

# The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 26, 1903.

Number 299.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

The approach of the New Year would be an appropriate season for American newspaper men, from lowest to highest; to make a few good resolutions; not to be broken along with other New Year's resolutions, but to be rigidly kept. In all modern American life there is nothing that needs reforming quite as much as does the American newspaper.

We are not alluding especially to "yellow" journalism. It is very common for respectable newspapers to denounce the "yellow" ones, and with great display of virtuous disgust; but in doing so they are in reality only "compounding for sins they are inclined to by damning those they have no mind to." The "yellow" papers are not the worst ones. The worst of all newspapers are those of the respectable order which disregard the golden rule of good journalism—to be intelligible, truthful and candid. "Yellow" journals are at the worst only sewers; and sewers are useful. But liars, whether they lie from indolence or malice, are of no use whatever—not as liars.

The resolutions that newspaper men of the respectable class ought to make and keep, relate to their responsibility to their readers. Their occupation is in character not a mechanical trade; it is a profession. They cannot therefore escape personal responsibility for their acts on the plea that they are under the coercion of superiors (or advertisers if they are proprietors), any more than a lawyer can

escape personal responsibility by pleading the coercion of clients. While a compositor may put into type sentiments against which his manhood revolts, pleading that he is only performing a mechanical act, the newspaper man must be responsible to his own character, and to the readers of his paper, for what he writes and how he writes it. No one is bound to go into journalism; but if he does go into it he assumes certain professional obligations which he ought to perform at all costs—even at the cost of possible bankruptcy.

That these are not the ethics of American journalism, though they ought to be, is evident to all newspaper readers. News reports seldom aim to state facts truly and intelligibly; they aim to catch and magnify the sensational. Editorials seldom expound with knowledge, candor and thoughtfulness; their chief characteristics are indifference, flippancy, pretentious ignorance and cynicism, not to say malevolence when definite purpose does actuate the man behind the pen or the man behind him. Then the paper as a whole. Is it not made with reference less to the needs of its readers than to the demands of a few large advertisers or the commands of some capitalist of the piratical type who owns the establishment "on the side"?

Perhaps we shall be better understood if we refer to an instance or two. Though related to particular persons and to a particular place, as concrete instances must of necessity be, they are distinctly typical the country over. One of these has to do with the report in a Chicago paper of the highest standing, of the socialism-single tax debate of the 20th. Another is connected with the hearings before a committee of the city coun-

cil on the Chicago traction question. A third relates to the editorial treatment accorded a serious effort on the part of the Chicago Federation of Labor to ascertain the effect of trade unionism upon recurring business depressions.

At the socialism-single tax debate, one of the single tax speakers made the point that the single tax would begin to yield beneficent results from the very beginning of its adoption in even a timid and preliminary way, and that these results would increase in degree as the reform advanced; whereas no beneficent results are claimed for socialism until it shall have accomplished a complete revolution. The term "revolution" was not used to imply that physical force is in the programme of socialism, nor was it so understood by the audience. Nothing offensive to socialists was implied or inferred. The socialists in the audience did seem to understand, however, that the speaker was not only asserting that a complete revolution was necessary before any of the benefits claimed for socialism could be enjoyed in any degree, but also that he was conceding that the working classes could not be benefited by any changes short of that revolution. This was in harmony with their own views, and they greeted it with two or three rounds of applause as a concession from an adversary. Inasmuch as most of the demonstrative part of the audience were socialists, the applause was emphatic. But it was entirely good natured, and there were no violent outcries. Yet note the report of the incident from one of the principal papers—not "yellow"—of Chicago:

"The purpose of you socialists is to abolish existing things, root and branch!" An uproar of wild cheers and

violent shouts of affirmation from more than 1,000 intensely excited listeners interrupted the singer taxer when he flung out the foregoing assertion as a reflection on the patriotism of the audience at the socialistic-single tax debate in West Twelfth Street Turner Hall yesterday afternoon. "Yes, socialism is revolution, isn't it?" cried the speaker when the noise had subsided. Again the remarkable demonstration made the rafters of the big hall to shudder, and for several minutes pandemonium seemed on the verge of breaking into violence. "That's what we want!" "Down with capital!" "Hurrah for the red flag!" were cries that could be distinguished.

No one who was present at that meeting could possibly regard the foregoing as a truthful report. It is absolutely false—false in color and false in fact. Other reports indicated that the debaters were at white heat with one another, whereas in fact there was no asperity beyond what may occur in the excitement of any debate and without more than momentarily ruffling anyone's temper.

The second instance relates to the traction hearing before the city council. At the hearing on the 21st John Z. White, representing the Henry George Association, made an able analysis of the proposed ordinance the council committee is considering (p. 584). In the course of his argument, he referred to the fact, now coming to be understood, that in proposing this ordinance the committee are acting under coercion, the Chicago City Railway Company holding over them threats of endless and appalling litigation and forcing from them an ordinance which the committee do not want but which they are powerless to improve. Recognizing this dilemma of the committee, Mr. White proposed a basis of settlement for them to offer the company as being in the nature of a compromise in which each side gives and takes, instead of one in which the city does the giving and the company the taking. Yet the newspaper readers not present at that hearing might fairly suppose that Mr. White had done nothing before the committee but propose

another franchise; and as to the nature of his offer, brief and intelligible as was the form in which he put it, the newspaper reader might keep on guessing to the day of his death if he went no further for information than the local newspapers. If the matter was worth reporting at all it was worth reporting intelligibly.

The editorial instance appeared in one of the leading Chicago papers of the 22d. It was nominally a discussion of a recent report of a committee of the Chicago Federation of Labor on the causes of hard times. The writer had evidently never seen the report. He evidently knew nothing about it except a few extracts culled by reporters, and a list of the contributors. But this was material enough for a sneering, class-contemptuous editorial, which craftily misrepresented without flat perjury, owlishly assumed to instruct without knowledge, and cynically condemned without fair consideration.

Although newspaper men cannot escape responsibility for such breaches of professional obligation, it is to be noted that they are, nevertheless, not wholly without excuse. The reporter may be excused because no standards are held up to him but the lowest. Does he fail to catch a speaker's meaning and to reduce the speech to the allowed space while preserving its substance? That is because reports that do not fail in that respect do fail to get published. What the city editor wants is something exciting, and the reporter tries to "make good" by culling sensational features without much regard for general subject matter. And all the way up some such lack of journalistic ideal exercises its influence until you come to the editor-in-chief, who in turn is controlled by the counting room, which in turn is controlled by the big merchant who threatens a withdrawal of patronage, or by the piratical capitalist who owns the whole concern, from publisher to office boy,

from editor to cub reporter. This is the season to reform.

Another exemplification of an official tendency to violate the law in the name of the law, is furnished by the police authorities of Paterson, N. J. A meeting was to have been held there a few days ago, similar to that in New York city (p. 563), to protest against the act of Congress under which John Turner (p. 584) is held for deportation—an act which excludes foreigners for "disbelieving in organized government" and makes it a crime for Americans to invite such foreigners to this country. This perfectly lawful meeting was forcibly prevented from assembling. A body of police barred the way to the hall.

One of the speakers advertised to address that meeting was Bolton Hall, a son of the late Rev. John Hall, the distinguished Presbyterian clergyman. Bolton Hall is a lawyer of standing and an author of note. He is withal a man of peace, who respects the law and upholds public order. His account of the lawlessness of the Paterson police is reported by the New York Herald of the 12th as follows:

Mr. Hall protested, saying that the hall had been hired, the meeting all arranged, that it would be orderly and had been advertised. The policeman in charge said he had orders from the chief of police not to allow any meeting and that the chief had his orders from Mayor Hinchliffe. Mr. Hall said he and his party went to see the chief of police at headquarters. He told them no meeting should take place and that the Mayor had ordered it stopped. The Mayor was appealed to. "He was hot," said Mr. Hall. "He refused to let the meeting go on." Mr. Hall wrote a letter to the editor of the Paterson Guardian in regard to the refusal to allow the meeting to be held. In the letter he wrote:—

The meeting was not called to spread Turner's doctrine or in favor of Turner, but to protest against a law which can be easily extended to threaten the liberty of every one, alien or native. This law has been condemned by such papers as the Outlook, the Independent, the Evening Post and the Brooklyn Eagle, and by such men as Senator Hoar, the Rev. Dr. Thomas C. Hall and Carl Schurz. An appeal to the chief of police personally elicited only the information that the Chief was powerless and that we must see the Mayor, which we did. The Mayor was excited and refused to listen to argument or even to reason.

He was told that the Constitution guaranteed the right of peaceable assemblage, but he merely laughed. Offers of guarantees as to the order of the meeting and as to the character of the speakers were ignored. It was explained that neither Turner nor the proposed speakers advocated violence, but the Mayor replied that he knew that "You people disbelieve in government and if you had your way we would not be running things." The latter statement was undeniably true. In my opinion neither the people of Paterson nor even the Mayor, much less the Federal authorities, can be afraid of Turner's disbelief in government. What they are afraid of is the organization of labor so ably represented by Turner.

Persecution for opinions' sake takes different forms in different places and times. Missouri at the present time furnishes an interesting instance of expulsion from civil office for no other reason than that the official has written a novel in which certain politicians in power think they see themselves as others see them, and don't like the portraits. Speed Mosby is the victim. He is deputy clerk of the Missouri Supreme Court and has been for many years. Nothing is alleged against his ability or fidelity. But in "Ben Blunt," a novel he has recently published, he sketches several political types. There is nothing personal, it appears, in these sketches. They are just types. But the politicians don't like the types—not when made visible to the naked eye of the citizen. Yet they appropriate the descriptions to themselves instinctively, and vent their indignation upon the unhappy because too perceptive author. "Ben Blunt" ought to be good reading for people who wish to see portraits of Missouri politicians which are so deftly sketched as to be easily recognized without a label, by the subjects themselves.

Archbishop Quigley, of Chicago, stands in a slippery place if he advocates, as he is reported to have done at a meeting of the Roman Catholic Woman's League in Chicago last week, that the State furnish the Roman Catholic church a fund for the maintenance of Roman Catholic schools. His argument, as reported, is that—

The State must provide schools for the minority as well as for the majority.

The State should divide the public school system and maintain a separate system for the minority—separate in the sense of religious teaching. The two systems could be under one control, but in the Catholic division Catholic principles should be taught. This would give the minority an equal chance with the majority. This would be just and equitable, but not satisfactory to the Protestants. The cry all over is for non-sectarian education. The Catholic schools are recognized by the State, but they are not supported by the State because non-Catholics believe that it would be dangerous for the State to support them.

We can conceive of nothing better calculated than this to revive in the United States the almost obsolete hatred once vigorously entertained by non-Catholics for Catholics. Moreover, the demand is utterly indefensible from any point of view but that of medieval European ecclesiasticism. The only defense of the public school system is that the State should provide opportunities for secular education, in order that all may have the ordinary educational benefits. Religious education is another matter. If the public school officials try to proselyte Catholic children through unfair teachers or unfair books, that is good ground of complaint. Any fair-minded non-Catholic will acknowledge it as such, and will volunteer his influence to correct the wrong—provided he is not thereby placed in a false position by demands of Catholic dignitaries for public money for church uses. But religious teaching is wholly a private matter. To make it a public matter with reference to one kind of religious teaching would make it so with reference to all kinds. Consequently if one division of the public school system were given over to Catholic teaching it could be logically insisted that the other should be divided up into sub-divisions of Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, Disciples, Christian Scientists and the rest, and also agnostics and atheists.

