right—is to be friendly.

The failure of intelligent persons to understand each other and to come to substantial agreement, arises from the failure to explain the sense in which words of double meaning are used, or from the misuse of words, rather than from the impossibility of agreement residing in the nature of things—in which nature of things our own nature must, of course, be included.

To illustrate by a word having more than one meaning. One might say to another: "Man is an animal," and be understood to mean the male portion of the race only, and that he has the animal nature and instinct and naught else. And the one to whom he should announce this might an-

swer: "I do not agree with you." If, then, the first speaker should hasten to add (recognizing the limitation as well as the range of the term that he had used), "I mean Man in the sense of the race, and not of the male portion only; and I mean that he has the animal organization on the physical side, but not that his nature is the nature of the animal;" provided that these words were the points of disagreement these two would be found at once to be in perfect accord.

To illustrate by a word having but one meaning: Suppose two boys to be looking out across the bay, and one to say to the other: "I see four sloops out there." And suppose the other to answer: "No, there are five." If the latter, thinking only of sailing vessels as distinguished from steam-power craft, has included a schooner among his sloops, and can explain what was in his mind, they will of course immediately come to an agreement.

If in either of these cases, however, the parties concerned should say to each other, "Do not let us discuss our differences; we can never agree; let us 'agree to disagree,'" such an attitude would foster and enforce the idea of disagreement where no disagreement in reality existed, and such a compact would perpetuate the idea and the hostility arising from it.

To the catchy phrase, "Let us agree to disagree," which is so freely used when difficulties arise in conversation or discussion, we owe the perpetuation of countless errors in thinking and much hostility of feeling. It should never be assented to by any who are interested in getting at the truth. Quite different is the proposition to lay aside a discussion for awhile, for lack of time or lack of preparation on the part of either to explain his own attitude fully and fairly.

In addition to the consideration of the use of the two classes of words thus noted—the class having more than one meaning and the class having but one specific meaning—there is the obligation to consider the use of some words at all for the purposes for which they were brought into existence. Among these are vituperative words, when used to char-

acterize men individually or collectively.

Before we raise the question of the rectitude of their use, however, let us note that vituperative words belong to the class of words having a definite, exact meaning, just as do the words "spade", "sloop", "black", or "blue". Whether one or another uses a spade, or for whatever purpose one or another uses it, it is still a spade, according to design and structure, and cannot be called a spoon or a boomerang without doing violence to the law and purpose of language.

A vituperative word is not one thing when one of us uses it and another thing when another of us uses it. It is not ugly and improper when used by Mr. Dowie to characterize the citizens of New York, and beautiful and proper when used by the citizens of New York to characterize Mr. Dowie. It is not ugly and improper when used by Tammany Hall to characterize the Reform party, and beautiful and proper when used by the Reform party to characterize Tammany Hall and the Democratic party.

A vituperative word is one intended to injure. The synonyms given for it are "vulgar", "scurrilous", "reviling". Under the first two of these synonyms would come such language as has received the name of "billingsgate", from its habitual use in the quarter of London bearing that name. And under the last would come such language, mild in itself, but having the unmistakable spirit of contempt back of it, as the mob used at the foot of the cross of Jesus.

To illustrate again: Suppose a man to have committed murder, and to have been tried and found guilty. A just judge condemns the man in the spirit and language of just censure simply, and pronounces the sentence. With this procedure lovers of simple justice are satisfied. Should a judge undertake to do more than this—to berate and villify the victim—lovers of simple justice would resent it as being in the nature of kicking a man after he is down—in the nature of the contempt heaped upon Jesus after he was condemned and sentence laid upon him. It would make no difference that the sentence was just

in the one case and unjust in the other; the language of contempt would be regarded as equally out of place in both.

Fortunately our courts of justice do not permit this language. But outside of the courts of justice undeveloped natures seek to tip the scales of justice so that they shall deal out injustice, by heaping upon the victim, in addition to the sentence pronounced upon him, such opprobrious and vituperative epithets as "vile", "beastly", "brute", "scum of the earth", or such scornful terms as "Aha, you expected not to be found out, did you?"

Every day the temptation to be drawn into this kind of injustice comes to us. But in times of great general excitement, such as a political campaign, the temptation is concentrated upon large numbers at the same time, and many fall under it then who do not habitually yield to it, yet who are not wise enough to appreciate its real power for harm. In the recent mayoralty campaign in New York both the newspapers and our public speakers, especially the the so-called reform side, lent themselves to this temptation.

The language of abuse, of scorn, of contempt, of hate (to say nothing of coarse and vulgar language) can never be justified in use even towards the "vile", by any believer in the gospel of love rather than that of hate; by any believer in the Golden Rule of "Do as you would be done by"; by any, therefore, who have normal respect for themselves. All such words and phrases savor of the Pharaonic spirit, of the I-am-holier-than-thou spirit. They are anti-Christian, for they are calculated to harm the life of the individual or individuals against whom they are used;—unless, indeed, it can be shown that it is no injury to the life of another to make that life harder to live. For if the judgment pronounced upon the person or party is unjust, added terms of scorn increase the sense of isolation and of being misunderstood. And if the judgment is just, added words of scorn increase the burden of the individual or party conscience, and by inspiring the unfriendliness and enmity that prompts them help to sear or crush out that conscience.

Many so-called religious teachers and others suppose that it does a "sinner" good to berate him. But until it can be shown, somewhere in the physical world, or in some other way made to appeal to our reason, that the greater the pressure that holds a thing down the easier it is for that thing to rise or the less likely it is to be crushed out altogether, we should hesitate to give our credence to the teaching that human souls can rise more easily the more they are pressed down by the contempt and scorn of their fellows, or that they will not be crushed out by that pressure.

In all this there is no wish to raise the question of the truth of the charges brought against persons, parties or movements at which vituperative epithets are flung. That is quite another question. My object is simply to maintain that the words and phrases of reviling used to characterize political organizations and to discount their future possibilities, cannot be justified by any code of ethics or morality that the civilization of our century ought to countenance or have a part in.

LIZZIE NYE NORTHPROP.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Washington, Dec. 7.—In discussing in the Philadelphia North American, three months ago, the contest between England, France, Germany, Russia and the United States to see which should have the biggest navy, I said: "The logic of this folly—if the term logic is applicable where such madness prevails—is for each of these nations in their strife for supremacy to go on increasing their navies until every adult male not already enrolled as a soldier shall be manning its warships."

I did not then think that any one could be found to advocate the carrying to its logical conclusion of this fatuous policy; yet the New York Times of November 30 indicates that the reception accorded Hobson on his return from Santiago has induced him to go the "limit" and advocate the logical end of the demands of the navy leaguers. Here is what the Times says:

Richmond Pearson Hobson, ex-commander in the navy, has prepared a bill which he has requested Representative Wiley, of Alabama, to introduce in the house. Its purpose, he says, is to make the United States the first naval power of the world. The bill makes a total appropriation of \$2,750,000,000, a certain portion of which is to be used each year for new ships. Fifty million dollars is made available for the present fiscal year, \$60,000,000 for the next, and so on, increasing

by \$10,000,000 each year up to 1915, when a lump sum of \$1,500,000,000 is made to carry on the programme to 1925.

Such insanity must shock even those heretofore callous to the moral aspect of this "big" navy delusion. Surely Hobson and other blatant advocates of stupendous naval expenditures cannot fail to see that this proposition will inevitably incite European navy leaguers to renewed activity and more ardent exhibitions of their "patriotism!" They will point to this demand to treble and quadruple the size of the American navy as a justification for enormous additions to the navies of their respective countries.

Just think that the United States, which some yet believe to be a real republic and with the idea of liberty still existing therein, which occupies a unique geographical position, absolutely unassailable, invulnerable to attack, should be asked to authorize in one year—1915—exactly ten times the sum spent by the greatest naval power in the world, Great Britain, for the present year! This is the inevitable result of our policy of "benevolent assimilation" and criminal aggression.

The utter recklessness of the Republicans in their worship of the tariff "fetich" was again shown in the speech of Congressman Hepburn, of Iowa, who asserted that "to-day every man in the United States who wants work finds employment in the great labor fields of the United States and at a compensating wage." As the leading newspapers of the country have for weeks been recounting the shutdowns and reductions of wages in nearly all the important industries, it is but fair to assume that Mr. Hepburn must regard the wages paid prior to these reductions as excessive, as more than "compensating."

The shutdowns and wage reductions have been especially numerous since the elections, despite the assertion of Mark Hanna that all the people needed to do was to "let well enough alone," and that the success of Tom L. Johnson would bring hard times. In order to be sure that this result should follow, the New York Central discharged 2,500 men six weeks before the election. Other railroads have since followed suit, while the Steel Trust has announced its intention to reduce its pay roll some \$15,000,000—enough to pay three per cent. upon its total bond issues, and has closed down sufficient plants to throw 25,000 men out of employment.

