

# The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 23, 1903.

Number 268.

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.

Gov. Yates, having signed the Mueller bill (p. 51) authorizing municipal ownership and operation of street cars, that measure is now a law in Illinois. —

In his message of approval, the Governor enumerated many objections to this measure, some of which are of little or no importance. But many of his objections are very important indeed. So much so that his assurance is a welcome one, that if the city council of Chicago undertakes to misuse the power conferred upon it by the measure, he will at once call the legislature together in special session to protect the people. The Governor is to be commended for his voluminous presentation of objections to the bill as an imperfect measure, which it certainly is. He is, at the same time, paradoxical as it may seem, to be commended for signing it with all its imperfections; for even an imperfect measure recognizing the principle of municipal ownership and operation is better than none. —

The essential objection to the Mueller bill is that it reposes in the city council unrestrained authority over matters in which the traction companies are most vitally concerned. The referendum is put into a strait-jacket, and the initiative has been excluded with marked premeditation and deliberation. But for this, the objection that too much discretionary power is conferred upon the city would be invalid. Too much power over the regulation of its local affairs cannot be conferred upon

the city. But too much can be conferred upon agents of the city; and the Mueller law offends in this respect when it invests the city council with so much power, while carefully cutting off in important directions all opportunity for the effective use of the popular mandate. —

The plain truth about the matter is not far to seek. Under pretense of procuring a municipal ownership law, certain influential interests in Chicago, firmly opposed to municipal ownership and desiring to postpone it indefinitely, had altogether too much to say in shaping the Mueller bill. While assenting to the authorization of municipal ownership in general terms, they so manipulated the details of the measure as to enable either a corrupt council, or a council dominated by "good citizens" with valuable financial interests, to head off the municipal-ownership movement in spite of popular demand for it. —

This is evident enough now, as the financial interests and their representatives in the city council set up a demand for an immediate and final settlement of the traction question by the council without reference to the people. Mayor Harrison's announcement that he will veto any franchise ordinance that does not provide for a referendum (modified somewhat in later interviews), has excited in certain quarters warm expressions of a very significant impatience. It is conceivable, of course, that the council may grant short franchise extensions, positively terminating at their expiration, in consideration of the waiver by the traction companies of their preposterous 99-year franchise. Such extensions, say for 8 or 10 years, might properly be made without a referendum, sim-

ply as a matter of compromise with the companies. But it is not this kind of franchise extension that our influential financial interests are impatient to make. They are endeavoring to settle the traction question for good and all, by a snap franchise which would leave the city no freer to deal at discretion with the subject—if, indeed, as free—at its expiration than now. In view of that evident purpose, Mayor Harrison should be encouraged to stand by his declaration regarding a referendum. —

So much has been published over the country about the purification of the Chicago city council by the Municipal Voters' league, that these expressions of distrust of the council may need a word of explanation. The Municipal Voters' league has, it is quite true, very completely purged the Chicago council of vulgar corruptionists. It may be said with reasonable confidence that no one could now bribe a "graft" measure through the council in the raw fashion which prevailed before the Municipal Voters' league began its work. But there is a species of venality which such organizations as the Voters' league cannot reach. It has its roots in the natural affiliation of financial interests, and the tendency of "good men" in office to serve those interests regardless of the interests of the people as a whole. It is with such men that the Municipal Voters' league has loaded down the Chicago council, in its laudable and successful effort to purge that body of disreputable corruptionists. What the people of Chicago have now to meet, therefore, under the Mueller law, is the bad tendency of "good" councilmen to conserve oppressive corporation interests while incidentally promoting profitable real estate investments.

Now that President Roosevelt has got beyond the reach of the brother of the assassin of McKinley, it may be no longer lese majeste to note and comment upon the action of the authorities in southern California with reference to this unfortunate man. John Czolgosz is not known to have committed any crime. Nothing is known against him except that his father and mother were also the father and mother of the Czolgosz who killed McKinley. He is an American by birth, by education, by association, and by continuous residence. Yet, he was arrested, when President Roosevelt came into California, not for any crime he had committed or was suspected of intending to commit, but solely as a "precautionary measure" for the protection of the President. The only difference between this sort of thing and what they used to do in France just before the great revolution is in the number of victims. When the police can arrest American citizens without any other cause than that a dead brother was once a criminal, and simply as a "precautionary measure," it is evident that we are getting perilously near to a state of affairs calculated not to suppress anarchy but to produce it.