A jury composed wholly of women sat in a Chicago court of record last week. It was impaneled by Judge Honore. The question

turned upon the separation of a little child from its mother, a friendless widow. So extreme was the mother's poverty, she could not bring up the child properly. But with all her poverty the mother-love was intense. She testified she could not live without her child. A jury of men was in the box. At this point Judge Honore invited a jury of women to sit and advise the jury of men. The jury of women promptly decided that the mother must not be separated from her child. Nor were they at a loss for method. If the child is dependent, they said, so is the mother. Both are dependent. Then let them go together to an institution where they need not be separated. It was a Solomonic verdict, one the jury of men would probably never have reached. But the man jury had to adopt it formally before it could have legal effect. Women are competent to advise male juries, it seems; but God forbid that any woman be allowed to serve on a real jury, while the duty of home-making calls for her at afternoon teas or the domestic washtub.

In memory of David Kennison, the last surviving member of that party of anarchists who threw the tea into Boston harbor a century and a quarter ago, a memorial stone was erected last week in Chicago. How true it is that the mobs of one generation become the heroes of another—provided the purpose they did the mobbing for "wins out."

If only three members of Congress paid railway fare to Washington to attend the special session of Congress, though all drew mileage at about four times the actual cost, who were the others? Baker was one, but who were the other two? Congressman Hepburn ought to have their names, so that he may insult them on the floor, as he did Baker, for refusing railway passes.

Is it "Alton B." Parker that the Wall street Democrats are put-

ting up for President? Or is it "Alter E."? Whatever his name or his political principles, supposing him to have political principles, he is conceded to be the alter ego of David B. Hill, and, like Hill to be a Democrat of the still type—very still.

### SANTA OLAUS.

How the old superstition comes back to the old children, as memories of Christmas time leap the gulf of half-a-century-ago. Santa Claus, St. Nicholas, Kriss Kringle, Kristinche—by whichever name we called him, he was real to us all. As real as anything we knew or knew of, was this benevolent old fellow who loved good children and didn't like bad ones, yet distributed his favors with so much less regard for the conduct of his little friends than for their worldly condition.

Our minds were logical then—as logical as they are now, perhaps, though not quite so well informed; and the conviction forced itself upon us that there was something unsound about the prevalent dogma that Santa Claus was no respecter of persons.

We knew, for instance, that Freel Remer, the carpenter's son, was just as good a boy as ourselves whose grandfather owned a farm. Our own folks might not have agreed with us, but we, being introspective, knew that really he was not only as good but better; and in view of Kristinche's omniscience (as to boys) we realized, of course, that the Christmas saint ought to know it, too. Yet Kristinche was content to fill Freel's stockings with a red apple or two and doughnuts like his own mother cooked, while making ours to bulge with strange and superior gifts.

And then we heard of other children's luck with Santa Claus when we visited our cousins in New York. They were ever so much better off than a country boy whose grandfather owned a farm. At least we thought so, and they dressed and acted so. And Santa Claus favored them more than he did us. If he discriminated somewhat against Freel in Pequest valley, how great was his discrimination against us in favor of our

cousins down in the city. Yet, both Santa Claus and ourselves, we two knew that those cousins of ours weren't any better than we. Nor was that the whole story. Our cousins told of acquaintances of theirs, rich beyond any of our dreams of avarice or ambition, so rich that their fathers and mothers wouldn't so much as speak to ours—more than to say: "Why, how-de-do?" if they met casually; and these rich boys and girls, though not especially good as the reports reached us, they received presents from Santa Claus in untold abundance and of indescribable magnificence.

Those were the facts. Of course we reasoned from them. We reasoned logically, too. If we didn't reach correct conclusions, it was because we hadn't yet got facts enough, or our inexperienced minds needed a little jog. What we thought about it was that the whole thing didn't fit together just right. Santa Claus might like good boys better than bad ones, but it didn't seem so. It seemed as if he liked rich ones better than poor ones. Or, he might be omniscient but the facts raised a doubt. Or, he might not be a respecter of persons, but then his actions at Christmas were no tribute to his judicial acumen. So we settled down to the state of mind that afterward served us with certain church dogmas at Sunday school. We concluded that Santa Claus was all he was said to be, disposing of the conflicting facts by assigning the whole subject to the realm of mystery into which little boys must not pry.

But the day of awakening came. There were no new facts. No more were needed. The whole case against Santa Claus was complete. Nothing was needed but a suggestion, a hint, a pointer. Freel Remer furnished the pointer. Who of all of us has not had his Freel Remer, to say to him in one form of phrase or another, what our Freel said to us:

"There ain't no Kristinche. It's your pap!"

One gasp and it was over. Every conflicting fact fitted every other now. We saw it all, and Santa Claus went instantly and forever out of our life, except as a delightful memory inextricably mixed up with red-mouth trumpets and

strange candy. There was no Santa Claus and never had been, but only "your pap"!

This accounted for Freel's doughnuts against our toys. It accounted for the cheapness of our toys as compared with our cousins'; and of the magnificence of what their rich friends got as compared with what they got. It accounted for the whole Santa Claus mystery, respect for persons and all. That one word, "pap," which only Freel was allowed to use without rebuke, for his folks didn't mind—that one disrespectful appellation fairly blazed with wisdom. We can see the red glow of it even now across the wide half-century gulf.

It wasn't agreeable at the time. Although we had learned a truth, we had lost a fetish; and that experience is never pleasant. Jolly old Santa Claus, beloved old St. Nicholas, dear old Kristinche, merry old Kriss Kringle, he was gone, and we mourned for him as we did for Freel's shaggy dog, "James K. Polk," when he died of old age. It was a new world now that we lived in, and a dead one. Love had gone out of it; for Santa Claus was no more, and what could any world be without its Santa Claus?

Who had wrought this havoc? Freel Remer had done it, and no longer could he be trusted friend of ours.

But now there succeeded another state of mind. Isn't it so? Didn't we then pretend to believe in Santa Claus, lest "pap" might forego presents on Christmas eve for children so highly sophisticated?

Yes, when Santa Claus ceased to be a superstition we turned him into a convenience. We had been pagans; we were now hypocrites.

We all did it, didn't we? But that was not for long, and maybe it wasn't altogether as sordid as it seems. Maybe we were still mourning in this crude way the dying out of our more childish faith in the god of the Christmas stocking.

At any rate, with the passing of the superstition something we had not expected came into its abandoned place. It was "pap." Santa Claus had faded into a myth, but the greater reality of parental affection, which Santa Claus only

personified, had entered into our consciousness.

Isn't this the experience of us all? And doesn't it repeat itself, in ever varying form, again and again through life?

One prized superstition after another—religious, political, social—fades away, leaving for a time a blank and possibly stimulating hypocritical instincts. But when it has served its uses (and all good superstitions serve good uses), we find upon fully relinquishing it, that the truth which it has only symbolized becomes more real to us than the symbol ever was.

Just as fatherly and motherly affection—a mere abstraction, if you please—looms up now above the accumulated memories of half a century, as infinitely more real and concrete than the Santa Claus myth by which that affection was expressed at Christmas time, so do even greater truths become the more real as with intelligence and good motive we abandon the superstitions that have supported them in the progressive stages of character building.

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Brooklyn, N. Y., Dec. 19.—The speech delivered by Congressman Robert Baker in the House on December 14th fully justifies the efforts put forth by The Radical Democracy of Brooklyn for his election in the campaign of 1902 in the Sixth Congressional District of New York. Our speakers then promised the voters of that district that if he were elected, unlike so many who had been sent to Congress in the past from our city, he would be heard from upon the trust and other economic questions in a way that would command attention from Congress and the country. He has already redeemed that promise in the speech referred to, which is a notably vigorous arraignment of the protectionist superstition, of the Republican claim that universal prosperity exists in this country and that every man who so desires can obtain employment—in the language of Representative Hepburn, of Iowa—"at a compensating wage." The falsity of this claim is vividly shown by Mr. Baker in the many instances he cites of the miserable wages paid to the coal miners, the farm laborers, the factory operative and the shop-girl; while convincing evidence is also presented in the list of lock-outs and shut-downs and wage reductions, culled

from the recent newspaper press, that even the limited prosperity of the past few years is rapidly disappearing.

We are gratified to learn from the New York Times' report that "the speaker had the undivided attention of the House and evoked frequent applause from the Democratic side;" and still more pleased at the sustained interest in the speech shown by requests for a large number of copies for distribution in their own districts received from two leading Congressmen of the West. These requests clearly indicate that the speech is as well adapted for circulation in rural communities as in the crowded labor centers, and The Radical Democracy strongly urges democratic Democrats everywhere to write at once to their Congressmen for as many copies as they can profitably distribute. In this connection we recommend the plan The Radical Democracy itself has adopted, of sending the speech to registered voters.

Requests for copies should be addressed to one's own Congressman, as it would be impossible for Mr. Baker, who is a poor man, to respond to more than requests for individual copies, while the Congressional committee can and no doubt gladly will fill orders given by any Congressman for as many copies as can be profitably used in his district.

Real Democrats will be particularly pleased at Mr. Baker's review of the principles for which Tom L. Johnson, of Ohio, and Gov. L. F. C. Garvin, of Rhode Island, are making such sturdy fights in their native States.

PETER AITKEN.

#### NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Dec. 24.

The Panama question (p. 554) has become a subject of most serious controversy at the American capital.

Since our last report on this matter the Republic of Panama has been recognized by Russia, Germany, Austria, France and China; but no recognition has yet been made by any country on the American continents, except the United States.

Reports of military movements by Colombia against Panama have frequently appeared in the news dispatches. None have been confirmed, however, except a recent one, to the effect that a small body of Colombian troops have taken possession of Pinos island, off the

Atlantic coast of Panama, about 50 miles west of Cape Tiburon. Even this is now denied.

Meanwhile the United States have been strengthening their naval and military forces at Panama. They have also sent William I. Buchanan, of New York, as American minister to Panama. Mr. Buchanan's appointment was confirmed by the Senate and he left at once for Panama. But on the 19th Senator Gorman moved a reconsideration on the ground that confirmation had been allowed inadvertently; in consequence of which, under the rules of the Senate, Mr. Buchanan's appointment now stands unconfirmed.

But the event of principal interest and importance regarding the Panama question is the carefully prepared speech delivered on the 17th by Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, in conditional criticism of the Administration. Mr. Hoar's speech is printed in full at page 291 of the Congressional Record for December 17th. The point he emphasized was not whether the Republic of Panama had been recognized prematurely by the Administration, but—

whether our Administration, knowing or expecting beforehand that a revolution was coming, so arranged matters that the revolution, whether peaceable or forcible, should be permitted to go on without interruption, and only took measures to stop the Republic of Colombia from preventing it. Did the President, or the Secretary of State, or any other department of our government, purposely prevent Colombia from anticipating and preventing a breach of the peace and a disturbance of the transit across the Isthmus by sending her troops there before it happened, and so virtually let the revolution take place, and say to Colombia, "You shall take no precautions to stop it?" Did we, in substance, say to Colombia, "We will not allow you to prevent a revolution in your province of Panama by moving your forces there" before it broke out?