Of course the Republicans are aware of the falsity of their claims, but the people have displayed such wonderful capacity to be fooled by these assertions that Hepburn, Grosvenor and others consider it safe to put out these ridiculous claims. The Democratic leader, however, loses no opportunity to puncture these statements, almost invariably setting forth the free trade position, although he calls it "tariff reform." I

should feel better satisfied if there were some evidence that his views on the tariff question were shared by all the Democratic members and there were others equally aggressive and outspoken. That this is not so was shown in the debate on the Cuban reciprocity bill, all the opposition to that measure on the part of the Democrats (as well as the Republicans) being based on protectionist arguments.

The committee assignments show that the Speaker has continued the policy of Speaker Henderson, who reduced the Democratic membership on the 16 important committees to six, as against 11 Republicans, thus indicating a determination to use the machinery of the House to the fullest extent to protect "graft" and special privilege. Such changes as have been made in the two great "graft" committees, those on the District of Columbia and on post offices and post roads, offer little assurance that the minority will aggressively and fearlessly expose the general "graft" hidden in appropriations to improve the District of Columbia—in other words, to increase land values—at the expense of the whole nation; nor the immense "graft" contained in the outrageously high rates paid to railroads for transportation of the mails. It is to be hoped that one of the new members of the post roads committee, William S. Cowherd, will show the same courage and determination to expose the railroad "graft" in that committee that he displayed during the last session in opposing a practical gift of some \$4,000,000 to the Pennsylvania and Baltimore & Ohio railroads.

Whether my assignment to the Pacific railroads committee is to be of any use in the fight here for "equal rights to all and special privileges to none" depends somewhat upon whether the democratic Democrats are going to "get busy." It is doubtful whether the committee will ever meet unless business is provided for it by those who can suggest plans, either in the shape of new legislation or of amendments to existing statutes, which aim to check the rapacity of the transcontinental railroads. I shall be glad to have suggestions, also copies of any proposed legislation or resolutions which those who assert the equal right of all men to nature's bounty may send to members representing their district.

ROBERT BAKER.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Dec. 10.

The special session of Congress (p. 503) ended at 12 o'clock noon, on the 7th, and the regular session began at the same hour. Soon after the opening of the regular

session, President Roosevelt's annual message was received and read. The President also made ad interim appointments, including that of Col. Wood to be major general, upon the theory that there was legally an interval between the adjournment of the special and the opening of the regular session, even though there was no interval in fact.

This Congress is confronted at its opening session with serious conditions in the industrial field. Although the Secretary of the Treasury gives assurances in his annual report that the business crisis in which the country has been floundering (p. 547) has passed, confidence is not restored and employes are still being discharged.

Among the men discharged are some of the officials of the steel trust, whose salaries range from \$10,000 upwards. They were politely notified last week that it will be agreeable to the trust if they secure employment elsewhere by the first of the year. For the most part these officials are men who belonged to subsidiary companies at the time of the absorption of those companies into the trust. A general reduction of wages of the organized workmen employed by the trust is in process of negotiation between the Amalgamated association and the trust. Reductions of about 12½ per cent. have been agreed upon in some of the mills. Cotton-mill workers everywhere are on the verge of a cut in wages, and in New England some 75,000 have already suffered the cut. In the Fox river valley of Illinois—including Aurora, Batavia, St. Charles, Geneva, Plano and Elgin—working hours have been increased from nine to ten, which will result in a strike if the workmen dare face the problem of insufficient employment; and in Chicago the army of the disemployed receives large accessions nearly every day. Reduction of miners' pay in Illinois is under consideration, and in the Pennsylvania region mines are closing down.

Bitter feeling has been engendered in connection with these manifestations of hard times for workingmen, by the published re-

ports of contemplated action by employers' organizations. From Dayton (O.), for instance, the press dispatches reported on the 4th that the executive committee of the Citizens' Industrial Association of America had met there on that day and outlined a "plan of battle" against unionism with a view to eliminating—

the walking delegate, sympathy strikes, closed shop and the union label.

It has also adopted a resolution—

—asking Congress not to indorse the eight hour bill when that document comes up for action. Another resolution requests all employers' associations throughout the country to affiliate with the national body. Still another action amounts practically to the establishment of a blacklist. It is proposed to establish a labor information bureau where will be kept a tabulated record of "undesirable" workmen. The boycott was bitterly denounced. A bureau of organization, publication and education, it is likely, will be located in Dayton.

This labor warfare was intensified in bitterness by a decision made on the 4th, by Judge Holdom, of Chicago (who has become notorious for drastic decisions against organized workingmen), to the effect that trade unions are liable as corporations for "picketing." His decision was in a contempt case brought by the Chicago Typothetae—a body of printing firms—against the Franklin union, charging it with violating the court's injunction of October 9 prohibiting picketing the plants of the Typothetae and intimidating their employees.

Still more significant is the labor situation in Colorado, where the governor has proclaimed martial law. A miners' strike has been in progress in Teller county (p. 408) since last August. It was called by the Western Federation of Miners in support of the 8-hour day. The Mine Owners' association immediately secured State troops from Gov. Peabody, against the protest of the sheriff, who reported that no serious violence had occurred, but upon the recommendation of a committee of his own appointment. Immediately upon arriving the troops arrested strikers without warrants, imprisoned them in a military guard-house ("bull pen"), refused to deliver them to the sheriff, and refused to record any reason

for the arrests. On the issuance of writs of habeas corpus, Gen. Chase produced his prisoners in court, but with a menacing show of military force; and when Judge Seeds discharged them, refused to obey, but detained the prisoners in his custody until after he had been ordered by the governor to release them. About the same time Gen. Chase suppressed an issue of the Record, the only daily paper of Victor, for criticizing this high-handed conduct of the military. Gen. Chase was subsequently convicted of disobedience of orders (pp. 425, 487, 504), for holding a striker in unwarranted military custody after the governor had ordered his release; but the governor set aside the verdict of the court-martial on the ground that although the verdict was just, Chase's previous record had been good. After these events but little was heard—and nothing at once important and trustworthy—from the scene of the Colorado disturbances, until the latter part of November, when further arbitrary arrests were made. They were followed up by Gov. Peabody's proclamation of martial law.

In this proclamation, issued December 4, after stating that it appeared that there were in Teller county "one or more organizations controlled by desperate men who were intimidating the civil authorities and setting at defiance the constitution and laws of the State of Colorado," and reciting some of the offenses alleged to have been committed, the governor said:

Whereas, The civil authorities have shown themselves unable to deal with these criminals and to bring them to punishment, or else are unwilling to perform their duty by reason of threats and intimidation, or through fear or subserviency to such bodies of lawless and armed men, so that a state of lawlessness exists in said county of Teller, the laws are set at defiance, and the citizens are unable to enjoy the rights guaranteed them by the constitution and laws of this State, and by reason of these conditions it appears that life and property are unsafe in said county; and, whereas, I have reason to believe that similar outrages may occur at any time, and, believing the civil authorities of said county of Teller are utterly unable, unwilling, and are making no practical attempt to preserve order and to protect life and property; now, therefore,

I, James H. Peabody, governor of the State of Colorado, by virtue of the authority in me vested, do hereby proclaim and declare the said county of Teller, in the State of Colorado, to be in a state of insurrection and rebellion.

The governor's proclamation was published in Teller county on the 5th and a censorship was immediately placed by the military authorities upon the Victor Record, the organ of the organized miners. Publication of an article criticizing the governor was forbidden, and the military officer in command at Cripple Creek announced that a censorship over outgoing dispatches would be immediately established. The military has entirely supplanted civil authority, the writ of habeas corpus is practically if not formally suspended, and business is reported as paralyzed.

In another county of Colorado, San Miguel, of which Telluride is the county seat, the militia is also stationed for the enforcement of the law against striking miners. In this region the impecunious strikers are treated as vagrants, being ordered either to go to work or to leave the city. In consequence an appeal from the Western Federation of Miners has been addressed to President Roosevelt as follows:

At the present time officers of the State of Colorado, under the guise and pretext of enforcing the law, have ordered a large number of reputable and self-sustaining citizens and residents to leave Telluride, Col., under penalty of being imprisoned or otherwise severely dealt with. The citizens and residents are not guilty of any crime against the laws of the State or the United States. The constitution and laws of the United States pertaining to civil rights are being frequently violated, and we call on you under the civil rights statutes and under section 1,988 of the revised statutes of the United States to investigate conditions prevailing there and give to these persons who have been so outraged the protection guaranteed to them by the laws of the land.

No action has yet been taken by the President.

The first public hearing before the traction committee of the Chicago city council, relative to the tentative traction ordinance (p. 553), was held on the 7th, and is still in progress. Advocates of immediate ownership

were first called upon to speak, and the following have responded: William Prentiss, Margaret Haley, E. N. Nockles, Charles L. Bonney, John C Harding, Thomas Rhodus, and R. G. Wall, representing various organizations, and Western Star and John Z. White especially for the Henry George Association.

NEWS NOTES.

—Herbert Spencer died at Brighton, England, on the 9th at the age of 83.

—William J. Bryan visited the French senate and chamber of deputies on the 8th.

—On the 3d the German reichstag was opened at Berlin by Chancellor von Bulow.

—The receivership of Zion (p. 554) was terminated on the 7th and John Alexander Dowie is again in undisputed possession.

