

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 4, 1903.

Number 274.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

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

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

A prompt and strenuous house cleaning is one of the things the Chicago Municipal Voters' League owes to its present good name and its future good influence.

This organization has acquired national fame and respect for its excellent work in driving "gray wolves" out of the city council. But just as that enviable reputation begins to ripen, seven of its own approved candidates for the council scandalize it by coming into the open as "gray wolves" without even a pretense of disguise. Constituting a majority of the councilmanic committee on gas, oil and electric light, these councilmen have caused that committee to recommend to the council a telephone ordinance which has "monopolily plunder" writ large all over it.

It will not do for the league to pass over this matter in silence. Its managers cannot afford to ignore the treachery of these candidates they have endorsed, trusting that the ordinance will not be adopted by the council. So far as the league is concerned, the important question is not the fate of the vicious ordinance; it is the action of the majority of the committee—Bradley, Friested, Willeston, Race, Woodward, Moynihan, Ehemann, Sloan and O'Connell—whose candidacies it endorsed. Unless the League finds means immediately to rebuke these men, League endorsements will not have as much moral value at future elections as they have had in the past.

In whatever way the hideous

lynching in Delaware may be considered, there is no room for escape from one conclusion at least. At that time and in that place and on that occasion civil government broke down. It proved inadequate to the protection of a citizen whom it had imprisoned for the purpose of inquiring into his alleged guilt of crime. When civil government fails in this, it fails in one of its most important functions. Having deprived the man of his natural right of self-defense, its obligation to defend him was supreme. Nothing can be much more abhorrent than a government that stretches out the long arm and the strong arm of the law to entrap an individual accused of crime, for the alleged purpose of giving him a fair trial, but only to yield him up, unconvicted and untried, to a fiendish mob.

It is true that the breaking down of civil government at one time, in one place, and on one occasion, does not necessarily imply a general failure. One mob does not make general anarchy any more than one swallow makes a summer. But the Delaware instance is not isolated. Hardly does a week go by, seldom even a day, without its report of a lynching. North and South, East and West, all quarters contribute their testimony to the impressive volume of evidence of this breaking down of civil government.

Yet, how little thought is given to the cause of that tendency to collapse. We are told that there is no such tendency; that we are only in the throes of a race question. But if civil government cannot preserve peace in the face of a race question, that fact itself adds testimony to the inherent weakness of the governmental system. It is explained, too,

that these mobs exemplify a reversion of power from the government to the people. But this is only another way of confessing governmental collapse. Many there are, moreover—and their numbers grow,—who admit the collapsing tendency, but with the reservation that it applies only to popular government. They hold that a strong government suffers from no such weakness. We forego the temptation to call to their attention the Kishineff massacre within the jurisdiction of the strongest government in the civilized world, and content ourselves with the observation that if the surrender of all individual rights is necessary for the preservation of civil government the cost is quite out of proportion to the value of the product. Still, we are unwilling to admit that there is any reason in the true principles of popular civil government for its collapse.

If popular civil government is breaking down, the reason is that as it exists it is unscientifically constructed. It is invasive where it has no legitimate functions, and correspondingly inadequate in its legitimate sphere. Power out of place seems best to describe it. Properly charged with the regulation of land tenures, for instance, so as to secure to each his equal natural rights to the land upon which and out of which he must live if he lives at all, it has divested itself of that prerogative. And there is the root of the race problem, with all the evils it engenders. Whether Negroes shall associate with whites is a matter of personal congeniality, entirely unrelated to government. Whether you would "like your daughter to marry a nigger," is a question for you alone, except as it is for her and the "nigger." It is no question for government.

Negroes have no right to associate with white men who object to them. They have no right to marry white girls who reject them. They have no social rights whatever except the right to share equally with every citizen in the common benefits that attach to their native soil. But this right they have; and the civil government that denies it to them signs its own death warrant, and begins from that moment to break down. Now civil government in the United States does deny that right to the Negro. By its perversion of the governmental functions of regulating land tenures, he is born landless. It is because the Negro race is landless and not because it is black, that there is a race question. Were the whites the landless race the race question would shift from white over black to black over white. Were neither race landless, but all were protected by civil government in their natural rights as land animals, there would be no race question. If, then, popular civil government is breaking down, it is because it has surrendered to a few that birthright of all with the conservation of which, if it has any functions, it is most sacredly charged.

One of the arguments in support of Negro peonage that comes from the South, urged by "the best citizens," is that the Negro won't work unless he is whipped, and therefore that he must be whipped. The same spirit finds abundant expression at the North, also among "the best citizens," with reference to white workingmen who go on strike. It is a very common notion everywhere, indeed, that if the "mudsills" of society won't work they must be made to work. But this notion is as false as false can be. No one, white or black, rich or poor, is under any obligation, in the absence of free contract, to work for anybody else. We often hear that the world owes no one a living, and that is true. All it owes him is free and unobstructed opportunities to earn his living. It

is just as true that no man owes the world work. In fact the second proposition is a corollary of the first. Obligations are always mutual. Consequently if the world owes no man a living it follows that no man owes the world work.

We have examined the Iowa platform of the Democratic party (p. 182) with considerable care to discover if possible some substantial basis for the jubilation of the remorganizers over what they assume to regard as a sharp slap in the face administered to their black beast which they call "Bryanism." Thus far we have met with no success. There may be a remorganization joker in the platform, but if so it is well concealed. True enough 57 per cent. of the delegates did refuse to refer in the preamble to "the last national platform;" and if that act stood alone it might be significant. But quite aside from the fact that the majority on this question was so narrow, the body of the platform is, on national questions, sufficiently radical to warrant the guess that part of this majority may have been contributed to by adherents of the general principles of the platform, who cared more for its principles than for its name. And this guess is encouraged by the great speech of the temporary chairman, Mr. Quick, who called for the spirit of the Kansas City platform and not for its letter. At any rate the Iowa platform, with which the remorganizers profess to be so greatly pleased, follows the Kansas City platform in denouncing government by injunction, in demanding the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people, in opposing imperialism, and in assailing trusts. While it ignores bimetallism it does not ignore the money question, but takes ground against money monopoly in harmony with the principles of the national platform. On the tariff it is even more radical, for it takes ground distinctly in favor of a tariff for revenue only. The same is true of its attitude toward trusts, which

it traces to "monopoly of original sources of supply of natural products." Its action on railroad monopoly was, indeed, vague enough; but there is encouraging significance in its demand that "the design of nature in making provision for the wants of man" shall "not be perverted into means for his oppression." If this platform is truly a remorganization triumph, how sadly have the remorganizers been misunderstood. We suspect, however, that the remorganizers did not make the Iowa platform and do not approve it. They are up to one of their old tricks of misrepresentation.

Above the hue and cry over the corruption of walking delegates, District Attorney Jerome's voice is heard in New York with a suggestion that deserves consideration. "The principal trouble, after all," says Mr. Jerome, as reported in the New York Times of the 18th, "is the underhand methods resorted to by building concerns who go out and look for walking delegates who are ready to sell out. If there were no bribing builders there would be no blackmailing walking delegates. The labor men learned their lesson of corruption from the employers."

When the American ambassador to Germany informed the Emperor that American law would not permit sailors in the American navy to accept a royal present, he was mistaken. The Constitution does not absolutely prohibit presents from foreign kings. It gives Congress power to consent; and in this case Congress doubtless would have consented. Still, it is well enough. The Emperor wished to give to two corporals and a private of marines medals or watches for having stood behind his chair at breakfast on board the American battleship Kearsarge at Kiel. Owing to the advice of the ambassador he was obliged to content himself with an intimation of his good natured intention. The marines may not have been as well sat-

ified, but wouldn't they have felt some humiliation at the thought of being tipped for acting as flunkies?

THE CHICAGO TRACTION QUESTION.

So much of important general interest is involved in the Chicago traction controversy, that its history and present status are of more than local concern. In greater or less degree it will be found to have a bearing and to throw a light upon the whole issue of street car municipalization wherever that issue has sprung up. We purpose, therefore, to set forth briefly the general character and leading incidents of this controversy, which may become extremely acute after the 30th of July, 1903, when some of the Chicago street car franchises expire by limitation.

I.

The first franchise under which the Chicago street railway systems are now operated was granted by the city, August 16, 1858, to Henry Fuller and others, for a term of 25 years. The validity of that franchise being questioned, on the ground that the city had no authority under its charter to make a street railway grant, the legislature passed a curative act on the 14th of February, 1859, which incorporated two street car companies—the Chicago City Railway Company, composed of Fuller and his associates, and the North Chicago City Railway Company—and fixed their corporate life at 25 years. To the former company this act confirmed the rights intended to have been granted by the city to Fuller and his friends by the supposedly invalid city ordinance of August 16, 1858, thus securing to that company the right to operate for 25 years and at the expiration of that time to continue operating until the city should purchase the plant and equipment. In addition to confirming this right in the Chicago City Railway Company, the act empowered both companies—the Chicago City Railway Company for the South Side and the West Side of the city, and the North Chicago City Railway Company for the North Side—to construct and operate street railways in such streets and on such terms as the city council had already authorized or might thereafter authorize.

Two years later, February 21,

1861, the legislature incorporated the Chicago West Division Railway Company for 25 years, with powers for the West Side similar to those conferred upon the two other companies, and with authority to acquire the West Side lines from the Chicago City Railway Co. This third company accordingly purchased the West Side lines in 1863, together with their extensions into the business center, which is on the South Side.

For the information of readers not acquainted with the political geography of Chicago, an explanatory digression may here be necessary. The Chicago river is formed by two tributaries, one flowing from the north called the North Branch, the other from the south called the South Branch. The river empties into Lake Michigan, and with its two branches forms a letter T, the foot of which rests upon the lake. All of Chicago within the right-hand angle of this T, formed by the North Branch and the main channel, is called the North Side; all within the other angle is called the South Side; and to the west, outside of both angles, the city territory is called the West Side.

With this explanation we may sum up the street car situation resulting from the passage of the acts of 1859 and 1861, by reciting that there were three street car systems in Chicago then, as follows:

South Side—Chicago City Railway Co.

North Side—North Chicago City Railway Co.

West Side—Chicago West Division Railway Co.

Not satisfied with the ample powers thus conferred upon them for a quarter of a century, the three original companies besieged the legislature within four years for an extension of their powers, with the result of securing, February 6, 1865, the passage of what is now known as the 99-year act.