After reviewing all the documents which the Administration had sent to the Senate, Mr. Hoar concluded that—

all our government, by its own statement, seems to have done in its anxiety that transit should not be disturbed was not to take measures that violence should not occur, but to take measures that violence should not be prevented. It performed its duty of keeping uninterrupted the transit across the Isthmus

only by interrupting it itself—interrupting it itself in its most sacred and rightful use, that of the lawful government of the country moving its own troops over its own territory that it might prevent a breach of its peace and an unlawful revolution against its authority. Mr. President, is there any doubt that, as now standing unexplained, this was an act of war?

But he closed with this explanation:

Now, I do not undertake to say—I do not say—that there has been anything, so far, on the part of our Government liable to any just criticism. But the American people and the Senate, as yet, know only part of the story. They are, in my judgment, entitled to know the whole, and to know it now, before action be taken upon the Panama treaty. We are entitled to know it in the way prescribed by the established custom of the government for a century—by an official communication from the Executive to one or the other House of Congress, and not to get it through some individual Senator, whose information may be colored, unconsciously, by his own wishes, or by what he fancies to be the wishes of anybody else, still less by the unofficial public utterances of the representatives of foreign states, or even of officials of our own executive departments.

For thousands of people in the wage-working class of the United States this is to be a dismal holiday season. The business depression (p. 566) has reached a point at which workmen in certain manufacturing lines are being discharged in large numbers, while others are having their wages sharply cut down. The details are meagerly reported by the newspapers, but enough appears to indicate the actual presence of the hard times among workingmen.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—The second East River bridge, connecting Manhattan island with Brooklyn, was formally opened on the 19th.

—Frederic R. Coudert, the New York lawyer of international fame, of the old firm of Coudert Bros., died on the 20th at the age of 71.

—In the progress of his European tour (p. 584), Wm. J. Bryan visited Tolstoy on the 18th, and was received by the Czar on the 21st.

—A celebration of the centennial anniversary of the transfer of the Louisiana territory from France to the United States was begun at New Orleans on the 18th.

—The United States authorities having prohibited gambling in Alaska, a

gambling palace is being erected on the ice of Behring sea, three miles from shore, within easy reach of Nome.

—John J. Brennan, a Chicago alderman, convicted of fraudulent practices at the judiciary election last June, was sentenced on the 21st to one year's imprisonment in the House of Correction.

—C. S. Hammond & Co., 165 Broadway, New York, have issued a new map of Panama, which is especially useful at this time, when the Panama question promises to take first place in American politics.

—Senator Hanna was reported from Washington on the 22d as having declined formally and finally to serve as chairman of the Republican National Committee during the coming presidential campaign.

—Judge Grosscup decided on the 17th, in the traction case recently argued before him (p. 584), to order the receivers of the Union Traction company to use electric power over the cable tracks on Lincoln avenue and Blue Island avenue.

—An earthquake on the 15th broke off the southeastern peak of Mount Ranier, lying sixty miles southwest of Tacoma. Hundreds of acres of rocks and ice, including a number of glaciers, were broken loose and hurled for miles down the mountain side into the valleys.

—The Cuban reciprocity bill (p. 584) was signed on the 17th by President Roosevelt, who at the same time issued a proclamation declaring the treaty to be in effect on the 27th. President Palma, of Cuba, proclaimed the treaty on the 19th, also fixing the 27th for its taking effect.

—A labor conflict between the livery drivers' union and the livery owners' union of Chicago has "tied up" the undertaking business, and funerals are conducted under difficulties. The owners' union charges the drivers with obstructing funerals, and the drivers' union charges the owners with this responsibility.

—At the by-election in the Ludlow division of Shropshire, England, held on the 23d, the result was pronounced against Mr. Chamberlain's policy, which was distinctly at issue. Although the Liberal-Unionist (Chamberlain) candidate was elected by a majority of 970, the division has heretofore been so overwhelmingly Liberal-Unionist that there was no opposition at the preceding election. At the last preceding contested election the Liberal-Unionist majority was nearly 4,000.

—Two officials of Franklin union, No. 4, of Press Feeders, of Chicago (p. 567), were indicted by the Cook county grand jury on the 21st, along with others, upon charges of assaults in connection with recent strikes. They were included with the actual participants under the ruling of Judge Gary in the anarchist

cases, which held public speakers liable for specific crimes committed under the influence of their speeches. Several indictments for riot in connection with the street car strike (p. 535) were found on the 23d.

—A successful trial of a flying machine was made on the 17th near Kitty Hawk, N. C., by Wilbur and Orville Wright, of Dayton, O., sons of Bishop Wright, of the United Brethren church. The machine flew for three miles, at an even speed of eight miles an hour, in the face of a wind blowing 21 miles an hour, and then gracefully descended at the spot selected by the navigator. The machine has no balloon attachment, but gets its force from propellers worked by a small engine. It is built upon the principle of the box kite.

—A debate on socialism versus the single tax, with reference to the interests of the working classes, took place at Chicago on the 20th between Ernest Untermeyer, Seymour Steadman and A. M. Simons for socialism, and Louis F. Post, Henry H. Hardinge and John Z. White for the single tax. A verbatim report of the debate, from the stenographic notes of W. C. McDermut, one of the best court reporters of the country, is announced by the socialist publishing house of Chicago, Chas. H. Kerr & Co., 56 Fifth avenue (room 509), for 25 cents.

—As chairman of a committee appointed by the Chicago Federation of Labor to investigate assertions that labor unions produce hard times, T. P. Quinn reported on the 20th that he had received replies from several economic students attributing hard times to inequitable distribution. Among those reported as having replied were Sir Charles Dilke, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Ernest H. Crosby, John Burns, Prince Kropotkin, and Lawson Purdy. The report recommended:

That the American Federation of Labor take immediate steps, first—to have all land now illegally held by individuals and corporations reclaimed by the government and held for actual settlement under the jurisdiction of the general land office; second—to have adequate appropriation made by the present Congress for the irrigation of all desert land, the draining of all swamp land and the whole held in the department for general use under the homestead law, and that an extra appropriation be made to cover preliminary expenses of all actual settlers; third—that each State federation of labor now in existence be urged to take immediate steps to secure the enactment of a State law making possible home rule in all municipalities within the States, this law to include the right to raise revenue in their own way.

#### PRESS OPINIONS.

##### MANIFEST DESTINY.

The Commoner (Dem.), Dec. 18.—When the Filipinos complained they were told that it was "manifest destiny." When Colombia complains she is told that it is "manifest destiny." The Boers were told that it was "manifest destiny." The Poles are told that it is "manifest destiny." Sinned down, the weaker peoples are compelled to accept subjugation by stronger

peoples as "manifest destiny." And "manifest destiny" as practiced in these strenuous times is only a hypocritical pretense of virtue put forth as the best possible excuse for wrong-doing.

**SUPPRESSION OF THOUGHT.**

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Dec. 18 (weekly ed.).—The suppression of a socialist club among the students by the authorities of Washburn college in Kansas for fear it might endanger gifts from the rich is about the worst example yet given of the subserviency of education to mere wealth.

**PHILANTHROPY.**

The American Cooperator (of Lewiston, Me.), Dec. 19.—The true test of one's benevolence is not to be found in his attitude toward individuals. It is in his attitude toward society. His attitude toward individuals is an important but a subordinate matter. . . . One man may be very charitable, giving to the poor, patronizing church suppers, or founding libraries, and be a good man. Another man equally able may refuse to do these things, and be equally good. In truth he may be better, for these things do not determine character. A man's attitude toward the whole of society does determine character.

**"STAND PAT."**

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Dec. 18 (weekly ed.).—The trouble with Mr. Hanna is that his stand-pat argument has lost an essential link since he first advanced it. The high tariff remains, and he talks of party success as remaining, too, but the bridge that originally connected the two—prosperity—has collapsed, and his continued cry of stand pat under the circumstances, therefore, becomes supremely ridiculous. If he does not know it, it is time some of his friends told him. But the discredit is not his alone; it attaches to the whole party, and must weigh heavily upon it in the approaching campaign.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Dec. 21.—The outlook for the workman is not very rosy. There are two hard winters ahead and the cost of living is about the highest ever known—thanks to the trusts which charge us all the tariff will allow, but sell their goods to foreigners at very low prices. Possibly the voters may find out by next year how to reduce their taxes in the only way worth considering, but it is impossible that their burdens can be lightened before 1907, for a Republican Senate stands between the people and lower tariff taxes. It looks as if the workmen would have to be ground between these millstones four years longer. But it is their own fault.

**ANARCHISM.**

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Dec. 18 (weekly ed.).—The Turner case involves a very simple issue. Are aliens who happen to "disbelieve in government," and who are guilty of nothing save an opinion, to be outlawed when they reach the shores of this republic? If so, then the United States has begun a reactionary warfare upon freedom of thought, which was supposed to be more secure in America than in any other part of the world.

Cole County (Mo.) Daily Democrat (Dem.), Dec. 20.—If Congress can prohibit anarchism it may by the same authority prohibit socialism, communism, or any other political belief. Whenever it invades the domain of private belief upon political questions there can be no logical limit to its usurpation. We do not like laws of this character. Better by far, we believe, is the axiom of Jefferson that all error is harmless so long as reason is free to combat it. Besides, anarchy cannot be stamped out by any such violent means. The more you persecute men for opinion's sake, the more tenaciously will men cling to those opinions. For aught we know, it may do us good to hear the arguments of some of these anarchists. We do not be-

lieve in anarchism as a political system; but anarchism, with all its faults and fail-laces, is infinitely better than Rockefellerism, Vanderblitism or Morganism. We believe, moreover, that if it were left to a vote of the people as to which should be deported, John Turner or John D. Rockefeller, Robber John would have to go.

**NATIONAL POLITICS.**

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), Dec. 16.—The Daily News' conclusion that Mr. Bryan is the most available candidate, was arrived at after considering the men who have been brought forward as candidates for the nomination. If Mr. Bryan is not the most available candidate, where is such a candidate to be found? To say that a candidate that would unite all elements of the party and bring to his support the independent voters would be the strongest candidate is not conclusive. Where is this ideal candidate to be found? Has his name been suggested? Who is he? From whence does he fall? . . . It is not a question of preference between Mr. Bryan and an ideal candidate, but of choice between Mr. Bryan and the men that are now in the field for the Democratic presidential nomination.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Dec. 17.—It has seemed to us that under all the circumstances the highest availability at this time was possessed by Edward M. Shepard, of New York. We still regard him as the really commanding figure in the situation. But apparently New York is no more able to agree upon him than it is upon Parker or Gorman or Oiney or Hill. It cannot agree upon Parker simply because the democratic Democrats—the democrats who have been voting the Democratic ticket—distrust the forces behind him. For the same reason they cannot agree upon Gorman and Hill. They not only distrust the forces behind these men; they distrust Gorman and Hill themselves—and not without profound reason. For both these men stand openly for plutocracy. Both have lent aid and comfort to the forces of privilege. Both have joined with the enemy at critical junctures in defeating the realization of democratic hopes and the fulfillment of Democratic pledges. If New York could settle upon Mr. Shepard we believe the country would acquiesce readily in her choice. Falling in this, where can the Democrats look for a more available man than to Rhode Island?