A curious petition for relief has been addressed to President Roosevelt. It is a bitter plaint from manufacturers of agricultural implements, and is curious because it reads so much like a trade union "tirade" or a "calamity howler's" speech. According to this petition, the great trusts on which the petitioners are dependent for materials, are using these manufacturers as errand boys to collect trust prices of farmers and turn over the proceeds to the trusts. They are able to keep none of the high profits for themselves. It seems, however, that one farm implement manufacturing concern has been able to circumvent the trusts, and the way in which it has done so is instructive. It has made its raw materials secure by providing them for itself.

To that end it has purchased mills, factories, furnaces, etc. But its managers have realized that this would not be enough. Producing plants do not yield raw material. To be quite out of the reach of trust dictation, you must get closer to the earth than that. And so thought the agricultural implement concern which circumvented the trusts, for it also bought timber lands and iron mines. For this reason it is now able to boast that it is no longer dependent upon any trust for its raw materials. The other agricultural implement manufacturers are unhappy calamity howlers who know not how prosperous are these very prosperous times. But they have done a wise thing. By appealing to Mr. Roosevelt they are certain either to get prosperity out of his bountiful horn of plenty, or to learn that they are missing it because they are incapables.

And now it transpires that the whole of Gen. Miles's report on conditions in the Philippines (pp. 49, 56), has not been published. The same policy of suppression and falsification that has prevailed from the beginning over the Philippine business is maintained to the last. A garbled report was published by the press after two months of total suppression; but whenever Herbert Welsh has applied for a copy of the report itself he has been told, first, that the report is not published, and second, that it is an inspector's report, and therefore confidential. There is a particularly ripe flavor about the excuse that a report of the commanding general of the army is an "inspector's" report; and, besides, this excuse has been removed by the garbled publication. No legitimate reason remains for suppression. It is a sensible suggestion, therefore, that Mr. Welsh (whose record entitles his suggestions to respectful consideration) makes when he proposes that the proper authorities be bombarded with courteous letters asking for a full copy of Miles's report. Such letters ought to be addressed to the

President, to Hon. Elihu Root, secretary of war; to Adjutant General H. C. Corbin, to Judge Advocate General George B. Davis, to Assistant Adjutant General W. P. Hall, and to Assistant Adjutant General William Ennis. As Mr. Welsh truly says, "either the hidden and suppressed report will at last see the light in response to popular demand, or the ominous fact will be demonstrated that the people of the country do not wish to meet intelligently and fairly a grave responsibility resting upon them."

The astonishing action of Postmaster General Payne, with reference to the revelations of a former cashier in the Washington city post office, need excite no wonder. Neither need anyone be at the fond trouble of imagining that the President will rebuke the postal member of his cabinet in his effort to suppress exposure of postal corruption. The Postmaster General is protecting the honor of the service in one department, precisely as the Secretary of War is protecting it in another. If President Roosevelt supports Mr. Root in guarding the "honor of the army" by suppressing exposures of savagery on the part of some of its officers and shielding them from punishment, why should he rebuke Mr. Payne for guarding the honor of the post office by suppressing revelations of corruption on the part of some of its officials and shielding them from punishment?

Human nature is pretty much the same wherever you find it. Here are Russian officials explaining the necessity for mobbing Jews in Russia, with the same kind of arguments that white men use to justify the mobbing of Negroes, and which American patriots bring forth to excuse water torture in the Philippines. "Give a dog a bad name and kill him," the old adage has it; a new version might run, "Call a race inferior and torture it."

In Cleveland a racket has been raised over the announced intention

of the board of public service to allow non-professional baseball games in the public parks on Sunday. It seems that there is a puritanical law on the statute books of Ohio, which forbids Sunday ball playing; and, as this is interpreted to apply to non-professional as well as professional playing, the board has been obliged to interfere with the boys of Cleveland who wish to play in the parks on Sundays. As might be inferred, a group of clergymen of the pharisaical variety are the strenuous leaders in demanding the enforcement of this modern blue-law. It is interesting to observe the civic antics of pagan pietists like these. They look calmly upon the robbing of their city, by liberal cash contributors to their church treasuries; but they turn pale with puritanical horror at the sight of a boy and a bat and a ball in the ball grounds of the public park on Sunday. Why is it any worse on Sunday to play at ball in a park than to play at religion in a pulpit?