The enactment of this law was secured without any legitimate necessity for it, and by means not at all defensible. Its vicious purport, moreover, was concealed in suggestive language; and as the Illinois constitution did not then require all legislative acts to disclose their purpose in the title, as the present constitution does, the 99-year act became a law before the public knew that the measure was under consideration. It was the surreptitious enactment of this law that led to the in-

sertion in the Illinois constitution of 1870 of certain protective clauses with reference especially to street car legislation.

No adjudication upon the validity and effect of the 99-year act has yet been had, and professional opinions of undoubted ability and unquestioned integrity are at variance upon the subject. In form it is an amendment of the curative act of 1859 and its supplementary act of 1861, both of which are described above. It distinctly extends the corporate life of the three street car companies already named from 25 years to 99 years, that is, to February 14, 1958; and it apparently attempts to extend all the street franchises of these companies for the same period, an attempt in which the corporations in interest and their representatives now claim that it succeeded. Following is the language of the act in which the latter purpose is studiously concealed:

All contracts, stipulations, licenses and undertakings made, entered into or given, and as made or amended by and between the said Common Council and any or more of the said corporations, respecting the location, use or exclusion of railways in or upon the streets, or any of them, of said city, shall be deemed and held and continued in force during the life hereof as valid and effectual to all intents and purposes as if made a part, and the same are hereby made a part, of the said several acts.

Against the effectiveness of this clause it is argued not only that it is unconstitutional in having failed to comply with the constitutional requirement for a local and private act that it deal with only one subject and mention that in the title, and that if constitutional it relates only to animal power and not at all to operation by steam, cable or electricity, but that in terms the clause merely confirms the contracts, etc., as "valid and effective," and does not extend the period for which they were granted. That contention seems, however, to ignore these words in the clause, namely—"shall be deemed and held and continued in force during the life hereof," which is 99 years, "as valid," etc. Those words sound very much like an express extension of the period of the original grants.

Such was the opinion, too, of Julius S. Grinnell, city attorney in 1883, when the original 25-year grants began to expire, and of his special counsel, Francis Adams (now a judge of

the Cook County Circuit Court); for they agreed upon an opinion to the city council in which they held against the city on every question involved.

In 1883, when the period of 25 years mentioned in most of the ordinances was about to expire, the city council took up the question of extensions. Inasmuch as they were advised by Messrs. Grinnell and Adams, as stated above, that the 99-year clause was valid and effectual, the controversy over it was postponed by a compromise ordinance which went into effect July 30, 1883.

Intervening legislation had placed a limit upon the possibilities of a compromise. By an act of July 1, 1874, known as the "Horse and Dummy act," cities were forbidden to grant street car franchises for a longer period than 20 years; and the new charter of Chicago (April 23, 1875), which permitted grants for "any horse railroad," also limited the period of such grants to 20 years. Consequently the city could make no grant by way of compromise for a longer period. But this grant it did offer on condition that the companies would pay one-half of an accumulated license tax of \$50 a car annually, which they had disputed, and thereafter annually pay this license tax in full.

Accordingly the compromise ordinance of 1883 was passed. It extended the franchises for all the then existing lines of the three companies named above until July 30, 1903, without prejudice to the "existing rights" of the parties. All questions under the 99-year act were thus postponed until the present time.

II.

As the termination of the compromise ordinance of 1883 approached, the companies undertook to fortify themselves with a 50-year franchise act, known as "the Allen law," their ultimate object apparently being to secure 50-year franchises by influencing the city council. Thereby they might have postponed the controversy over their 99-year claims for another half century. This law went into effect July 1, 1897, but it created such an uproar of hostility that it was repealed at the very next session of the legislature.

Out of the popular excitement caused by the passage of "the Allen law," came increasing demands in Chicago for public in place of private

ownership of street car systems, and these demands at length obtained an opportunity for pronounced formal expression under an advisory referendum law.

This law had been enacted by the Illinois legislature at the session of 1901. Allen Ripley Foote drafted and lobbied for the bill, and Representative Clayton E. Crafts fathered it and secured its passage. As originally drafted, the bill authorized a non-mandatory vote on any question of public policy upon the petition of 10 per cent. of the voters. To make the measure ineffective, its enemies changed the 10 per cent. to 25 per cent for cities, leaving it at 10 for the State (vol. iii, p. 803; iv, 83), and in this supposedly innocuous form the bill passed and was signed by the governor.

Under that law Daniel L. Cruice and a voluntary committee that came to his support, effectively aided also by the Chicago American, accomplished the apparently impossible task of gathering the signatures of the necessary number of petitioners (104,000), for the submission to the voters of Chicago at the municipal election (vol iv, pp. 299, 690, 803, 817, 821) in the Spring of 1902, of a proposition for municipal ownership of street railways. This proposition was approved at the election by a vote of 142,826 to 27,998, out of a total vote for candidates of 213,857 (vol v, p. 11); and from that time on, the demand for municipal ownership has been insistent. Public men have for the most part been either outspoken in its favor or discreetly reserved.

About a year ago Mayor Harrison consequently appointed a committee of aldermen and other citizens to consider the subject; and this committee recommended a bill for municipal ownership that came afterwards to be known as "the Finn bill" (vol v, p. 663), from having been offered by Alderman Finn in the city council for recommendation to the legislature. Opposition to the "Finn bill" developed in the council and a bill offered by Alderman Jackson, purporting to aim at the same object, was adopted as a substitute (vol. v, p. 663). Meanwhile (vol v, p. 663, 695) the traction companies were trying to get new franchises from the city, and negotiations with the local transportation committee were under way until (vol v, p. 730) the mid-

dle of February, when they were abruptly broken off.

At the party conventions in March last the Republican platform "hedged" on the subject (vol v, p. 775), but the Democratic platform (vol v, p. 792), following the county platform of the preceding Fall, committed its candidates explicitly to the municipal ownership side of the question. As the campaign progressed, the sentiment of the people became so marked in favor of municipal ownership that the Republican candidate for mayor joined the Democratic candidate in urging the Republican legislature to pass an act enabling the city to establish a system of public ownership of street car lines. In this he failed, and doubtless in consequence lost the election. But after his defeat, the legislature broke away from the corporation leaders who had until then controlled the Republican majority, and enacted the "Mueller law" (vol v, p. 70) which allows any Illinois city adopting it locally to establish municipal ownership of street car systems under certain restrictions.

Chicago has not yet acted upon the local acceptance of "the Mueller law," but steps to that end are being taken by a conference of local civic and labor organizations. At the first meeting of that conference a committee of twenty-five citizens was appointed to formulate a plan for immediate municipal ownership of the street car systems; and the committee reported to an adjourned meeting of the conference on the 28th, advising that body in substance as follows:

1. Immediate municipal ownership is feasible.
2. The first thing in that direction necessary to be done is to submit the so-called Mueller law to a vote of the people; and no settlement of the traction question should be made prior thereto.
3. Any proposed franchise should be submitted to popular vote before final adoption.

These recommendations were adopted by the conference on the 28th, and a committee of three,—Thomas J. Morgan, Margaret Haley and A. B. Adair—appointed to present demands accordingly to the city council.

III.

Toward the last of April of the present year a new move was made in the interest of the franchise corpora-

tions. New York owners of Chicago street car bonds plunged the Chicago traction question into the Federal Courts (p. 40) by alleging the insolvent condition of the bonded roads. The suit was brought in the United States Circuit Court for the circuit in which Chicago is situated, by the Guarantee Trust Company of New York against the West Chicago Street Railroad Co., the North Chicago Street Railroad Co., and the Chicago Union Traction Co. None of these defendants, it will be observed, are exactly the same in name as the three original corporations, while one—the Chicago Union Traction Co.—differs from them in name altogether. This requires explanation.

The Chicago Union Traction Company, as well as the other two defendants with names slightly different from those of two of the original companies, is a corporate product of the prolific brain of Charles T. Yerkes.

In 1886 Mr. Yerkes acquired control of the North Chicago City Railway Co., one of the three originals, by purchasing a majority of its stock. With his associates in this enterprise he then incorporated, May 18, 1886, the North Chicago Street Railway Company. Six days later this precious "combine" of "business interests," acting on the one hand for the North Chicago City Railway Company through their ownership of a majority of its stock, and on the other for the newly organized North Chicago Street Railroad Company, executed and accepted a lease from the former to the latter of all the property of the former for 999 years, and thereupon bonded the latter company.

A similar scheme was worked out on the West Side. The original company in that territory was, as already stated, the Chicago West Division Railway Company, incorporated in 1861. In 1883 the Chicago Passenger Railway Co. (originally the Chicago Horse and Dummy Railway Co., incorporated in 1874) procured various West Side franchises. By June, 1887 three quarters of the stock of the latter company had come into the possession of the former: so that for all operating purposes the original Chicago West Division Railway Company managed the whole system. At this time the Yerkes "combine" purchased a majority of the stock, and

then leased its property for 999 years to a new company which they organized, July 19, 1887, as the West Chicago Street Railroad Company. They also bonded the latter company.

In further exemplification of the wizard's art of transmuting corporate "water" into precious metals and paper currency, Mr. Yerkes and his party organized the Chicago Union Traction Company, to which he transferred the interests of his North Chicago Street Railroad Company and his West Chicago Street Railroad Company, and then dumped the whole thing upon the confiding "widows and orphans" (see Moody's Manual, 1902, p. 982 and 1903, p. 974) who are now alternately demanding and begging a continuance of their present valuable privileges in the streets of Chicago.

Such rights as these "widows and orphans" may have, it must be noted in passing, rest upon nothing but the surreptitious 99-year act of the Illinois legislature passed in 1865. If this act is invalid, the corporations have no right to any continuance of their street privileges beyond the terms fixed by the city, and these begin to expire July 30, 1903. If, however, that act is valid, then by the broadest possible application it affects only such street car routes as were authorized prior to 1875, when the franchise terms were limited by law to 20 years, and probably only such as were authorized prior to 1865, when the 99-year act took effect. The 99-year act would therefore apply to so inconsiderable a part of the street car systems, in point of mileage, that the corporations would be powerless to extract so much as one drop of blood out of their pound of flesh. Though this part is in the center of the city, it could not be operated to advantage at all without concessions from the city regarding the outlying parts that are not affected by the 99-year claims. So the 99-year act is of no great practical importance except for use as a legal club or a financial cork.

It is upon the basis of this 99-year act, nevertheless, that Mr. Yerkes's "widows and orphans" have asked the Federal court to intervene.