**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. 28 of that publication.

Washington, Dec. 14-19, 1903.

**Senate.**

Discussion of the Cuban commercial treaty was continued on the 14th (p. 170), 15th (p. 203) and 16th, when the bill was passed (p. 253). On the 17th Senator Hoar spoke at length on the Panama republic resolution (p. 291). He was followed by Senator Gorman (p. 293), and he by Senator Foraker (p. 296); and on the 18th Senator Daniel spoke (p. 347) on the same subject, Senator Pettus (pp. 402-03) speaking on it on the 19th. Adjournment was taken on the 19th, under concurrent resolution previously adopted, to January 4.

**House.**

There was desultory debate on the 14th, in committee of the whole on the pension appropriation bill (p. 182). Also on the same bill on the 15th (p. 216), 16th (p. 255) and 17th (p. 306). On the 18th a committee resolution regarding postal frauds (p. 364) was discussed and (p. 370) passed. On the 19th a resolution calling for submission to the House of the evidence in the postal frauds cases was passed (p. 408), after which the House adjourned (p. 409), pursuant to concurrent resolution, to January 4.

**Record Notes.**—Text of commercial treaty with Cuba (p. 161). Text of Morgan resolution as to Panama canal purchase (pp. 170, 202). Speech of Senator Mitchell on the Oregon country apropos of the Lewis and Clark exposition at Portland in 1905.

**MISCELLANY**

**"NIGHT BEFORE CHRISTMAS."**  
(Satan ruminating in the Market Place.)

For The Public.

Grace! What a show is this!  
A gala traffic surely 't the name  
That stands for Love, Peace, and Good Will  
to Man,  
(In the first person, mark ye, as we see  
The Gospel here interpreted in acts.)  
Christ! If these seeking throngs were  
pressing down  
The brilliant avenues of trade to buy  
Thy godly virtues, it were meet that I  
Should fling myself beneath their conquer-  
ing feet,  
And own my kingdom vanquished in the  
earth.  
But in the Name they carry on their  
tongues  
The crowds fall prostrate with their sacri-  
fice  
Upon the altar of their idol—Sham—  
And love is sold for tinsel and for paste.

And all the while the Christ whose won-  
drous birth  
Men claim to celebrate, is lying wrapped  
In swaddling rags, uncomforted, un-fed,  
In wretched tenement and manger cold  
When pious followers of Cant and Sham  
Come not to lay their offerings of love  
And lend their hands to service of the Child.  
Ha! who comes here with countenance of  
light,  
Fair as the star that centuries ago  
Guided the Wise Men in their quest for  
God?  
—A woman, by my faith! Yet not of these  
Who bow to idols in the name of Christ.  
She is Love's priestess, and she hears a  
voice  
Above the tumult of the greedy crowd,  
Calling: "Come, blessed of my Father,  
come,  
For I was hungry and ye gave me meat  
For I was thirsty and ye gave me drink,  
Naked, ye clothed me, sick, ye comforted;  
I was in prison and ye came to me."

Meekly she bows her head with questioning  
How she shall do these things unto the  
least,  
And all about her shines the guiding light  
That makes the Devil quail.

Ah, Love divine!  
In the still beauty of thy radiant face  
I feel like the black sphere that rolls within  
The growing crescent of the new-born  
moon;  
And know that, soon or late, the time shall  
come  
When Satan's kingdom shall be gulfed in  
light,  
And God in Man shall be the only Power.

A. L. M.

**CHILDREN WHO KEPT THEIR HEADS.**

Panic-stricken by the sight of fire and almost suffocated by smoke, the children of St. Mary's Catholic school of Evanston started a stampede in their efforts to get out of the building yesterday afternoon. When the excitement was at its height little Ethel Jennings hurried to an organ and began playing a lively march. Above the

children's voices could be heard the music, and remembering the fire drill which they had so often practiced for such an emergency the pupils fell into line and marched out of the building. Then Raymond Schaeffer, the nine-year-old son of Sergeant Schaeffer of the Evanston police, ran hatless and coatless to the firebox a block away and standing on his tiptoes turned in the alarm.

The fire department soon arrived and extinguished the flames. The fire was caused by an overheated furnace and the damage to property did not exceed \$200.—Chicago Chronicle of December 17.

#### A CHRISTIAN CHINAMAN.

"Me no plosecute. Me gotte Chlistian lelligion. Me do by burgial men like me be done by."

His pigtail bobbing as he laughed in glee, Ching Wong, Chinese laundryman, 667 West Forty-seventh street, today refused to prosecute the man alleged to have held him up and robbed him of \$30.

Although Justice Jandus and police from the Stockyards police station insisted that the Chinaman prosecute the man they had taken so much trouble to arrest, Ching Wong smiled, blinked his biased little eyes and insisted that it wouldn't be the duty of a "Chlistian."

When his place was held up October 18 he had been insistent in his demands on the police to ferret out the case. When Patrick Bligh was arrested December 7, Ching Wong was positive in his identification and wanted to prosecute the man to the fullest extent of the law. Now he only smiles and says he doesn't care to get his money back or punish the man.

"Not Chlistian," is his only excuse.—Chicago Evening Post of December 19.

#### WHAT THE PHILIPPINE CENSUS HAS ESTABLISHED.

From the Report of the Secretary, Erving Winslow, to the New England Anti-Imperialist League at its meeting in Boston, November 30.

The recent census in the Philippines has established two points—the comparatively insignificant number of those wild tribes, the Apaches of President Roosevelt, who would have produced in the islands a welter of blood on the withdrawal of the American forces, and the fact that the Filipinos were practically a Christian nation, there being 7,000,000 civilized Filipinos, meaning those who have been baptized in the Catholic church,

and but 650,000 wild or barbarous Filipinos scattered through the various islands. Our census takers found no better means of prosecuting their work than to employ the very careful and trustworthy enumeration of the Roman church. To get the entire population it would be necessary to add the number of foreigners, Japanese and Chinese. The million and a half Filipinos who have died by act of war or in consequence of war brings up the number close to that of the original estimate.

#### ARE WE AS PROSPEROUS AS MR. HEPBURN CLAIMS?

Portions of the speech of Hon. Allan Benney, of New Jersey, in the House of Representatives, on Friday, December 11, in answer to the Hon. Wm. P. Hepburn, of Iowa, as reported in the Congressional Record.

Mr. Chairman: As a new Member of this House, I have been much interested in its proceedings, and somewhat amused to find that the House of Representatives has resolved itself into a sort of a close corporation, with the Speaker of the House (owning 51 per cent. of the stock) as president, secretary and treasurer, and a board of directors, consisting of the gentleman from New York, the same from Iowa, and ditto from Ohio, with the gentleman from Pennsylvania acting as sergeant-at-arms [laughter]; the stockholders of this corporation being Republican Members and the lambs represented by the Democratic on-lookers, who hang around waiting for the only chance they ever get in this Congress—the chance to talk. [Laughter.] . . .

But you might have done worse. There is the gentleman from Pennsylvania, always affable, always polite, in fact, always a gentleman; the gentleman from New York, so courteous that it hurts, and so big that he has been permitted to carry your banner with the word "Leader" emblazoned thereon; and the gentleman from Ohio, good-natured and as full of fun—and stickers, too—as a Republican platform is of promises or the Post-Office Department of room for improvement. [Laughter.]

And your Speaker, though rather top-heavy with offices and stock in your corporation, is compelling us to grow fonder of him every day. And then last, but not least, the gentleman from Iowa, the power behind the throne, the real big gun, the "Long Tom" of this political warfare, to be brought forth only on special occasions, when annihilation is all that is proposed to be done to the minority;

the gentleman who, when he addresses himself to the Democratic side of the House, takes on that awful voice and fierce frown and to interrupt whom, even to ask a question or to set him straight, is an unpardonable offense, punishable by bluff repulse, sometimes amounting almost to insult.

From the Republican side of this House we learn that when the gentleman from Iowa speaks he gives forth simon-pure Republican belief, Republican doctrine, and Republican policy, and that no man dare contradict him or be in opposition to him, and I think the majority side of this House has shown its indorsement of that proposition. I was dumfounded a few days ago to see a large number of Members on that side laugh and applaud at the utterly unfair reference made by the Iowa thunderer to the gentleman on this side of the Chamber from New York [Mr. Baker], who, by the way, in the face of that unfairness conducted himself in such a gentlemanly manner as to win the approbation of every man in the room. It was an exhibition of servility on the other side not to be expected in this body. . . .

On November 19 last the oracle from Iowa said on this floor:

There is labor in every part of this country for every man who wants a place to work. And there is a compensating wage for every man who will perform a day's labor.

And on December 1 he repeated that statement in these words:

To-day every man in the United States who wants to work finds employment in the great labor fields of the United States, and at a compensating wage.

Mr. Chairman, the brilliant gentleman made only two mistakes in his proposition—

First. There is not work in the United States for every man in the United States who wants to work.

Second. There is not a compensating wage for every man who will perform a day's labor.

I bow to the gentleman's superior knowledge and information in some things, but this is not one of them. This particular time I ask him as a loyal Republican to bow to the statement of Hon. Carroll D. Wright, who says there are 1,000,000 men in the country out of work.

I live in the city of Bayonne, a city of 40,000 inhabitants. Every morning at the gates of our great manufacturing establishments—the Standard Oil company, the Babcock & Wilcox Boiler company, the Safety Insulated Wire and Cable company, and other large

concerns—hundreds of men congregate and beg for work. Across Newark Bay, at the works of the Singer Manufacturing company, other hundreds gather, also looking for work. Every large factory in Jersey City, New York, and in every other city that I know of, will furnish a similar sight each morning.

Every man in public life, if he lives in a city and is known to have a heart in him, can testify that he is overrun with applications of deserving men looking for work. And the men at these factory gates are the men who really want and deserve work. In addition to this evidence, do not the newspapers almost daily contain accounts of works shutting down, certain railroad companies laying off 150,000 men within the last three months, and so on? . . .

If the old Pharisee who used to stand on the street corner in Jerusalem and thank his Maker that he was not like other men should suddenly walk into this chamber and listen to three ordinary Republican speeches, he would hide his face in shame and admit that in comparison with the Latter-Day Republican Saints here he in the old days in Jerusalem knew absolutely nothing about his business. (Laughter.) . . .

If the gentleman from Iowa had looked before he leaped, or rather before he talked, he must have discovered that for more than one hundred years labor in this country has been battling, at first for its very life and later for a betterment of its condition; that while less than one hundred years ago the leaders of the shoemakers of Philadelphia and the tailors of New York were fined for combining to raise wages, to-day the leaders of the coal miners and of workers in other lines are welcome guests at the table of the President of the United States. Oh, things have changed.