Auditor Wright, of Cuyahoga county, Ohio, who is doing his best to secure fair assessments of railroad property, is meeting with the same obstacles from his fellow auditors that Mayor Johnson encountered before Wright's advent (p. 19) and when the whole auditorial outfit were evidently sub-agents of the railroads. At one meeting of the board, held in Cleveland on the 15th, Wright's request that Prof. Bemis be heard, called out an objection from a fellow auditor, who said that all the auditors present had either listened to Bemis or were familiar with his material. Wright disposed of this objection with neatness and dispatch as well as with a certain degree of illumination as to the objecting auditor's motives. He asked the objecting auditors some questions about the railroad under consideration which developed a degree of ignorance of the subject so dense that all further objections to hearing Bemis were withdrawn. But it made no difference with the final decision. Most

of the auditors were on hand in the interest of the roads, and they acted up to the full measure of their corporate obligations. The road in question was the Cleveland & Mahoning Valley, the gross earnings of which have increased since 1897 fully 50 per cent., while the tax assessment—not the tax, but the tax valuation—has increased only 1 per cent. The auditors of Ohio are making good campaign material for Mayor Johnson.

The effrontery of these Ohio auditors was especially refreshing when the tax assessment of the N. Y. P. & O. railroad was made, which occurred on the 14th. As was reported by the Cleveland Plaindealer—

early in the meeting and before the board had commenced to vote on the different schedules, it became apparent that a determined effort would be made to sidetrack Prof. Bemis, Mayor Johnson's tax expert. After Auditor Wright had made a brief plea for a reform in appraising the railroad under discussion, and requested permission for Prof. Bemis to speak, the feeling against Bemis took the form of long arguments, numberless questions and counter-arguments, which held up the question of allowing Prof. Bemis to speak. Finally, however, Auditor Wright pounded vigorously for order and demanded a vote on the motion. Auditor Wright virtually insisted that Prof. Bemis address the board. Fifteen minutes were allowed for that purpose and Prof. Bemis outlined his ideas and arguments.

When the work of valuation began, the railroad's agent, Mr. Talcott, was allowed to address the board in the interest of the road. But when Prof. Bemis requested one minute to reply, in the interest of the county, the auditorial friends of the railroads shouted him down with demands for a vote. Then the farcical proceedings went on, as reported in the Plain Dealer, in this manner:

A motion to appraise the rolling stock at \$3,000 a mile, the same figure as that of last year, was amended to read \$3,500. The secretary announced a victory for the friends of higher valuation, but upon closer scrutiny of his list he corrected himself, and the rolling stock went again this year at \$3,000. Then the buildings were appraised at the same old figure, \$228.35 a mile. A spirited attempt to boost the valuation

of the main track was made, but after a long wrangle and many votes the old figure, \$9,000, went through. An attempt was first made to appraise this at \$12,000 a mile, and when this was defeated by the board an attempt toward a compromise was made, with \$10,000 as the figure. Even this was not satisfactory, and it ended in renaming the figure of a year ago, \$9,000. A motion to appraise the second track at \$5,000 was made by Auditor Smith, of Portage county, which is \$1,000 above the return of last year. Tax Agent Talcott at this point arose and remarked that the old figure was only \$4,000. A compromise was effected at \$4,500. After that brief and spasmodic efforts were made to boost the valuation of different schedules, but, except in a few rare cases, the railroad's figures were accepted by the board without a murmur. A trifling increase in the total valuation over that of last year was made, but this was only one-half per cent., or, in round numbers, \$15,922.

In the Associated Press report of the consolidation of the two street car systems of Cleveland, the outside world is informed that "Mayor Johnson is credited with being largely interested" in "the construction of a system of 3-cent fare lines." The obvious intention is to convey an impression that Mayor Johnson is financially interested in the company—the only company, by the way—which stands ready to carry passengers in Cleveland for a three cent cash fare. This would imply that there is a good profit in fares at three cents, and that Mayor Johnson is scheming to get some of it. But if that is true, what do Senator Hanna and other street car magnates all over the country mean when they insist that three cent fares won't pay?

Following close upon the remarkably small majority with which the British ministry defeated the bill for the taxation of land values (p. 44), the London County Council has approved the principle of that bill by a sweeping majority. The committee of the Council recommended approval of the bill itself; but when the Council came to act upon the report, the bill had already been beaten in Parliament. Consequently a motion to amend was made in the Council. This amendment substituted for ap-

proval of the bill, approval of the "principle of the rating of land values by the separate assessment of land and buildings." It was adopted by 76 to 20. There is not much reason left for doubting the progress of the land value taxation principle in England.