—Louis F. Post will speak on the "Negro Question" before the Old Hickory Club of Englewood, 6157 Wentworth avenue, Friday evening, December 11, at 8 p. m.

—William M. Springer, formerly a distinguished congressman from Illinois and Democratic leader in the House, died at Washington on the 4th. His age was 67.

—The latest experiment with the Langley flying machine (p. 442) was made near Washington on the 8th and failed. The machine pitched into the river, but the operator was saved.

—Two postal clerks—Thomas W. McGregor and Columbus Ellsworth—were convicted in the Federal court at Baltimore on the 8th of conspiracy in connection with the notorious postal pouch frauds.

—At the municipal elections in Massachusetts on the 8th the Socialist mayoralty candidates at Brockton and Haverhill were defeated for re-election. In both cities the Republicans and the Democrats had made fusion nominations.

—The monthly statement of the United States treasury department (see p. 504) for November shows on hand November 30, 1903:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash.....	219,237,429.64
Total	\$369,237,429.64
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1903.....	384,394,275.58
Decrease	\$15,156,845.94

—The 16th annual debate between Yale and Harvard, at New Haven on the 4th, was won by Yale, which held the affirmative of the following resolution: "That the history of trade unionism in the United States for the past twenty years shows a general tendency detri-

mental to the best interests of the country."

—The monthly treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government (see p. 504) for the month ending November 30, 1903, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff	\$113,983,606.52
Internal revenue.....	102,496,822.29
Miscellaneous	18,609,451.67
	\$235,089,880.48
Expenses:	
Civic and misc.....	\$58,331,474.45
War	57,652,035.73
Navy	42,120,807.54
Indians	4,832,737.73
Pensions	62,501,219.92
Interest	11,717,529.83
	\$237,155,805.20
Deficit	\$ 2,065,924.72

PRESS OPINIONS.

PRESS CENSORSHIP.

(Cleveland) Waechter und Anzeiger (Dem.), Dec. 7.—When the freedom of the press was interfered with in the Philippines by our imperialistic administration, some "wise" people may have thought: "How does that concern us! That is away off in Manila. Such a thing would not be possible in this country." But it is possible. It has ever been thus. When a free people once give consent to the curtailing of the liberties of their dependents this is only the precursor of the curtailing of their own liberties at home. In Colorado freedom of the press has been abolished, because workmen are contending for their rights with greedy corporations.

NATIONAL POLITICS.

Johnston (Pa.) Daily Democrat (Dem.), Dec. 2.—The reorganizers are not saying very much about Rhode Island either. Yet the result in that State last month surely was interesting. There never was a larger vote cast in the state, and a majority of it was given to Hon. Lucius F. C. Garvin, single tax free trader and Bryan Democrat. Republican majorities in the Aldrich rotten borough had been ranging for years from 6,000 to 14,000—and even in this case everyman on the Republican ticket except the nominee for governor was elected. The majority for Garvin was 1,587 and the party is in better condition to win now than it has been before in ten or fifteen years.

ANNIHILATING TRADE UNIONS.

(Cleveland) Waechter und Anzeiger (Dem.) Dec. 4.—Parry declared openly at Dayton yesterday that the association which he represents has for its aim the annihilation of the labor organizations. Some evil genius must have given Mr. Parry this idea. For the labor organizations are the natural result of the labor conditions of to-day. Independent of the will or intent of the individual employer, unjust competition in the labor market is forcing wages down to the lowest conceivable level—often below the point of subsistence; therefore the workers to-day must organize. If any employers' association were purblind enough to declare a war of annihilation, there would of course be war—a war as ruinous not only for the side of labor, but for the side of capital, as was ever carried on. And at the end of this war there would still be found—organization.

BRYAN ABROAD.

London Daily Mail (Lib.), Nov. 27.—Amid the cheers of his enthusiastic countrymen Mr. W. J. Bryan, the famous American democrat, rose last night at the Hotel Cecil to deliver his speech on Thanksgiving day. It was at the dinner of the Amer-

ican society, and in introducing his distinguished compatriot Mr. Choate, the American ambassador, dwelt on the excellent relations that existed between the two great countries. Mr. Bryan's speech was a remarkable oratorical effort. In dead silence he urged upon his hearers the solemn character of the day. Taking for his text the great ideal of the universal brotherhood of man, he held his audience spellbound as he recounted the blessings that the United States had received from the world, and advanced the responsibilities of that country to posterity. There was a fascination in the strong, fine face of the orator; the strength of the jaw, the mobility and delicacy of the mouth, and the splendid independence indicated in the poise of the head kept the eyes of his hearers riveted on the speaker. His voice, low at first, and melodious always, carried to the furthestmost limits of the hall. The wild bursts of cheering as he carried his listeners along did not interrupt him, and clear through the roar of applause his voice cut audibly and distinct. Seldom had such an oration been heard in London as the American society were treated to last night. At the conclusion the Americans rose to a man and cheered.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Dec. 4.—There are some of us who cannot help being amused by the dash being cut by Mr. Bryan abroad. His special enemies at home show some signs of irritation, which is human, for the man is really making a favorable impression in England, according to the reports. In any event, Mr. Bryan captured completely the London Times by his oratory, which has lauded "the dignity and literary beauty" of his speeches, comparing him even with Lord Rosebery as an orator—which is about as far as the Times could go in praising the speeches of any man. The London correspondent of the New York Times says that he spoke so finely at the Thanksgiving dinner of the American society of London, and "with such exceeding grace and polite consideration for the people among whom he is sojourning that the thought came to some of his fellow-Americans seated about the tables that it was a great pity he had turned his activities into the propagation of political vagaries instead of making a solid man of himself."

THE PANAMA QUESTION.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Dec. 8.—It is regretted that the President has not more frankly outlined his course in dealing with Colombia and the Panamasecession. He has failed to throw any light whatever upon the methods by which the revolution was fomented under encouragement from Washington and he avoids a discussion of the part our naval and consular officials played in preventing the Colombian government from protecting its own sovereignty and maintaining its treaty obligations.

Advocate of Peace (Am. Peace, Soc.) Dec.—No stretching of international law, as the government has endeavored to stretch it, can be made to cover our "indecent haste," which, with any other than a weak and helpless country, would have immediately brought on war; no manipulation of the principles of justice and equity, no specious pleas of commercial necessity and of the rights of civilization can be made to justify this high-handed and altogether unnecessary conduct toward a weak friendly state.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), Dec. 7.—The President's justification in its last analysis is that the ends justified the means. True, he undertakes to establish that the means employed were proper and that there has been no infringement of Colombia's rights by the United States, but in this he is not convincing. He resorts to the "manifest destiny" plea—that the revolution and its resulting advantage

to the United States was the work of Divine Providence rather than the fruit of chicanery, intrigue and greed. In this he has followed well-established precedent. No modern world Power ever grabs territory or preys upon the weak and defenseless. When it becomes necessary for it to despoil the weak, it does so in the interests of civilization and humanity as an instrument of a Higher Power.

Toronto (Ont.) Weekly Sun (Goldwin Smith), Dec. 2.—"We needed Panama in our business, we have got her, and we are going to keep her." So writes the editor of a great American journal. It is starting to find that such words can be penned, and are probably read by large numbers with satisfaction, in a civilized and professedly Christian country. But such are the tone and tendency of the day. Even if the conduct of the American government has been as bad as appears, other governments are not qualified to cast the first stone. Russia wants Finland to round off her despotism, and in defiance of her solemn covenant she takes it, while a British writer of eminence justifies her action on the principle that force makes law. Great Britain wants the Transvaal that she may paint South Africa red; and she takes it, solemn pledges notwithstanding. We are apparently drifting into a renewal of the age of Machiavel, when in politics expediency, or what to rapacity seemed expediency, made right. The forces of moral resistance are happily greater now than they were in Machiavel's day, and we may have faith in their ultimate triumph. But before righteousness regains its ascendancy humanity may have a bad quarter of an hour.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Dec. 4 (weekly).—Rev. Dr. Newman Smyth's "misgivings rather than thanksgiving" for the Panama business was a telling phrase in the New Haven divine's Thanksgiving day sermon. He was quite justified in deciding to "postpone giving thanks for the Panama canal until another Thanksgiving day." But better still was Dr. Smyth's daring rebuke of the Outlook—and the word "daring" is used because it is a rare and courageous clergyman who will call attention from his pulpit to the sanctimonious humbuggery of the New York weekly journal which fills a semi-religious role with such artful solemnity. There has been nothing more laughable during the Panama affair than the Outlook's antics with the moral law—unless you except the Amherst college professor's funny theory of "international eminent domain." Happily there is an eminent divine who is not deceived by these moral and legal prestidigitateurs, and his name is Smyth. "We are not to be satisfied," said Dr. Smyth, "with hypocritical explanations or pretenses, or with any such easy justification of it, superficial in reasoning, and with large spaces in it vacant of facts, as has appeared in papers representing the religious sense of the community, like the Outlook."

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of Congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 37 of that publication.

Senate.

Washington, Nov. 30-Dec. 5, 1903.