The whole civilized world has progressed. The people of the earth have grown better and wiser year by year. An unfettered press in America—excepting, of course, in the State of Quay and Pennypacker—continually advising the people of their rights and educating them in every line, has assisted our people tremendously. Our schools have done their share. Of course labor has risen! Why shouldn't it rise? Let us examine that rise for a moment.

We read that at one time in this country our laws arbitrarily fixed 48 cents per day as the top wage that could be paid to the best workman. There was no bottom wage. The inferior workman had his wage fixed by the village constable, and it would take

a magnifying glass to find it. That beautiful city in which we are now assembled was built largely by men working for 50 cents per day, the hod-carriers received \$70 per year for a working day that commenced with sunrise and finished with sunset.

That in 1835 weavers were paid \$65 per year and worked twelve hours per day.

That in 1844 factory girls received \$1.25 to \$2 per week, working from 5 a. m. to 7 p. m., with fifteen minutes recess for breakfast and one-half hour for dinner.

That in 1800 workmen's average wages were \$65 per year, and in that year one clerk with a few pigeonholes for filing purposes conducted all the business of the Patent Office.

That in 1850 the average wages were \$247.

That in 1900 the average wages were \$446, and in this last year more than 27,000 patents were granted in the United States and the clerks in the Patent Office constituted an army.

That the wages of the bricklayers climbed up as follows: In 1776 the wages were 50 cents per day of fourteen hours; in 1850 the wages were \$1.75 for twelve hours; in 1901 the wages were over \$4.80 per day of eight hours.

The tariff didn't do that! The condition is the fruit of labor's one hundred years' fight for its own. The fight isn't over yet, but when John Mitchell forced the strongest combination of moneyed interests in this world to treat as humans and not as beasts the 147,000 coal miners in the anthracite fields labor saw the dawn break and the sun rise.

In the words of John Hay, every sympathizer with the downtrodden should continue to pray:

Wherever man oppresses man  
Beneath Thy liberal sun,  
O God! be there Thine arm made bare,  
Thy righteous will be done.

If, as the gentleman maintains, "there is a compensating wage for every man who will perform a day's labor," how is it that in many parts of the country workingmen are striking for a wage that will be a suitable return for their day's labor?

Unless the gentleman's statement is utter nonsense, it can mean only one thing, viz., that the coal miner, the trolley conductor and motorman, the track repairer, the railroad employe in every station, the carpenter, mason and craftsman of every kind, the ditch digger, and, in fact, every workingman "who will perform a day's labor" is now receiving a "compensating wage," or, in other

words, all the wage he is entitled to, a suitable return for his labor.

What an insult to the laboring men of our land! Does the gentleman presume now to say that when the labor organizations of this country look for better wages they ask for something they are not entitled to? Doesn't he know that no man is more willing to do a full day's work for a full day's pay than the laboring man? Yes, sir; the laborer is, as a rule, more willing to do a day's work for his wage than are the members of this House, and in order to have them do it they need not be watched any closer than our own Members. If anybody disagrees with me, look around at the empty desks. [Laughter and applause.]

The gentleman from Iowa fairly thundered forth, on December 1, these words:

When has there been a time when the distribution of wealth was as great as it is now, and when the humblest and the poorest had so large a share of the accumulations of each year as now?

There never has been a time.

Has the gentleman not read the figures in the United States census of 1900 which show that 8.99 per cent. of the people own 72.67 per cent. of the wealth of this country? Has he never seen the estimates of Mr. Charles B. Spahr, whereby it appears that one per cent. of the people own 54.8 per cent. of the wealth; another 10.9 per cent. of the people own 32.2 per cent. additional, which added together shows that 11.9 per cent. of the people own 87 per cent. of our wealth, the other 13 per cent. of the wealth then remaining being owned by 38.1 per cent. of the people? Add all these items up and you will see by these figures all of our wealth is owned by just 50 per cent. of the people, the other 50 per cent. of our people, or in round numbers 40,000,000 souls, owning absolutely no part of the country's great wealth.

Has it not been stated over and over again without contradiction that when the board of directors of the steel trust meets, the 22 men who there sit down own one-twelfth part of the entire wealth of the United States?

Does that show the present to be a time when the distribution of wealth is greater than ever before, and that the humblest and the poorest have a larger share of the accumulations of the year than ever before?

Shame on the suggestion!

On the 1st of this month the gentleman from Iowa said:

I live in a county of 24,000 people—a farming community. There is not a protected industry in that county. On the 1st day of last October there were \$2,580,000 on deposit in the little banks of that county. Ninety-five per cent. of those deposits belonged to farmers, and they amounted to more than

\$100 for every man, woman and child in the county.

Where can you find anything like that anywhere in the world outside of the influence of our protective tariff?

Mr. Chairman, the success of the land we love, as pictured by the gentleman's description of conditions in his home county to-day, cannot be duplicated, so far as I know, in any other country in the world. I congratulate him upon the prosperity of the community in which he lives, and for that prosperity, due almost solely to the fact that Providence assisted that county to raise a very large crop of wheat and other cereals during late years, he and every other man who shared in that prosperity ought to spend less of their time in praising Dingley schedules and more of their time in thanking Almighty God. (Applause on the Democratic side.)

I despise his suggestion that these conditions exist there because of our protective tariff. It is a small reason for a big man to advance for the grand position to-day of the greatest land on earth. We have the conditions suggested by the gentleman, not because of the tariff, but rather in spite of it, or at least a part of it; not because the people at present favor his party or mine; not because of this law or that law, but because this is the United States of America, a country without parallel since time began. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Has the gentleman ever stopped to consider the land we live in and compare it with other lands less favored? Does he recall that our country from the time of its first settlement until now has been the one place on earth to which was attracted the best blood and sinew of all the countries of the world? Does he not know that such blood and sinew, intermingling here and fostered under the freedom of our Stars and Stripes, has produced a race of men whose equal never lived before, and will he not now, in due humility, admit that this superior race of men in this beloved land has been signally favored by an all-wise Providence?

Does it count for nothing in the world's competition of nations that the American people have a land so large, so fertile, so favored by God's sun and rain in just the proper proportion, so abundantly provided with inventive geniuses, so situated as to climate and temperature, so rich in minerals and in everything else that goes to make a country so great, so well equipped with seacoast and natural inland waterways as to facilitate commercial intercourse among ourselves and with foreign countries, and

so placed with reference to other countries as to make us practically secure forever against any method of foreign attack, thus permitting our people to devote more of their energies to peaceful pursuits; so placed and so favored, in fact, as to constitute a marvel to every foreigner who visits our shores?

Why, sir, a people placed in these surroundings and with these advantages, who are not one whit better equipped personally than the people of other countries, ought still, by reason of the surroundings and advantages mentioned, lead all other people in every line of endeavor, but when we find this favored land and this superior people in combination, what is there on the earth to-day that can stand in opposition to it?

"Where," says the gentleman from Iowa, pointing to one of the evidences of our splendid success, "can you find anything like that anywhere in the world outside of the influence of our protective tariff?" etc.

If the protective tariff is responsible for the prosperity pictured by the gentleman, then our people and our country are not. If it is a question of tariff and not people and country, then it is quite evident that all countries should prosper in proportion to the height of their tariff schedules. Why, then, I wonder, does not the Republican party double the tariff rates, and thus increase twofold the wages and the general prosperity?

#### WHY "COMPENSATING" WAGES ARE NOT PAID.

Portions of the speech of Hon. Robert Baker, of New York, in the House of Representatives, on Monday, December 14, in reply to the Hon. Wm. P. Hepburn, of Iowa, as reported in the Congressional Record.

Mr. Chairman: I had not expected to take up the time of the House so early in the session. I had thought of exercising that modesty which is becoming in a new Member; but there have been two statements made upon the floor recently, by men conspicuous in leadership on the other side—one economic and the other political—which, it seems to me, demand a reply, even if it be by a new Member.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Hepburn), in his speech on the 19th of November, said:

There is labor in every part of this country for every man who wants a place to work.

And that sentiment found, as it necessarily and properly would, applause upon the Republican side. There was no reason why there should not be applause

upon the Democratic side, if it were true! And then the gentleman from Iowa proceeded:

And there is a compensating wage for every man who will perform a day's labor.

It is because my views are so entirely at variance with what the gentleman evidently regards as a "compensating" wage that I have asked for the privilege here now of making some comments upon what in my estimation is a most extraordinary statement.

What constitutes a compensating wage? In my humble judgment, a compensating wage means the entire product which any laborer gives to an article by his toil, and if any part of the value of that labor which he has implanted upon that article is subtracted or taken away by some other power, then to that extent that labor does not obtain a compensating wage.

Is there any man, even upon the Republican side, who will claim to-day that, as we see growing up on the one hand gigantic fortunes almost beyond calculation, and as we see in our great cities especially hundreds of thousands of individuals who scarcely know where their breakfast is coming from in the morning, who will pretend that these men, these hundreds of thousands of individuals, having none of the wealth of the world, have received compensating wages for their past toil? . . .

[Mr. Baker then cited at length facts showing the lack of a "compensating" wage to the laborers of this country. Upon being asked during this portion of his speech, by Mr. Olmsted, of Pennsylvania (Rep.), if he would yield the floor for an interruption, Mr. Baker replied: "I want to say, this being the first time I have spoken upon this floor, that I shall maintain the invariable rule I have followed outside this House, to answer every question that may be addressed to me, no matter who the gentleman may be." This statement was received with applause.]

#### WHY A "COMPENSATING" WAGE IS NOT PAID.

Why is it that a "compensating" wage is not paid to the coal miner; to the worker in the clothing sweat shop; to the farm laborer; to the factory operative, whether in cotton, worsted, woolen, and paper goods, boots and shoes, or other industries; to the sales girl of our city department stores; even to the clerks and bookkeepers—most of whom regard themselves as superior to factory operatives—thousands of whom, even in New York, with its high cost of living, receive less than \$12 a week? Why is it that despite the manifold inventions which more than anything else mark the latter

half of the nineteenth century, inventions which in some instances have increased the power of labor to produce ten, twenty, and in some few instances, forty fold—why is it that capital even (capital not engaged in monopolistic enterprises or having some monopoly privilege) finds its return steadily diminishing, except, maybe, during a few years of particularly flush times? The answer to one is the answer to all of these queries—monopoly! I am well aware that in the public mind the word monopoly is associated almost exclusively with what has become known as the "trusts," but these combinations are merely the more glorious illustrations of the effects of monopoly. The ownership of valuable lands in our large cities, of water powers and water privileges—wharves, etc.—of mineral and timber lands, constitute monopoly privileges, and their ownership confers a power quite distinct from the possession of capital by the same individuals.