On the 22d of May last the New York Guaranty Company, as stated above, brought suit in this court at Chicago against the West Chicago Street Railroad Co., the North Chi-

cago Street Railroad Co. and the Union Traction Co., asking that the property of the defendants be placed in the hands of receivers. Nominally for the purpose of explaining the insolvency of the defendants (p. 40), but evidently to raise the issue of the 99-year act, the formal petition in this suit asserted that it had been publicly stated by the mayor of Chicago and by members of the city council and the local transportation committee of the council, that no application for a renewal of franchises would be granted unless the North Chicago City Railway Co. and the Chicago West Division City Railway Co. would renounce their claims under the 99-year act.

Receivers were appointed by Judge Grosscup, who named for that office (p. 40) Rafael R. Govin of New York, and James H. Eckels and Marshall E. Sampson of Chicago. At their request he subsequently advised them (p. 120) that neither the receivers nor the court can relinquish the 99-year claim if the act is valid.

At the same time he instructed the receivers to prepare a petition for argument on the 18th of June in which all interests, whether parties to the law suit or not, should be invited to participate informally. This invitation was intended especially for the city; but under the professional advice of Edwin Burrill Smith and John C. Mathis, special counsel, Mayor Harrison declined (pp. 170, 171).

An argument in favor of the companies' claims was made, however, to which Judge Grosscup listened with great judicial gravity (p. 183), although he expressly acknowledged that he was sitting not as a judge in a case but as an administrator of property. He was evidently chagrined at the refusal of the city to participate in this moot court proceeding, and intimated the probability of his being bound to do something judicially, without full information, "when July 30 of this year arrives."

In consequence of a conference on the following day between Judge Grosscup and representatives of the city as well as representatives of the company (p. 183), inferences were drawn by the local press that the city had receded from its refusal to participate in the receivership proceedings. This was a mistake. The representatives of the city had refused to par-

ticipate in a moot court proceeding from which they could gain no advantage if the decision were in their favor; but they had not refused to confer. The fact of a conference, therefore, indicated no recession on their part.

What object either the city or the receivers and those they represent could gain from a non-judicial decision by Judge Grosscup is not altogether clear. At best it would be only the opinion of a lawyer of judicial experience, and several other such opinions are already afloat. Judge Grosscup himself might be obliged to reverse it when the matter came before him judicially. To the city, therefore, his non-judicial opinion, if in its favor, would not be worth the paper it might be written on; the receivers wouldn't dare to surrender claims held to be invalid only by a judge off the bench. To the receivers, on the other hand, if the decision were in favor of the 99-year claim, it would count for nothing, since that is the attitude they are in safety bound to maintain until the validity of the 99-year act is judicially passed upon. Apparently no one in the universe could be benefitted by Judge Grosscup's non-judicial decision, rendered under such circumstances, unless it were some of Mr. Yerkes's "widows and orphans." A decision in support of the 99-year act, though absolutely non-judicial, yet if made by a sitting judge, might be used to affect the stock market and so enable these "widows and orphans" to "unload" upon other "widows and orphans" in whose prosperity they were less interested. While it is unthinkable that Judge Grosscup should be a party to such a purpose, and no one imagines it, yet it is quite conceivable that certain investors and financiers would gladly utilize the incident as a fortunate opportunity. At any rate the city was evidently wise in declining to submit its rights to an informal tribunal which would place it in an awkward position if it lost and from which it could gain nothing if it won.

While the interests of the West Side and the North Side systems are thus in the Federal Court under a receivership, those of the South Side are in course of negotiation between the city and the Chicago City Railway Company, the only one of the original three companies affected by

the 99-year act which has not experienced the process of yerkesization.

It is understood that this company is willing to waive its 99-year claims in consideration of a 20-year franchise upon certain probably acceptable terms. (p. 170).

IV.

As matters stand at present, the representatives of the city are willing to extend all the expiring franchises until 1923, upon the terms embodied in sections 15, 16 and 17 (p. 170) of a franchise ordinance now in preparation. These sections were drafted by Edwin Burritt Smith and John C. Mathis, special counsel to the city council, as the result of negotiations with the Chicago City Railway Co., the owner of the South Side lines affected by the 99-year act.

They contemplate a 20-year franchise. At its expiration the city would have the right to purchase, or to cause a new corporation to purchase, the tangible property of the company at its then cash value exclusive of franchise value and of all considerations of earning power. But notice of intention to exercise this right would have to be given by the city between the last day of the 18th year and the first day of the 20th year of the life of the new franchise; and upon failure of the city so to exercise its right of purchase the city would be obliged to grant a new franchise upon terms then to be agreed upon. In consideration thereof the company would surrender its 99-year claims.

The special counsel warn the city, however, that if the city should fail to give the notice and purchase the tangible property, or cause it to be purchased, and should also refuse or fail to make a new franchise, all claims under the 99-year act would revive with the same force as if they had never been surrendered.

Standing upon this proposition the city representatives (not including Mayor Harrison, however, for he has expressed his opposition to the surrender of the 99-year claims conditionally), insist that—

1. The companies are now so various and the interests so conflicting and complex that there must be a reorganization of all their interests in one new company, so that the city may have some complete responsible legal person to deal with.

2. A franchise is necessary for two reasons: (a) local public sentiment would not tolerate the peremptory

and unconditional freezing out of financial investments made under circumstances for which the city as well as the investors is in part to blame; and (b) there would be a harassing litigation for eight or ten years, during which the street car service might be so bad that there would be great danger of the development of an unreasoning public sentiment in favor of any kind of compromise through which good service might be had, and that in these circumstances a complete revolution of opinion against public ownership might occur.

3. Nevertheless, if the companies refuse a fair readjustment, falling back upon such technical rights as they may have under the 99-year act, thus clearly relieving the city of the odium in the public mind of unwillingness to be fair, and assuming that odium themselves, then the city also should stubbornly stand upon its technical rights and let the war go on.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Freiburg, Baden, Germany, June 15.—John Quincy Adams was an ardent and persistent upholder of republicanism. Educated at his father's house in Paris at the time when the great wave of revolution was gathering that irresistible force which was soon to sweep over continental Europe, he early learned to love republics and to hate monarchies. On his return to the United States he became a fit exponent of the spirit that prevailed in the young American republic. As secretary of state in Monroe's cabinet he saw the danger that threatened the weak South American countries, and the Monroe Doctrine was to him and to the American people a cry of defiance to the kings of the old world. America was and should remain free.

Since then nearly a century of industrial development has passed and the resources that seemed almost limitless have been used, or at least appropriated by corporations or private persons for speculative purposes. Thus American capital, compelled to seek an outlet, has not only entered into competition for European markets, but has forced upon the people a colonial policy, which, by occupying the Philippines, violates the tacitly understood converse of the Monroe doctrine, that the Americans remain in America. This same commercial activity has developed an important interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine that was undreamed of by its formu-

lator. It is no longer a contest between the republican and the monarchic principles, but an industrial fight of nations; and in this war South America has come to be regarded by the capitalists of the United States as a specially preserved territory for their exertions, fenced around and protected by the Monroe Doctrine. The constant maintenance of this point of view will bring the United States sooner or later into conflict with the German Empire, which, under the leadership of its vigorous emperor, is after a suitable field to carry out a great colonial policy.

In support of this view the following observations of an American student who has been at German universities during the past two years, where his opportunities to observe the trend of official sentiment have been exceptional, are of special value to Americans:

For some years back the talk in high circles, both intellectual and political, has been over the absolute necessity of German colonies. The professors of political economy have explained from their chairs in the several government universities that if Germany is ever to make a fourth to the great trio of world powers, England, Russia and the United States, she must possess important colonies to which the surplus population can be sent and from which can be imported those articles which the Fatherland is unable itself to produce.

But the question loomed up in what portion of the world can these colonies be located? Asia with the exception of India belongs by common consent to Russia. On Africa the claws of the British lion are fixed too deep to be eradicated. All that can be expected in these quarters are but remnants from the feast. There remained to be considered but South America, a land with all variations of climate, rich in forests and natural resources, drained by noble rivers and peopled by a race weak and comparatively inferior. But around this promised land, this future Greater Germany and companion picture to India and Siberia, stretched—as barriers—the Monroe Doctrine and the fleet of the great American Republic.

The first impulse at the court of Berlin was to laugh at this principle and to act as if it did not exist. Professor Jellinek, a creature of the administration and professor of international law at the University of Heidelberg, a man of wonderful plausibility and some eloquence, spontaneously began to give a series of lectures, proving that the Monroe Doctrine had never been recognized by the European powers, and that even if it had been the recent operations of the

United States in the Philippines had robbed the document of all force. But while these lectures were in the process of delivery, the Emperor was informed by one who understood from personal observation the conditions in America, that recognized or unrecognized the Monroe Doctrine was an abiding article in the faith of the people of the United States.

The move that then remained was to try diplomacy. William the Second, although a blunderer himself in the field of politics, whatever his attainments may be in art and music, has a brother, Prince Henry, who has inherited all the delicate skill for which the house of Coburg, the family of his mother, is famous. Graceful, smooth and fine, a rival even of his uncle, the King of England, in the art of conversation, he had already been often used on difficult and important missions. The launching of the new imperial yacht offered the opportunity and Prince Henry was chosen as the man best fitted to seize it.

The instructions with which he was charged were twofold: First, to create in America a favorable impression towards Germany; and, second, to come to such an understanding with the President as would insure Roosevelt's silence if any attempt was made to encroach on South American territory. The success of this undertaking was considered as assured, both from the German estimate of the character of Roosevelt and the false impression then commonly prevailing in Europe as to the tenacity with which Americans would support the Monroe Doctrine. The most extravagant reports were circulated through the inner circles of Berlin about the eagerness and rapidity with which America was adopting the manners of an empire. News from the Philippines was gloated over as affording fresh evidence that the annoying Monroe Doctrine, with the Americans invading Asia, could not stand in the way of establishing the required colonies in the only available place, South America.

The report that Prince Henry made was satisfactory beyond the most optimistic expectations. The Republic's reception of him had been more enthusiastic than even the most conservative of European monarchies might have afforded. The President had been flattered and flattering. Gifts and jewels had been exchanged, and the youthful daughter of Roosevelt had promised to return the visit in the name of the nation, at the earliest possible date. So it was with the utmost confidence that the word was now passed through both diplomatic and military as well as court circles that things could go ahead. So sure was the administration of the ultimate success, that colonial schools were enlarged and their equipment increased.

The disapproval with which the gift of the statue of Frederick the Great was met with in some quarters caused a slight cloud to appear on the horizon, but this was quickly dispelled when it was explained in the high places that those who had objected were only socialists, anarchists and similar uneasy characters.