The University of Michigan seems to have got a fine specimen of the genus snob into its collection of economic instructors. He is not unique, perhaps, unless in his candor. His name, by the way, is Harrison G. Smalley. Presumably Mr. Smalley's blood is blue; for he praises blue blood, and such as he rarely do that without being inspired by pride of possession. Mr. Smalley places the laborer on a lower plane physically than the capitalist. Not in "sinews, muscles or lungs," he hastens to explain; for that kind of physical inferiority is certainly not characteristic of laborers. What he alludes to is, so he says, "a particular kind of physical inferiority;" by which he appears to mean the blood, for he observes that "the laborer has not the warm, rich, blue blood, which means physical superiority." Inferentially, of course, the capitalist has. So has Mr. Smalley, or he wouldn't be acute enough to discover this comforting difference between the classes he wants to flatter and those for which he wishes to exhibit contempt. But, after all, is Mr. Smalley right about that matter of blue blood? Is the best blood blue, as a scientific fact, or has Mr. Smalley been dropping into poetry? If his description of the best blood as blue is scientific, he ought to cite his authorities. But if it is not scientific but only poetic, one might prefer the authority of a better poet—John Boyle O'Reilly, for instance, who writes—

That the bluest blood is putrid blood  
—that the people's blood is red.

"So you belong to an anti-swearing league. Have you accomplished much good?"

"Yes, indeed. Why, we have persuaded some of the South Water street teamsters to say: 'Oh, fudge!' when their teams tangle up."—Chicago News.

### A POSSIBLE LABOR WAR.

Those of us who reflect upon the crystallizations of sectional hatred over the slavery question, which set in strongly in the later 50's and were precipitated by the Presidential election of 1860, can hardly escape a foreboding feeling that analogous crystallizations of class hatred over the labor question are gathering now.

Men who are on either side of the conflict which these new crystallizations of hate forebode, are much less likely to appreciate the signs than those who come into more or less sympathetic relations with both sides. It was not the men of the North nor the men of the South who foresaw most clearly the terrible cataclysm of the early 60's, but the men of the border States. So now it is not the employing class on the one side nor the organized labor class on the other that most clearly perceive the climax to which the wretchedly unthinking and enormously expanding hatred of each toward the other is moving with the dreadful onrush of two opposing battle lines. One must have the opportunity of entering into the feelings of both sides, if he would realize what is almost surely coming.

He must be able to sympathize with organized labor in its just complaints and to realize the necessity for united action. He must be able to sympathize with employers in their indignation over the aggressions of organized labor. He must be above the narrow field of view which makes the cause of each seem to its devotees altogether right and that of the other altogether wrong. He must be free enough from the blinding fury of either side to realize that both are impatient to run amuck. He will be none the worse as an observer, either, if he understands the essential issue of the conflict well enough to know that this combat of capital and labor is a battle between allies, from which only their common enemy, monopoly, can profit.

To such observers it is plainly evident that the bitterness of the labor struggle, heretofore sporadic, bursting out in one place or another and after a spasm passing away, has become general, and that in intensity it is unprecedented. Never since the

anti-slavery fight have the lines of bitter hatred been so sharply drawn.

Among the older trade union men it is not so noticeable, they having become inured to the feeling sufficiently to have recovered their self-possession in some degree. But the new blood in trade unions thrills with it.

On the other side, Mr. Parry is a type. We may regard him as a blatant spouter if we choose, but the fact remains that he speaks the sentiment of his class and that they are rallying around the banner he has raised. The day is not far off when the business house that does not unite with the other houses of its trade to combat trade unionism, will be to the business world what the "scab" is now to the labor world. To a degree that day has already come. It is not easy, even now, for the managers of business establishments to be on good terms with organized labor and at the same time in first rate repute with "the trade."

In some degree this difficulty may be attributed to the irritating exactions of labor unions, which make it well nigh impossible to manage a business and be altogether on good terms with organized labor. But in much higher degree it is due to the great and growing class bitterness of the business class toward the organized labor class, a bitterness that embraces everything and everybody that encourages, excuses or tolerates unionism, and which is most heartily reciprocated.

