

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 6, 1903.

Number 270.

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.

British imperialism has now worked its way to the surface in England herself, with an amazing eruption. The people there are informed by Mr. Chamberlain, in an enthusiastic outburst of jingo patriotism, that the interests of the empire as a whole demand the sacrifice of free trade at home.

Mr. Chamberlain's argument rests upon the imperial idea. He declares that preferential duties must be adjusted reciprocally between England and her colonies, or the colonies will fall away and the empire disintegrate. So he would have England reestablish the bread tax, with a rebate to her colonies, in order that colonial producers may have an advantage in the English food market, and in return would demand an advantage in their markets for British manufactures.

But Mr. Balfour, the premier, supplements this political motive with an economic one. He argues that the markets of the rest of the world are closing against British exports, while her markets are free to foreign imports, and that the time is near when she cannot pay for the food she imports except at a great disadvantage in the disposal of her exports. He, therefore, would tax foreign breadstuffs in order to hold Great Britain in commercial equilibrium.

Back of both these motives is one that has as yet not attracted general notice. This new departure of the Conservative party, with Chamber-

lain in the lead and the Premier a good second, is expected to receive the support of the agricultural landed interests of Great Britain, which it would certainly serve.

It would serve those interests in one respect by increasing the value of British farm land. If the products of foreign farms were taxed, as Chamberlain and Balfour propose, and a rebate of duties were allowed the British colonies, as they also propose tentatively, the products of British farms would sell upon the British market at considerably higher prices than now. This would enhance the demand for British farming land, and by increasing agricultural rents would fatten up the great landlord interests most agreeably.

But it would serve these landed interests even more vitally in another respect. Since neither colonial farms nor English farms altogether could fully supply the great manufacturing and commercial centers of Great Britain with foodstuffs, foreign products would come in. Under the tariff they would yield, at the expense principally of British workingmen, greatly increased public revenues; and this would postpone for another season the issue in Great Britain of taxing land values for the benefit of the general exchequer. The ministry has long realized that it must soon meet the issue of a tariff tax on bread versus an ad valorem tax on land, all other sources of taxation being practically exhausted.

Thus the question Mr. Chamberlain raises is not only an imperial question; it is a land question. It is good policy to mix it up with questions that admit of appeals to pride of empire, but the land question is the real issue. And the agitation may

reach very deep down into the roots of that question by the time the fight the ministry is now courting has been fought to the finish. Cobden warned the British landlords that if they did not promptly concede tariff free trade, the struggle to gain it would culminate in a free trade that would shake the unearned increment of their estates out of their pockets. They yielded in time then, but their unearned increment will be in just as much danger now, even in greater danger, if the issue of protection or free trade is revived. The benefits of tariff free trade have been largely diverted from the people of Great Britain by the urban landlord interests, which have absorbed them. A new agitation of the subject, such as that which Chamberlain has precipitated, will cut deeper and hew closer to the line than the half-hearted free trade with which Sir Robert Peel prematurely stopped the democratic agitation that Richard Cobden had begun.

The election for Illinois judges in Cook county, which came off on the 1st (p. 81), has resulted on the whole quite satisfactorily. It is to be regretted that Capt. Black and ex-Judge Barnum were defeated. Both are pronounced democratic-Democrats. But with these exceptions and one other, every Democratic candidate for the Circuit bench, all competent and some of them highly so, was elected. Of the successful ones, at least four among the ablest are well known for their democratic-Democracy—Murray F. Tuley, Edward F. Dunne, Thomas G. Windes and Edward Osgood Brown. Judge Brown is moreover a single tax man of long standing and national repute.

The result was a distinct set-back for the Republican machine under

"Boss" Lorimer. From the Republican ticket the machine had excluded the best among the sitting Republican judges, Judge Waterman (p. 51), because Judge Waterman would not give judicial sanction to the dark ways and vain tricks of the machine politics of his party. But the worst man of all the sitting judges, Judge Haney, was forced by "Boss" Lorimer into a place upon the Republican ticket, and the remainder of the ticket was a queer mosaic of the good, the bad, and the middling. The contest became a negative one against Haney rather than an affirmative one for any particular candidate, and Haney was badly beaten. In a poll of 28 candidates for 14 places he was returned as the 26th.

Of the eight Republican candidates at this election who were indorsed by the Chicago bar association—not the Chicago bar, but a select association within the bar—only three were elected, which is a fairly good indication that the indorsement of this Association was not effective. The effective voting was done regardlessly of that indorsement. This is a wholesome sign. If the sentiments of the whole bar could have been fairly obtained with reference to judicial nominations, laymen might properly have been influenced by that result. But the sentiments of a bar are not represented by a small club of lawyers; and neither in the bar at large nor in such a club is it possible to prevent electioneering, the effect of which is to deprive a bar indorsement of its value.

It is equally gratifying to observe that the indorsements of the "independent newspapers" were no more effective than those of the Bar Association. Where they made shrewd guesses, the candidates they approved were elected; but their guesses were well away from the mark except as to the Democratic candidates they approved. They hit the mark here because "Lorimerism," with all its manifest evils, had put the Dem-

ocratic party to the fore. We say that this is gratifying, because we can conceive of nothing more dangerous in politics than an "independent" newspaper which picks and chooses candidates from opposing tickets and is supported therein by the voters. A regular political "boss" is innocence incarnate by comparison. For, mind you, the "independent" paper often has its own private axes to grind, the same as has the political "boss." The only difference is that they are axes of a different kind, and that the fact that the private axes of the newspapers are hunting for a political grindstone is kept dark. Voters who accept editorial mixed tickets suppose they are supporting a non-partisan selection of good men, when they may in fact be supporting some little scheme of an "independent" editor or proprietor. The people of Chicago are to be congratulated upon the failure of the "independent newspaper" ticket, as well as the Bar Association ticket, and upon having secured a bench of judges which is composed for the most part of able men with excellent judicial equipment, most of whom are Democrats in name and several of whom are democrats in fact.

The Postmaster General intimates that he desires to keep quiet the scandals in the post office department, lest their exposure be injurious to the department and to the party. Under the original theory of our government the Postmaster General and every man under him is a servant of the people. The people are entitled to know everything, no matter what it is or whom it hurts. More and more, however, the idea grows that the people are to be governed and the politicians are masters.

Secretary Root has ordered an inquiry into one of the cases of outrage upon Filipinos which Gen. Miles brought to light. It is the case of Maj. Robert L. Howze, who is accused of having authorized the brutal and fatal whipping of prisoners of

war at Laoag, Luzon, in the Spring of 1900. The impartiality of the investigation may be judged by the instructions of the Secretary of War in ordering it. He impresses upon the court of inquiry to be summoned that "Howze's character and conduct afford a strong presumption against the probability of his having done the things charged," and that Maj. Hunter, who collected the incriminating proofs, "appears by his own evidence and the testimony of his brother officers to have entertained a bitter personal animosity towards Maj. Howze." The court of inquiry that convicts Maj. Howze after that broad hint from the Secretary of War, no matter how strong the inculpatory evidence may be, will exhibit fortitude of a kind that does not usually flourish in army circles, where physical bravery is cultivated at the expense of moral courage. After such a hint from headquarters, what chance of promotion could the members of a court of inquiry expect, if it were to confirm the report of Maj. Hunter and convict Maj. Howze?

If William E. Curtis may be relied upon for a simple statement of fact, another scheme is about to be adopted by the American government in the Philippines for the Christianization of their inhabitants and the incidental profit of some enterprising Yankee. This scheme contemplates the "farming out" to a private monopolist of the entire opium trade. The ostensible purpose is said to be the better regulation of that traffic. But if opium, why not alcohol? And if alcohol, why not prostitution? The principle is the same, and there is no lack of monopolists able and willing to regulate almost any of the vices of the Filipinos upon monopoly terms.

David S. Rose, "Democratic" mayor of Milwaukee, is another man to come out against what he calls "Bryan's dictation,"—the same being Mr. Bryan's public expression of opinions which a highly influential number of people voluntarily accept.

Rose, however, is candid enough to admit that he has a personal grudge against Mr. Bryan. "He beat me for governor of Wisconsin," says Mayor Rose. True enough! He did it by denouncing Mr. Rose as undemocratic, in consequence whereof democratic Democrats of Wisconsin refused to vote for Mr. Rose. And this is one more mark to the credit of Mr. Bryan as a democratic leader of the Democracy.

In a previous issue (p. 85), we told of a race war in Mississippi, merely quoting an Associated Press dispatch. We are now able to quote, from the Vicksburg Daily Herald of May 20, what is evidently a fair review of the situation, based upon an account by the Laurel (Miss.) Ledger. The conflict occurred on the Scott and Smith county border. A condition of apparent amity was broken by "a squabble between a white Smith county farmer named Bruce, and a black laborer." The white farmer tried to compel the Negro laborer to work on a Saturday afternoon. Being unable to do so himself, he called in his brother, and between them "the Negro was severely beaten." He and a brother of his then abandoned Bruce's farm and crossed over into Scott county. The two Bruces followed them, accompanied by a third white man. Coming up with the Negroes the white party shot one of them. Thereupon the father of the victim shot back, hitting the third man of the farmer's party. "With the shedding of white blood," says the Vicksburg Herald, "the affair became a race conflict." It then quotes from the Laurel Ledger:

As soon as it became known that the Negro had shot Craft about a hundred men organized into a posse and began shooting and beating all the Negroes in the neighborhood. Most of the Negroes made their escape, but two are known to have been killed. Others have "disappeared," among whom was the Negro that did the shooting. Not a Negro remains in that entire section. Wednesday, Thursday and Friday the men searched for Negroes all day. Now that they have all

disappeared, things have assumed their normal aspect.

The Herald had hoped that previous reports of the circumstances had exaggerated them; but it confesses that the hope was dispelled by "this story from the field of action." In further comment it describes the affair as "bloody and shameful," and strikes an additional note of condemnation in these concluding words: "As to this latest emeute, the Negroes had not even been guilty of anything criminal." The bare facts in this case are so eloquent that the strongest comment upon them would seem feeble.