The exclusive franchises to perform certain public functions in our cities, such as the supplying of gas, water and electricity, street car and elevated railroad service, as well as inter-State transportation, are monopoly privileges of the highest value, the possession of which gives the power to continuously tax the people. Colossal fortunes have been secured ("earned" is the mistaken term generally used) by the few men controlling these enormously valuable privileges, which have been used to lay the whole people under tribute. The factory girl and the saleslady of our great stores, many of whom receive as little as from \$3.50 to \$5 per week, have their scanty earnings reduced by the extortionate toll which the street-car monopolies exact. A service which it requires a stretch of the mind to figure as costing one-half of the five cents collected (even if seats were provided for all), and for which a three-cent fare would yield a generous dividend on the actual capital invested in the lines and their equipment. This two-cent excess collected twice a day constitutes during the week a serious depletion of the meager wages which these girls receive, and has, undoubtedly, been the means of driving many of them to the streets.

How is this condition to be altered? By what means can we prevent the further appropriation by monopoly of an ever-increasing proportion of the wealth which labor and capital produces?

The answer is simple. Complex as our present civilization appears to those who have not studied economic principles, it is complex only in the subdivision of labor. The effects of monopoly

are as clearly apparent to those who will study the matter as though primitive civilization existed and all wealth was produced directly from the land. To secure a "compensating" wage to labor, to secure a just and full return to capital, we must strike at the causes which produce monopoly. We must strike at the roots. We can do this by substituting in place of the cumbersome, unintelligent, discordant, complex system—or lack of system—which taxes production and accumulation, which says, in effect, to every individual that the more industrious and more effective your methods of production, the greater judgment and skill displayed therein, the greater burden of taxes shall you bear; while it says to monopolists in effect, the more you monopolize natural opportunities (thereby depriving labor and capital of the means of production) the greater the extent and scope of your monopoly, and the less use you permit these opportunities to be put to, the less burden of taxation shall you bear. To secure a "compensating" wage to every toiler it is but necessary to restore natural law, to institute the "natural" system of taxation—the single tax. No words that I can use can so clearly and graphically portray the benefits that would follow if this were done as those contained in "Ethics of Democracy," by Louis F. Post, who in this book has illumined fundamental Democratic principles, and who, week by week, in the columns of the Public, comments upon current events of the day from the standpoint of real Democracy in a manner that cannot fail to clarify the thought of those who read his paper, and I therefore commend it to my Republican friends on the other side, who stand so much in need of it. He says on page 141:

By means of the single-tax principle the abolition of land monopoly can be fully accomplished. By means of the single-tax method it can be far advanced. Under this simple land reform, sound in economics and unassailable in morals, no one could hold any kind of land out of use without suffering serious and continual loss. Land would have to be used, and be well used, or be abandoned. There would be no profit in mere ownership. That goal being reached—indeed, long before it had been fully reached—trade having meanwhile and by the same method been freed by the abolition of commercial and industrial taxes and of highway obstacles, the benefits of economic improvement would be generally diffused and the evil spirit of the trust would be exorcised.

With the annual value of special landed advantages applied to common use and no longer retained by private owners; with taxes on industry thus made unnecessary, and consequently abolished; with highways freed from special privilege; with unused land everywhere made freely accessi-

ble, and the barriers of the industrial corral thus broken down; with demand for productive work thereby made to exceed supply, and through the free interplay of all the economic forces of consumption and production perpetually to maintain that excess—with these demonstrable effects of the single tax realized, there would be no more possibility of subjugating labor and monopolizing business with paper agreements than of holding back the waters of Niagara with a paper dam.

#### GOD HELP RHODE ISLAND!

I now come to the political matter that I expressed a desire to discuss at the opening of my remarks. A few days ago I was impelled to ask the member from Ohio this question on the occasion of his annual antelection prophecy: "Does the gentleman know that the reelected governor of Rhode Island is the same kind of a man as Tom L. Johnson—a Single-Tax Democrat?" and as the only reply he made was: "God help Rhode Island!" and as I now learn that that portion of his remarks wherein he spoke of the recent election in that State does not conform to the facts, I take this, the earliest opportunity, to state just what the facts are, and also why I, a resident of another State, deem it of importance that the country and also the prophet of the Republican party should know for what these men stand.

It will not do for my Republican friends to insinuate that the people of Rhode Island do not know for what Gov. Garvin stands. They know he stands for—

#### EQUAL ELECTORAL REPRESENTATION.

So that 200 votes in a Republican rural community shall not have equal political representation with 10,000 Democratic votes in Providence.

#### THE INITIATIVE.

So that not more than 5,000 voters shall be required to initiate amendments to the Constitution, to be submitted directly to the people.

#### TAXATION OF PUBLIC FRANCHISES.

So that the exploiters of special privileges shall not escape taxation—the farmer and workingman now bearing nearly all the burden of taxation.

#### THREE-CENT RAILWAY FARES IN PROVIDENCE.

So that shop girls shall not be forced to give quite so large a proportion of their scanty earnings to monopoly.

#### TEN HOURS' LABOR IN TWELVE HOURS FOR MOTORMEN AND CONDUCTORS.

So that these men can occasionally see their children during daylight.

#### THE REFERENDUM.

So that no franchise shall be valid until approved by a majority vote of the electors.

He has been several times a member of the State Senate as well as of the

Lower House, having been elected some thirteen times, as well as having been a candidate for Congress at four successive Congressional elections, while as the Democratic candidate for Governor in 1902 and 1903 he polled on each occasion from 2,000 to 5,000 more votes than the other Democratic candidates for State offices.

Gen. Grosvenor, among other things, said that the Republicans last year elected the Lieutenant Governor by 700 or 800 and this year by some 8,000. I have here a letter from Gov. Garvin's secretary, in which he gives the figures which show that the Democratic candidate for Lieutenant Governor was elected in 1902 by 2,164, and that so far from the Republicans electing their candidate in 1903 by 7,000 to 8,000 he only had a plurality of 381, sufficient, it is true, to elect him, but indicating no such change of political sentiment in Rhode Island as the gentleman would have the country believe.

"God help Rhode Island!" It would seem that this appeal is unnecessary, as the people of that State at the last two elections have given the best evidence of their ability to help themselves. For years that little State has been the happy hunting grounds of the boodler and corruptionist. Immense sums have been annually spent to make certain that the State would remain in the "right" column, the column which the gentleman from Ohio states is to aggregate some 260 votes in the electoral college.

Like Tom L. Johnson in Ohio, Gov. Garvin is one of those few men in public life who will not spend one illegal or corrupt dollar to influence political results, not even to secure his own election. As he is by repute a poor man, it is very doubtful whether, even if he had the disposition, he could raise pennies where the Republicans raise dollars. The beneficiaries of "protection" are not contributing to the support of real Democrats—those who oppose every form of special privilege. But the gentleman from Ohio says: "We have not only both branches of the Legislature, but we have them by a larger majority than we elected them by one year ago." What does the gentleman mean by a larger majority? Does he mean to imply that a majority or even plurality of the voters in Rhode Island last year, or even this year, voted for the Republican candidates for the Senate and the Assembly? I imagine not. Yet I cannot see how the uninitiated could draw any other inference from his language.

What are the facts? We find that in 1902, 20 towns—with a total population

of 36,672 and but 8,994 voters, and in which the aggregate vote cast for all these 20 Republican Senators was but 3,855, or 43 per cent. of the vote of those towns—elected a majority of the Senate, which consists of 38 members. While 3,855 Republican voters were able, under the grossly unfair apportionment existing in Rhode Island, to elect 20 Senators, it took 22,579 Democratic votes to elect ten—not 20—Senators in Democratic districts. We thus get a glimpse of what the Democrats, under the leadership of Gov. Garvin, have been "up against" in that State. Under the law there, as amended in 1901, these 20 Senators, a majority of the Senate, in effect, constitute the Government of the State of Rhode Island, as the Senate is really the executive power. All that these 20 men have to do is to refuse to confirm any appointment by Gov. Garvin, and then, under this strange law, they can in the course of a stated number of days (very few) proceed to nominate and confirm whoever they may select.

Incidentally, and for the information of the gentleman from Ohio, I wish to call attention to the fact that it took 10,997 Democratic votes in the city of Providence to elect the one Senator which this Republican apportionment permits that city to have.

The marvel is, not that the Republicans have a majority of both Houses of the Legislature, but that the Democratic representation is half as large as it is where such gross inequality prevails.

It is entirely true that, as the general says, they—the Republicans—have the Legislature, and that is what they wanted. Of course they wanted the Legislature. Without it "oil and philanthropy" would be deprived of their most skillful leader and strongest supporter at the other end of the Capitol. But the Rockefellerers do not boast of the methods employed to retain control of "their" Legislature, while I notice that the gentleman from Ohio is content to let that phase of the subject severely alone. Even he will not boast of the saturnalia of corruption and political debauchery which the Republicans have resorted to to retain control of the Legislature of that State, for without wholesale corruption, without the expenditure of an immense boodle fund—the extent and persistent use of which one would think should make even Republicans blush with shame—they could not, even with their shockingly indecent apportionment, elect a majority of the Legislature.

WHAT JOHNSON AND GARVIN STAND FOR.

But why is it that I am so interested in

the Governor of Rhode Island, and what induced me to call attention to the fact that he is the same kind of a Democrat as the last Democratic candidate for Governor of Ohio? It is because these two men represent the highest ideals of Democracy, because they stand for its noblest aspirations, because of all the candidates of the Democratic party in the United States at the last election, who were known outside of their own districts, these two men alone stand unreservedly, unequivocally and unqualifiedly for that fundamental Democratic principle—"equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

It is because the United States has strayed far from this principle; it is because the people have not been alert to the insidious attacks that have from time to time been made upon that principle; it is because as a whole they have never yet fully realized its great import; it is because they have listened to the siren song of those who wished to emasculate it; it is because the people have permitted this and other legislative bodies to nullify it by granting special privileges to this and to that special interest, until they become drunk with the power and immense wealth which the possession of special privileges has enabled them to wring from the people; that monopolists have become so insolent and domineering that they have come to regard these special privileges as their inherent and inalienable rights, threatening with annihilation, political and commercial, any who may have the temerity to challenge their right to continue to oppress the people.

It is because these two men, Tom L. Johnson and Lucius C. F. Garvin, are devoting their lives to the endeavor of educating the people to see the causes which produce monopoly, well knowing that, once its primal cause is understood, the people will make short work of the whole system of special privilege, that I hope the public will know more of them.

It has been said that the recent election in Ohio means the political death of Tom L. Johnson. Those who thus prophesy do not know the man nor the power of the truths for which he stands. To such men, imbued with a great moral purpose, the determination to devote their lives to the uplifting of humanity in the only effective way that mankind can be permanently benefited, by abolishing monopoly, defeat is nothing more than a temporary obstacle.

Johnson and Garvin, as well as less conspicuous workers in the cause for which Henry George gave his life, know full well the forces massed against them.

They well know that every artifice of which shrewd, able, unscrupulous and extremely wealthy men are capable are and will be exerted to deceive the people as to the principles for which they contend. They know that all the power that monopolistic wealth can control—financial, commercial and social—is being organized and marshaled against them. That the great daily and weekly newspapers with few exceptions are likewise so controlled and are used to misrepresent them and their cause. But even this combination does not appall them. No temporary defeat will deter them from continuing the battle against every form of special privilege, against every law which gives one man an advantage over his fellow, and for the establishment upon this earth here and now of an order of universal justice which shall secure to even the weakest and poorest the full value of his toil.