There was no session on the 30th, and no business of general interest was transacted on the 1st. Adjournment was taken on the 1st to the 4th. No business of general interest was transacted on the 4th nor on the 5th.

House.

There was no session on the 30th, and on the 1st, after a random debate the House adjourned to the 4th. No business of gen-

eral interest was transacted on the 4th, and on the 5th the time was occupied with desultory debate.

Record Notes.—Itemized statement of expenditures of the Isthmian Canal Commission (pp. 380-86).

MISCELLANY

WHAT IS LIBERTY?

Translated from the Norwegian, for The Public, by Waldemar Lee.

What is liberty? Define it if you can—Liberty, that all the world demands; Liberty, that scorns our man-made law, And in the crippled soul of serf makes longings grow.

Liberty! Just try a definition, And give an answer worth consideration. Well, here is one:

"In liberty the horse is often sent To show his tricks upon the tanbark, 'neath the tent."

THE TRUE OPTIMISM.

Portions of a sermon on "Optimistic Pessimists," delivered by H. S. Bigelow at the Vine Street Congregational church in Cincinnati, December 6.

The parable of the mustard seed reveals to us the philosophy from which Jesus drew his abounding optimism.

Truth was to him like unto a grain of mustard seed, "which, indeed, is less than all seeds; but when it is grown, it is greater than the herbs, and becomes a tree, so that the birds of heaven come and lodge in the branches thereof."

Jesus spoke this parable to men who who had become imbued with the truth he taught. But they were humble men. They were only a handful against the world, and they were altogether without honor in their time.

"Yes," said Jesus, "it may seem to be a forlorn hope. You despair because you compare your feebleness with the world's strength. If that were the contest, there would be no hope. You forget the all-important factor, namely, the vitality of the truth."

Truth is not a burden that must be upheld by the hand of men. It is a seed that you put in the ground. It is a thing that grows. A man might as well try to manufacture an oak from an acorn, as to overcome by his own might the power that is arrayed against the truth. But he can sow the seed. And it is as vain for men to contend against the growing truth as it would be for them to try to put the oak back into the acorn.

For those who keep their religion tucked away in a snug little church; for those to whom Christianity is a creed, and not a deed, a dream, and not a battle, this parable will have little significance.

But this parable is pregnant with hope for those who find their religious endeavor in service for humanity.

The men who have sided with the truth, which the power of their day has frowned upon, and before which ignorance has trembled; the men who, in advance of their fellows, have stood on the skirmish line, looking with blood-bespattered faces into open cannon mouths; the men who, with hope deferred, have waited for prejudices to melt and passions to subside; the men who have toiled on in patience, while year after year the fickle multitude has been thrown into paroxysms of joy over the defeat of that truth which was its only salvation; the men who have made war upon the hoary customs and legal crimes by which the race has been held in bondage;—these are the men who must find comfort in the parable. For the parable declares to them that they are not alone; that the truth they plant is sending its roots into the ground, even while its misguided foes dance upon what they take to be its grave; that the same power which brings the oak out of the acorn is working in silence, and working mightily for the triumph of their just cause.

The true optimist is the man who fights the wrong with good heart, because he knows he is but contending for the recognition of eternal laws, and because with the eye of faith he can see the future grandeur of his humble truth. What inspires him is the assurance of the good time coming when the thoughts of down-trodden men will soar on high, and the heavens resound with the mighty shouts of the Sons of God, rejoicing in their new-found freedom.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

CIVIL SERVICE IN THE WATER WORKS.

A delegation of prominent South side Democratic politicians, headed by Louis Cook, Stanley Harrison, Dan Kollicker, called upon Mayor Johnson yesterday afternoon to file a formal protest against Prof. Bemis. They said that Bemis has alienated many good Democratic workers, and that he has become an object of hatred among the workers. They insinuated that the revolt of Democratic councilmen last Monday night, when two administration water works measures were defeated by Democratic votes, was aimed at Bemis over the head of Johnson.

"You cannot hit Bemis without hitting me," replied the mayor. "I approve of what Bemis is doing, and I stand for the

policy which he has inaugurated in the water works department. He entered upon his work under directions from me as to how I desired the department to be conducted, and he has continued to conduct the department as I think it should be conducted. There will be no change in this policy while I am mayor."

The delegation of prominent South side Democratic politicians thereupon departed in deep gloom.—Cleveland Plain Dealer, of Dec. 3.

STAND FIRM FOR THE MERIT SYSTEM.

A delegation of Democratic politicians who still hold to the doctrine that "to the victors belong the spoils" waited upon Mayor Johnson to file protest against the retention of Prof. Bemis at the head of the water works department. They claimed that the professor had alienated many good Democratic workers, and his retention in the position was damaging the party. The mayor, so far from being impressed by the protest, announced his intention of standing by Superintendent Bemis who, he explained, was but carrying out his instructions, and the policy would not be changed. In taking that determined position Mayor Johnson should have the support of men of all parties who believe in municipal government on a strictly business instead of a partisan basis.

When Mr. Bemis was placed at the head of the water works department by Mayor Johnson it was avowedly for the purpose of operating it on the merit instead of the political spoils system. Mr. Bemis had no party friends to reward or enemies to punish. He was given a free hand in the work of eliminating the inefficient and obtaining effective help regardless of party. He retained those he found in office who were doing faithful and efficient service, although they were complained of as being Republicans. He dismissed summarily those who had no other claim to their positions than as rewards for partisan services. He assigned men to places according to fitness, and endeavored to proportion their pay to their value as public servants. In short, Superintendent Bemis undertook to manage the water works department as an experienced railway superintendent manages the working force of his line.

The spoils politicians of Mayor Johnson's party rebelled, and the question was sharply forced upon the Mayor whether he would stand by the merit system superintendent or by the party spoilsmen, who demanded his decapitation or suppression. The decision was

promptly and decisively made. Superintendent Bemis was emphatically indorsed, and the spoilsmen submitted with what grace they might. The results of the late election seemed to give the politicians another opportunity. Believing the Mayor would be more inclined now to listen to partisan arguments they have renewed their demands for the ousting or coercion of Bemis in the interests of the party. The answer is the same as before. Mayor Johnson is behind Superintendent Bemis in his policy of making service in the interest of the public the test of efficiency, instead of political "work" in the interest of the party.

In taking this ground the Mayor is but carrying out the pledge he made to the people when he sought their votes, and which he renewed when he assumed office. Whatever cause he may have given for criticism in his course otherwise, he has been consistent to his promise in the support of Water Works Superintendent Bemis and the maintenance of the merit system in that department. The public should stand by him in this important matter, to the end that, whatever changes may hereafter take place in the political complexion of the municipal administration, one department, at least, may be reasonably secure against the assaults of spoilsmen of any party.—Editorial in Plain Dealer of Dec. 4.

UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL.

Printed from the Original MS.

Dear John: It's a long time since I wrote you, but I've been dazed like, and a rubbin' my eyes. I've had boy orators, and boy poets, and boy evangelists; but boy presidents are the worst yet. Why, I spent three thousand million dollars, four years of war, and thousands of the finest men on earth, teachin' that a State could not secede; and here Theodore throws it all away before breakfast. The whole Republican party is on the back track from '61, Theodore recognizes the new State of Panama in three days, and dickers with her for a slice of land. That will be a pretty bird to come home to roost, I don't think. Suppose my States should want to secede. Suppose Ohio should feel imperialistic—she's 125,000 that way now—and join Canada; or the United States split down the back bone of the Alleghenies and go off. You fellows could recognize the new deal, and say to me: "You set the example, Sam. It's three days. It's a precedent that we favor. What you goin' to do about it?" and I vum! I don't know.

What do you suppose made Theodore throw away the fruits of the Civil War

for a strip of canal land five miles wide, specially when he had a better and nearer strip offered him for nothin'? Hey? Well, I tell you. It looks to me as if some of my corporations had taken stock in the Panama route, and didn't want to lose their money. The corporations have a wire connection with Theodore some way. When they kick, he kicks. I don't understand it, but I see the queer thing a happenin' right along. But Theodore don't mean to do so no more. He's a goin' to issue a proclamation that we are not aggressive; and if we have stolen the Philippines and Panama in the past, why, we've got our Christmas turkey now, and the rest of the flock may well settle their feathers and go to sleep. Besides, if it's wrong, publicity is the remedy. When the Romans stole the Sabine women it was publicity that stopped it—and the fact that there were no more Sabine women. I mistrust that Theodore will run his pen through that last part.

I dropped the whole question into the poetry machine; but it took no notice of Theodore. The minute I dropped it in, the machine made a noise like pattin' juba, follored by the song and chorus lilt of a Bowery theater on a Saturday night:

OLE MISTEH COON.

Ole Misteh Coon is a mighty fine man,
Ole Misteh Coon,
Ole Misteh Coon.
He like a big slice off de fat o' de lan',
An' he like it done brown in de heat o' de pan,
Ole Misteh Coon.

Ole Misteh Coon he don' play no craps,
Ole Misteh Coon,
Ole Misteh Coon.
He play it in de ch'ch whar he take his Sunday naps,
An' whar he'll git it back agin in soft ginger snaps,
Ole Misteh Coon.