The battle line is already pretty distinctly drawn. Employers' unions are forming, not here and there but everywhere, to check the advance of laborers' unions and crush them if possible. They are forming not calmly and from motives of economy, as the trusts have been formed, but with anger at white heat. No less hot is the anger on the other side.

Possibly some accident may intervene to calm this passion and avert the unreasoning combat to which it is leading. But without some such intervention a passionately furious struggle between organized laborers and organized employers seems unavoidable. We are squarely facing a civil war, in which the battle lines will be class lines and not sectional

boundaries. The weapons may not be warlike, but the social disruption and industrial stagnation will be more awful, if possible, than the destruction of military warfare.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, May 21.

The massacre of Jews in Kishineff (p. 52), the capital of the Russian province of Bessarabia, which was formerly a Turkish province, proves to have been much more bloody and horribly cruel than at first reported. The news comes through private letters and from refugees, and is fairly regarded as trustworthy in spite of the apologetic denials of Russian officers.

A letter from David Rosenthal, of Kishineff, the authenticity of which is vouched for by his children in Chicago, to whom it was written, describes what he saw as follows:

Great horror and disorder is now reigning in our city. The first day of Passover an enraged mass gathered in the Jewish quarter, killed our young and old right and left, broke the windows, tore pillows, destroyed the furniture and robbed us of our possessions. Many of us applied to the governor for help, but they were not admitted. Some went to the telegraph stations to report the danger to St. Petersburg, but were not received. Police were sent out to protect the Jews, but assisted the rioters in their horrible massacre. For two days and two nights I closed myself up, together with mamma and the rest of the children, in a cellar and we were afraid even to go out in the yard. Our store was entirely destroyed. On the third day, being nearly starved to death for lack of food, I dared to go up in the house. I found the house entirely destroyed, and, looking through the window, I noticed piles of dead bodies stretched on the street. I was afterward informed that many young girls and women were outraged and killed. About Wednesday morning an official arrived from St. Petersburg, having received a telegram from a neighboring city, and commanded soldiers to restore order.

Other reports describe the horrors more in detail. A Jewess named Sura Fonarschi was brought to the hospital with two nails, seven inches long, driven into her brain through her nose. One Jew was brought in with one hip, both ankles and wrists broken, and his severed hands and

feet dangling by the skin. A Jew named Chamfon was minus his under lip, which had been cut away with a kitchen knife, after which his tongue and windpipe had been pulled out through his mouth with pincers. A Jew named Selzers had had his ears cut away and his head battered in 12 places. He was a raving maniac. At the corner of Spischoj and Gostinnj streets a woman about to become a mother was dragged from her house, seated in a chair within a circle of her tormentors, and thrashed about the abdomen until the child appeared, which was wrenched out and cut into two pieces. A carpenter was surprised at his work and both of his hands were sawed off with his own saw. A Jewish girl was assaulted by several brutes, who cut her eyes out with a pocket knife. One woman, after trying to defend her children, was thrown on the pavement, disemboweled and feathers and horsehair from her bed were stuffed into her body. All the half-grown girls were assaulted until they died. Small children were flung out of windows and trampled on by a crowd.

The savage mob seems to have comprised only a few hundred men, but the evidence is strong that they were encouraged and protected by the police under instructions from Mr. Plehwe, the reactionary member of the Czar's cabinet. Plehwe is reported to have issued a secret circular, dated March 25, to the governor of Bessarabia, which is translated by the London Times as follows:

It has come to my knowledge that in the region intrusted to you wide disturbances are being prepared against the Jews, who chiefly exploit the local population. In view of the general disquietude, the disposition of the population of towns to seek a vent for itself, and also in view of the unquestionable undesirability of instilling by too severe measures anti-governmental feelings into a population which has not yet been affected by propaganda, your excellency will not fail to contribute to the immediate stopping of disorders which may arise, by means of admonitions, without at all having recourse, however, to the use of arms.

All the reports of the massacres indicate that the Kishineff authorities acted under some such orders. Though the police and military were ample to suppress the massacre, it was allowed full headway for three days—April 19, 20 and 21st; and

every effort to communicate with the imperial authorities by telegraph was frustrated. It appears, too, that the Czar holds the governor responsible for this inaction, and that the reactionaries at court have tried to shield him; for on the 18th it was reported from Berlin that the Czar had dismissed the governor, over the protests of the reactionary clique. The ultra-patriotic papers, moreover, do not hesitate to propagate the doctrine that whoever kills a Jew is a good Russian patriot; and with this sort of journalism the Russian censors neglect to interfere, although they have suppressed the *Woschod*, of St. Petersburg, for printing the facts about the massacre.