Such was the state of the official mind at Berlin when the internal condition of affairs in Venezuela offered an excuse to the German foreign office to interfere. The uncollected claims of the German citizens were a serviceable pretext. The real object was to obtain a foothold in Venezuela similar to the position occupied by England in Egypt. "Land we must have" was not only said in the secret councils, but openly in the universities. The official attitude of America at this time was not encouraging. The President, as had been expected, was silent. Secretary Hay entered no protest to the peaceful blockade and bombardment of South American ports. And not only did the American administration offer no objection, but it went even further in its aid of the German colonization programme. The inspired journals, notably "The Washington Star," began to publish articles about "The Robber Castro," "The Unbearable Acts of the Venezuelan Government" and similar stuff known to have been inspired by persons in connection with the Washington government.

Then came the surprise, both to the powers in Washington and Berlin. The people of the United States, the common people, who had not been consulted in the original agreement, objected, and made their protests known. Roosevelt, who had his finger on the public pulse (feeling his chances for reelection) at once perceived which way political safety lay. The rapid "about face" would have been comical if it had not been tragic in its results here in Germany. The changed tone of "The Washington Star," with its caricatures now of the allied powers, was not more vivid than the gloom that pervaded the foreign office at Berlin. To say that William the Second was dumbfounded by Roosevelt's refusal to act as arbitrator, which would have been regarded as equivalent to a decision in favor of Germany, is putting the situation mildly. He was storming mad, and the Emperor's temper is no light matter. Some sort of a scapegoat had to be provided. It required all the personal tact which Prince Henry could command to escape filling this distinguished but unpleasant office himself; but the lot fell on the unlucky Ambassador v. Holleben, in Washington, who was immediately taken sick and ordered home to recover.

Further in confirmation of the foregoing view of German official senti-

ment, note the following extract from the Freiburger Tageblatt of May 16:

If Mr. Roosevelt is not reelected, the envious and ill-willed opposition of the United States against Germany will come to the front more unveiled than is at present the case, thanks to the well-meant efforts of the President.
EDWARD RUMELY.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, July 2.

The new King of Servia, Peter I. (p. 180), took the oath of office on the 25th, and on the same day received and accepted the resignations of the provisional ministry. These formalities over, the King requested the late provisional premier, Avakumovics, to form a ministry; and upon the recommendation of Avakumovics, he appointed the ministers who had just resigned. Another ceremonial of the day was the King's proclamation to the people and his announcement to the European sovereigns of his accession. In his proclamation to the people he promised to remain a true constitutional sovereign.

Another vote has been taken in the British parliament upon the proposal of the protectionists to strike from the ministerial budget the clause repealing the war tax on grain (p. 152), Mr. Chaplin having made the motion in committee of the whole on the 27th. His motion was defeated by 416 to 32. In opposing this motion the chancellor of the exchequer, Mr. Ritchie, took uncompromising free trade ground. He explained, moreover, that this tax falls with greatest severity upon the poorest of the poor; and, arguing that it could be justified only by the necessities of war, stated that its repeal had been agreed upon by the ministry unanimously.

The German parliamentary elections (p. 184) are over, the reballotings having taken place on the 25th and 29th. Reballoting is a peculiarity of the continental elections. They both serve the necessities of many parties as well as encourage their organization. If in any district no candidate receives a majority over all, a reballoting is ordered at which only the two candidates who received the highest and the

next highest vote at the first balloting can be voted for. This operates to make the first balloting a primary vote unless a clear majority of the people support a particular person. At the German reballoting on the 25th all parties united to defeat the Socialist candidates. The effect of this opposition was manifest in the result; but the Socialists nevertheless elected 27, making a total Socialist representation of 81. The city of Munich has for the first time a solid Socialist representation, while the kingdom of Saxony is all Socialist but one, who is Anti-Semite. Following is the reported final result:

Conservatives	52
Free Conservatives	19
Centrists or Clericals.....	102
Socialists	81
National Liberals	51
Poles	16
Agrarians and Peasants' League.	7
Alsatians	9
Hanoverians	3
Danes	1
Anti-Semites	9
Richter Radicals	21
Barth Radicals	9
South German Radicals	6
Independents	11

Most of the Socialist gains in representation (from 51 to 81) appear to have been at the expense of the other radical parties. The Socialist leaders are reported from Berlin as attributing their gains principally to the tariff issue, they having made the campaign chiefly thereon. Details of the election returns are reported to confirm their claim that Socialism is spreading rapidly among the agricultural laborers and small farmers, and the organs of conservative opinion comment on the election as foreshadowing serious times for Germany.

In connection with the movements in Somaliland, northeast Africa, of British troops against the "Mad Mullah," the report (p. 155) that there are several British prisoners in the Mullah's camp has been denied by the British war office upon the strength of a message from Gen. Manning. Upon the same authority a subsequent report of a disaster to the British forces is also denied. It is stated, on the contrary, that the "Mad Mullah" suffered a disaster in a battle with Abyssinians near Jeyd on the 31st of May; and that an early junction of Abyssinian and British forces was expected to be followed by

a cooperative pursuit of the Mullah and the destruction of his army.

The process of South African rehabilitation by the British was marked in the latter part of May by a municipal congress held at Johannesburg and called by the Johannesburg town council for the purpose of revising the draft of a proposed Government ordinance for the regulation of municipalities in the Transvaal. The congress appears to have been an important one; and its most important act, in the estimation of the Johannesburg Tribune, was the adoption of an amendment proposed by one of the delegates, Mr. Niven. Of this amendment the Tribune of May 23 says:

It cannot have been with great hopes of success that Mr. Mackie Niven, the able exponent of the exemption of improvements from taxation, moved that the rating provisions of the municipal ordinance should be amended to make land values alone taxable. The proposition was a novel one to many of the delegates, the time for argument was short, and there was a natural disinclination to sanction such a radical reform. Nevertheless the amendment was carried by 15 votes to 13.

Along the same lines of fiscal reform the Ohio Single Tax League is preparing to make a campaign during the present Summer and the coming Fall, for the support of which it is calling for a national subscription. At the seventh annual conference of this league, held at Columbus on the 30th and 31st of May last, the following resolutions, upon which the projected campaign is based, were adopted:

Whereas, the tax laws of Ohio, bearing most heavily as they do upon personal property and improvements, which are the product of labor, and exempting as they almost entirely do, monopoly and special privileges, which are created by the States, are a direct means of promoting fraud and corruption, and a constant discouragement to industry and thrift, and are, therefore, unscientific and unjust; and, whereas, they promote fraud and corruption, not only by taxing property that nature has made it impossible to reach, but by permitting such public values as street and steam railway franchises to remain untaxed; therefore, resolved, that until the repeal of these laws can be brought about, these special privileges should be taxed on the same basis as the farms, stores, houses,

factories and other property within the State, and not be permitted to escape as they now do at about one-fifth of their taxable value; and further, resolved, that we recommend and endorse, and pledge ourselves to aid in every honorable way the efforts of Mayor Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland, to bring about these reforms in county, State, and nation; and further resolved, that we appeal to the people of Ohio to lend their aid to all candidates for office, regardless of party, who by their words and acts aim to institute justice.

Whereas, the single taxers of Ohio have in the past given liberal support to the tax-reform movement in other States; and whereas, public interest in the abuses and discrimination in taxation laws has developed in Ohio to a high degree; therefore be it resolved, that the single taxers of Ohio be urged to concentrate their efforts on the work of taxation reforms in this State, and call upon our friends throughout the country for their cooperation.

The officers of this league, elected at the meeting noted above, are: Wm. Radcliffe, Youngstown, president; Otto K. Dorn, Cleveland, vice-president; and J. B. Vining, Cleveland, secretary-treasurer. There is also a governing board composed as follows: F. H. Howe, Columbus; O. P. Hyde, Marietta; L. S. Davis, Dayton; Daniel Kiefer, Cincinnati; James McBride, Akron, and F. H. Augspurger, Trenton.

Pursuant to the resolutions quoted above, the officers and the governing board of the league submitted to Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, for his advice, a plan involving the sending of the president, Mr. Radcliffe, over the State of Ohio to arouse public sentiment on the subject mentioned in the resolutions. Mayor Johnson's reply, which the league has published, is as follows:

Mr. J. B. Vining, Secretary Ohio Single Tax League. My Dear Sir: I have considered the proposal of your League to have your president, William Radcliffe, devote his entire time from now until November in those Ohio counties which give hope of securing members of the legislature who are in accord with our views on Home Rule and Taxation. The plan meets with my hearty approval, and will receive my earnest support financial and otherwise.

Accordingly the secretary of the league, Mr. J. B. Vining, of 76 Harriet avenue, Cleveland, has issued the following announcement, which is

being circulated throughout the country:

We propose to put Mr. Radcliffe in those Ohio counties where we have a fighting chance for the legislature. To do this, we will need about \$500 worth of literature, and \$60 per week to meet Mr. Radcliffe's expenses. He will be equipped with a team of horses, and will canvass these counties in advance of Mayor Johnson, who expects to follow with short automobile campaigns, such as he recently made in Richland county. We feel confident that the friends of the movement will gladly embrace this opportunity in supplying the necessary funds for this work, and we earnestly solicit your contribution and cooperation, that it may be made a complete success.

The mention of Richland county in the foregoing announcement recalls the extraordinary campaign which Mayor Johnson made (p. 113) in that county in May last, for the purification of his own party at the primaries.

Mr. Johnson's view of the political situation in Ohio appears to have been outlined in what purports to be a newspaper interview had with him at Cincinnati, where he spoke on the 30th at a dinner at the Grand Hotel, as the guest of several leading Democrats of that city. In this interview Mayor Johnson is made to say:

I don't believe we can elect the State ticket this year, but we may be able to elect a judge of the Supreme Court and the legislature and defeat Senator Hanna—a thing devoutly to be wished for. Hanna is the ideal of all things the Democrats oppose, and it would be a great thing to defeat him, but a greater thing would be to undo some of the things the Republicans have done. I don't want to run for governor, and I would not run for the Senate, as it is out of my sphere; but I am willing to undergo defeat if the Democrats think it best for the party that I make the race for governor. I believe that I can do more good as a free lance in close counties if I am not a candidate. I believe if a good State ticket is named and a good man nominated for the United States Senate we can and will carry the legislature.