Ole Misteh Coon, he's made a mint o' cash,
Ole Misteh Coon,
Ole Misteh Coon.
For de fellows what he squeeze it from, he don't care a dash,
For de Lord made 'em easy an' pore white trash—
Ole Misteh Coon.

Ole Misteh Coon he ain't nobody's fool,
Ole Misteh Coon,
Ole Misteh Coon.
He carries all his deals through on de golden rule—
To salt a thousan' dolla's, give one unto a school,
Ole Misteh Coon.

Ole Misteh Coon, he hangs well onto de limb,
Ole Misteh Coon,
Ole Misteh Coon.
Jedgin' by de Good Book, his chance a little slim,
But de comfort of religion, it is precious unto him,
Ole Misteh Coon.

UNCLE SAM.

COL. EDGARTON'S VIEW OF THE LIFTING OF PANAMA.

"If," remarked Col. Abe Edgerton, the Arizona mining man, "my friend Marshall P. Wilder happened to be promenading past the White House, swinging a particularly natty cane, and Champion Jim Jeffries should come along and take a fancy to that cane, and lift Mr. Wilder with a left hook and annex the cane, would I admire him for his courage, audacity and dash? Would any gentleman in this cafe admire that matchless heavyweight for doing up a featherweight just because he could, and because the featherweight had something he wanted?"

"Jeffries," observed Prof. Jenks, of Pennsylvania, "would be a cowardly dub to do a thing like that."

"Precisely," replied Col. Edgerton, "but only yesterday I heard you, as a good Republican, lauding President Roosevelt for stealing the Isthmus from Colombia, which hasn't any more chance against us in a fight than Wilder would have with Jeffries."

"In national affairs, sir," began Prof. Jenks, with dignity, "we—"

"In national affairs," interrupted the Colonel, "we remain barbarians. It's a curious thing that it should be so, too. As individuals we've tamed ourselves. If a man steals your wife you go to court instead of gunning. If you are insulted, you draw no sword, but appeal to the police. And we describe this change as progress in civilization. So it is. But as a nation we, like every other nation, still believe in the duelist's code. The most personally peaceable, pigeon-breasted, thin-blooded citizen wants his government to stand on the point of honor and carry a chip on his shoulder. He wants it to act with a ferocity and violence that he himself is quite incapable of in his dealings with his neighbors. He likes to be brave and fierce by proxy, I suppose. And the less sand he has in his own craw, the more eager he is likely to be for his country to go about with hand on hilt and full of strange oaths. He wants Uncle Sam, his big representative, to be a bad man and fight at the drop of the hat.

"And it surely does puzzle me," continued Col. Edgerton, "to see the way a decent citizen lets himself be morally up-ended when it comes to judging the acts of his government—how he manages to admire and applaud deeds that he wouldn't think of doing himself, and that he would consider any individual a cowardly scoundrel for doing.

"It's bigness that blinds him," argued the Colonel, toying thoughtfully with his glass. "Now, Professor, if I were to

lift your pocketbook while handing you this cigar as a mark of good will and friendship what'd you think of me?"

"I'd say you were a thief," came promptly from the Professor.

"Exactly. But if Morgan and Schwab and the rest of them, by lying prospectuses and giving the weight of their names to the enterprise, get you to put your all in shipbuilding stock, or steel, and copped off every dollar you had, you would call it business, I dare say, even if you did rip around and curse with the other victims, and it never would occur to you to have them pulled for larceny. The extent of their looting would bluff you away from realizing the real quality of the business they were doing."

"Still, I maintain," persisted Prof. Jenks, "that the moral standard which properly controls private conduct cannot be applied to the proceedings of government."

"Why not?" demanded the Colonel, raising his voice. "What right have a dozen men, or a million men, or seventy million men, to do a thing that in a single man would be cowardly and dishonest? If it would be base in Jeffries to hold up my small friend Wilder and separate him from his cane, it wouldn't be any less base if a wilderness of Jeffrieses did it. It's this notion that what is dishonorable in private conduct becomes excusable or even praiseworthy, when a nation does it that has made the nations what they are—a set of brigands armed to the teeth, all watching each other to see that no one of them gets he drop. There isn't a Christian power on earth to-day, gentlemen, that doesn't deserve to be in the penitentiary, and all because the people have got it into their heads that they can do collectively without sin what any man among them, if not criminal, would be ashamed to do."

"Sir!" cried Prof. Jenks, indignantly, "do you mean to intimate in my presence and in that of these other American citizens here present that our high-minded and gallant President—"

"Don't you worry about our high-minded and gallant President, Jenks," advised Col. Edgerton, soothingly. "He isn't worrying any about himself, except when he turns his eyes on the equally high-minded and gallant Hanna. Our revered President is one of the luckiest men alive, for he was born with a round head and the kind of mind that approves itself with enthusiasm. The fact that he does a thing makes it all right to him. So long as he's conscious of no immorality in any act of his you couldn't convince him that the angels themselves would be able to find anything wrong with it. If he instead of Jeffries

recognized the independence of Wilder's cane and made a treaty with it on the sidewalk that gave it to him while Marshall lay on his back in the roadway, he'd see the hand of Providence in the transfer and feel that civilization was in debt to him for putting desirable property into the right hands."

"I deny that," proclaimed Prof. Jenks. "Nothing could make me believe that Theodore Roosevelt, the soldier-statesman, would knock down and rob Marshall P. Wilder."

"Of course not, of course not," agreed Col. Edgerton. "I was speaking in parables. But this country and the world may as well understand our high-minded and gallant President has got to have the center of the stage, and any Spanish-American Wilder that happens to be carrying a canal by way of a cane, or is packing other valuables on its person, will do well on its promenades to avoid the neighborhood of the White House." —Arthur McEwen, in *Chicago Examiner*.

INTERFERENCE WITH FREEDOM OF BELIEF.

Letter of Edward M. Shepard to mass meeting held December 3, 1903, at Cooper Union, New York.

John S. Crosby, Esq., Chairman:

I am not able to accept the invitation to speak at the meeting this evening to protest against the deportation of John Turner. But I feel bound to express my deep sympathy with the purpose of the meeting, which I understand to be the promotion of sound, orderly, law-abiding freedom.

I do not know Mr. Turner; nor do I know anything of his speeches, writings or beliefs, except as they appear in the proceedings against him. They have now resulted in the order of a Cabinet officer of our Republic that he be excluded by force from our country for believing in a theory of human society different from that held by you and me and the great majority of Americans and other civilized men, and in a decision of a Federal Court that there is no judicial power to interfere with that order. To my mind the order of Secretary Cortellou is thoroughly un-American, and is dangerous to the future prosperity, and dishonors the true and useful glory of our Republic.

I am not sure that the protest I would make is quite the same protest which is to be made to-night. For I do not limit my protest to the statute itself. That is not, it seems to me, well or fitly framed; but I am far from conceding that it was ever intended, or can now be rightly interpreted, to justify an executive act such as that of Mr. Turner's de-

portation. The Federal judge has pointed out, and, I suppose, rightly, that he has no power to review the finding of fact made by the Commissioner of Immigration or the Board of Special Inquiry which sat under his auspices. That is to say, since that board has found that Mr. Turner is an anarchist, the court cannot lawfully, so it is held and probably correctly, review that finding to ascertain the real truth. The judge being, therefore, shut up to the proposition that Mr. Turner is an anarchist, and the statute prescribing the exclusion of anarchists, and the constitutional rule being (and that, it seems to me, of necessity) that the United States as a sovereign and Congress as its law making power, may determine what foreigners shall be admitted and what shall be their qualifications—the Federal judge has drawn the conclusion, and perhaps of complete logical and legal necessity—that he must not interfere. Until his order is reversed it must, in a law abiding community like ours, be assumed that he is speaking the law.

Nevertheless, it seems to me to be clear that the word Anarchist, as used in the law, did not refer to the philosophic and peace-loving belief held by Mr. Turner. He believes, as I understand, and as the judicial record fairly implies, that humanity would be better off without government dependent upon force. The statute, as I conceive it should be interpreted, referred rather to a disposition and will on the part of the foreign visitor or immigrant to use force or advise others to use force against organized government. The statute does, indeed, refer to "persons who believe in the overthrow by force or violence of the government of the United States or of all governments and of all forms of law or the assassination of public officials." This part of the statute is not well phrased; but the word "believe" as here used I understand to refer to an effective disposition and will to use force and not to any philosophic creed.

I take it we must all approve the exclusion of those who come here to use force themselves or to advocate the use by others of force or violence to overthrow any part of our Government or any kind of murder, high or low. The decree against Mr. Turner is based solely, however, upon the provision for the exclusion of Anarchists, a provision never intended, I believe, to apply to those who hold philosophic and high-minded, even if impracticable, theories of human society, and do not threaten or urge violence. My fault-finding, therefore, is

not so much with the statute, except that its phraseology is not clear, as it is with the application made of it by the National Executive. That application I regard as un-American, high-handed, tyrannical and stupid.