Kishineff has a population of about 140,000, of which about one-third are Jews. Its commerce is almost entirely in their hands. The recent onslaught upon them appears to have been instigated by the publication in anti-Semitic papers of an absurd story, older in its origin than the Christian warfare upon Jews, that they had murdered a Christian child in Kishineff for the purpose of getting Christian blood for ritualistic use in the celebration of the Passover. According to the official report of the Russian minister of the interior, M. Plehwe, as cabled by the American consul general from Odesa, the casualties were 45 killed, 74 seriously wounded, 350 slightly wounded, 750 Jewish houses wrecked and plundered, and 600 Jewish shops robbed. Reports from London, through the Jewish Chronicle of that city, make the injuries appear to have been much more severe. According to these reports the victims number 1,000, of which at least 65 were killed and more than 300 maimed or crippled for life, while hundreds escaped with serious injuries from which they will eventually recover. The damage to property is estimated at not less than \$510,000. Lord Cranborn, the British foreign secretary, stated the number of killed to be about 80, when questioned in parliament on the 20th. Four thousand Jews are said to be unable to get away from Kishineff and to be starving, while thousands are emigrating from southern Russia aimlessly southward.

In the United States it is not the Jew, but the Negro who furnishes food for massacres, and an instance is reported this week from Mississippi.

We give, without comment, expansion or condensation, the regular press report, dated at Laurel, Miss., Saturday, May 16, which is presumably and evidently friendly to the whites rather than the blacks. It is as follows:

Armed to the teeth, posses of white men are riding throughout Smith county shooting down Negroes wherever they can be found. The Negroes are arming and scores are gathering, it is said, in the northern part of the county, near Burns. When morning dawns it is feared that the bloodiest race war ever known in the South will be in progress. The trouble originated over a Negro who abandoned a crop which he had planted for a white farmer. The white man remonstrated with him, and the Negro replied with threats. When the colored man had gone the farmer gathered a few of his friends and set out after the colored man, with the intention of forcing him to return. In the meantime the Negro had gathered a number of his own race and concealed them beside the road. The white posse was ambushed. One white man was wounded, but the others retreated without any further casualty. Both sides then took the warpath, with the result that one white man has been killed. The loss of life among the Negroes is said to be frightfully heavy, the whites having threatened to exterminate them. The feud began Tuesday. It has raged intermittently all week, and yesterday practically every able-bodied white man in Smith county was reported to be in the saddle.

The assurances of peace in the Philippine island of Mindanao, which Gen. Davis reported last week as a consequence of the victory of Capt. Pershing over the Moros of the lake region (p. 89, 90) are not confirmed by this week's news. Dispatches of the 18th from Manila report that the remaining fighting Moros of Bacolod and Taraca, who have been resisting the Americans under Capt. Pershing, are reassembling near Pantan. Three days previously, according to another Manila dispatch, Capt. Overton and his command were approached by a force of Moros at Sucaltan, Mindanao. The Moros pretended to be friendly until they were close to the Americans, when they made a rush with holos and cut down three Americans before the latter could get into action. By quick work, however, the Americans routed the Moros.

The more northerly island of Cebu appears also to be disturbed. "Bands

of fanatics," is the press description of the "rebels" there. Col. Taylor, says an Associated Press dispatch of the 18th from Manila, with a force of constabulary, defeated several of these bands of fanatics in the interior of the island May 14, killing twenty and wounding several of them. The fanatics repeatedly charged the constabulary and a few of the constabulary were wounded.

Aguinaldo's chief supporter in the Filipino republic (which the Americans destroyed in 1899) Chief Justice Mabini, of the supreme court of that republic, who remained an American prisoner until last February, when he secured his liberty by taking the oath of allegiance (vol. v. p. 760), died of cholera last week at Manila. He was given a public funeral on the 17th, at which 8,000 Filipinos, headed by Aguinaldo, marched in procession from Mabini's house to the church and then to the grave. Mabini was accounted a great lawyer and able statesman.

NEWS NOTES.

—The thirteenth annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans was opened in the great auditorium at the New Orleans fair grounds on the 19th.