Of course this sort of thing goes deeper than riotous feuds. It is one of the natural results of a regime in which Negroes are regarded as a different order of beings from the white men among whom they live. The rioters are not alone to blame for these race riots. Everyone is in some degree responsible who fosters race antipathies. That these are fostered where Negroes are numerous, and by "the best people," is evident from one significant phrase of the Vicksburg Herald's: "With the shedding of white blood," etc. The previous shedding of black blood, which provoked the shedding of white blood, doesn't count. The same state of affairs is evident from the reports, if true, that are coming up from Alabama, which show a deliberate plan, connived at by officers of the law, to reenslave Negroes. This plan in operation appears to begin with bringing a poor Negro before a magistrate on a flimsy charge. He is convicted and fined, and having no money to pay the fine, a white man offers to advance the money provided the Negro will make a labor contract with him for a length of time sufficient to reimburse him for his money and trouble. The Negro is thereupon taken away and begins what is frequently a long term of cruel servitude, in which frequent whippings are incidents. These reports may not be true. But unhappily they are not inherently impossible.

ON SECURING THE LEGAL RIGHTS OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO IN PRACTICE.

As matter of abstract principle, it can hardly be unblushingly denied that the legal rights of the American Negro, in respect of his life, his liberty, his pursuits and his property, ought to be precisely the same as those of the American white man. Such is our inference, at any rate, from a brief examination we have heretofore made (p. 83) into the proposition, which seems, indeed, to be almost axiomatic, and which in that examination appears to stand the test alike of Christianity, of morality and of ethics. But if the American Negro's legal rights ought to be the same as those of American white men, as matter of abstract principle, there is no fair escape from the conclusion that they ought to be so as matter of correct practice.

Nothing can be bad in practice which is sound in principle. It is often said, to be sure, of one thing or another that is admitted to be sound in theory, that it wouldn't work in practice; and this astute observation is made occasionally with reference to solutions of the Negro problem which take into consideration any of the rights of the Negro that white men do not feel bound to respect. But all such notions will be found upon examination to be either a lazy man's or a selfish man's door of escape from a dilemma.

The lazy man who indolently concedes a false principle, or indolently makes a slovenly experiment, may save himself the trouble of revising the false principle or of correcting the slovenly experiment, by resorting to the shallow shift of explaining that while the idea is all right in theory it won't work in practice. Or, the selfish man, obliged to acknowledge the soundness of an abstract political principle at variance with some privilege he enjoys or hopes to enjoy, may endeavor to evade it and to guard against the loss, by the same sort of stultification.

Whatever his motive, anyone who asserts that a sound theory won't work in right practice is mistaken. The only sound theories that don't work in practice are those that

are prevented from being put into practice.

To this law of the universe the rights of American Negroes to equal legal protection with American whites, in respect of life, liberty, pursuits, and property, make no exception. If Negroes ought to have such rights, as matter of abstract principle, they ought to have them as matter of right practice. There is no room for distinction here between principle and practice; and in the language of John Randolph of Roanoke, we "envy neither the head nor the heart of the man" who thinks there is.

But if this equality of legal rights does belong to the American Negro, not only upon abstract principle—whether of the Christian religion, or of intuitional morality, or of utilitarian ethics,—but also as matter of right practice, then a vitally important practical question arises: Who is to secure those rights to the American Negro?

We may concede that, in abstract principle, the Negro ought to have the same legal rights of life, liberty, pursuits and property as white men, without bothering ourselves about their enforcement. But the moment we advance to the point of conceding that if he ought to have those rights as matter of principle, he ought to have them also in practice—from that moment we are obliged to grant the necessity of lodging protective power with some one who will exercise it faithfully, or at least try to do so.

Should this power to protect the black race be lodged, then, with the white race? The proposition is wholly inadmissible.

Southern leaders, it is true, often assure us that the whites of the South would protect the ballotless Negro in all his primary rights. Recently the Hon. R. G. Humphreys, of Mississippi, put the assurance in brief and positive phrase. On Confederate Decoration Day at Port Gibson, Miss., May 1, 1903, he delivered the memorial address, in which he said:

It is my firm conviction that whenever we convince the people of the North by frank and honest arguments,

that the Fifteenth amendment was an error, and by our conduct satisfy them that the Negro disfranchised will be protected in all his civil rights, and secure in his life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, that they will then be as persistent in correcting the errors of reconstruction as they were relentless in committing them."

So far as this is an assurance of protection for the Negro disfranchised, it cannot be trusted. Not because the assurance comes from a Southern white man about a Southern community. That makes no difference. It would be no more trustworthy if it came from a Northern white man about a Northern community. The reason is that no governing class ever did or probably ever will fully protect a disfranchised class in the enjoyment of their civil rights. In verification of this we need do no more than point to the Greek helot and the Roman slave of the ancient world; to the serf of the mediaeval ages; or, in our own time, to the Jew of Russia, or the Kaffir workmen of South Africa, whether under Boer or Briton. Whenever and wherever any class is treated as incapable of participating in the government by which it is governed, it is also treated as incapable of enjoying the same rights of life, liberty, property and pursuits as the governing class arrogates to itself. This is what history tells us, and our knowledge of human nature assures us that it cannot be otherwise.

If the power to protect the black race were lodged in the white race, there is not a State in the Union, with a considerable Negro population, where legal rights to life, liberty, pursuits and property would long be the same for Negroes as for white men. It may be difficult to prove this with reference to some Northern States, where there are too few Negroes, except in some obscure localities, to make a Negro problem; but it is easily proved with reference to Southern States; and what can be proved against them in this respect may be taken as a sufficiently accurate index of what could have been proved also against the Northern States if the provocative circumstances had been the same.

When the civil war closed, with the Negro a freedman instead of a slave,

the power of protecting the Negro's legal rights of life, liberty, pursuits and property, lodged at first with the white race. But instead of protecting those rights alike with the same rights of white men, the white race set at once about reducing the Negroes to legal serfdom. The "black codes" that immediately followed the war, gave little promise of a disposition on the part of the whites to secure equal legal rights of life, liberty, pursuits and property regardless of race. On the contrary, they showed what all human experience testifies would be shown in similar circumstances in any community, North or South, in Europe or America, now or aforesaid. They showed a purpose to establish Negro slavery in some form legally consistent with the abrogation of the old form. It was to enable the Negro to protect himself against this new species of aggression that the ballot was given him by amendment to the Federal Constitution.

Whether Negro suffrage has served that intended purpose, or has proved a failure, as is freely asserted by party leaders in the political party whose traditions are associated with its bestowal, and if it has proved a failure, why?—these are questions that call for no consideration at this point. It is more appropriate here that we deal with the most familiar apology for arbitrary disfranchisement of the Negro, namely, that he used the ballot not to protect himself but to oppress the whites.

If he did use the ballot to oppress the white race, he only did what the white race had long done to him, and what any race will do to another if it holds the ballot for both. But the Negro did not hold the ballot for both. Whites as well as blacks were voters at the South; and although the latter were in the majority in some States, the enfranchised Negroes as a race nowhere oppressed the whites as a race. They paid to the minority voters that respect which majorities always pay to minorities, of enacting, adjudicating and executing laws without distinction of race.

Yet the charge that they did oppress the whites has a semblance of

truth. Such maladministration as they were accountable for bore heavily upon tax payers, and the whites were nominally the largest tax payers. But in fact the oppression of tax payers through maladministration was a burden that fell upon both Negroes and whites. And when it is considered that in the last analysis the earner and not the mere appropriator of wealth is the true taxpayer, this burden fell upon Negroes more heavily than upon the whites, for most of the work of the South was done not by the white race but by the Negro race.

There is no real basis for the accusation that the Negro of the South used his ballot to oppress the whites. Neither is it to be inferred that the maladministration when he freely voted and was in the majority furnishes evidence of any peculiar lack of voting capability on his part. The corruption of the South during the Negro regime was peculiar neither to the Negro nor to the locality.

At that time "Boss" Tweed was riding on the crest of his corrupt career. He and his ring were exploiting the tax payers of New York under the sanction of a majority of its voters, but few of whom were Negroes, to a degree and with an abandon that makes the Negro legislatures of the South seem almost like ethical institutes by comparison. Nor was the Tweed ring alone in its satanic glory. Political corruption was rampant, without regard to party, or race, or locality. The politics of almost every State and even of the national government was at that period streaked with putrescence. With a wave of political corruption sweeping over the country, is it remarkable that the men whom Negroes voted into office in the South should have been less than immaculate? Does it reflect especially upon the Negro race to point to the office holders they elected, as imitators of the Tweeds, the Sheppards, the Colfaxes and the rest? Is it significant of civic inferiority, either, that newly fledged Negro voters were not swifter to discipline their leaders than were Tweed's white constituents to discipline him?

Let it be remembered, too, that it was not black men alone who availed themselves of Negro majorities to do what Tweed and his like were doing or had done with white majorities. The white man was well in evidence in all the rascalities at the South in reconstruction times. Nor were these white men by any means all Northern adventurers. Native vultures were in no wise reluctant when the savor of the flesh pots scented the air. The whole thing was neither "nigger" nor "carpetbagger," especially, but human; a bad kind of human, to be sure, but a kind, nevertheless, of which no race has a monopoly.

And when the whole story is thought over, one can hardly feel that it was "nigger," or "carpetbagger," or "scalawag" (as the native vulture was called), that wrought the worst.

Was it not, rather, those white Southerners of aristocratic lineage, who, though too big to be corrupt, were not big enough to seize upon a great moral opportunity in higher politics. They could have made of the South a fair land for two distinct and flourishing and mutually confiding races of American citizens, each with its own message for the other, each rendering its own service to the other, each bound to the other by joint pride of citizenship, and each in the full and secure enjoyment of all the legal rights which the other claimed.

Such an opportunity there was. For old leaders in the South were besought at first to take the lead again—not of one race now, but of two. Their experience and ability and acknowledged probity were in demand for the highest offices. Had they responded with the broad good feeling of fellowcitizenship, instead of recoiling with the narrow ill feeling of race arrogance, the South would have had a different and better history and there would be no Negro problem now.