The political event of the week in American politics is the Republican convention of Iowa, which met at Des Moines on the 1st. Gov. Cummins was renominated by acclamation, but the principle he stands for was defeated and all the power of the organization was transferred to his adversaries. Instead of connecting the

trusts with the tariff, as Gov. Cummins does in his "shelter to monopoly" doctrine known as the "Iowa idea," the convention deliberately separated the trust plank from the tariff plank and wholly excluded the "shelter to monopoly" plank, which reads as follows:

We assert the sovereignty of the people over all corporations and aggregations of capital, and the right residing in the people to enforce such regulations, restrictions, or prohibitions upon corporate management as will protect the individual and society from abuse of the power which great combinations of capital wield. We cordially indorse the position of President Roosevelt in appealing to the courts to secure regulations that will control great combinations of capital that prevent competition and control the industries of the people without legal sanction or public approval. We favor such amendment to the interstate commerce act as will more fully carry out its prohibition of discriminations in rate making, and any modification of the tariff schedules that may be required to prevent their affording shelter to monopoly.

The cutting out of this plank was a practical defeat of the governor, notwithstanding his unanimous renomination; and he announced himself as a candidate to head the Iowa delegation to the next national convention. But the State committee is organized to head him off, with an anti-Cummins man reelected as chairman.

In giving the vote at the Democratic convention of Iowa last week on the platform plank favoring national ownership of railroads (p. 182), an error was made in the figures. The press reports announced the defeat of this plank by 628½ to 129½; whereas authentic reports from convention officers put it at 628½ to 199½.

Following the burning at the stake of the Negro charged with murder in Delaware (p. 183), disorder prevailed in Wilmington for awhile, and a conflict between white and colored mobs was at one time imminent. Public sentiment among the whites so strongly approves the horrible lynching that it is doubtful if any serious prosecutions against the lynchers will be made. The coroner's inquest is reported to have been farcical.

Relative to this lynching the Rev. Montrose W. Thornton, of the First A. M. E. church of Wilmington, in a

sermon on the 28th, spoke in these scathing terms of white civilization:

The white man, in face of his boasted civilization, stands before my eyes to-night the demon of the world's races, a monster incarnate, and in so far as the Negro race is concerned seems to give no quarter. The white is a heathen, a fiend, a monstrosity before God, and is equal to any act in the category of crime. I would sooner trust myself in a den of a hyena than in his arms. With a court, law and officers of law in his hands the despised Negro can expect no mercy, justice, nor protection. The Negro is unsafe anywhere in this country. He is the open prey at all times of barbarians who know no restraint and will not be restrained. There is but one part left for the persecuted Negro when charged with crime and when innocent. Be a law unto yourself. You are taught by this lesson of outrage to save yourself from torture at the hands of the blood seeking public. Save your race from insult and shame. Be your own sheriff. court and jury, as was the outlaw Tracy. Die in your tracks, perhaps drinking the blood of your pursuers. Booker T. Washington's charity, humanity, advice of forgiveness, love, industry, and so on will never be reciprocated by white men.

In similar strain was the sermon on the 28th of the Rev. R. G. Ransom, pastor of the leading Negro church of Chicago, who is reported as saying:

The Negro has been in this country nearly as long as any one else. He has drained its swamps, raised its cotton, rice, and cane, and fought its battles. He has left a crimson tide of blood from the foundation of the country until now. I am weary of the sentiment of compromise and surrender, which is responsible for the present condition of the black man. The Negro, who has helped to make this country what it is should be entitled to as much consideration as the foreigner who comes here with his belongings wrapped in a greasy oilcloth, and who is not considered a race problem because he hasn't a black skin. If there is anything that the American people respect it is a man. Anybody will kick a cur, but did you ever see anybody kick a bulldog or a mastiff? The time has come when we want a voice. We are urged to relinquish our political rights, but I plead for vigorous patriotism, the constitution, our law, and our flag, and all it stands for. There are plenty of milk and water Negroes in Chicago who talk of surrender and compromise, and say that it is 'best for the time.'

Why is my boy and your boy less than the boy of the German or the Pole or any other foreigner who comes to this country? For God's sake get some backbone into you. The government of the United States is founded on law without regard to race or class. This epidemic of lynching and burning which is sweeping the country is without justification, and the American pulpit should not be dumb. Why should violence, hatred, and murder vent itself upon Negroes accused of crime? There were nineteen lynchings in the month of June. What should the Negro do? First, he should behave himself; second, he should stand for every sentence of the law that makes for its enforcement. Negroes are not guilty of any more brutal crimes than the white men. Whatever is the right of any other citizen of the United States is the right of the Negro. We demand nothing more—nothing less. We appeal to the ministers of the American pulpit, to the American judiciary, to the respectability of the citizen to strengthen sentiment and public opinion against the lawless sacrifice of human life to the passion of murderers.

Four Negro lynchings succeeded that in Delaware are reported. One occurred on the 25th at Brinkley, Ark., where a masked mob hanged a Negro who was in jail awaiting an indictment on an alleged murderous assault upon his landlord. Another occurred on the 26th at Newton, Ga., where three Negroes in custody pending indictments for a homicide committed while drunk, were hanged upon a tree by a masked mob, and their bodies riddled by the mob with bullets. Still another occurred on the 26th near Jonesville, La., where a Negro was riddled with bullets by a mob of white men for having assaulted a white man. The fourth lynching of similar character occurred on the 30th at Scottsboro, Ala., where a Negro in jail under unproved charges of criminal assault upon a white woman was seized by a mob and hanged. The sheriff was wounded with a pistol shot in his efforts to protect the prisoner. Five of this mob were identified, and the governor of Alabama has ordered a special term of court to try them.

NEWS NOTES.

—President Roosevelt went on the 27th from Washington to Oyster Bay, L. I., for the summer.

—The Federal judge of New Jersey

decided on the 3rd to appoint receivers for the United States shipbuilders trust, on the ground of its insolvency.

—A reform conference is called by J. A. Edgerton of Denver, Colo., to meet at Denver on the 27 at 2 p. m.

—The 83rd annual convention of the New Jerusalem Church of the United States of America (Swedenborgian) was held at Chicago from June 27 to 30.

—The annual meeting of the First Church of Christ, Scientist (mother church of the Christian Scientists) was held at Boston from the 28 to the 1st.

—Count Cassini, Russian ambassador to the United States left for Russia on the 3d. It is suspected that he has been quietly recalled at the quiet request of the American government.

—Judge Holdom, of Chicago, has advanced a step in his condemnation of strikers for "picketing" (p. 163). On the 2d he sentenced two union leaders—Arthur A. Hopkins, business agent of Brass Molders Union No. 127, and William Lynch—to jail for three months, and fined two others \$100 each. He refused to allow an appeal from his decision.

PRESS OPINIONS.

GORMAN AND THE PRESIDENCY.

Elizabeth (N. J.) Evening Times (Dem.), June 23.—Probably no man did more to make Grover Cleveland's last administration a failure than this same Arthur Pue Gorman. It seems a pity, indeed, that now that the Democracy of the country has such an excellent chance to unite for victory, party leaders should be seriously considering the availability of men of the Gorman type. We cannot for a moment believe that Gorman will ever receive the nomination from a Democratic convention, but if by any chance he should, the party vote would show an unparalleled shrinkage. He would carry the South, and that alone. Not only would the many sincere admirers of Mr. Cleveland in the East and North largely refrain from voting; but the great body of Democratic voters who through two campaigns supported William Jennings Bryan, some because of and some in spite of the free silver plank, would, we believe, take a special pleasure in compassing Gorman's defeat. Unquestionably, if the party hopes for a "ghost" of a chance next year it must not name the traitorous and crafty Gorman.

OHIO POLITICS.

Cleveland Recorder (Dem.), June 24.—Time was, not very long ago, when it was not considered nice to be a single taxer. . . . The farmers were made to specially fear the single tax. They were told by those who desired to deceive that under the Henry George way of doing things all the taxes would be raised on the farms. They had never been shown that it would be the greatest boon possible to the farmer. . . . Ohio is to be the great battle ground of the single tax. It has made more rapid progress here than anywhere else in the world of late. That of course is largely because of the manly and successful fighting of Tom L. Johnson. . . . It is now coming to the time when everyone who has seen the light is very willing and anxious to have his fellows know that he is a single taxer. There is a single tax mayor in Marietta as well as in Cleveland, and there

are a lot of men in public life who are coming to see what the movement means.

POST OFFICE CORRUPTION.

Kansas City World (Dem.), June 29.—It is not a secret, and never has been one, that the post office department makes contracts with railroads to carry mail matter at a higher rate than any of the express companies pay for a similar service. . . . For many years this department has been prostituted to a system of party rewards, from the office of postmaster general down to the remotest country crossroads post office. It cannot even be pretended that the present head of the department had experience, skill, or even exceptional business training to justify his selection. His appointment was due solely to his party services.

DEMOCRACY AT STAKE.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), June 28.—Prof. Goldwin Smith would suspend the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution granting the Negroes equal political rights with the whites, and meanwhile place the colored people in a sort of political school. That is the old tory notion that one set of men has the divine right to say how much liberty another shall enjoy. If the principle is once admitted its application will not be confined to the Negroes. There are a good many people in this country who would like to see the laboring classes disfranchised for the same reason.

PATERNAL MUNICIPALISM.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), June 28.—George Vanderbilt has concluded to build a model city in North Carolina, and has just purchased a site for that purpose near Asheville. It will, of course, be Mr. Vanderbilt's conception of a model city, and the people to inhabit it will doubtless be selected with that end in view. The late George M. Pullman established a city of that character near Chicago over 20 years ago, but inside of ten years it was anything but "model," except in the sense that the inhabitants had to hand over all they earned to the lord of the manor in the form of rent.

CHAMBERLAIN'S POWER.

The London Speaker (Lib.), June 13.—A vivid and sympathetic imagination endows some men with a peculiar moral force; the very want of it, if that want is only absolute, makes other men strong and robust and direct. Mr. Chamberlain, like Lord Milner, belongs to the second category. He will pursue a borrowed idea with a certain cold passion, and the narrowness of his vision gives him a formidable and fatal energy. He sees so few things that he always sees them near and accessible.

MISCELLANY

THE LOST CAUSE.

For The Public.

Was it only a vivid dream of night—
Of a night grown black with boastful crime—
That a people trusting the God of right,
Dared to encounter the demon of might
With burning zeal for a faith sublime?
Were they phantom heroes who braved the scorn
Of a British host with front of peers,
Meeting the odds with a hope forlorn,
Their leaders from ranks of the lowly born
Forestalling with prayer all coward fears?
The world, so late with their valor athrill,
Has lost their names from its faithless lips;
The demon of might, victorious still,

Laden with honors, is working his will,
While the God of right bideeth long eclipse.