—The "Mueller bill" for the ownership and operation of street car lines by municipalities in Illinois (p. 70-71) was signed by Gov. Yates on the 18th, and is now a law.

—A fire on the 20th in the Torondo district of Manila destroyed 2,000 houses. The financial loss is estimated at \$1,000,000, and 8,000 Filipinos are made homeless.

—Ex-Mayor Ames, of Minneapolis, who was convicted two weeks ago (p. 90) of bribery, was sentenced on the 16th to imprisonment for six years at hard labor in the Minnesota penitentiary. Upon giving bail he was released pending his appeal to the Supreme Court.

—The war department has received mail advices from Manila to the effect that Miss Floy Gilmore has been appointed assistant attorney general for the government in the Philippine islands. She went to the Philippines as a stenographer and has served in the office of the attorney general.

—President Roosevelt (p. 90), having left San Francisco for a trip to the Yosemite, appeared at Sacramento on the 19th and delivered an address from the State capitol. On the 20th he went through the Shasta

region, speaking at Dunsmuir and Sissons, on his way to Portland, Oregon, where he was to arrive on the 21st.

—The Wisconsin Senate concurred on the 19th in a primary election measure passed by the lower House, referring the bill to a vote of the people at the general election next year. The bill applies to city and county officers and to eight State officers, including governor and the members of both houses of the legislature. Congressmen are to be nominated by the old method.

—The efforts of Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, to secure universal transfers on the street cars of that city with fares at 3 cents, have resulted so far in the consolidation of the two street car systems in a new company. This company is to give universal transfer privileges at once. But as it refuses to reduce fares, the mayor has still to fight out that part of his street car fight.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States (see p. 41) for the ten months ending April 30, 1903, as given by the April treasury sheet, are as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold and S for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M ...	\$1,283,740,663	\$864,729,889	\$359,019,774 exp.
G ....	20,094,789	40,598,143	20,413,354 imp.
S ....	40,545,437	20,457,873	20,086,569 exp.
	\$1,284,380,889	\$925,637,630	\$358,693,259 exp.

—The locked out knitting mill girls of Dover, N. J., have organized a co-operative knitting mill company. The president of the company says: "We are inaugurating a new and powerful method of coercing employers, many of whom will almost ruin themselves rather than yield to arbitration. The success of the Yankee Girl Knitting Company will show that more often than not the employers can be eliminated. Our capital stock is \$50,000, divided into 2,000 shares at a par value of \$25 each. The subscribers are required to pay only \$2.50 per month until the shares are paid up."

—By the signature of Gov. Yates to the Torrens land registration bill adopted by the recent legislature, the Torrens system of land titles comes into compulsory use in Cook county, Illinois, if adopted by the voters of that county at the election in November, 1904. The new law requires executors and administrators of estates to register the titles of all lands coming under their control, and it is estimated that in this way practically all the land in Cook county will come under the Torrens system within 30 or 35 years. The law provides, however, that the probate judge may excuse registration when it is apparent a hardship would be worked on the property of any estate.

**PRESS OPINIONS.**

**THE RUSSIAN AMBASSADOR AND THE MASSACRE.**

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), May 20.—Count Cassini's statement in "explanation" of the massacre at Kishineff was indecent and revolting. It amounted to this: The Jews are usurers, money lenders and exploiters of the poor peasants. Their victims occasionally lose patience and an explosion occurs. The conflict is between the Jewish oppressor and the downtrodden peasant, and the government, with the best will in the world, cannot prevent reprisals. The defense would be absurd and puerile if its premises were true. But they are absolutely false. Count Cassini is ignorant of the laws and regulations of his own country, and his statements are mere echoes of the abominable and impudent lies of the anti-Semitic press of which one judges him to be an assiduous reader. The peasant is effectually protected by the benevolent government from the alleged predatory tendencies of the Jews. The latter are prohibited from living in the villages of the "pale" and from engaging in the pursuits which would bring them into close business relation with the peasants. They are not allowed to own land in the villages. They are excluded from most of the liberal professions, and to the great majority of them even ordinary education is rendered a luxury by discrimination and arbitrary restrictions. To say that any considerable number of them are bankers and money lenders is to indulge in riotous and malignant nonsense. The whole Cassini "interview" is a farrago of falsehoods, insults and perversions of notorious facts.