It was not Negro domination that offended then, for the Negro neither dominated nor sought to dominate. It was narrow white pride in the white race. The men who ought to have led, and could have led, and were begged to lead, contemptuously refused to lead, a

mass of Negro citizens up out of the slough of an old bondage.

So the Negro, with an impulse eminently human, having discovered that the old master race of the South was not to be his friend and mentor but his deadly enemy, retreated to the recesses back of the race veil in which the whites force the blacks to live; and thence he peered out in awe upon the savagery of the white man when the era of persecution began.

Talk of the corruption of the Negro in politics! It bears no comparison for iniquity with the persecution he has suffered at the hands of white men. During the shameful "Klklux" period, murder and arson and incidental rape were among the outrages to which the Negro was subjected—for merely being a Negro. Even that period of criminal intimidation has since been outdone in the boasted crusade to nullify his vote by fraud at the polls, and to prevent its being cast at all by menacing his family with the midnight shotgun in the hands of valiant assassins. And what could Negroes do to rival the barbarity of whites, as exhibited in the press dispatches that tell of the mobs that lynch Negroes? From the various horrible burnings at the stake of the past decade, to the mobbing of the Negro residence quarter at Joplin a few weeks ago, there is nothing in the history of Negro crimes upon whites—whether political or not—to equal in barbarity the outrages of whites upon Negroes.

It will not do to charge these barbarities to the savagery of a low class of whites or to the frenzy of angry mobs. Such savagery and such frenzy—distinguishing, as they do, people of a particular race for their peculiar victims—do not originate in lower class instincts or mob fury. The race distinction they make identifies them with the race hatred of all the whites as a class. They are the brutal expression by brutal or frenzied men of the brutal prejudices of the community in which they do or can occur.

Wesay "can occur" advisedly. The community where these outrages do occur is not alone responsible for them, any more than are the brutes who actually commit the crime. Race hatred causes them, and whoever fos-

ters race hatred makes himself an originating cause of race outrages. As the Jew haters of Russia, no matter where they live, are morally responsible for the massacre at Kishineff, so the Negro haters of the United States, North as well as South, are morally responsible for the outrages of white brutes upon Negroes. Such outrages could not occur if public opinion everywhere were as sensitive to the rights of Negroes as to the rights of white men.

The whole history of the relations of whites and Negroes affords overwhelming proof of the incompetency of white Americans to protect the rights of black Americans. If the Negro is to be protected equally with white men, respecting his life, his liberty, his pursuits and his property, one thing is certain, however uncertain other things may be. It may be doubtful if the Negro is capable of protecting these rights for himself; but it is absolutely certain that the white race cannot be trusted to do it for him.

And that answers the question we have propounded: Should the power to protect the black race be lodged with the white race? The answer must of necessity be, No. The white race cannot be trusted either to exercise it faithfully, or to try to exercise it faithfully.

But there is only one alternative. We must either lodge this power with the white race, or else make Negro suffrage secure, so that the Negro himself may use it to protect his own rights. If the first horn of this alternative must be rejected—and who with a conscience has the temerity to argue for its acceptance—then the second must be adopted. It must be adopted, that is, by those who recognize the Negro's right to be protected.

Wherever the Negro has been divested of voting power, partially or wholly, the white men of that community must either insist upon its full restoration upon equal terms with whites, or by their refusal confess that they do not believe the Negro ought to have, either in principle or practice, the same rights to life, liberty, pursuits and property that they claim for themselves.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, June 4.

Great Britain is stirred from Lands End to John O'Groats, by a political agitation of the first magnitude. It is due to nothing less than a proposal, made by Joseph Chamberlain, the British secretary of state for the colonies and leader of the Unionist faction of the Conservative party, seconded by Arthur J. Balfour, the British prime minister and Conservative leader, that Great Britain abandon her policy of free trade and return to the policy of protection.

This proposed change of front with reference to an economic policy that dates back to the days of Cobden and Peel, in the 40s. when Parliament began the abolition of tariff taxes on imported food, is urged as a necessity for the maintenance of British imperialism. But it is believed to have been inspired in no little degree by the seeming necessity for raising a new patriotic issue to save the Conservative party from disaster.

That suspicion is reenforced certainly by the manifest decline of this party in popularity since the close of the Boer war (vol. v., p. 264), with its incidental advantages as a political issue to the party in power. Several by-elections, this Spring, to fill vacancies in Parliament, have been badly disappointing to Conservative hopes. The only one in which Conservatives even pretended to find consolation, had returned the Unionist candidate by only half the usual majority; and this poor consolation was more than neutralized by the triumphant election of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, a thorough-going "Little Englander." His majority was several hundred larger than the Liberals usually poll in his constituency: notwithstanding that Mr. Chamberlain forced the Boer war question against him in the contest and that he responded by placarding the district with a strong denunciation of the annexation of the Boer republics. These Liberal successes created a widespread impression that at the next general elections the Conservatives would be retired from power.

About this time the first clear intimation of the new tariff policy was made. A large and influential dele-

gation of Unionist members of the House of Commons, supported by members of the Lords and delegates from chambers of agriculture and of commerce, waited upon Mr. Balfour on the 15th of May to protest against remission of the war duties on grain. Mr. Balfour is reported to have made a long and groping argument in reply to their representations. He explained that this grain tax had accidentally and without the slightest intention on the part of the ministry, given some protection to millers and thus indirectly and unexpectedly helped farmers, but that inasmuch as the measure was never intended to be protective, the ministry must not be blamed for now remitting the tax. He urged them to consider, also, that protection cannot be introduced silently, as if by accident and without a broad public indorsement of such a change in the national policy. at the same time assuring them that he must not be understood as saying that the existing policy must necessarily be permanent. On the contrary, he thought it must be recognized that new conditions have arisen since the old free trade policy was adopted, and he could imagine circumstances under which Great Britain would no longer consent to be made a passive target for other countries living under different conditions. While he believed in universal free trade, he realized that at present every country except Great Britain is protected. In conclusion, he said that he would welcome a closer fiscal union of the motherland and the colonies, but that the movement would be extremely difficult to carry out, and must come from the heart, conscience and intellect of the great masses of the people.

On the very day of that conference with Mr. Balfour, Mr. Chamberlain addressed a great Unionist mass-meeting at Birmingham, making the abolition of British free trade the burden of his speech. As this speech was cabled, Mr. Chamberlain declared—

that England had reached the point in her career where she must abandon the policy of free trade or lose her colonies; that on imperial policy for the next few years depended whether the British empire should stand together as a free nation against the world, or fall into separate States, each selfishly seeking its own interests and losing those advantages which unity alone could give; and that the policy of dictation and interference by foreign Powers was justified by the be-

lief that England was so wedded to the policy of free trade that she would not even defend her own colonies. He advocated, consequently, a departure from the existing interpretation of free trade, proposing the establishment of preferential tariffs between the colonies and Great Britain. His main point was that England's present condition in this respect is absolutely new and that this new situation must be met by a new policy. Referring to Canada as in the full swing of extraordinary prosperity, which he hoped and believed would result in a great increase in population, strength and importance, he recalled the fact that Canada in 1898 voluntarily gave Great Britain a preference of 15 per cent, which it afterward increased to 33 1-3 per cent, and stated that Canada is now willing to go further, especially regarding goods in which the British compete with foreigners, if Great Britain will give her a drawback or a tax of a shilling per quarter on grain. The government has had to refuse the offer, because the established fiscal policy binds it to keep the British market open for all the world, even though other nations close their markets against Great Britain. England, he said, could not offer any favor to her own children or make any difference between those who treat her well and those who treat her badly. That was the accepted doctrine of the free traders. He himself was a free trader, but he doubted whether the present interpretation of the term was the true one. Continuing his speech, he said: "I am no protectionist, but I want to discover if the true interpretation of free trade is that it is our only duty to buy in the cheapest market without regard to whether we can sell there. If that is the theory of free trade, and if it finds acceptance here and elsewhere, then you will lose the advantage of the further reduction in duty which Canada offers to the manufacturers of this country, and you may lose a great deal more, because the minister of finance in Canada told the Canadian parliament the other day that if they are told definitely that the mother country can do nothing for them in the way of reciprocity they must reconsider their position and reconsider the preference they have already given. The policy which prevents us from offering an advantage to our colonies prevents us from defending them if they are attacked. We may well have supposed that an agreement of this kind, by which Canada does a kindness to us, was a matter of family agreement concerning nobody else. Unfortunately, Germany thinks otherwise. Germany insists upon treating Canada as though it was a separate country, and has penalized Canada by additional duties on Canadian goods. German newspapers frankly explain that this is a policy of re-

prisal, and that it is intended to deter other colonies from giving us the same advantage. This policy of dictation and interference is justified by the belief that we are so wedded to our fiscal system that we cannot defend our colonies, and that any one of them which attempts to establish special relations with us will do so at its own risk and must be left to bear the brunt of foreign hostility. That is putting us in a humiliating position. If we allow it to prevail how can we approach the colonies with appeals to aid us in promoting the union of the empire, or ask them to bear a share of the common burdens? Is it better to cultivate the trade of your own people, or let that go in order that you may keep the trade of those who rightly enough are your competitors and rivals? That is the new position which the people of this empire have to consider. I do not want to hasten their decision. They have two alternatives. They may maintain in its severity the artificial and wrong interpretation which has been placed upon the doctrine of free trade by the small remnant of 'little Englanders,' who profess to be the sole repositories of the doctrines of Cobden and Bright. In that case they will be absolutely precluded either from giving preference in favor to the colonies abroad, or from even protecting the colonies when they offer a favor to us. The second alternative is that we must insist that we will not be bound by any purely technical definition of free trade; that while we seek a free interchange of trade between ourselves and all nations of the world, we will, nevertheless, resume the power of negotiation, and, if necessary, retaliation, whenever our interests or our relations with the colonies are threatened by other people."

On the 20th, Mr. Chamberlain made two speeches of the same tenor in London, one at the Guildhall, upon receiving congratulations upon the results of his mission to South Africa, and the other at the Mansion House, at a luncheon given to him and Mrs. Chamberlain by the Lord Mayor.