From those vanished heroes no word may come

To cheer the darkness in which we grope;
While weakness and wiles our zeal benumb,

The vanquished are silent, the slain are dumb—

One last brave stand was their word of hope.

So their faith died not with the camp-fire's glow

When sure defeat let the curtain fall;
Though ever "the mills of the gods grind slow,"

They were saved for aye by a last vain blow

From the curse and shame of willing thrall.

Shall we tollers, still with sinews astrain,
Fill to the brim the coffers of greed,
With an idiot cheer that mocks our pain,
Lest the wary tyrant tighten thachain
Fast gripped to our children's meager need?

Shall our love breed the living alpenstock
For upward climb of a pampered race,
To be flung at will from plateau to rock
With taunting laugh at shatter and shock,
A stronger waiting to fill its place?

D. H. INGHAM.

THE DIFFERENCE.

For The Public.

"Look here, you said that when I finished your lessons I would be able to earn \$50 a week; and I am only getting \$10 a week after I have taken two courses."

Professor—Ah, I said you would be able to earn \$50 a week; I did not tell you how much of it you would get.

B. H.

THE SWIMMING TENTH.

An extract from an address on "The Little White Slave Trade," delivered in New York June 22, 1892, by Hugh O. Pentecost.

Mr. Carnegie said the other day: "It is the swimming tenth I want to help; not the submerged tenth." What does "submerged" mean? It means to be under the water, where you cannot breathe and live. How did the submerged tenth get down under the social water? Take Mr. Carnegie's expression, "the swimming tenth." They are swimming for their lives—you, and you, and you; swimming for your lives; liable to drown every day; you are the people that Mr. Carnegie says he wants to do something for—not the "submerged tenth;" the people who are being kicked down by those who are swimming and pushed off by those ashore. How did they become submerged? By people like Mr. Carnegie. It is his weight that has kept them down—fat man that he is; all his millions bearing down upon them until they cannot get their heads above water; submerged because he

takes what they earn and adds it to his millions upon millions that he now says cannot be given to the "submerged tenth," but only to the "swimming tenth."

MYSTERIES OF FINANCE.

From the Hartford Courant of June 15, 1903.

It is common belief that the exposure of the Sam Parks performances in New York labor circles may lead to a clean-up. Can we not also hope as much in New York capital circles from the exposure made by the kickers in the United States Shipbuilding company? They are charging that Schwab pocketed a monstrous pile by turning over to the shipbuilding company the Bethlehem Steel company. That prolific concern was established in 1899 with a capital of \$15,000,000, par value of shares \$50, amount paid in one dollar per share, or \$500,000. Within two years it has sold out to a syndicate at \$24 per share, or 24 times as much as the capital paid in. Then Schwab philanthropically got it for the shipbuilders, and in his statement of defense he says that he received for it \$10,000,000 bonds, \$10,000,000 of preferred stock and \$10,000,000 of common stock of the ship company. With this little matter of \$30,000,000 he succeeded in securing a property capitalized at \$300,000, and sold out at \$7,200,000. These figures are taken from "Moody's Manual" for 1902. If Mr. Park's followers feel aggrieved that he has \$25,000 in bank, how do Mr. Schwab's followers feel about the easy way that he handles sums which a dozen years ago would have been considered fabulous, not to say humorous? When society begins to clean house, its most important and cleansing work will not be done on board floors or ingrain carpets.

**UNCLE SAM'S LETTER TO JOHN BULL.
HE SUMS UP THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.**

Dear John:

It's a queer thing, politics! Do you remember your boy, George Canning? He was your minister for foreign affairs about '23. Well, George Canning helped my boys, Monroe and Jefferson, in starting the Monroe Doctrine—suggested it; said that it would prevent, rather than provoke, war. He was bright, George was, and saw the Monroe Doctrine was to your interest as well as to mine. You had Canada and I had the States, and the Holy Alliance was reaching for things then.

Perhaps he knew it was right also, but I ain't chargin' George with anything undiplomatic. Well, you don't have statesmen any more, only grabbers who think that annexing a country of Boer sharpshooters means strength in future wars, and long ago forgot George Canning. His monument is just beyond Westminster Hall; the sparrows nest in his marble elbow and are the only things British that have any use for George Canning. Strange how a man will be forgotten and yet how his acts will spring up again like a seed in out of the way places! In Chicago once I had a boy, John Altgeld, who led a forlorn hope against the mayor in an election for municipal ownership. Forty-five thousand men followed his standard to defeat. Altgeld died, but the leader's cry was a good one and the mayor, the man who defeated him, took it up, yelled municipal ownership and was elected and came to much honor in the clothes of the great leader, and on the same question he had opposed. It's a queer thing, politics; but Altgeld cast the seed! So I say "sow;" the wrong man will get the honors anyway, most likely, but the people may reap something some time.

How is your money, John? Mine's unsartin'. I've got lots of prosperity, but there was a time when I didn't have to take the children from school and put 'em to work to pay the rent. My financiers ain't none too well satisfied, neither. It tickles me a little to see the straits they have got into, fer I knew all the time they was wrong. They turned heaven and earth till they got one of the good old money metals thrown out; and now they haven't any basis and are a goin' pell mell, brakes off and throttle valve wide open, for "wild cat" currency—"asset currency." I remember it well—same thing we had before the war, when if a fellow got a dollar bill he had to tote it over to the store and look into the "Bank Note Reporter" to see if there was any assets behind it. They do say they expect me to back the notes to make 'em good; but I dunno. I'm on a good deal of security now, and I'd rather back a farmer's note than a financier's, anyway. You see, there is a cyclone cloud of paper a restin' on a little funnel point of gold, and nobody knows when the rip-roarin' thing gets started whose fences and trees will be pulled. That's why the financiers are a lookin' backward over their shoulders as they drive. That's why the silver fellows are a sittin' on the fence and grinnin' to see 'em go by.

What do you think about this lynchin' of niggers? I'm ashamed of it; and I vum, I believe it's a mistake! Anybody can see the crime against white women is increasin' under it; and severity of punishment always did increase the crime. When you, John, hanged men for stealin' 20 shillin', as you used to, there was more stealin' than now. Cause why? It advertises the crime. Look at it! The spectacular appeals to the nigger anyway. Here is the fire and the kerosene and an audience of 5,000 and the howling death of one of the old martyrs. Then next day 5,000 newspapers print it, and 500,000 young negroes read about it and learn that here is a crime so seductive that men will be burned at the stake for it. The spectacular strikes him. He remembers it, and when he has a grudge, or feels ugly, or ornery, he recalls it. Where is the good of advertisin' this crime? If the fool men have no more sense, the women of the country should take it up themselves and stop it. Let every woman say to her husband, "No more lynchin' of niggers! No more advertisin' of me. Your act puts me in danger. Stop it. Let the law take its course!" And it would stop.

Another gentle persuader to virtue would be a State law that every county whose citizens lynched a man should pay \$5,000 to his next of kin. Then, at the suggestion of lynchin' every man in the county would have palpitation of the pocket-book. The suggester would get a dash of cold water. The virtuous citizen would say: "The nigger is worthless, but man! you touch the dollar in my pocket! You are meddlin' with sacred things! You touch vested rights! Hush! Let the jury attend to him!"

I notice the Jews are urg'in the president to send their petition on the Russian massacres to the czar; and I guess Theodore is a tremblin' on the verge of doin' it. I wonder if the Jews would sign a petition to the president to stop doin' the same thing in the Philippines. The Jews were sound money and voted almost to a man with the Republicans for the Philippine massacres. They don't enjoy their principles when applied to hum. Hard money, hard hearts, hard times! That's my Republican party—short as Caesar.

UNCLE SAM.

"But I thought salvation was free."
"Well, sir, it's free to some, because others are kind enough to pay for it."—Puck.

THE SPIRIT OF DEMOCRACY.

Speech of John Herbert Quick, Ex-Mayor of Sioux City, as temporary chairman of the Iowa Democratic State convention at Des Moines, Iowa, June 24, 1903.

This convention is evidence that its members are not entirely satisfied with the prevailing conditions in state and nation. We are here both protesting against things which we condemn, and demanding remedies. Unless there are governmental conditions deserving of our denunciation we might better have remained at home, and joined in the paean of prosperity so loudly sung by the republican press and platform. Our presence here is proof that there are wrongs of which we know. Such being the case, unless we can offer to the people remedies, our deliberations will end in failure; for, however useful may be the office of the physician who points out diseases, that of the healer who brings cure is the only one which a great political party should emulate. The party which lays bare its opponent's mistakes does less than half its duty. It must be for things as well as against things, if it would be called to power or retained in it.

What, then, are the conditions against which we protest? Is not the nation prosperous? It is true that all over the land labor seems discontented and labor disturbances agitate the people. Capital is arrayed against labor, and labor against capital. But, strange to say, we have grown to regard these strifes as something to be expected, and it may be said by some that their existence is no proof that we are not prosperous.

It is true that in many occupations wages are lower than ten years ago, and that where they have seemed to advance, the cost of living has advanced still more. Yet, employment is more easily obtained, the mills and factories are running, the railways are gorged with traffic and all the processes of production are going on, pouring out golden streams of wealth.

Of what, then, do we complain? Against what public foe is it our duty to unfurl the banners of democracy? Where is the adversary against whom a Jefferson would lead the hosts of the people, and on whose armor would be rained the ringing blows of a Jackson? If these mighty ones of the past were with us to-day where is the evil at which they would bid us strike? In what respect do we Americans of to-day in our personal and national life fall short of the Americans of the day of Jefferson and Jackson? The answer must come spontaneously to the mind of every man present. Within the past few years

we have all become conscious of a great and ominous change in the conditions under which we live, a change which fills every thoughtful man with regret and foreboding, a change which has crept across the spirit of American institutions and cast over all a sinister shade of doubt and fear, dimming the bright sunlight of freedom which we once regarded as our inalienable birthright. This change has not come about by violence and bloody revolution, but by the insidious advances of secret usurpations of a class of powerful men, a class constantly narrowing until it is now scarcely more than a group. It has not been accomplished by open and avowed attacks upon the rights of suffrage, of freedom of speech or of the press, or upon any of the express rights upon which we have been taught to look as the safeguards of liberty, but it has come with the gradual cornering of our mines, our coal and oil fields, our highways, the great original sources of production, the means of transportation, the avenues of employment, until the time has arrived when the once free born American is born into a monopolized and fenced-up world, in which he must walk in the mighty shadow of the owners of his country and ask of them the right to labor, to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Here lies the wrong at which the spirits of Jefferson and Jackson bid us strike. This issue we must meet. If the democratic party has any mission to-day, that mission is to set itself in battle array against these industrial Caesars for whom we have coined a new name—the trusts.