In the brief submitted to Judge Lacombe in behalf of the government, no assertion, not even a hint, is made against Mr. Turner's character. He is not accused of desiring or seeking violence. The whole charge is that he has called himself an anarchist. The able contention of his counsel is not disputed that he is an anarchist only in the sense of those who believe that peace and virtue and happiness do not need the exercise of governmental force.

The sole defense of the government is that Mr. Turner "disbelieves in all organized government." Secretary Cortelyou applies a statute evidently intended to exclude persons who threaten violence or murder, to the case of a man merely holding in his own conscience and mind, and who in the freedom of his own England has expressed, a belief that human progress and safety do not need the aid of armies or police. In my opinion the conclusion of the commissioner of immigration and of his board ought never to have been permitted by the administration.

Upon every theory of constitutional or statutory interpretation prevailing in our country the statute ought to have been interpreted strictly to favor and not to disfavor freedom of opinion. I must frankly say that the action of Secretary Cortelyou seems to me to have been only of a piece with much else indicating a temper in our administration, and possibly (though I believe not) for a time dominant in American life, of hostility to freedom and favoring those narrow, arbitrary, obstructive, militaristic theories of public administration against which the very birth of our republic was a protest; theories which all countries, as they have grown more intelligent and more prosperous, have left behind.

Is it not intolerable that our government should admit freely a man who believes in despotism, religious persecution, or who supports polygamy (for mere belief in polygamy does not exclude), but that, on the other hand, men should be excluded for holding doctrines long preached and even practiced by many of the Quaker and other sects greatly respected by us all, doctrines held to-day by Tolstoy—doctrines the very holding of which implies a certain nobility and generosity of temper and faith. For me those beliefs are as yet impracticable and unsound; but I

am far from saying or believing that they are more impracticable than much of the doctrine formulated in the Sermon on the Mount.

Has not America, has not civilization, come to everything now dear to them, to everything upon which their civilization and happiness depend, through the triumph of beliefs which were once odious and once treated as criminal, and for which men were deported and even burnt and crucified? Because Mr. Turner's belief is very far from mine, who am I that I shall say that, in the ages to come, he shall not be found right and I wrong? Who are Secretary Cortelyou and the commissioner of immigration, and the rest of the great majority (including myself), that we should assert that we better know the truth than the majorities just as virtuous as we are, who in other ages burnt saints and bade the leaders and thinkers and saviors of mankind to be dumb?

Are we to envy England the glory of her freedom? Are we not rich that the archives of our state department hold the drafts of the noble dispatches we sent to Austria, when she was displeased with our courtesy to Hungarian exiles? Must we in the twentieth century envy England the replies made in the middle of the nineteenth century by Lord Palmerston to Louis Napoleon and to other monarchs of continental Europe who would reduce the liberty of thought and speech in England, replies ever since steadfastly sustained by the English government and English sentiment? Are we not to serve better rather than worse, the cause of human freedom than the nation, once our oppressor, to which we sent the Declaration of Independence as an affirmation by America of a sound, sober, safe policy of public administration for all time to come?

Is it credible that in our day and in our land there should be found men in places of great power who do not see that nothing is so conservative, nothing so safe as an absolute liberty to think and to speak and to write, so long as there is no urgency or invitation to vice or to violence!

I earnestly hope that the meeting at Cooper Union will demand that the statute shall be so modified as to make it clear that no belief shall exclude any man from our land, except as it shall form part of an intention to promote crime or vice or violence. I hope that the meeting will go further, and, assuming—as I think it ought to assume—that no such thing as this deportation of Mr. Turner was ever intended by Congress, declare that his deportation or

any other interference with peaceful freedom of belief by the executive authority is a high-handed offense against American right, American law, American conscience, American order and American freedom.

EDWARD M. SHEPARD.
Brooklyn, Dec. 3, 1903.

JUDGE DUNNE ON THE PANAMA TREATY.

On Sunday afternoon, December 7, Judge Edward F. Dunne spoke before the Henry George Association of Chicago on the recent Panama affair. The Chicago Examiner reports that "Handel hall was crowded and Judge Dunne was enthusiastically received." The Examiner's report of the speech is as follows:

In the year 1846 the United States of America concluded a treaty with the republic of New Granada, now known as the republic of Colombia, in which, in return for certain valuable concessions to American citizens, among which were the same privileges of commerce and navigation enjoyed by the citizens of Granada in crossing the Isthmus of Panama, the United States of America "guaranteed positively to the republic of New Granada the neutrality of the isthmus and the rights of sovereignty and property which New Granada has and possesses over the said territory."

This treaty has been faithfully observed by the republic of New Granada and its successor, the republic of Colombia, down to the present day, and until the month of November, 1903, was respected and adhered to by the United States of America.

During the month of November just past the United States government, without any pretense of this treaty being violated, hurriedly equipped in its navy yards a number of gunboats, loaded up a number of its war vessels with ammunition and marines, and hurriedly dispatched them to Colon and Panama in a time of profound peace.

Immediately upon their arrival, as by a preconcerted signal, a few hundred men in the cities of Colon and Panama, cities located at either end of the isthmus railroad, seize a few hundred rifles and a splendid supply of ammunition and small arms opportunely placed at their disposal by some disinterested philanthropists, occupy the railroad termini and declare themselves to be the republic of Panama in revolt against the republic of Colombia.

At once, by orders from Washington given several days before, United States marines are landed from the United States gunboats, the railway stations seized by United States troops and all transportation of Colombian troops

over the railroad prohibited. The United States gunboats blockade the harbors and Colombian vessels are warned off and prohibited from landing at their own ports, Panama and Colon.

Within 100 hours after this preconcerted and prearranged emeute, before any election is held, before even any semblance of a convention or convocation is called, before a shadow of a congress is gotten together, before the rudiments of a provisional government is gotten under way; before, so far as the press dispatches disclose, a provisional president or even a dictator is appointed, the president of the United States gives official recognition to an agent of the French canal syndicate in Washington, who declares himself minister plenipotentiary of the undelivered foetus of a government, and within a few hours afterward concludes an alleged treaty with this worthy which violates the solemn pledges made by this government with the southern republic 57 years ago.

The foregoing is the shameful story of American history for the month of November, 1903.

A more scandalous and disgraceful exhibition of Punic faith and breach of national honor is not recorded in the pages of history.

In 1846, when the treaty between these countries was negotiated, the young republic of Granada was weak in population and financial strength, but she possessed then and she possesses now one of the most important strategic possessions in the world—a narrow isthmus, about 30 miles in width, separating great oceans, capable of being cut across by modern engineering skill, and thus reducing by thousands of miles and weeks of time navigation around the world. Even in 1846 the envious eyes of the great nations of the world rested upon this isthmus, and enlightened, broad-minded and fairly disposed American statesmen at that date, recognizing the tremendous importance of the position and fearing lest the great land-grabbing nations of Europe might despoil the young republic of its most valuable possession, inspired and brought about this treaty of 1846, which was fair to both republics and mutually advantageous.

The American statesmen of that day were incapable of fomenting rebellions within the territory of sister republics and grabbing off what they could lay their hands on during the disturbances that followed.

In making the treaty of 1846 they were inspired by the spirit of the Monroe doctrine, and guaranteed to the

young republic of South America, then but recently sprung into being, that no European nation should despoil her of her territory or sovereignty.

That our government at Washington connived at the outbreak at Panama is established beyond all question:

1. Walter Wellman, a very reliable and well-informed correspondent, stationed at Washington before the outbreak, wrote to his paper that the United States authorities were hastily dispatching gunboats, marines and munitions of war to Panama, and that something "was in the wind" at Panama.

I remember reading the letter several days before the outbreak.

2. On November 17 a New York paper printed the following: "Mr. Dugue (publisher of the Star and Herald at Panama) is said to have informed Mr. Hay that the revolution was scheduled to take place on September 23," to which Mr. Hay replied: "September 23 is much too early."

Mr. Dugue went back to New York. The revolution was postponed to November 3.

3. American war vessels had, by orders of the government at Washington, been collected within striking distance, and on the day before the revolution began Admiral Glass was notified to go to the isthmus.

4. The planting of the agent of the French canal syndicate, the soon-to-be minister plenipotentiary of the unborn republic, at Washington before the outbreak, so as to be ready to sign the previously drafted and arranged treaty.

5. The scandalously indecent violation of international law and customs in recognizing a representative of a government not even provisionally organized, within a few hours after the outbreak.

6. The signing of a cut and dried treaty with a man notoriously interested as the agent of companies which would acquire \$40,000,000 thereunder at a time when the alleged republic he claimed to represent had neither a president, a senate, a congress or a flag, so far as the press dispatches disclose to the world.

7. The insolent, outrageous and high-handed conduct of the United States marines and sailors, acting under orders from Washington, in refusing to allow Colombian troops to travel upon the Panama railway to suppress the rebellion, and in refusing to allow the soldiers of the republic to be landed in Panama and Colon, when sent there by their government to put down the disturbance.

The conduct of our government at Washington in this regard shows that not only was the outbreak organized with the full approval, if not active assistance, of the United States authorities, but that our government openly succored and assisted the rebels by preventing the Colombian government from suppressing the revolt. That the Colombian government could have suppressed the revolt within a few days, or weeks at most, cannot be doubted in view of the fact that even if every citizen of the state of Panama was in revolt, which is far from the fact, they would be outnumbered as 13 to 1 by the citizens of Colombia.