The subject came up in the House of Commons on the 28th. Sir Charles Dilke, of the Radical faction of the Liberal party, interpellated the ministry with a question regarding the significance of Mr. Chamberlain's speeches. He asked—

whether Mr. Chamberlain, in advocating something in the nature of a protective tariff, spoke with the authority of the financial department or of the whole cabinet, and also whether negotiations had been opened with the colonies.

He reenforced his questions with an

effective speech. In reply, according to the cable reports—

Mr. Balfour deprecated "the waving of the ragged, moth-eaten flags of either the protectionist or the free trader in the controversy now as far removed as the poles from the controversy of half a century ago." A part of the speech of the honorable baronet, the Prime Minister said, had been devoted not to the fiscal policy of the country, but to the less elevated object of making mischief between Mr. Chamberlain and himself. Continuing, the Premier asserted that the position of the British islands is entirely different from what it was in 1846 and 1847. It is different from what the free traders supposed it would be. They predicted that free trade would become universal, but they were wrong. England is the only free trade country in the world, and if the present condition of things continues, the time must come when England's only neutral markets will be the Turkish empire, the British protectorate and crown colonies, and India. England would then be in a position where she would be obliged to import a large proportion of food stuffs and raw material and would have to pay for them with exports which she would find it extremely difficult to dispose of in any but the countries he had named. He therefore urged "that the time has come when it should be publicly discussed whether the doctrine that revenue was never to be raised except for purposes of expenditure must not be abandoned."

With reference to negotiations with the colonies, he said that if foreign countries were to be allowed to treat British colonies as foreign nations, England must be forced by patriotic motives and a regard for her colonies to retaliate. Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and India were parts of the empire, and it would be absurd for them to be treated as separate aggregations because they had been given self-government. If preference was to be given to imports for the benefit of the colonies, they, in exchange, would mitigate the severity of their hostile tariffs against England. That could only be done by taxing the food of the people and raw materials. The Premier said that he did not think it would be wise to tax raw material. He did not know whether a tax on food would be accepted, but unless something of the kind was accepted the scheme could not be carried out. He did not feel sure that certain wealthy classes in England would repudiate the suggestion, as had been intimated. He did not know whether the working classes of the country or whether the colonies would accept the proposed tariff modifications, as had been asked, although he knew the traditional objections of the for-

mer to taxation of food and of the latter to abandoning protection. If these objections could not be overcome, this plan would have to go. It was not the case that the plan had been originated by Chamberlain as a policy of his own without consulting his colleagues. He, himself, was in agreement with the colonial secretary, and if this scheme or some other were not practicable the empire could not be brought to that stage of fruition that had occurred in the United States of America.

When the Premier had finished, Mr. Chamberlain took the floor. He expressed surprise at the special attention his Birmingham speech had attracted, remarking that it was absolutely the same in substance as speeches delivered before by Lord Salisbury and by Mr. Balfour, between whom and himself there was no difference of opinion. There was no intention, he insisted, of reversing Great Britain's fiscal policy, if Cobden's definition of free trade as "a free exchange of commodities at their natural prices" is accepted. But—

Although nothing is now suggested in the nature of a reversal of Great Britain's fiscal policy, it is certain that a mandate must be given the ministry if the suggestions he had thrown out are to be carried into effect. He would do his utmost to bring this question in all its bearings before the people. Thus far he had only raised a principle and had not formulated a plan. If there was to be no change in the fiscal system the country would have to give up all hope of closer fiscal relations with the colonies and must abandon all idea of securing at any time closer political relations with them. If the ministry receives a mandate he will produce a plan. He would call another colonial conference; but he cannot negotiate with the colonies before the people have given a mandate. Everything depends upon what the country has to offer. In the first place, however, he must learn from every manufacturing district what articles made in those districts could be more largely sold if there were preferential rates in the colonies. What Great Britain would have to give is preference on great colonial products, and that preference will have to be on raw material, on food, or on both. He agreed that it is undesirable to tax raw material, because Great Britain would be required to give drawbacks on the finished article, which is a complicated system, and he preferred the simple method of taxing food. The workman's dislike to taxes on food had no terrors for him. He was prepared to go into the homes of the laboring men and argue the subject with them. He

would give them a table showing how much beer and bread they used and exactly how much duty they would have to pay if this policy were carried out. He would also give them a table showing how much extra wages they would require to earn. If the opposition were able to show that it meant greater cost of living with no increase of wages their optimism would be justified, but if he was able to show greater increase of wages than loss on food then "I think I shall have a chance." It was inevitable, if preferential duties were levied, that a tax be placed on foodstuffs, and as the working classes would pay three-quarters of such a tax, it was only fair that this money and the one-quarter paid by the rich classes should be applied to social reforms, like old age pensions. Such a tax is not protective in intention, but, incidentally, it would be protective. He would say to the workman: "Not only do you get back in benefits the whole sum you pay, but also all that is paid by the richer classes. In addition to that, you receive higher wages, and it will be possible to press forward other social reforms, which are at present impracticable for lack of money." He observed that the grain tax, though not intended to be protective, had incidentally protected the farmer. If food were taxed in the future it would not be an unmixed evil, because it would help the depressed industry of agriculture and increase Great Britain's home supply of food. More than that, it would enable her to deal with Germany in defense of Canada. We should not enter on war tariffs, but I would say to Germany 'I am afraid if you cannot meet us in this matter I may be compelled to put a duty on that.'" The Colonial Secretary said repeated representations had been made to Germany in regard to Canada, but he did not see what Germany could do to meet the British views until Great Britain was in a position to touch the pockets of the German people. "Is it not also conceivable," asked Mr. Chamberlain, "that Great Britain would have to defend her trade against unjust competition, such as that of the trusts of America and the continent? At present Great Britain is the one open market of the world, and therefore a general dumping ground. If dull trade comes, the trusts will flood our markets and the markets in which we compete with iron and steel at prices that we cannot meet. If that happens nothing will prevent the people from putting on a duty to protect our staple industry." Mr. Chamberlain concluded with an emphatic assertion that he intended to press the matter on public attention.

With a view to making good the final assurances of this speech in the

Commons, Mr. Chamberlain has invited 6,000 of his constituents to a garden party at Birmingham on the 20th, when he is expected to make another address on his tariff proposals. The cooperative societies of the United Kingdom have formally denounced the proposals. At a delegate convention at Doncaster on the 2d, attended by 1,500 delegates, a resolution emphatically protesting against "any tampering with the free trade policy of this country by preferential tariffs" was adopted with only three dissentient votes.

The principal item of American political news is the assembling of the Republican State convention of Ohio, at Columbus on the 3d. It was in session only an hour on that day. But permanent organization was effected, the usual convention committees were appointed, and the new State central committee was elected. Senator Hanna is reported to have been from the opening in complete control. Of the 21 members of the new State central committee, 17 are described as Hanna men. Senator Hanna presided as temporary chairman. His speech appears to have had reference wholly to national issues, nothing in the reports of it showing that he considered State issues at all.

A judicial election for Cook county (Illinois) judges (p. 81) was held on the 1st, each of the principal political parties presenting a full list of candidates. The result was as follows:

Superior Court:

Republican — Theodore Brentano (reelected).

Circuit Court:

Democrats—Edward F. Dunne (reelected), Murray F. Tuley (reelected), Francis Adams (reelected), Richard W. Clifford (reelected), Charles M. Walker, Frank Baker (reelected), Thomas G. Windes (reelected), Lockwood Honore, Julian W. Mack, Edward Osgood Brown and George Kersten.

Republicans—Richard S. Tuthill (reelected), Frederick A. Smith (reelected), and John Gibbons (reelected).

Three other judges of the Circuit court were voted for under an act of the legislature which has been repealed, but regarding which the repealing act is claimed to be unconstitutional. Those elected were—

Democrats — Thomas M. Hoyne, George Mills Rogers and Joseph A. O'Donnell.

Socialist and Prohibition candidates

were on the ballot, but the result has not yet been officially reported, and the votes for candidates cannot be given.

Reports of great national disasters have made up much of the news of the week. Advices received at Constantinople from Asiatic Turkey on the 28th, told of a terrible earthquake on April 2 at Melazgherd, in the vilayet of Van, 80 miles south and east of Erzeroum, on the Euphrates. The town was totally destroyed, with its entire population, numbering 2,000 souls. These included 700 Armenians, as well as the troops forming the garrison of Melazgherd. In addition over 400 houses in neighboring villages collapsed. Melazgherd is described as being situated on the south side of the Euphrates river, near its source, in a tableland country traversed by mountain ranges running west from the Caucasus mountains. The 2,000 inhabitants of the place were divided about equally between Moslems and Christians. The town had several churches, mosques and bazaars.

A tornado of unparalleled fury struck Gainesville, Ga. on the 1st. "In a space of less than two minutes," says one of the reports, "nearly 200 people were killed, 400 more were injured, of whom not fewer than 50 will die, and property aggregating \$500,000 was reduced to splinters." The day was hot and cloudless. The tornado struck a couple of small houses on the outskirts of the town and then leaped to the Gainesville cotton mills, where the employes were at dinner. It cut the two top stories from the large brick building and cast the bricks a quarter of a mile away. In the debris, or thrown far by the storm, were the bodies of the operatives, many of whom never realized that death was upon them. Not until after the mischief was done did the sky become overcast with a blackish green cloud, making it almost as dark as night. This had been scarcely seen when it leaped to New Holland and then out to Sulphur Springs, towns a few miles distant, where great loss of life was caused. The tornado did not enter the business districts, but made a wide circle around the outskirts of the town, leaving a yawning streak of earth in the place of residences, stores, churches and large buildings. Everything in its path was torn up and scattered far and wide. The first onslaught of the

tempest was without rain, but as soon as the dark cloud appeared the rain began to fall in torrents and those in the streets who, amazed and panic-stricken or wounded by flying debris, were seeking shelter, found themselves swept off their feet by the flood. In this flood, buildings, trees, human bodies and property of all kinds imaginable, were hurled hither and thither by the force of wind and torrent.