Do I exaggerate this evil? Let him who thinks so look about him. I see before me many farmers and the representatives of farmers. The Iowa farmer is the synonym of independence. Yet he sells at prices fixed by the grain and meat trusts, buys at prices made by iron, steel, lumber and other trusts, and reaps that the railways may garner in. He is fortunate (if he owns his farm) in having a living assured, but as to whether or not he shall earn profits, the lords of the factory, market, mine and highway determine for him as absolutely as czars. But how is it in America with the man who has no farm, with the young man going out into a world in which he has no possessions? Where are the avenues of self-employment, which opened so invitingly to his father? To him is left scarcely more than the one single chance, to enlist in the service of one of those corporations by which the trust barons do their work. He may think with sorrow and

envy of his ancestors who went forth with gun or ax, or plow or level—each his own man—and worked out each his own independent fortune. But he cannot expect to do the same. The American is fortunate and exceptional now, who is his own man. He finds himself immeshed in a new feudalism where the lords of soil and highway are not, as of old, proud nobles zealous of glory, but invisible corporations, greedy of power and out for the stuff. Such conditions ought not to exist in a democracy. In any democracy where the people have not been led away from the truth, such conditions cannot exist. In any nation where such wealth and power are permitted permanently to be so concentrated, democracy cannot exist. The trust principle and the principle of popular government are so exactly opposed to each other that where both are in the field, they must fight, and one must fall.

This convention should go down to history for its fearlessness in recognizing this battle and placing itself upon the fighting line. I have no fear that we will commit any great error, if we keep our eyes fixed upon the north star of democratic principle and steer our course by that. There will always be found some timorous and venal souls who will prefer any course which promises an easy campaign and success at the polls. But I say to you that success at the polls won at any sacrifice of true democracy will be more disastrous than any defeat. There are those who say with great plausibility, that by making peace with Wall street we might make sure of winning in 1904. Such gentlemen hold out promises of much fatness in the honors and emoluments to be won. The temptation is disguised under specious words, but essentially the thing proposed is a bargain, in which a campaign fund and offices are offered as the prize of the Morganization of the Democratic party. I do not know the extent to which such views are held here, but as for me, I pray we may not be led into such temptation, but be given defeat with honor rather than so shameful a victory.

But those who dream of such a departure from the straight path, are, I am persuaded, few. Moreover, their reasoning is plausible rather than sound. Our party is strong where it is moved by the deep swell of opinion from the people. It is weak when it listens to the voice of the tempter of plutocracy. In 1892 the platform offered by the committee to our national convention was a rehash of the victorious one of 1884. But there sprang to the platform

a man who knew that the people were weary of paltering with protection, and demanded a tariff plank which would mean something. "My God," said he, "must we now, in 1892, go back to the straddle of 1884?" The convention said not, and the Neal tariff plank was adopted. There followed a tariff campaign on free trade lines, and free trade principles won. Democracy was strong at the polls because it was true to its convictions.

But the leadership of the party saw fit to abandon the issue on which this victory was won and pushed to the front questions alien to those on which the party had been called to power. The result was such disaster as we had never known. Victorious in 1892, and in full possession of all branches of the government, we met in 1894 such defeat as was never met before or since.

The party was corroded and eaten away by the feeling among the rank and file that it had abandoned the principles of Democracy at the behests of plutocracy. And when its convention met in 1896 its former leaders had lost power over it and the so lately victorious Democracy of America stood, like a leaderless army, awaiting the sound of some voice calling to battle in the name of the people. That waiting was not in vain. In that convention a democracy as deep and basic as Jefferson's found voice, and when the circling standards of the states at last clustered about the standard of Nebraska, those who saw and understood, knew that real democracy had found words to express its thoughts and a general to lead it in the field. Under that leadership the beaten, disorganized, discouraged army took the field against the exultant hosts of plutocracy and waged a conflict which carried consternation into the very throne rooms of modern feudalism. They trembled because the platform of 1896, in what it implied, even more than in what it said, was a declaration of war upon every special privilege, every legalized robbery, every vested wrong. Had the policy of 1892 and 1894 been indorsed in that convention the Democratic party would have sunk to the rank of a third party. Vitalized by the new leader, and the new defiance of aggregated wealth, we polled almost a million more votes than ever before, and a larger per cent. of the total vote than in 1892. We won back nearly forty congressmen lost in 1894, and cut down the Republican majority by two-thirds. And this in the face of the most desperate campaign of corruption and intimidation ever known.

In 1900, in spite of the administra-

tion's successful foreign war, in spite of the spirit of militarism, notwithstanding the full dinner pail argument, and in the face of the Republican party's becoming a guarantor of prosperity, by marching on the same path, and appealing to the people to discard the evil policy of imperialism, we cut down the Republican majority in the house to twenty, and while defeated, still held the ground gained since 1894.

I cite this history to show how fallacious is the argument of those who think that our party can win by becoming like the Republican party. There was never a greater mistake. The more unlike the Republican party we become the better our chances to win. The policy of imperialism abroad, and of shameless subserviency to the demand of monopoly at home must in time bring destruction to the party in power. We as a party, must stand for the reforms which they oppose. We must not be afraid to speak out for the things in which we believe. In 1892 we moved up from the platform of 1884 and won. In 1896 we advanced from the position of 1892, and saved the party from destruction. In 1900 we added that noble appeal for righteousness against imperialism which raised the party to a moral altitude superior to that of the churches. And now let us take counsel as to how we shall apply the eternal principles of liberty and democracy to the new conditions of 1903.

For that there are new conditions who can deny? Let us not now make the mistake which the convention of 1892 so narrowly avoided—the mistake of worshipping the verbal expressions of former platforms as fetishes. Therein lies the backward road to ruin.

The chief issue of 1896, in the form then put forward, is dead. To attempt to galvanize it into life is to be false to the spirit of 1896. The spirit maketh alive, but the letter killeth—let this text shed light upon your deliberations. The paramount issue of 1900 must wait. The consciences of men were and still are wrung by our arguments against imperialism, but the fancied welfare of their pocketbooks prevailed on the day of election. And now the new feudalism of the trusts so overshadows all else in men's minds that they will not shape their political course by considerations of our foreign or colonial policy. The issue of to-day was implied in every past platform, yea, in the declaration of 1776, in Magna Charta, wherever right has striven against might. But it awaits expression at our hands. All forms of oppression have been bound into a single sheaf and named the trust. In it

is slavery for the producing masses. In it is the tariff wrong. In it is the currency monopoly, reaching out for the banking business of the world. In it is government by injunction invoked by corporate employers of labor. In it is imperialism seizing the homes of weaker people for the exploitation of capital. At the trust we may aim our blows, confident that when the Goliath falls, down will go all the hosts of Philistine evils at which we have been hacking.

The problem was simple if it were as easy to do as to know what to do. Three roots bear up the dominion of the trusts. These are the highway monopoly, tariff monopoly and land monopoly. Land monopoly in the form of ownership of mines and forests has so far come forward as to have been made an issue by the Democrats of New York in a platform denouncing the anthracite trust. This great evil demands the attention of all who hope to see industrial wrongs set right.

The tariff monopoly alone seems to me insufficient to account for any of the great and powerful trusts. They rose under its shelter, but, controlling as they now do, our mines, forests and railways, most if not all of them could still live though trade were free. Yet, any movement towards free trade is in itself good, and how can we better serve the cause of truth than to couple the name of such industrial giants as the trust with the ancient and absurd lie "protection to infant industries." Furthermore, while free trade might not kill the trusts it would establish a line beyond which their robberies could not extend. Hence, we should renew our war on protection, unfurl again the tariff reform flag, and demand free trade in trust made goods. Of the very essence of liberty is the right to move from place to place and to transport property. He who is bound to the place where he was born is a serf. He who controls the highways by which we must move and transport goods holds us in a sort of serfdom. The third great bulwark of the trusts is highway monopoly. It appears in every city in monopoly of our streets by the public service corporations, and everywhere in the privately owned steam railway lines, controlled almost exclusively by the same group of industrial potentates who own the other trusts. Whether private individuals could under any circumstances successfully compete in business with the trusts may be questioned, but it may be taken for granted that, as long as the stock of the railways and the trusts are owned by the same interests, no one can compete with

either. There are those who seem to believe that proper restrictive statutes vigorously enforced will cure this evil. I am not in agreement with these optimistic views. There is no force in law to compel the single owner of two railways to compete with himself, nor is it possible by statute to prevent men as railway owners from granting favors to themselves as shippers. Against a combination so fortified all the Quaker guns of mock strenuousness will be pointed in vain. So long as this concentration of ownership exists there can be but two kinds of business in this country, that done by the trusts and that done by consent of the trusts. So long as this condition exists government of the people, by and for the people must remain a theory only and not a condition. Be not deceived; there are two horns to the railway dilemma. We must choose between railway ownership and the operation of government and government ownership and operation of railways. And in the resumption by the people of the control of their own highways will be found the most simple and practicable way toward depriving the trusts of their power for evil.

It lies with you, my friends, to make this day great. You may do so by a brave recognition of the stupendous questions to which I have referred, and an intrepid attempt to do the utmost thing needful. As a party we have marched far, but we must march on. There will beset us the temptations to retreat to pleasant fields long since passed over, but we must march on. To some it may seem best to linger on last night's camping ground, but if we are true to our duty, we must march on. To halt is to retreat; retreat is rout and ruin. The forward march is not only the road to honor, but the way of safety.

The people are ready for issues adequate to meet the needs of this great crisis. They will greet with acclamations him who will speak the word for the hour. Have the greatness to speak that word here and now. Take counsel, not of your fears, but of your courage. Be guided, not by your doubts, but by your convictions. Speak out the uttermost thing in your hearts and the people will rise to it. Nay, I wrong the people: Give utterance to all the democracy which is in you, that you may rise to the level of the common man. Turn to the future and not to the past. Never did the great world spin so swiftly down the ringing grooves of change. With our eyes upon the pole star of principle, let us shape our course with reference to where we stand to-day. Give us a platform and a ticket expressive of

these truths, and in the history of our State and our party this day will be forever memorable.

NOBODY KNOWS.