The population of Colombia is 3,878,600. The population of Panama is 235,000. As well might the county of La Salle revolt against the great State of Illinois.

There is no possible doubt but that our government at Washington connived at, if it did not actually organize, the revolt at Panama, and that it actively and openly assisted the insurgents after the outbreak and prevented the constituted authorities of Columbia from suppressing the revolt.

It is a record so unprincipled, so indecent and so vile as to cause every American citizen who has country's honor and glory at heart to hang his head in shame.

We take the young Republic of Columbia in 1846 under our protection, and pledge ourselves to protect her from the designs of the great robber nations of the earth. She has around her a girdle of surprising value.

In 1903 we despoil her and steal her girdle.

No wonder that in the agony of her disgrace and misplaced confidence the young republic has appealed from our government to our people, and pointed out to them in words that burn and brand the infamy of our conduct.

I utter these words, not so much in criticism of the powers that be in executive station at Washington, but in protest at the confirmation of a treaty which, if it is consummated, will forever degrade my country and disgrace the American name, character and flag. This soiled, be-greased, foul, ill-scented and bedraggled document bearing the names of John Hay and "what's-his-name," minister plenipotentiary of the alleged Panama republic, must be presented, even if it is presented with a tongs, to the United States senate for confirmation. In that senate there are men professing allegiance to two or more parties. The dominant party does not control the senate by a two-thirds

vote. In the dominant party there are men who love their country and have its honor at heart. In the minority there are men of like caliber. Is there not in the senate of the United States at least a minority of one-third among all parties who have intelligence and virtue enough to prevent by their votes of "Nay" on a motion to confirm this scandalous iniquity and disgrace to the American nation? For the honor of America it is to be hoped there is. If there is not I see only a degeneracy of the great American republic like to that which submerged the old republic of Rome into the degradation and final dismemberment of the Roman empire.

It remains to consider the explanation offered by the state department and its apologists.

First—it is asserted by them that in guaranteeing the sovereignty of the republic of Colombia over the isthmus, we only pledged the faith of the United States to protect the republic from the aggressions of foreign countries, and that we did not guarantee it from revolt within its borders.

The words of the treaty do not bear this construction. No reference to foreign countries is made in the words of the guarantee. It is absolute and unconditional, and given for most valuable considerations. The guaranty runs not to the state of Panama or its citizens, but to the republic of New Granada. But even if it did not cover insurrection from within, it certainly does prevent the government of the United States, in honor and in conscience, from taking sides in case of insurrection with the insurrectionists, or giving them aid or comfort. Yet this is just what our government has done, and has done so flagrantly, openly and indecently, that even the most shameless apologist of the administration has not the temerity to indorse it.

The press dispatches, without contradiction, all show that we prevented the Colombian government from landing Colombian troops to suppress the outbreak, and prevented the Colombian troops on the ground at the time of the outbreak from using the railroad for a like purpose. The admiral commanding the United States squadron, which had been collected at the isthmus in anticipation of the outbreak, even refused to allow an envoy from Bogota to land at Panama for the purpose of discussing the situation with the rebels—a most scandalous proceeding for an alleged neutral nation.

Secondly—it is alleged by the apologists of this national crime that in recognizing this spawn of greed and corrup-

tion, yept the republic of Panama, we were following international precedents. I know of no such precipitous recognition of a national weakling in history.

In 1861 great States of the United States, having a population of probably 8,000,000 souls, formally seceded from the United States, established a new government and carried on a great war with varying success for four years, and yet no civilized government deemed it proper to accord the new government recognition. The Cuban insurrectionists carried on a successful war for many months against Spain, and had absolute control over large tracts of country in Cuba, and yet neither the United States nor any other government accorded them recognition.

Aguinaldo and the Philippine insurgents against Spain carried on successful war against Spain, and held undisputed sovereignty over a great part of Luzon for many months, and yet neither the United States nor any other civilized government recognized them as a defacto government. Numberless other cases of like character will be found in history, but not a case can be found where an insurrection which springs into being between two days has ever been dignified with recognition as a government within five days after its origin, by any civilized government on earth.

The whole scaly, slimy, miserable plot is so transparently fraudulent and corrupt that an attempted defense of it exposes its defenders to the charge of dishonesty or moral obliquity.

Be bad, and others can talk about you;
Be good, and you can talk about others.
—Chicago Tribune.

What Russia wants in China is an open door that only Russia can get through.—N. Y. Press.

Mr. Morgan's "undigested securities" are coming to be viewed by the public more in the light of "digested insecurities."—Life.

"You say your daughter is fond of music?"

"I should say so," answered Cumrox. "When Gwendolyn makes up her mind to play the piano nothing can stop her. And she seems to like it, no matter how bad it sounds."—Washington Star.

BOOKS

"THE FAILURE OF JESUS AND HIS TRIUMPH..."

Under the pseudonym of "Frater Occidentalis," some brilliant writer has

issued (Argus Press, Red Wing, Minn.) this attractive little monograph on the meaning of the mission of Jesus. The work is not orthodox. But neither is it irreverent. On the contrary, there may be more religion in it than in most of the books that are classified, as this one would not be, among religious books.

The author pictures Jesus as having come to save the world by making of the Jewish nation the Messiah-Nation as he himself was the Man-Messiah. Christ ruling Israel, "Israel would have been heaven on earth; and no people could long have withstood such an example." It was for this that he came up to Jerusalem at the passover and made his royal entry. In contrast with that view, the author describes "the Christ of old orthodoxy" as "an all-knowing, all-powerful God, who simply masquerades as man," and his royal entry into Jerusalem as "only a theatricality." But Jesus appears to the author to have regarded this entry as veritably triumphal; and when he proclaimed himself king of the Jews, to have meant what he said.

The people responding to his proclamation of kingship, the reformation began and the temple was purified. But when he turned to them to teach them of the kingdom of God, their enthusiasm died away and the Jewish nation sank back again into the torpor out of which he had led it. Jesus had failed in what he had hoped to do.

But he triumphed in what he had really come to do. Hoping even to the last "for the manifestation of the glory of the Lord" in some miraculous conversion of the multitude, confident that his sacrifice was not after all to be in vain, he was faithful even to the supreme test. Instead of the conversion of the multitude, he witnessed "their complete apostasy, when they jeered and mocked him on the cross." But still he stayed on the cross—

though a nod of his head would have dissolved the torture into bliss. He still patiently waited for the command from heaven. "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Absolutely nothing external or internal to cling to! God himself hiding in the clouds of wrath. Darkness and the nether depths in charge of the universe. Dying in unspeakable agony on the cross. And still absolute obedience! Lying in very hell and knowing that one word would transform hell into paradise, yet he speaks not that word, because he has asked guidance from God and God is silent. This is the Perfect Faith! Such a faith overcometh the world. Such a faith is a reality compared with which empires and solar systems are mere shadows. Humanity is saved, for here is a faith that suffices. . . . Now the darkness vanishes from his soul. The Infinite Father presses the Son to his heart. With a flash, the true meaning of Calvary dawns upon the Man on the cross. . . . He sees the victory of his abounding salvation over death and hell.

That was the triumph of Jesus.

Into much that is of the experience universal, with much that belongs in the category of hard common sense yet not a little that is fanciful and

rhapsodic, Frater Occidentalis has evidently woven his own spiritual biography. As such, it is the story of an independent traveler, who scorns to ask the way or to accept a "lift," and who trusts nothing but the staff—a very good staff—which he himself has whittled from a sapling by the roadside.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

"Whether Common or Not." By Will M. Maupin. St. Louis Christian Publishing company. To be reviewed.

"The City Jail." A symposium. Compiled and edited by Fay Lewis. Rockford, Ill. A collection of facts and opinion bearing upon penology in general, but with special reference to city jails, particularly that at Rockford.

PERIODICALS.

The leading article in the Westminster Review for November occupies considerably more pages than the usual magazine article, and is a strong argument for free trade and the single tax. It seems inevitable that the land question must come to the front in the conflict for which the political forces in England are now marshalling themselves. Other articles in this issue are of interest and importance, making it on the whole a number well worth buying. J. H. D.

The Open Court for November contains several articles of more than usual interest, notably the one on Falkland, by Henry Beers. Sir Lucius Cary, Lord Falkland, was born in 1610 and was killed during the civil war in the battle of Newberry, September 20, 1643. As this article points out, his distinction rests not upon his services as soldier, politician or writer, but upon certain clear-sighted, original opinions which he managed to get expressed as a member of parliament. What he said of the bishops, whom he wished to put out of the House of Lords, but was opposed to abolishing, whom he valued for service and not for succession, makes most interesting reading for modern churchmen. J. H. D.