Floods have wrought enormous destruction in Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas and Missouri. In Des Moines, Ia., on the 30th, business was entirely suspended, 500 factories and business houses were submerged, 1,000 inhabitants were surrounded by water, and railroad traffic was at a standstill. The flood came so suddenly that no preparations for protection could be made. North Topeka, Kan., suffered on the 30th, with both fire and flood, and many lives were lost. The waters rose higher in the Kansas river than at any other time since 1844. On their joining those of the Missouri at Kansas City, Mo., that place also was submerged. On the 1st it was without gas, electric lights and waterworks, the street car service was very limited and railroad transportation was blocked. Better conditions began to prevail on the 2d as the flood in the rivers subsided. Following is a newspaper estimate, made June 1st, of the damage and casualties:

	Homeless.	Dead.	Losses.
Kansas City, Kan.....	20,000	20	\$2,500,000
Kansas City, Mo.....	10,000	50	2,700,000
Argentine, Kan.....	4,500	..	475,000
Topeka, Kan.....	3,000	34	2,000,000
Ottumwa, Ia.....	3,000	..	100,000
Des Moines, Ia.....	3,000	..	1,000,000
Hutchinson, Kan.....	2,000	..	2,000,000
Manhattan, Kan.....	1,500	50	1,000,000
Eddyville, Ia.....	500	..	25,000
Eldon, Ia.....	..	1	10,000
Council Grove, Kan..	..	14	20,000
Clinton, Ia.....	..	1	3,000
Madison, Ind.....	500	..	100,000

NEWS NOTES.

—At Liverpool on the 31st, T. P. O'Connor was reelected president of the Irish National League.

—On the 28th the Presbyterian General Assembly, in session at Los Angeles (p. 121), completed the adoption of the explanation of certain parts of the Presbyterian confession of faith.

—The Woman's National Single Tax League, of which Mrs. John S. Crosby (7 W. 108th St., New York City) is president, will hold its third annual conference on the 25th, 26th and 27th of June, at New Haven, Conn.

—A general strike at Philadelphia, under the order of the Central Union

of Textile Workers, began on the 1st. The object is to secure higher wages and a 55-hour week. The number of employes involved is 90,000.

—The personal property of ex-Speaker Thomas B. Reed was judicially appraised in New York on the 2d, at \$431,099. It consisted principally of shares in corporations controlling railroad and other landed interests.

—President Roosevelt, after leaving Butte, Mont. (p. 121), on the 27th, was in Idaho on the 28th; in Wyoming on the 29th, 30th and 31st; in Nebraska on the 1st, and in Iowa on the 2d. He reached Illinois at Freeport on the 3d and went southward through the State on that day and the 4th.

—Frederick O. MacCartney, Socialist member of the Massachusetts legislature, died on the 26th, of pneumonia, at the age of 39. He was first elected to the legislature in 1899 and was serving his fourth term at the time of his death. By profession Mr. MacCartney was a Unitarian clergyman.

—The Canadian banking and stock brokerage firm of A. E. Ames & Co., of Toronto, failed on the 2d with liabilities amounting to \$10,000,000. The failure was due to a break in the stock market—more especially to a raid in the New York market upon Canadian Pacific. As a result of this failure, the Atlas Loan Co., of St. Thomas, suspended on the 3d with liabilities to the amount of \$400,000.

—In consequence of the examination of the books of the Workingmen's union at Manila (p. 120), the president of the union, Dominador Gomez, was arrested on the 29th, charged with using the funds of the union to furnish arms and food to "insurgents" in Rizal province. The union has a membership of 15,000, is closely affiliated with the Nationalist party, and is strongly in sympathy with the "insurgents."

—Mrs. T. H. Tibbles, wife of the editor of the Nebraska Independent, died on the 26th. Mrs. Tibbles was the daughter of an Omaha Indian chief. Under the pen name of "Bright Eyes," a translation of her Indian name, she had been a contributor to the newspaper and magazine press. She was also a lecturer and worker for the recognition of the rights of her race.

PRESS OPINIONS.

CHAMBERLAIN'S NEW MOVE.
Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), May 29.—The British government has evidently determined upon early dissolution of parliament and an appeal to the country. As jingoism and territorial aggression will no longer serve as campaign capital, a new issue is imperative. Mr. Chamberlain has one ready. . . . The whole scheme is absurd, and purely political. If the country is asked to pronounce judgment upon it, the answer, we believe, will be emphatic.

ically and overwhelmingly adverse. Chamberlain will not get his mandate; in fact, the election may prove his Waterloo. The British masses will not vote to revive the infamous corn laws.

The (London) *New Age* (Rad.-Lib.), May 21.—Mr. Chamberlain is apparently of opinion that the time has come for him to supersede Mr. Balfour; and he announces a policy—issues, in short, another unauthorized programme. The result of the last did not exactly realize Mr. Chamberlain's anticipations. The Liberals went out and the Tories came in, but Mr. Chamberlain did not become prime minister. As a result of this new move, the Tories may go out, and still Mr. Chamberlain fail to reach his goal. But the point of importance for all good Radicals is that we should keep our eyes open, and be ready for the great fight which may be sprung upon us at any moment. We should make all the running possible on the free trade and the educational questions. On both the Unionists are at loggerheads, and Tory adversity is Liberal opportunity. Nothing can be better for the cause of democracy than the thorough discussion of free trade and education.

HANNAH AND ROOSEVELT.

Cleveland Recorder (Dem.), May 27.—The surrender of Hanna on the proposition to endorse Roosevelt for nomination in 1904 certainly marks the beginning of the end with the great boss of the Republican party.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), May 27.—The withdrawal of Hannah's opposition to the Foraker resolution not only marks the passing of Hanna as a dominating force in Republican national politics, but it marks the collapse of the opposition to Roosevelt's nomination.

Pittsburg (Pa.) Post (Dem.), May 27.—Mr. Roosevelt is left in the revealed predicament of having notified the country that he had asked no man for support, but that since the Ohio issue was up it might as well be settled, and then by private message of having begged Mr. Hanna to clear the track.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), May 29.—Mr. Hannah has reason to be in good humor. He has brought the President a suppliant to his feet, and, magnanimously, he has consented to let the Ohio Republicans endorse the great man for the nomination next year. Just why anybody should consider Mr. Roosevelt the victor in this affair is not clear.

CLEVELAND'S GREATNESS.

The New York Press (Rep.), May 30.—It must be a source of gratification to Mr. Cleveland to know that, whereas by the Sun's measurement he sank from zero in 1884, to minus one million in 1896, remaining stationary until the clash of Theodore Roosevelt with the "trust" powers in 1902, he has ascended in the brief interval since then to plus billions and billions.

MISCELLANY

THOSE WHO TOIL.

For The Public.

I am weary, I am weary;
Life is hard and sad and dreary.
I and joy have long been strangers;
Pleasures are long absent rangers.
Fortune keeps her smiles for others;
I and poverty are brothers.
Hoping, toiling, doing, daring.
Effort I have not been sparing.
Brain and motive I've not needed,
Only—I have not succeeded.
Millions also any time

Are guilty of the selfsame crime.
Disappointment, pain and worry—
That's my pay, for toil and hurry.
I protest amid the huddle,
Society's a goddess muddle.
Cunning, selfishness and sinning
Give the likeliest chance of winning.
Conscience, beauty, pity, kindness,
Pertish in the scramble. Blindness,
Heartlessness, deceit, vain glory,
Make this life a purgatory.
Yes! I'm weary, very weary;
Life is hard and sad and dreary.

Shall I uselessly repine?
No! a nobler part is mine.
Wrong is trampling down the right—
That's a call for me to fight.
Error blinds the masses; so
I must speak the truths I know.
Poverty and crime abound;
Misery everywhere is found.
Then I must not dilly shirk;
I must resolutely work,
Poverty and crime to cure,
And make human miseries fewer.

Oh! how trifling is my load!
Smooth by contrast is the road
I must tread, while bleeding feet,
Cruel thorns, sharp-stones must meet;
Aching and unresting know
Summer's heat and winter's snow,
Bearing loads I could not bear.
Into hopeless, blank despair
I'd be crushed by their dark fate,
Tempted, hungry, desolate!
Helpless children cry for bread!
Hungry women are not fed!
Hearts are breaking—hearts that know
All the depths of human woe!
Souls are lost! Strong souls they were,
Caught at last in evil's snare.
Could I fight where they fought well?
Could I conquer where they fell?
Tempt me not; I am but weak.
I would for the erring speak.
And I speak, I weep for those
Who the dregs of human woes
Daily drink, those who can tell
What it means to live in hell—
Hell of want and madd'ning care.
Not a bright ray anywhere
Shines upon their deep despair.
They must work and weep and toil,
While the owners of the soil
Loll within the silken fold
Purchased by the toilers' gold.
Could I from these crowds who earn
Just enough to starve on, turn
With unsympathetic stare,
Turn with supercilious air
To my gold, and smiling stand
'Mid an idle, useless band
Bent on pleasure? Spurn—could I—
Those who toil and starve and die?
No! by God! I'd rather share
E'en their crimes and their despair;
All their woes would sooner feel,
Than possess a heart of steel.
Or be the sleek "rich fool" who says:
"All these crowds could change their ways
If they chose, and learn to be
Just as wise and good as we."

Yes, indeed, I'm very weary,
And the world is getting weary,
Weary of the silly nostrums
Vended from well paying rostrums
By the various tribes of quacks
Who won't get off the people's backs;
Weary of the rags and tatters
Of old creeds and other matters,

Weary of the man who flatters
Unearned wealth, and idly chatters,
Preaching patience to the toilers,
Breathing blessings on the spoilers.

Weary is the world, I say;
Wearier it will grow each day
Until forced to see the cause
Of its woes in unjust laws—
Laws which make the toiling sinners
Buy the idle fellows' dinners;
Laws which let one landlord call
Part of this terrestrial ball
"Mine," while it belongs to all.

O you pawns, you common folks,
Who bear patiently the yokes
Put upon you by the few;
Don't you see? One thing is true,
Those who own the earth own you.
All your grumbling, growling, toiling,
All your hurry, worry, molling,
Won't enrich you one red cent
Until you divide the rent.
The more you get the more you'll give
In rent for place to toil or live.