The leading monopolists of this country, the men who during recent years have piled up fortunes of scores and hundreds of millions of dollars, know them, whether the members of this House do or not, and they also know that the principles for which Gov. Garvin and Tom L. Johnson contend, and of which they are the most conspicuous advocates in the United States, would, if applied, solve the anthracite-coal problem as well as any and all other monopoly problems. It is because of this knowledge that these two men were especially singled out for attack in the last campaign by all the great exploiters of special privileges, whether Republicans or whether masquerading as Democrats, whether residents of New York, Philadelphia, Boston and Chicago, or residents of Ohio and Rhode Island.

Of one thing the members of this House may be assured—that the big monopolists of this country have a keen perception of the danger to their monopolies that would follow the complete triumph of men like Tom L. Johnson and Gov. Garvin. The monopolists fully realize that these two men mean business, that no sneers or calumnies will deter them from their purpose to aid in overthrowing every monopoly in the country, and that the way to accomplish this is to deprive them of their special privileges, for it is through the possession of special privileges that men obtain the power to rob their fellow-men.

These men are two of the most conspicuous of those in the United States of whom Henry George, with that profound faith in man's inherent sense of justice which was his most marked characteristic, with a seer's vision, prophe-

sied in the closing chapter of "Progress and Poverty" when he said:

The truth that I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance. If that could be it would have been accepted long ago; if that could be it would never have been obscured; but it will find friends, those who will toil for it; suffer for it; if need be die for it; for this is the power of truth.

#### MISS SHAW AND THE "DAUGHTER."

Rev. Anna H. Shaw, at the recent annual meeting of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage association, told an amusing story of a woman who once urged her to leave the suffragists and join the D. A. R. "We are a better class of women, you know," said the Daughter.

"Unluckily, I am not eligible," said Miss Shaw, who is an Englishwoman. "Is it possible? Were not any of your ancestors in the war of the revolution?"

"Oh, yes, they were there, and they fought bravely, but they were all on the British side."

"Oh, what a pity! I am so sorry for you!"

"You needn't be," answered Miss Shaw. "I am not a bit sorry for myself. You stand to-day where my ancestors stood, advocating taxation without representation; and I stand where yours did. I would rather line up with your ancestors than with mine. I would rather be right myself than have my ancestors right."

"Well," said the Daughter, "I am glad that I have descended from a long line of revolutionary ancestors."

"Yes," answered Miss Shaw, "that is the trouble—you have descended from them. I would rather ascend than descend from my ancestors. There are no women more inconsistent than those who belong to those patriotic societies and boast of their ancestors, yet repudiate the principles for which those patriots fought!"—Woman's Journal.

Slumslopogas, the aboriginal convert, was sprinkled with water and became John. It being a high church community, the pastor impressed on his flock the necessity, if they would be saved, of eating fish and not meat on Friday. But, alas for the frailty of flesh, the pastor, passing John's wigwam on a meat-prohibited day, saw a savory beef-steak stewing. Said he: "Oh, John, this is indeed evil."

The backslider made answer: "It's like this, sir. You sprinkle Slumslopogas with water, he no more Slumslopogas, he John. Me sprinkle cow with water, he no more cow, but fish."—Sporting Times.

#### PANAMA, AND WHAT THE PEOPLE THINK OF IT.

For The Public.

We want a policy of pride,  
From base contrivances exempt;  
And not of diplomatic tricks,  
A target for the world's contempt.  
Let us be honest to the core;  
We needn't steal because we're strong;  
We'd rather pay ten millions more,  
And take our self-respect along.

We see the end beyond the means;  
We recognize the great intent,  
To make two mighty oceans one,  
And unify a continent;  
But truth and honesty and right  
Are greater far, and far more strong  
Than all the victories of might,  
And all the armaments of wrong.

'Tis grand to grapple such a task,  
To gird the titan with a girth,  
To send our navies beating through  
The giant breast-bone of the earth;  
We feel the full temptation; but  
Our eighty million eyes are strong,  
And, though we've tried to keep them shut,  
The method's wrong—ignobly wrong.

Not crimson yet, like other wrongs,  
(Those crimes which heaven can't forget);

It is not wet with women's tears,  
Or red with blood of men as yet;  
No burning homes blot out the sun;  
But these will come, ere it be long;  
The swift descent has just begun—  
Down!—Down!—From wrong to deeper wrong.

BERTRAND SHADWELL.

"What the boy needs," said the doctor, "is good red blood. We must—"

"Heavens!" exclaimed the aristocratic mother; "why, that's what the common people have."—Chicago Evening Post.

Hungry Mike—Any free lunches in Boston?

Wise William—Sure, dey is; but yer don't want ter look fer no signs readin': "Free lunch."

Hungry Mike—Gee! Don't they have no signs out?

Wise William—Sure, dey do; but in Boston dey read: "Luncheon Gratis."—Puck.

"After all, the old saying 'There's always room at the top' doesn't mean anything."

"Unless it means," replied the traveling man, "that the lower berths in a sleeper are usually taken before you get there."—Philadelphia Press.

"But—how can you sell this land so cheap," said the investor, "when you say there's a gold mine on it?"

"My dear sir," replied the agent, "it's a way we have down here—a gold mine goes with each purchase every Wednesday and Friday."—Atlanta Constitution.

## BOOKS

## INEQUALITY AND PROGRESS.

In what different spheres men live—yet all are men. Not to speak of the multifarious life of a city, in which no quarter knows how the other quarter lives, it is true of the great reading public in the world of thought here in democratic America, that there are different sets, whose intellectual food and mode of thought are as different as if some of us lived in Peru and others in Japan. The books we read, the periodicals we take, have utterly different ideals and points of view, and it is only rarely that they cross each other. The result is that hardly any of us know how the other half thinks. What a surprise, for example, it would be, if the Outlook and the Appeal to Reason could exchange for a month their subscription lists. Clergymen, even of different denominations, sometimes exchange pulpits—would it not be a good idea for some of our many weeklies to try the experiment of exchanging subscribers for an issue or two? It might be both amusing and profitable.

This thought of the ignorance of some men concerning the thoughts, sentiments and philosophy of others, cannot but be suggested to some who may read a book by Prof. George Harris, entitled *Inequality and Progress* (Houghton, Mifflin & Co., \$1.25). Dr. Harris, at the time of the publication of this book, was a professor in Andover Theological Seminary; he is now president of Amherst College.

The central theme of the book is sufficiently indicated by the title, and necessarily a large part of the argument deals with equality of opportunity. There must be to-day thousands of readers, readers on economic subjects, who do not imagine that such a book could be written, printed and read in these latter days; and yet our election returns indicate that it voices the sentiments of a majority of American voters.

It may be said that the author himself seems to illustrate the point of our ignorance of one another, for in this book, dealing with the problem of inequality of economic opportunity, he ignores, and one would think is in fact ignorant of, the works of the man who in modern times has written most and most clearly on this very subject. In some parts of the book it would seem that if he had known Henry George at all he must perforce have mentioned him from the sheer impulse of diametrical opposition.

In chapter 5, which is entitled *Economic Equality a Chimera*, he deals with "certain theories of equality which have some currency"; and then he goes on to say, "After the impracticability of those theories has become evident, I shall proceed from negation of equality to the positive advantage

of inequality as a condition of progress." There is nothing to show in these chapters that he has any conception whatever of what is really meant by equality of opportunity in the economic sense, and yet he closes chapter 7 with the following expression of satisfaction: "What, now," he says, "is the use of talking equality of opportunity under any economic or political system? A mouse and an ox may be in the same field, ranging over the same area, but the roots are no opportunity for the ox, and the grass is no opportunity for the mouse."

May we not see in this sentence the fundamental belief of all such writers as this theological professor and college president? To them the difference in men amounts to a difference in genus. To them we are not all oxen—some fat and some lean, some large and some small, some red and some white—but some of us are mice. They make, as the above illustration perhaps unconsciously shows, a real difference of genus. They have not attained the conception of the value of man as man. They deny humanity, and with all their theology virtually deny God.

Mazzini has a great sentence: "Yesterday," he says, "we revered the priest, the lord, the soldier, the master; to-day we reverence Man, his liberty, his dignity, his immortality, his labor, his progressive tendency—all that constitutes him a creature made in the image of God." Writers, like the author of the present book—and they represent even now the majority of us—are still living in Mazzini's yesterday. It is the "priest, lord, soldier, master" that they really reverence, not the man; and with this thought—whether it be conscious or not—they do not really know the meaning of the word "equality" as it is used by the great modern champions of freedom. With this thought, they do not and cannot believe in "equality of opportunity." With this thought, they honestly believe that some men have a higher right, by virtue of being lords and masters, to the privileges which heighten superiority and emphasize inequality.

J. H. DILLARD.

## THE LAND FOR THE PEOPLE.

One of the most valuable contributions of the year to the reading public is "The Yellow Van," by Richard Whiteing (New York: The Century Company, \$1.50). The book has a claim to be read by whomsoever is interested in bringing about a total change in the absurd social system under which we live to-day. Its story centers about a village in the England of the present time. Though a great landlord, the duke of Allonby and his wife hold an important place in its pages, it is with "the infinitely little of Slocum Parva, mere items of entry in

the parish register," that the book has most to do.

Into this village, from which a false state of society has drained nearly all its life, comes the American wife of the duke to take her place. She has been brought up, as Americans mostly are, to believe in the England of fiction and poetry. Here she finds it in the grim reality of its poverty and squalor, its abject degradation of body and almost total annihilation of mind. The procession of villagers, gentry and clergy, which welcomes her husband and herself is but an evidence of the fact that feudalism has lived over into this twentieth century and, like the older feudalism, bases its power to exist upon the power of its might to exclude the great mass of humanity from the land, save on the terms of slavery. From the large farmer down through the varying degrees of men who own some 50 acres of land to the men and women who own not one spot to rest a foot and call their own, all living things in human shape come that day to do homage to their lord and master.

The yellow van with its words of revolt against this system, "The Land and the People," reaches this village one day. Speaking from its steps, the owner makes one firm convert to his teaching, a young man, George Herion. Just here is where the human interest deepens. For George has committed the folly, so his betters call it, of marrying and having a home. Opportunity, self-made, brings him a new sense of independence, and Rose and himself seem on the road to success. But, in punishment for his having supported the Radical candidate in an election, they are evicted from their cottage. This means ruin for them, as they can go nowhere else in the countryside under the ban of the great lord's displeasure.

In despair they turn to London. There they sink from poverty to utter penury, their rent paid in the city as in the country to the duke of Allonby eating away their youth and strength. For awhile they are lost to us. They have entered that room which Hugo tells us is utterly dark and where people who have lived on little, entering in, live on nothing.