Nobody knows when de col' winds am blowin',
 Whar all de po' little chillun am a-goin'.
 Nobody knows when de night time's hoverin'
 How many little ones am dest'tute ob coverin'.
 Nobody sees, but de Lo'd done see 'em,
 An' bime-by de Lo'd 'll tell humanity ter free 'em.
 Nobody knows jes' how many am in rags,
 A-sleepin' in de hot blocks an' roun' on de flags.
 Nobody sees all dis poverty an' woe,
 A-livin' on de emptyin's an' not a place ter go.
 Nobody sees, but de Lo'd done see 'em,
 An' bime-by de Lo'd 'll tell humanity ter free 'em.
 Nobody knows whar dis poverty all comes—
 How many po' folk am sleepin' in de slums.
 Nobody knows jes' how few am befriendin',
 But de good Lo'd knows dar mus' soon be an endin'.
 Nobody sees, but de Lo'd done see 'em,
 An' bimeby de Lo'd 'll tell humanity ter free 'em.

—Ben King.

Hamberton—Yes, poor fellow, he stepped on a dynamite giant torpedo Fourth of July.

Crashworth—Did you attend his funeral?

Hamberton—Some of them.

G. T. E.

The Fulanis fought with fanatical bravery.

Thirty chiefs, gathered about the emplr's great white flag, were defiant to the last, and their corpses were found hedging the standard.—Press Dispatches.

Just how fanatical the bravery of the Fulanis was is made clear by Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, who rises in his place in Parliament to say that the discomfiture of these heathen has added 100,000 square miles to the domain of Merrie England.—Life.

BOOKS

MRS. GASKELL'S NOVELS.

The dollar edition of these novels (Smith, Elder & Co., London) ought to be welcomed by all lovers of surviving nineteenth century fiction. The print is black and clear, and the volumes are tastefully bound—entirely worthy of a place in any book-lover's library.

Of course the best known of Mrs. Gaskell's novels is "Cranford," which has become a classic. I am inclined to think, however, that two or three others are fuller of modern interest. "Mary Barton," for example, and most

of all, "North and South," are admirable social studies. In the latter book there is an account of a strike in the north of England, which occurred fifty or more years ago, and yet is as modern as one of yesterday.

Those who care to read Mrs. Gaskell nowadays must be prepared to make some allowances. She had certain social and religious limitations that were well within the lines of present orthodoxy, and the classifications of English society are naturally dealt with as matters of course and not of criticism.

But granting these concessions, the novel reader who harks back to Mrs. Gaskell will find himself in an atmosphere of thought, sincerity, earnestness and refinement of feeling that are all too rare in most of the novels of today. He will find, too, a very clever and careful study of character, done in the most delightful way. She has the rare ability of making her characters really live for us, not, indeed, by too much description and analysis, but by showing concretely their ways and conversations. Take, for example, Mary Barton herself, or Mr. Hale and Mr. Bell in "North and South," how well we come to know them.

No mention of Mrs. Gaskell, however brief, can fail to include the great biography which she wrote of the Brontes. It has a uniqueness among such books that will make it live for all time in English literature. It is one of the best specimens we have of biographical writing, and it tells with the vividness of truth one of the saddest stories ever written.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—Unfrequented Paths. Songs of Nature, Labor and Men. By Geo. E. McNeill, author of "The Labor Movement; the Problem of To-day," "Eight Hour Primer," etc. Boston: James H. West Co. Price, \$1.60. To be reviewed.

PERIODICALS.

It would be interesting to know whether the artist of the front page of the Saturday Evening Post in the issue of June 6, the "College Man's Number," was intentionally drawing a clever satire or not. The College Man is standing with bulldog pipe in his mouth and with a real bulldog by his side. He has '06 on his front and a self-satisfied air on his face. Whether the artist meant him as satire or not, is he not an interesting spectacle, worthy of serious

consideration on the part of promoters of higher education? J. H. D.

In the Young Men's Journal for June Mr. John S. Crosby contributes an article of singular force and clearness on the Meaning and Purpose of the Single Tax. Apropos of the thought that we need to go to other continents for land—as Dr. E. E.



The Souls of Black Folk

By W. E. B. DuBois

A REMARKABLE BOOK that is provoking much discussion because of the wonderful eloquence with which the author pleads for right and justice to his people. In these days of increasing agitation over the "negro problem" this passionate human document can neither be overlooked nor ignored. Aside from its remarkable presentation of facts it holds the reader—prejudiced or not—by its fascination of style and overpowering pathos.

Some of the Chapter Headings follow:

- OF OUR SPIRITUAL STRIVINGS.
- OF THE DAWN OF FREEDOM.
- OF MR. WASHINGTON AND OTHERS.
- OF THE MEANING OF PROGRESS.
- OF THE TRAINING OF BLACK MEN.
- OF THE BLACK BELT.
- OF THE SONS OF MASTER AND MAN.
- OF THE FAITH OF THE FATHERS.
- OF THE PASSING OF THE FIRST-BORN.
- OF ALEXANDER CRUMMELL.
- OF THE COMING OF JOHN.
- OF THE SORROW SONGS.

3d Edition \$1.20 net Published by A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago

Do you know of
 Any democratic-Democrat
 Anywhere

who does not subscribe
 for The Public?

If you do . . .

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

THE TRUSTS

What Can We Do with Them?
 What Can They Do for Us?

By WILLIAM MILLER COLLIER
 Recently appointed Special Solicitor-General
 . . . for the Prosecution of the Trusts . . .

There cannot be any doubt that the trusts are filled with great dangers to our industrial, social, and political system. To say that these dangers are "awful" is no misuse of the word.—PREFACE

CLOTH, 12mo, 346 PAGES
 Publisher's Price, \$1.25—OUR Price, 65 cts.
 Postage, 10 cts. extra

TWENTIETH CENTURY PRESS
 17 East 16th St., NEW YORK



A FOURTH OF JULY TEST.

Hill—Grover, see if you can read that out with your hand on your heart without choking; I can't.

Hale is suggesting—the following paragraph is especially worth quoting: "The opening up of unused land by the single tax has been compared not inaptly to the discovery of a new continent in its effect upon industrial and social welfare, but it will be even better, for the land will be brought into use in close proximity to established communities eager and free to take its products in exchange for theirs, and within helpful touch of industrial and social advantages from which pioneer settlers are for a long time far removed."

J. H. D.

The Booklovers' Magazine (Philadelphia) improves in every way with every issue. Its cover for July is an extraordinarily rich specimen of color printing; and the leading article of the same issue is peculiarly timely and welcome, for it deals sympathetically with the possibilities of the Negro race. "The Advance Guard of the Race" is its title. Among the men whose work is described are Washington, the educator; Woods, the electrical inventor; Morris, the Chicago lawyer; Tanner, the artist; Williams, the distinguished surgeon; Chestnut, the novelist; Miller, the mathematician; Grimke, the clergyman, and Dunbar, the poet, while the article itself, a fine piece of literary work, is by DuBois, the sociologist and scholar. The article is accompanied with portraits, which clearly enough refute the contention that Negro triumphs in civilization are due to the admixture of white blood, for several of these portraits testify clearly to the total absence of white blood. But what of it? pertinently asks DuBois. "The fact remains that these men, all of them, are representa-

tives of the American Negroes. . . . They all equally represent those who suffer from caste proscription, from political disability and wanton narrowing of opportunity." In accounting for the ignorance of Americans as to the successes which Negroes like those he describes have accomplished he pungently explains that it is natural, because "a man works with his hands and not with his complexion, with his brains and not with his facial angle; and the result of his work is human achievement and not necessarily a 'social problem.' Thus his work becomes gathered up and lost in the sum of American deeds and men know little of the individual."

Dyspeptics Incurable preferred.
Try the new failing Popp's
German Stomach Powders. Sampled
Free. Mailed upon receipt of \$1.00
Popp's Stomach Powder Co.
656 West Park St. Chicago, Ill.

ANARCHISM

A Criticism and History of the Anarchist Movement

By E. V. ZENKER

The fullest and best account of Anarchism ever published. A most powerful and trenchant criticism. —LONDON BOOK GAZETTE.

CLOTH, 12mo, 338 PAGES

Publisher's Price, \$1.50—OUR Price, 65 cts. Postage, 10 cts. extra

TWENTIETH CENTURY PRESS
17 East 16th St., NEW YORK

SOCIALIST TRIUMPH IN GERMANY

At the recent German elections the Socialists have won a victory too notable to be concealed by the capitalist papers of the United States. They therefore claim that socialism in Germany is something different from socialism in America; that it is merely a democratic reform movement. That this is false will be seen by reading THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION, by Karl Kautsky, the leading socialist writer of Germany. Translated by A. M. and May Wood Simons. Cloth, 189 pages, 50 cents, postpaid. Mention this paper and we will include without extra charge a copy of the Communist Manifesto and a late number of the International Socialist Review. Address

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, 56 Fifth Ave., CHICAGO.

The Public
 PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY
 1641 UNITY BUILDING
 CHICAGO, ILL.

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

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

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

TERMS.

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

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

POST OFFICE ADDRESS:
THE PUBLIC, BOX 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

ATTORNEYS.

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

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

CONTRACTORS.

G. H. ATKINSON & CO., CONTRACTORS,
 JERSEY CITY, N. J.
 Electric Light, Telephone and Municipal Work.
 Trolley Roads Built and Financed.

SOCIALISM and the Social Movement in the 19th Century

By WERNER SOMBART
Professor in the University of Breslau

WITH A CHRONICLE OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT 1750-1896

Sombart's treatise on Socialism impresses me as admirable.—J. B. CLARK, Professor of Political Economy in Columbia University.

CLOTH, 12mo, 218 PAGES

Publisher's Price, \$1.25—OUR Price, 65 cts. Postage, 10 cts. extra

TWENTIETH CENTURY PRESS
17 East 16th St., NEW YORK

Progressive Religious Literature free. Apply Mrs. C. F. Wetmore, 4432 Sidney Avenue, Chicago.

NOTICE is hereby given that in accordance with the laws of Illinois, the capital stock of Elaborated Ready Roofing Company, a corporation, the principal office of which is at 34 Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, has been increased from Ten Thousand Dollars to Twenty-five Thousand Dollars, and the object for which said corporation was organized has been enlarged so as to include the purchase of raw material for and the manufacture of roofing material, fibre lumber, fibre lumber boxes, varnishes, oils, paints, paint driers and paint powders, and to sell such manufactured products.

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 17th day of June, 1908.
 ELABORATED READY ROOFING CO.,
 By MATTHIAS B. BECKER, President.
 HARLAN D. COOK, Secretary.
 JAY D. MILLER, Attorney.