Have some common sense and see,
Earth belongs to you and me.
All the timber, all the land,
The rivers and their golden sand;

All the surface, all the mines,
Every gem that in them shines;
All the iron, all the coal—
To us all belongs the whole.
All the silver, all the gold—
We own everything—all told.
Yes! I swear it by the powers,
All this solid earth is ours.

If some big trust should come our way
And want a part of it, I'd say:
"Take just what you want—and pay."
Bigger pay for richer spot.
Bigger pay for corner lot.
Telephone, street car, must pay;
And telegraph, for right of way.
The most convenient right of way

Would justly bring us bigger pay.
We should be the landlords then,
Get our rents in yearly, when
You are ready, working men!

Oh! what strikes, what stress, what pain,
Do you have, and scarce maintain
Undiminished your small gain.
How you fight for shorter hours
While all this bounteous earth is ours.
Stupids, clarify your mentals,
And divide the total rentals.
Franchise values and ground rent—
We produce them, yet consent
Private purse shall take alone
What we all produce and own.
When we claim this earth as ours
You'll not fuss about short hours,
You'll not need to strike for pay
When the rentals come your way;
Nor entreat the employer then—
He will bow to working men.

Not alone for work, but leisure,
Life is given—for joy and pleasure.
Weary hearts there need not be,
Nor joyless homes, if life were free.
Claim your heritage, the earth.
It is yours by right of birth.
You are growing more and stronger;
Waste the precious hours no longer,
Asking small things. Ask for all;
Claim this whole terrestrial ball.
I now proclaim, by right of birth
This earth is ours. Demand the earth.

SAMUEL BRAZIER.

MUZZLING THE LAND SPECULATOR 4,000 YEARS AGO.

"Land must be cultivated, and if neglected the owner had to pay the same as neighboring land!"—Babylonian Code 4,000 years old.

The monument which bears this inscription is a pillar of black diorite eight feet high, and was found by M. de Morgan at Susa, in the Acropolis mound, in December and January, 1901-2. One of the most remarkable historical monuments that has ever been recovered from the buried cities of the ancient world.—The London Times.

TOM JOHNSON'S VICTORY.

A Republican newspaper, commenting upon the Cleveland election, announces gravely that Tom L. Johnson has succeeded in "cramming his humbugs down the throats of the people," and also refers to the "fakir's evanescent popularity."

Without desiring to enter into any political argument or to discuss Johnson's future, it seems to the News that its contemporary is unfair to the Cleveland man. The "humbugs" that the fearless Cleveland mayor has crammed down the throats of the people are the beliefs that it is unfair for a man with \$500,000 worth of property to pay taxes on one-tenth that valuation, while the man with a \$2,000 house pays taxes on two-thirds, and that traction companies have not the right to charge a five-cent fare when they can make a reasonable profit on a three-cent basis. Briefly stated, these are the "humbugs" responsible for Johnson's "evanescent popularity." Other reasons are his courage, his rugged honesty, his business ability, and, what is rare in politics, his belief that promises are made to be kept.

But this talk of "humbug" is rot on its face. There is not a man living who by "humbugging" could be elected mayor three times in a city the size of Cleveland. The people are not so easy as all that.—Wheeling News, quoted in The Commoner.

PARABLE OF THE OFFICE BUILDING.

For The Public.

Now it came to pass that in the land of US, men did build most like unto the Tower of Babel—20 stories high—and called it an office building. This they separated into parts, and let the offices out for hire at so much per, according to location desirability or size.

One man who thus did hire an office spent many shekels on beautiful furni-

ture and extra fittings for his place, and made it a credit to the building, of which the owners were justly proud.

Another man, having an equally desirable office, at the same rent, only put in a few old chairs and a desk.

Then along came another man with money to invest in "futures." Finding a third office unoccupied, as good as the other two, he saw the owners, informed them he wished to buy or rent it, so as to make a profit from some one who would hereafter need it. He would not put anything into it, but would allow neighbors to throw such rubbish as they wished in; and of course, would not expect to pay as much rent as the man who did lots of business in his office.

But the cold-hearted corporation could not see it, saying that offices were rented according to their desirability, regardless of the use made of them, the business done, a man's inheritance, his ability to pay, or the equipment he put in. But if any rebate or lower rent was to be given, it should justly go to the man making improvements which were a credit to the institution, and not to the man acting the dog in the manger, holding opportunities in a disgraceful condition. They did not fine or charge rent to a man on the improvements HE put in.

And they further said unto the investment man: "You should go unto the City or National government, and get land, which is their office building. They encourage the industry of weeds, tin-cans and garbage—holding natural opportunities out of use—by less taxes. And annually fine a man by more taxes for improvements HE makes."

Moral: For common sense in taxation see what modern corporations do, and don't look to fossilized governments that are wedded to ancient traditions.

GEORGE W. PATTERSON.
Denver, Col.

HUMORS OF THE ENGLISH INCOME TAX.

A fact, not altogether free from humor, is that the salary of the English tax collector is a percentage of what he can extract from the taxpayer.

He asks you to send him the amount of your income, and warns you that you will have to pay a penalty of \$250 if you send him a false return. I have it on the authority of Mr. W. S. Gilbert that every Englishman sends a false return and cheats his government; but now a good many men, I am sure, cannot cheat the government, those, for example, in receipt of a sal-

ary from an official post and many others whose incomes it is easy to find out.

Of course some cannot be found out; so that those who cannot conceal their real and whole income have got to pay for those who can.

A merchant sends his return and values it at \$10,000. The collector says to him, if he chooses to do so: "Your return cannot be right. I will charge you \$20,000. Of course, you can appeal."

The merchant is obliged to lose a whole day to attend the court of appeal, taking all his books with him in order to prove that the return he sent is exact.

Very often he pays double what he owes, so as not to have to let everybody know that his business is not as flourishing as people think. But the most amusing side of the whole thing is yet to be told.

If you sell meat in one shop, and groceries in another, and you make \$5,000 in the first, and lose \$3,000 in the second, you must not suppose that you will be charged on \$2,000, the difference between your profit in the first business and the loss in the second. Not a bit of it; the two businesses being distinct, you have to pay on the \$5,000 profit made in the first, and bear your loss in the other as best you can.

As an illustration, I will give you a somewhat piquant reminiscence. Many years ago I undertook to give lectures in England, under my own management. My manager proved to be an incompetent idiot, and I lost money.

When I declared my yearly income I said to the income tax collector: "My books brought me an income of so much, but I lost so much on my lecture tour; my income is the difference; that is, so much!"

"No," he said, "your books and your lectures are two perfectly different things, and I must charge you on the whole income you derived from the sale of your books."

Then I was struck with a luminous idea which proved to me that I was better fitted to deal with the English tax collector than to manage a lecture tour.

"The two things are not at all distinct," I replied; "they are the one and the same thing. I gave lectures for the sole purpose of keeping my name before the public and pushing the sale of my books."

"Ah!" he exclaimed, "you are right; in that case you are entitled to deduct your loss from the profit."

And this is how I got out of the difficulty, a little incident which has made

me proud of my business abilities ever since.—Max O'Rell, in the Chicago Examiner.

GIVING UP.

THE MILLIONAIRE SUNDAY SCHOOL CLASS.

Topic: Giving Up. Golden Thought: Give and Make Others Give.

Leader—You will notice that our topic this morning is Giving Up, which, we infer from the Scripture lesson, means that we must give up something in life. First, let me suggest that we need not worry with the argument of the Nazarene, that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than it is for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven; the comparison is not well drawn, for all depends upon the size of the needle and the camel.

He also mentions that we should give all we have to the poor, but we know that it would be simply folly to consider that literally. The Nazarene was undoubtedly a wise person, but he never managed a coal trust, nor an oil trust, nor a beef trust. If he lived to-day and should happen to be president of an oil company, and should attempt to do business on those lines, he would soon go to the wall. (Unanimous assent from the class.)

These injunctions must be taken practically. We naturally desire a few shares of the future life, therefore we know that it is business to give up something that will extend our influence with the Creator of all natural products—the one who made a universe of trusts, each of which he holds in the hollow of his hand. The question is: What will be the easiest service for us? Giving!

Now we come to the underlying thought. The command to give is virtually a command to get, for we cannot give unless we first get something to give. How shall we get it to give? From the people! This will be a twofold work: When we get it from other people that we may give up, we will be making them give up, too, and they unconsciously will be saving their souls.

I should like to have an expression from a number of the class as to how we can arrange to give up something according to these principles. As for myself, I have advanced the price of oil two cents on the gallon, and at the end of a year I not only will have made others give up, but will have gotten enough extra profit to enable me to give a few hundred thousands to a university.

Coal Operator—I can easily cut miners' wages and clear enough to endow charities to help the poor buy fuel.

Head of Beef Trust—I can fix the prices of beef and other meats and raise a sum to establish friendly inns and soup houses for those who cannot get enough work to live.

Steel Trust Magnate—I can manage to clear the price of a few free libraries where people can read and forget their miseries.

Head of Sugar Trust—I can make people give up enough extra for sugar to defray the expenses of a hundred or so missionaries in Cuba and the Philippines.

Leader—This is what I call a practical Christian spirit. By our works we shall be known!—James Ravenscroft, in Life.

THE MAN IN THE DESERT.

There are incidents in the individual life that fasten on the mind and remain vivid so long as memory itself endures.

Such an experience came to me in the Idaho desert.

I was aboard a train, traveling eastward. As we sped over the dreary desert, flat almost as the ocean, and so alkaline that only the low, scraggy sagebrush will grow at clumpy intervals, the train stopped about nightfall at what was marked on the railroad map as a station.

There was a little shed for a depot, and a huge water tank and a fuel bin for the locomotive; and two or three frame houses not far away.

Nothing else appeared but sunset sky and alkaline prairie, the latter cut in halves by straight lines of steel track.

It was as lonely a place as ever a coyote prowled over.

The arrival of this train was one of the events of the day, yet so few people lived in that part of the world that only three or four men were at the station to meet it.

The engine took water and fuel. From one of the forward cars a bundle of newspapers and a small mail pouch were thrown off, and a small pouch taken on.