The duchess, searching for many days, can find no trace of them. When, by accident, she comes upon George she finds him maimed and helpless in the ward of a city hospital. There is the old excuse for such a wrong—neglect of an employer to protect a place of danger, a misstep and another man thrown to one side, broken and useless for all his days to come. In the depths of their misery a little child had come to them, not to lead them as was promised years ago, but to be another weight to drag them down still deeper. Rose, working by day and night, weakened by starvation, despair and sickness, dies before aid can reach her. And so they are taken back to Slocum.

It is around this central story of man and wife that Mr. Whiteing writes, with clearness, his condemnation of our social wrong. He shows us how, for having expressed a belief in an economic doctrine, this young Englishman, in a country whose boast is of its freedom, is driven from his home, all avenues of earning a living closed to him in the country and in an overcrowded city, where they seek only to keep body and soul together, how he and his wife are quickly ground between the upper and lower millstone of disease and rent.

As things go, the agent of the estate congratulates himself on having won the victory. With George dead in all but mind and that bound to go before long, with a baby soon to forget its mother over in the graveyard, it would seem that the agent was right. But with all human experience telling us that one day's defeat may be the next day's victory, the agent should be proven wrong in time.

Great moral and economic change may not seem to be brought to any community by such an outwardly uncouth messenger as the yellow van. Yet many years ago there entered into an ancient city, where men and women had reached below the level of the beast, a man seated upon an ass which his followers, in their poverty, had taken from a stranger's field close by. The archetype of landless men and women all the world over, through endless centuries, he raised them up out of the moral slavery in which they waited for death, by the new law he gave to all humanity of brotherhood and justice and that charity which is love.

MAUD MALONE.

**"WHETHER COMMON OR NOT."**

Readers of the Commoner will recognize this title as the name of the department of that paper to which Will M. Maupin, Mr. Bryan's able and versatile assistant editor, contributes so much that is readable without being vacuous, and humorous without lacking in common sense. Mr. Maupin has now gathered together some of his sketches and verses ("Whether Common or Not." By Will M. Maupin. St. Louis: Christian Publishing company) and put them out in a fairly attractive little volume.

In writing the "foreword" for Mr. Maupin's work, Mr. Bryan well says that it is to be commended—

to those who enjoy innocent fun, delicate humor and philosophy seasoned with sentiment. His fables and paragraphs are to the point, and the wit is made subservient to the argument which he presents. We is especially happy in his verses when—as he often does—he deals with the tender attachments of the family and the virtues of every-day life. The moral in his writings is always apparent and paramount.

Such titles for stories as "The Feud That Flickered Out," "The Merger at Four Corners," "The Schoolmarm of Cracker's Neck," and "The Ghost of Raccoon Coombs," are inviting, and the stories are as interesting as their titles suggest they may be.

We wonder if this quotation from a collection in the book of Mr. Maupin's brief paragraphs is true: "A little investigation will demonstrate that those who complain loudest about 'yellow journalism' are usually those who have something they want to keep concealed because they are afraid of the results of exposure."

**BOOKS RECEIVED.**

—Studies in the Evolution of Industrial Society. By Richard T. Ely, Ph. D., LL. D. New York: The Macmillan Company. To be reviewed.

—Socialism: The Nation of Fatherless Children. By David Goldstein. Edited by Martha Moore Avery. Boston: The Union News League. To be reviewed.

—Letters addressed by Edward M. Shepard to the Evening Post on the Negro Suffrage Question. This is a collection in pamphlet form of Mr. Shepard's famous letters to the New York Evening Post on the subject named, written at the request of the editor. The editorials in reply are included in the pamphlet.

**PERIODICALS.**

High school magazines are among the later and better expressions of the public school idea, and those that are well conducted ought not to escape attention in the outer world. One of these is "The Maroon and White," which is published by the students of the Moline (Ill.) High School, under the general editorship of Herbert Putnam.

"Petty bribery, falsehood, grab and graft" are the terms applied by the Springfield Republican to the Congressional mileage allowance. While the law provides for the payment of "actual individual traveling expenses" to and from the capital once each session, Congressmen vote themselves by custom 20 cents a mile. The Republican figures that the expenses cannot exceed five cents a mile—and worse, the members do not pay anything, simply pocketing the mileage! The editor calls it "a contemptible little steal," refers to the manly course of Congressman Baker, of Brooklyn, and says "it is a matter which calls for summary correction." The statement has been made that only three members of the present Congress paid railroad fare in attending the extra session called this fall. J. H. D.

The Booklover's Magazine, which enters upon its second year with the current (January) number, has made good its promise of taking the lead as an artistic magazine. There was some backsliding during the year, but the later issues have been distinct improvements upon even the best of the earlier ones, and that for January is superior to all its predecessors. Willis J. Abbot's political article on "The Democratic Problem" will be read with special interest. The portrait sketches accompanying it are good sketches but poor portraits. All the color printing, however,

**JOHN MITCHELL**, President of the coal miners, is acknowledged to be one of the foremost leaders in the Trade Union Movement in the world. No student of modern economic forces can afford to ignore this movement, therefore get and read his book on **ORGANIZED LABOR**.

Cloth, \$1.75; Blue Seal, \$2.75  
Half Morocco, ..... 3.75  
Full Morocco, Autograph Copy 5.00

**GEO. A. SCHILLING, Room 519,**  
85 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

**DANCE** On Friday Evening, Jan. 15, 1904, the members and friends of **JAN. 15 THE HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION** will give a dance at Schiller Hall, 108 Randolph Street. Invitations will be issued by Miss Leonora Beck, 30 South Wood Street, Dr. Anna M. Lund, 1018 Masonic Temple, Phone Central 331, Miss Nellie Carlin, 1202 Ashland Bk., Phone Central 125.

is excellent, from cover to cover; and so are the photographic reproductions.

"Christianity in the Modern World" is the title of an article of more than usual power and clearness in the November issue of the Contemporary Review. It appears to be the first of a series, which will doubtless be published later in book form. The writer, D. S. Cairns, treats fearlessly of the intellectual strain to which the Christian faith has been subjected during the past century—from Science, Philosophy and Biblical criticism. He believes that the attacks, which have been most formidable have now done their work, and that a positive Christian faith is beginning to emerge from the long analysis of the past century, which is to be of incalculable value for the world at its present stage of social and intellectual development. J. H. D.

Speaking of presidential candidates the New York Independent says: "It is a curious fact that the only candidates now prominent in the Democratic party are a quiet gentleman of domestic habits (Parker) as to whose views concerning the political issues of the last ten years the party knows absolutely nothing, except that he voted the regular ticket; and a professional politician of subtterranean ways (Gorman) whose acts have been at variance with the economic policy in support of which the party desires to make its campaign." In the same issue it says: "It is now understood that the State's delegates will vote as a unit for Judge Alton B. Parker, whose friendship for Mr. Hill will probably prevent the removal of the latter from the place of Democratic leader." J. H. D.

"Hobson as a Symptom" is the title of an editorial in the Advocate of Peace (Boston) for December. As has been announced, the ex-captain has prepared a bill carrying a total appropriation of \$2,750,000,000, to be spent on the enlargement of the navy during the next 18 years! "If he were alone," says the writer, "if his scheme came wholly from his own overheated imagination, no attention would need to be paid to his extravagant effusions. But that which is behind him, of which he has made himself the noisiest and most insistent exponent, is a very serious condition, and constitutes the greatest peril but one that has ever hung over the nation." This is perhaps an over-serious view of the matter. It may be that Hobson's absurd extravagance will in the end, if he goes on talking, actually assist in bringing a reaction. J. H. D.

The Rev. John Whitehead, in a recent sermon published in the New Church Messenger (St. Louis), said: "It does not follow that because the founders of our republic were impelled by high motives, and held noble ideals of government, that we shall ever afterward enjoy a similar degree of liberty and perfection. It is possible to pervert and destroy the goods re-

**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 finished paper, uncut pages, gilt top, etc., and bound in fine blue cloth with gold lettering. Pp. 396.  
Price per copy, \$2.00. (Net, delivered.)  
**MOODY PUBLISHING CO., Publishers,**  
35 Nassau St., NEW YORK 1801 Unity Building, CHICAGO

**DEBATE** There will be a debate at Handel Hall, 40 E. Randolph Street, at 2:30 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.



DR. JEKYLL—AND—MR. HYDE.

celved from our forefathers. It is possible to destroy the liberties previously attained." The repeated asseverations like this in pulpit and press are beginning to sound more and more like warnings—as if those who utter them suspect that we are really in danger of falling away from ideals and high motives. What none of these prophets tell us, however, is that the reason we may be failing to retain "the liberties previously attained" is that we have not been brave enough to advance to other liberties. J. H. D.

Herbert Spencer's recent death has brought out many comments upon his life and work. The Springfield Republican publishes the words of a writer in its own columns four years ago in regard to Spencer's views on government. "The gist of his philosophy," says this writer, "is that there should be as little interference with the individual as possible. He would have laws against murder, violence and fraud, but in all else leave men free. As an anarchist, Spencer wishes for the destruction of society as it exists, the destruction of the state, because it is the source of laws, and laws are the framework of society. He thinks that country best governed that has the least government. This authority must cease, the individual must establish

the reign of justice and righteousness. Equality shall exist, liberty shall exist, fraternity shall exist, peace shall reign, because nations and central governments will no longer exist. The world must be reborn." It is doubtful whether anyone writing to-day of Spencer would venture to use the word anarchist; and yet a good case could be made out that his extreme individualism certainly borders on what is called philosophical anarchism. His last book of essays, reviewed some time ago in The Public, contained several papers which might be bound together as a vade mecum for individualists. J. H. D.

### LABRIOLA'S ESSAYS on the Materialistic Conception of History.

The greatest socialist book that has appeared since Marx's Capital. Written by a socialist professor in the University of Rome, published in the leading countries of continental Europe and translated by Charles H. Kerr from the latest Paris edition. Extra cloth, gold stamping, 246 pages, \$1.00 postpaid. CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, 56 Fifth Ave., 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

**The Third Debate** between the Single Taxers and Socialists takes place at Lincoln Turner Hall, 1351 Diversey Boulevard, corner Sheffield Avenue, on Sunday afternoon, 3 o'clock, January 3, 1904. Question—"Resolved that the Working Classes should take up the Propaganda of the Single Tax rather than that of Socialism." John Z. White and Henry Hutchins Hardinge, affirmative; A. M. Simons and Seymour Steadman, negative. This debate will be repeated in the Elgin Opera House, Elgin, Ill., on Monday evening, January 4, 1904.

**DEBATES** The Socialists and Single Taxers have arranged for the following debates:

**SOUTH CHICAGO**—Labor Hall, 92d and Erie Streets, Sunday, December 27, 8 p. m. Thos. J. Morgan, Socialist; John Z. White, Single Taxer.

**ELGIN**—Monday, January 4, 8 p. m. A. M. Simons and Seymour Steadman represent the Socialists; John Z. White and Henry H. Hardinge represent the Single Taxers.

**ROCKFORD**—Wednesday, January 6, '04. A. M. Simons for the Socialists; John Z. White for the Single Taxers.

**STREATOR**—Friday, January 8, '04. A. M. Simons vs. John Z. White.

## 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,  
1106 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 the HOLIDAYS

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. 3.50

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.



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.