The Arena for December is more than usually interesting, with B. O. Flowers' exposition of the spiritual significance of Wagner's "Parsifal," with Robert Tyson's Belgian System of Proportional Representation, with a symposium on the irrepressible conflict between democracy and reaction, by Wm. Hendrick, Eltweed Pomeroy and George H. Shibley; and its discussion of criminality in the treatment of crime by Harris R. Cooley, Mayor Johnson's efficient administrator of the de-

DEBATE

There will be a debate between the Socialists and the Single Taxers at the West 12th Street Turner Hall, 118 West 12th Street, near Western Avenue, on Sunday afternoon, December 20th, at 2 o'clock, on the following question: "Resolved, That it is to the interests of the Working Classes to Take Up the Propaganda of Socialism Rather Than That of the Single Tax." The affirmative will be represented by A. M. Simons, Seymour Steadman and Ernest Untermyer; the negative will be represented by John Z. White, Louis F. Post and Henry H. Hardinge, thirty minutes for each speaker, the affirmative being allowed ten minutes in closing.

DEBATE

There will be a debate at Handel Hall, 40 E. Randolph Street, at 3:30 p. m. Sunday, December 27, 1903, on the following question: "Resolved, That the interests of the Capitalist and Laboring Classes Alike Demand the Immediate Adoption of the Single Tax on Land Values by the Legislatures of the Various States."—Mr. John Z. White, Aff., Col. W. A. Roberts, Neg.

REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE

Henry George Association

OF CHICAGO.

Handel Hall, 40 East Randolph Street.

Every Thursday Evening, 8 o'clock.

Every Sunday Afternoon, 3:30 o'clock.

partment of charities and correction in Cleveland.

On the "Banishment of Worry" Good Housekeeping holds a symposium in its December number. Most of the advice is of the orthodox kind which we have heard before. The last of the writers, however, is at least fresh and definite. "The conviction," she says, "of the present writer, after a prolonged consideration of the subject, is that worry is a lung disease and is caused by a lack of oxygen. I have yet to meet the man or woman who could breathe deeply and worry at the same moment. Do not take my word for this; test it for yourself." J. H. D.

From unexpected sources, in periodicals expected to be purely literary, attacks upon our present-day civilization are beginning to be made, which sound like the words that were thought to be exaggerated screams in the obscure radical press of a decade ago. The poet, Bliss Carman, is moved, in The Reader, to make the following sweeping criticism: "Anglo-Saxon civilization, to speak of no other, has become a humiliating and unscrupulous game. Our fathers and grandfathers cared for many ideals, for honor, for honesty, for patriotism, for culture, for high breeding, for nobility of character, and unselfishness of purpose. We care only for wealth and respect only those relentless and barbarous traits of character by which it is attained." When a singer stops his trade to write such words in plain prose it is high time for sober people at least to consider whether he is telling the truth, or is only indulging in a variation of poetic imagination. J. H. D.

Magazine readers who may be willing to follow figures occasionally should not miss the articles by Henry George, Jr., already alluded to in The Public, which are to appear in Pearson's Magazine. In an introductory note to the first of the series, appearing in the December number, the editor says: "That many, perhaps most, of the great consolidations have been grossly unfair is manifest. They are based upon one or more government-granted or government-fostered advantages, which enable them to beat competitors to death. Huge monopolies are thus formed, through which

NOW READY FOR DELIVERY

ETHICS OF DEMOCRACY

A Series of Optimistic Essays on the Natural Laws of Human Society.

By LOUIS F. POST

The volume is beautifully printed on high-grade dull-finished paper, uncut pages, gilt top, etc., and bound in fine blue cloth with gold lettering. Pp. 386.

Price per copy, \$2.00. (Net, delivered.)

MOODY PUBLISHING CO., Publishers, 35 Nassau St., NEW YORK 1601 Unity Building, CHICAGO

NOTICE TO READERS.

If you have been reading The Public on trial, this notice may interest you. Your regular subscription for three or six months or a year, if sent in before January 1, 1904, will begin at once and continue until three or six months or a year, as the case may be, after January 1, 1904. Thus \$2 will give you the paper from receipt of your subscription until January 1, 1905; \$1 will give it to you from receipt of subscription until July 1, 1904; and 50 cents will give it to you from receipt of subscription until April 1, 1904. The same offer is open to all persons not already on the regular subscription list of The Public.



THE ROOSEVELTIAN IDEAL.

prices are raised and the public is robbed. With a view to showing the methods pursued in the organization and manipulation of many of these giant industrial consolidations, and with the purpose of thereby saving innocent persons from ruin and distress through future similar temptations, Pearson's Magazine herewith commences publication of a series of articles from the pen of Mr. Henry George, Jr., who has made a special study of typical cases."—J. H. D.

"Gambling in the United States," says the Nebraska Independent, "has passed beyond anything known in the history of the world before. The records show that during the season at Saratoga more than \$2,000,000 a day was bet on horse races. The amount of money bet on horse races alone during the year is estimated to be

above \$2,000,000,000. The bucket shops and board of trade gambling involves still larger sums. There are many more forms of gambling, running all the way from shooting craps in back alleys to amounts involving hundreds of thousands. The age of gambling is upon us. It pervades every part of society from the lowest to the highest." The Independent thinks the churches are to be blamed for not preaching against the vice. This may be true, but they would have to begin far back of the most flagrant forms and attack much that we call business. Most of the forms of gambling that offend pious people are merely the overgrown sideshows of the legitimate circus.—J. H. D.

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.

HENRY B. TAWRESEY,

ATTORNEY-AT-LAW,

1105 Real Estate Trust Building, S. E. Cor. Broad and Chestnut Sts., Philadelphia.

CONTRACTORS.

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

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

BOOKS REVIEWED IN THE PUBLIC

Can all be purchased through the Purdy Publishing Company

New Book of Kings, a Republican counterblast, by J. Morrison Davidson. 50c

BOOKS FOR CHRISTMAS
By HENRY GEORGE.

- Progress and Poverty, pa. 50c. cloth \$1.00
- Social Problems, pa. 50c. cloth..... 1.00
- Land Question, pa. 50c. cloth..... 1.00
- Protection vs. Free Trade, pa. 50c. cloth..... 1.00
- Perplexed Philosopher, pa. 50c. cloth 1.00
- Science of Political Economy..... 2.50
- Our Land and Land Policy; Speeches, Lectures and Miscellaneous Writings 2.50

Life of Henry George, by Henry George, Jr., \$1.50; 2.00.

Order anything that has ever been reviewed in THE PUBLIC; will fill order promptly. Henry George's books in paper and cloth binding and other Economic Literature on sale. PURDY PUBLISHING CO., McVicker's Building, CHICAGO.

Now Ready for Delivery

BISOCIALISM:

The Reign of the Man at the Margin

By OLIVER R. TROWBRIDGE

An entirely new and original work on economics!—

It treats of the positive theory of value, and of an entirely new and palpably correct theory of interest. It for the first time furnishes a scientific means for determining the proper scope of Economic Science, and discusses all its phases and phenomena in a complete and consistent manner.

It points out clearly the distinctive economic principles which dominate the established order, and also those involved in anarchism and in the different forms of socialism. It discusses the economic principles involved in all the leading reform movements since the civil war. A thoughtful, scholarly work. Price, \$1.50 net.

BISOCIALISM is a masterpiece. It is a book to make the quibblers squirm. The professors are challenged on their own ground. JOHN Z. WHITE.

NEW YORK: 35 Nassau Street

MOODY PUBLISHING CO.

CHICAGO: 79 Dearborn Street

State of Illinois, County of Cook.—ss.

Public notice is hereby given that at a Special Meeting of the Stockholders of The American Bank Service Company, a corporation organized under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Illinois, held at 178 Quincy Street, in the City of Chicago, County of Cook and State of Illinois, on Thursday, the Nineteenth (19th) day of November, A. D. 1903, at the hour of one o'clock in the afternoon, at which meeting all of the stockholders were present or represented by legally appointed proxy, notice of publication being expressly waived by said stockholders, the capital stock of said corporation was increased from fourteen thousand dollars (\$14,000.00) to forty thousand dollars (\$40,000.00); stockholders representing more than two-thirds of all of the stock of said corporation, being present and voting in favor of said increase of capital stock, and a certificate of said increase has been duly filed in the office of the Secretary of State of the State of Illinois, and with the Recorder of Deeds of Cook County, Illinois, as required by law.

Dated: Chicago, November 20, A. D. 1903.
C. L. MOULTON,
President.

M. J. FOYER,
Secretary.

THATCHER, GRIFFEN & WRIGHT,
Attorneys.

HERE IS A SHORT LIST

of the books that you have seen advertised in THE PUBLIC, and that you were intending to order in time for Christmas:

- Realist Not Evil, by Clarence S. Darrow. 75c
- Oratory, its Requirements and its Rewards, by John P. Altgold..... 50c
- The Sale of an Appetite, by Paul Lafargue, illustrated..... 50c
- The American Farmer, by A. M. Simons..... 50c

All handsomely bound in cloth, and mailed promptly on receipt of price by the publishers,
CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY,
56 Fifth Ave., Chicago.



JOHN Z. WHITE.

The Henry George Association of Chicago

has arranged to place MR JOHN Z. WHITE in the lecture field for work in the U. S. and Canada. For dates and particulars address

F. H. MONROE, President,
206—134 Washington St.,
CHICAGO, ILL.