The signal was then given to start. But scarcely had the train got in motion, when it stopped with a tremulous jolt.

The conductor and brakeman got off, ran back, disappeared under the last car, which was a sleeper, and

pulled forth a dusty, forlorn-looking man.

He had sprawled himself out, face downward, across the beams of the rear truck, within a few inches of the revolving axle, intending, doubtless, in that fashion to ride during the night through the clouds of dry, choking alkaline dust that sifted past double windows into the sleeping cars and covered all within with a fine powder.

When the man had been pulled out the signal was given to go ahead.

The train again started. But the man was not to be left behind. He bounded forward and darted under the rear car, between the front and rear trucks. Practice, doubtless, had made him skillful in the dangerous feat of climbing in over a car's moving wheels.

Again there was a jolting and a jarring, and the train stopped. Again the man was dragged out, the trainmen using threats this time. And they saw that he did not try the thing again, as at last the train moved on without him.

The miserable man from first to last said not a word.

And there he was left, standing on the track; a stolid, motionless, silent figure, that became smaller and smaller as the train drew away, until figure and station, houses and water tank, were lost in the gray of the desert and the shades of descending night.

Who was he—this man? Who, indeed? Had he credentials? What! he, who had scarcely better than rags to cover him, and must needs ride cheek by jowl with death, to get through the desert?

Who would believe him, even if he told the truth? Left at nightfall at a stopping place in this vast sea of sand, where men are few, and where such as he are regarded with suspicion. Perhaps if he should ask for alms and a sleeping-place he would, instead, get the dog!

Marooned in the desert!

Marooned as much as ever the victim of buccaneers was along the Spanish main.

Marooned! with miles upon miles to the next station, and the next station is just as inhospitable as the last; and with never a drop of sweet nature's water by the way!

This is one of the too frequent pictures of the vast, the naturally bounte-

ous, the wonderfully varied west. Its population is as nothing, yet its lands suitable for farms, its forests, its mineral regions, its grazing tracts, its very watersheds and watercourses are enclosed. Not a ten-thousandth part in use, or, at least, its highest use, but practically the whole held speculatively for a "rise." It is a colossal speculation in a prime necessity of human life—in mother earth.

The masses of men are cut off from access to the soil, save at an increasing price, and more and more men cannot pay the price. They cannot become fixed to the soil, but are compelled to roam about in quest of work. They roam and roam, until hope dies within them, and pride is smothered. Then they become human coyotes called "tramps."

In a letter written from France in 1785 to Rev. James Madison, Thomas Jefferson said:

Whenever there is, in any country, uncultivated lands and unemployed poor, it is clear that the laws of property have been so far extended as to violate natural right. The earth is given as a common stock for man to labor and live on. If for the encouragement of industry we allow it to be appropriated, we must take care that other employment be provided to those excluded from the appropriation. If we do not, the fundamental right to labor on the earth returns to the unemployed.

This means that instead of making human coyotes, we should open the land to labor—we should tax out the speculators.—Henry George, Jr., in *Boyce's Weekly* for Feb. 11.

THE GOOD JUDGE.
CONTEMPORARY HISTORY
by
Anatole France.

Translated for *The Public* by Frank W. Garrison.

M. Goubin wiped his glasses. He had tender eyes and a penetrating glance, and he looked at Jean Marteau intently and said with more surprise than sympathy: "You say you have not eaten for 36 hours?"

"That is true," replied Jean Marteau. "I have eaten nothing for 36 hours. But I erred—it is bad form to lack food. Hunger should be a crime like vagrancy; but in reality the two crimes are identical and article 269 punishes with from three to six months in prison those who have no means of support. Vagrancy, says the code, is the state of vagrancy. The great offenders are persons whom no lord owns as his vassals, who have neither home nor means of subsist-

ence, and who do not habitually engage in any trade or profession."

"It is remarkable," said M. Bergeret. "that the conditions of these vagrants, liable to six months' imprisonment and ten years' surveillance, is precisely that in which the good St. Francis placed his companions. St. Francis of Assise and St. Anthony of Padua, if they came to preach in Paris to-day, would stand a very good chance of being summarily dispatched to the 'lock-up.' I do not say this to turn the police upon the wandering monks now swarming here. They have means of support and practice all trades."

"They are respectable because they are rich," said Jean Marteau, "and vagrancy is only forbidden to the poor. If I had been found under my pear tree, I should have been arrested and that would have been justice. Possessing nothing I should have been presumably an enemy of property and it is justice to defend property from its enemies. The august task of the judge is to secure to each one that which is his, to the rich man his riches and to the poor man his poverty."

"I have meditated upon the philosophy of law," said M. Bergeret, "and have concluded that all the justice of society is based upon two axioms: 'Theft is infamous.' 'The product of theft is sacred.' Those are the principles which assure the security of individuals and maintain order in the state. If one of these guardian principles were forgotten the whole structure of society would crumble. They were established at the beginning of the ages. A chief clad in a bear skin, armed with a stone hatchet and a sword of bronze, with his companions entered the stone enclosure where the children of the tribe were gathered with the herd of women and reindeer. They had carried off the girls' and young men of the neighboring tribe and took with them the meteoric stones which were precious because swords which would not bend could be made from them. The chief climbed a hillock in the enclosure and said: 'These slaves and this iron which I have taken from the weak and despised are mine; whoever stretches his hand over them will be struck with my hatchet!' Such is the origin of laws. They are old and barbarous in spirit, but since justice is the consecration of all injustices, everyone is satisfied. A judge may be good, for men are not all wicked; but law cannot be good, because it is prior to all idea of justice. The changes that have been made in it in the course of time have not altered

its original character. Jurists have made it subtle but left it barbarous. In fact it owes its respectability and seeming authority to its ferocity. Men are inclined to worship strange gods, and that which is not cruel does not seem venerable to them. The amenable believe in the justice of laws; they have no moral standard higher than the judges, and, like them, believe that because an action is punished it is deserving of punishment. I have often been touched to see in the police courts or courts of assizes that the prisoner and the judge are perfectly at one in their conception of good and bad. They have the same prejudices and a common moral standard."

"It could not be otherwise," said Jean Marteau; "an unfortunate who has stolen a sausage or a pair of shoes has not on that account penetrated deeply or with profound insight the origin of law and the foundations of justice. While those of us who are not afraid to see in the origin of codes a consecration of violence and iniquity, are incapable of stealing a cent."

"But, after all," said M. Goubin, "there are just laws."

"Do you think so?" demanded Jean Marteau.

"M. Goubin is right," said M. Bergeret. "There are just laws; but law having been instituted for the defense of society, cannot be in spirit more equitable than that society. So long as society is founded on injustice the function of the laws will be to defend and sustain injustice. And the more unjust they are the more respectable they will seem. Observe, also, that, being ancient, for the most part, they do not represent altogether present iniquity, but a past iniquity—rougher and more brutal. They are the monuments for barbarous times which have survived to a gentler period."

"But they are revised," said M. Goubin.

"They are revised," replied M. Bergeret. "The Chamber of Deputies and the Senate work over them when they have nothing else to do. But the harsh fundamental principle remains. As a matter of fact I should not greatly fear bad laws if they were interpreted by good judges. It is held that law is inflexible. I do not think so. There is no text which does not lend itself to divine interpretations. Law is dead—the magistrate is living. He has a great advantage over it. Unfortunately he seldom makes use of it. Ordinarily he proves more dead, colder and more insensible than the text which he inter-

prets. He is not human; he has no pity. The spirit of caste stifles all sympathy within him. I refer only to upright magistrates."

"Most of them are upright," said M. Goubin.

"Most of them are upright," assented M. Bergeret, "if we refer to common righteousness and morality. But is it enough to be simply an upright man in order to exercise without error or abuse the monstrous power of punishment? The good judge ought to unite simple rectitude with the philisophic spirit. That is a good deal to ask of a man who is intent on his career and anxious for promotion. Not to mention the fact that if he shows a moral sense superior to that of his time he will become odious in the eyes of his colleagues and arouse universal indignation. For, all morality which is not our own, we class as immorality. All those who have brought a little new goodness into the world have earned the contempt of upright men. Precisely that has happened to President Magnaud. Here are his decisions collected in a little volume. When they were pronounced, austere magistrates and virtuous legislators were indignant. The decisions are marked by a profound philosophy and delicate feeling. They betray a most elevated mind and tender soul. They are full of pity; they are human; they are just. It was the opinion of the bench that President Magnaud did not have the judicial mind, and the friends of M. Meline accused him of not having enough respect for property. It is true that the 'whereases' on which his judgments rest are singular, for every line betrays an independent mind and a generous heart." M. Bergeret, taking a little volume from the table, turned the leaves and read:

Probity and delicacy are virtues much easier to practice when one does not lack anything, than when one is destitute.

That which cannot be averted ought not to be punished.

In order justly to appreciate the crime of the indigent, the judge ought, momentarily, to forget the comfort which he enjoys, so that he may put himself as nearly as possible in the unfortunate place of the destitute.

The care of the judge in his interpretation of the law ought not to be limited to the special case which is submitted to him, but should extend to the consequences, good or bad, which his decision might produce in a general way.

"And I have cited almost at random," added M. Bergeret, closing the book. "They are living words reflecting a noble soul."

Mr. Carnegie's gift of \$1,500,000 to put up a building for The Hague Court

of Arbitration to sit in is indeed warming.

At the time of the Homestead imbroglio (Judge Gray instructs us that strikes are not war) Mr. Carnegie got himself talked about some by his reluctance to arbitrate.

But if he had arbitrated, the chances are he would have been beaten and forced to raise wages, and if he had raised wages, who may say that he would nevertheless have this \$1,500,000 about his clothes?

Time is never in a better business than when it is vindicating the purposes of great and good men.—Life.

"David B. Hill doesn't seem to be so conspicuous as he used to be."

"No; he ought to petition the New York legislature to change his name to Valley." G. T. E.

When it was proposed to create yet more public offices, the stupid masses were made suspicious.

"There is no work for more offices!" protested the masses.

But fortunately constructive statesmen were not lacking.

"More offices," explained these, "will necessitate the erection of additional public buildings, which means a graft for about everybody."

Now the masses changed their tune and filled the air with paeans of thanksgiving, in that there was somebody at hand to tell them what was what.—Puck.

"Don't you think three-cent street car fares would pay?"

"Oh, I don't know as to that; but if they were legalized it would be gross injustice to the shoe dealers."

G. T. E.

I'm glad the sky is painted blue,
And the earth is painted green,
With such a lot of nice fresh air
All sandwiched in between.
—Unknown.

The Englishman, the Russian and the American rushed into one another's arms. "We are brothers!" they exclaimed.

The Boer, the Finn and the Filipino wondered—not because of the assertion—they wondered that for once the gentlemen had spoken the truth.

G. T. E.

BOOKS

THE LOST ART OF READING.

If a reader has not lost this art, he will find exceeding delight in this book (The Lost Art of Reading, by Gerald Stanley Lee, Putnam's Sons, \$1.75). He will like to own it and keep it near, that he may, at any time, and especial-

ly when depressed by the literary rush, take it up for ten minutes or an hour or longer. After he has got into fairly intimate acquaintance with the scope and spirit of it, he will not care much at what page it falls open; he will like to browse about in it anywhere. It will be a very good test for him whether he has lost the art of reading—as expounded by the author. For if he has, then the chances are that he will be utterly unable to get on with it. No hustler need apply.

The pity is that those who need it most may most likely find it hard reading.

I would enjoin upon the intending reader not to give up too soon, not to be deterred by certain mannerisms in the table of contents or in the very first section, and not to be discouraged by the thought that he has lost the art until he has read—at least to midway page five. There he will come upon the following:

"One almost wonders sometimes, why it is that the sun keeps on year after year and day after day turning the globe around and around, heating it and lighting it and keeping things growing on it, when, after all, when all is said and done (crowded with wonder and with things to live with, as it is), it is a comparatively empty globe. No one seems to be using it very much, or paying very much attention to it, or getting very much out of it. There are never more than a few men on it at a time, who can be said to be really living on it. They are engaged in getting a living and in hoping that they are going to live sometime. They are also going to read sometime."

The author does not tell us why nearly all of us have to be engaged all the time in getting a living and can only hope to live sometime; but he does tell us with wonderful insight and cleverness how the modern rush to gain life is destroying the good and beautiful things that make it worth living. It is especially the literary rush—the rush for quick-raising culture and get-there education—with which he deals.

With all its lightness of style and play of delicate satire, it is a serious book. It is a book that the American public at the present stage of our game of life would do well to ponder. There are certain sets of people that ought surely to take it to heart—such as teachers and librarians and all promoters of organized knowledge. It is perhaps the author's central point of attack, where he satirizes and tells the truth about the deadening effects of so much organization and machinery in the modern processes of promoting education. In crisp but pleasant humor and in good form, he pleads for freer spirit, and protests against subjecting every earthly and heavenly thing to science and system.

As to the subject announced in the

book's inadequate title, the author's conclusion is: "There is but one way to recover the lost art of reading. It is to recover the lost art of living."

It seems to me that his word "recover" is unfortunate. It is too limited. We want not only a recovery of the art of living for the few, who seem once to have known it better than any of us in these days know it, but we want, and for the salvation of democracy must have, more chance for all of us to learn this art.

"The poor, the poor, the poor they stand Wedged by the pressing of Trade's hand Against the inward-opening door That pressure tightens evermore: They sigh a monstrous foul-air sigh For the outside leagues of liberty, Where Art, sweet lark, translates the sky Into a heavenly melody."

With this thought of Lanier, and remembering the presence and inevitable demands of democracy, let Mr. Lee give us another book. If he will trace the relation of the art of living to modern social conditions, and will face the problem with the same brave candor

and philosophic insight which he has shown in his present volume, he will, I believe, perform a great service.

J. H. DILLARD.

PERIODICALS.

The Booklovers Magazine, a publication that improves with every issue, opens for June with a rare collection of portraits and signed biographies of men of the time who are about passing from the stage.

Trumbull White's "The Red Book" (Chicago), the second number of which, the number for June, is just out, is distinctively a short story magazine.

It can hardly be said that Everybody's Magazine is much improved by its change of publishers. There is more of a hustling tone in its announcements, which are disagreeably lacking in dignity, and are almost as much "too personally familiar" as street car advertisements.

McClure's for June is attractive without and within. The light-blue cover is very pleasing and summer-looking. The leading article by John La Farge on the "Barbizon School" is the most important art paper that has appeared for some time.

Virgil," one of the famous paintings of the world, he was the last in the competition, obtaining only the number sixty."

The May number of the Nineteenth Century opens with a vigorous attack upon the Irish land bill, in which all manner of ill results are predicted. There is a very interesting paper on the Social Democratic party in Germany, showing an inevitable conflict of some kind between this party and the Emperor.

Gen. Wm. H. Carter, U. S. A., has an article in Scribner's Magazine for June on the War Department. While confessing that "the Department has not come unscathed from the wordy conflict," he writes with great enthusiasm of the recent achievements of the army.

REAL BARGAINS IN BOOKS

Socialism and the Social Movement in the 19th Century

By WERNER SOMBART

Professor in the University of Breslau.

With a Chronicle of the 1750 Social Movement — 1896.

Cloth, 12 mo, published at . . . \$1.35 Net 65 Cents . . . Postage 10 Cents Extra

Sombart's treatise on Socialism impresses me as admirable, and the translation is certainly an excellent piece of work.—J. P. Clark, Professor of Political Economy in Columbia University.

The Slavery of Our Times

By LEO TOLSTOI.

Cloth, 12 mo. Published at \$1.25 Net 65 Cents. Postage 10 Cents Extra

The author in this book treats of modern industrialism. He claims that slavery exists among us and traces its cause; declares that the public is indifferent to the ruin of men's lives, and that science exonerates the existing system;

We Buy } For Cash
We Sell }

Any of These Books Mailed for 75 Cents

All Four for

\$2.50

Send for our Catalogues of Best Books at Low Prices

ANARCHISM

A Criticism and History of the Anarchist Theory.

By E. V. ZENKER.

Cloth, 338 pages, . . . Published at \$1.50 Net 65 Cents . . . Postage 10 Cents Extra

"The fullest and best account of anarchism ever published . . . A most powerful and trenchant criticism."—London Book Gazette.

The Trusts

What Can We Do With Them? What Can They Do For Us?

By William Miller Collier.

New York State Civil Service Commissioner and Recently Appointed, by the President, Special Solicitor General to Prosecute the Trusts.

Cloth, 346 Pages, . . . Published at \$1.25 Net 65 Cents. Postage, 10 Cents Extra

A careful discussion of the economic and political questions springing out of the great trust problem, dealing with the industrial benefits and evils of trusts, and also the necessary restrictions and limitations that must be put upon them.

20th Century Press, 17 East 16th Street, New York



A NECESSARY REMINDER.

"Gentlemen, I'm not a Problem, I'm a MAN!"

more specific articles by the same writer on some such subjects as "War and Commerce," or "Washington and Funston,"

or "The Water Cure as Practiced by Our Highly Civilized and Intelligent Troops." J. H. D.

The Sunday Afternoon Meetings to be Continued Throughout June.

LECTURES ON ECONOMIC SUBJECTS

At HANDEL HALL, 40 East Randolph Street

SUNDAY AFTERNOONS, AT 3 O'CLOCK

UNDER AUSPICES OF THE

HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION

JOHN Z. WHITE

Will Lecture Each Sunday Afternoon during June. Subject "Questions and Answers on the Single Tax."

Lectures every Thursday Evening throughout the year in Lecture Hall, 608, same building.



- THURSDAY, JUNE 11th — **HON. JOHN J. McMANAMAN**, "The Grand Jury System."
- THURSDAY, JUNE 18th — **GEO. A. SCHILLING**, "Twenty-Eight Years in the Labor Movement in Chicago."
- THURSDAY, JUNE 26th — **H. B. LOOMIS**, "The Single Tax."
- THURSDAY, JULY 2nd — **HON. THOMAS G. McELLIOTT**, "The Torrens Land System."
- THURSDAY, JULY 9th — **LEON HORNSTEIN**, "A Review of Tom Watson's 'Story of France.'"
- THURSDAY, JULY 16th — **JACOB C. LeBOSKY**, "The Sweat Box—The Tool of Tyranny."
- THURSDAY, JULY 23rd — **ADDISON BLAKELY**, "A Review of Henry Demorest Lloyd's 'A Country Without Strikes.'"

THURSDAY, JULY 30th — **HONORE J. JAXON**, Secretary for the National Council of Metis or French Indian Federation of the N.W. "A Review of the Causes and Events of the Riel Rebellion."

THURSDAY, AUG. 6th — **L. P. STRAUBE**, Secretary and Business Manager of Allied Printing Trades Council and Editor of Allied Printing Trades Journal. "The Relation of Labor Unions to the Question of Taxation."

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.

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

CONTRACTORS.

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

HENRY GEORGE

Shortly before his death wrote: "I most heartily commend 'From Earth's Center.' It contains in entertaining form an explanation of the practical workings of the 'Single Tax,' and is in many other matters of social concern suggestive to a high degree." Only a few copies of this book are still for sale. 274 pages. We offer them while they last at ten cents each; postage six cents.
CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, PUBLISHERS,
56 FIFTH AVENUE, CHICAGO.

THREE DAINTY BOOKLETS

The Ghost of Murdered Love
Fables and Parables by Avery Quercus
The Straight Edge Cooperative Industries

Sent to any person suspected of interest in this sort of thing. The enclosure of a dime arouses the suspicion.

STRAIGHT EDGE, 1 7th Ave., N.Y.

HAVE YOU READ

SWEDENBERG ?

I will send "Heaven and Hell," paper cover, 416 pages, for Twenty Cents in stamps.
REV. L. G. SWEDENBERG,
8741 Windsor Place, St. Louis, Mo.

Volume V of The Public

Complete Volumes, including index, sent post paid at Regular Subscription price, \$2.00.

BOUND VOLUMES, PRICE, \$3.00, by Express, prepaid, \$3.50, are ready for delivery. Address,
PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.