**BRYAN AT ST. LOUIS.**

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), May 14.—That was a pretty small piece of business which the managers of the dedicatory exercises of the Louisiana Purchase exposition displayed in snubbing Mr. Bryan. He had been invited to attend and had a right to expect decent treatment. But when he found that he was not going to receive it, when he discovered that it was designed publicly to slight and humiliate him, he wisely remained in the background. It is now apparent that the exercises were not without political design. The programme was so arranged as to exploit both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Cleveland. The former was there as the champion of his own policies and Mr. Cleveland's presence was hailed from ocean to ocean by the plutocratic press as a sort of challenge to "Bryanism." His visit was made the occasion of starting a third term boom for the ex-president; and organs of monopoly were particular to keep him in the limelight and to give the impression that the people were delirious with enthusiasm wherever he showed himself. That the exposition people went out of their way to snub Mr. Bryan is practically admitted by the Kansas City Times. It jeers at him because he resented the treatment accorded him. Yet if all Mr. Bryan's friends should remain away from the exposition as a protest against the indecent behavior of its management toward the gifted Nebraskan the success of that enterprise might be seriously impaired.

**GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.**

Nashville Daily News (Dem.), May 11.—Rather than suffer the continued domination of the railroads, it were better to have a full and complete revolution in public utilities—state, county and municipal—and place them all under governmental control. If it be expedient for the government to expend money on rivers and harbors, why should it not make expenditures for railroads?

**GEORGE FRED WILLIAMS.**

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), May 12.—Democratic Democrats throughout the

country will welcome the news that George Fred Williams, of Massachusetts, is to be urged for the Democratic presidential nomination by the democratic Democracy of New England. He merits and is certain to receive most cordial consideration at the hands of a party in whose recent battles he has borne so conspicuous and so honorable a part. Probably next to Tom L. Johnson Mr. Williams is the most popular Democrat mentioned seriously in connection with the nomination.

**MISCELLANY**

**"I GREW OLD THE OTHER DAY."**

I grew old the other day  
And I waked uneasily.  
Then I thought: This need not be;  
By and by we shall not say,  
I grew old the other day.  
—Timothy Otis Paine.

**OUR FOREIGN POPULATION.**

Miss Jane Addams, of Hull House, Chicago, before a joint meeting of Women's clubs in Boston, as reported in the Chicago Chronicle.

There are few who know how much good these immigrants bring with them, the love of art and useful accomplishments for which they find no market.

I know a man in Chicago who was put out of his rooms in a tenement because he had carved his door in the evenings when he came home weary from work and sought to tell what there was better in him. It was exquisite work, the same he had done in a church in Italy, he said proudly, which is double-starred in Baedeker. Another had trouble with his landlord because he decorated his ceiling with stucco. This man said that he had been paid for such work at home, but he supposed he ought not to have attempted it here, where the "American people like everything smooth and such a queer white." These men were artists, but they were not appreciated in their new surroundings.

The children are eager to learn, and in many families they have adequate instructors in their parents, from whom they have inherited artistic tastes, but they grow ashamed of it, as they see that it has no reward, and they lose their heritage in our materialistic surroundings.

We once had a Greek play in Hull house, played by the fruit peddlers, who are laborers in the summer time. We found out that these Greeks knew and had read the stories of Homer, and they were delighted to play before the Americans, that they might illustrate and emphasize the fact that they were not barbarians. One man always prayed before rehearsing his part, and I asked him the reason for his

prayer. He told me that he prayed for power to properly present the honor and glory of ancient Greece to the ignorant people of America, and he was absolutely sincere.

We very freely express our opinion of the immigrants to this country, but we don't always stop to think or to question what they may think of us. The answers would be informative and useful.

**UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL.**

**HE IS NOT PLEASED WITH MILITARISM.**  
Printed from the original MS.

Dear John: Your chancellor of the exchequer made the statement the other day, on introducing the annual budget, that if other nations wished to reduce their navy, Great Britain was fully ready to follow suit. There, John, I'm with you! That's the kind of an alliance that strikes me as better than supportin' you in raids agin republics and the like.

This whole military business is un-American and agin the grain with me. I used to brag that I had no standin' army—had but 10,000 men, and there was room a-plenty for them to sit down; but now I've a whin of soldiers, and I am not satisfied. Worst of all, my Republican administration's got the idea that it's a credit, and have been actually paradin' them down at St. Louis. Now I'm of two minds about it. A military parade in war time is one thing; but in peace it's another. Troops are the symbol of death, and to my notion, have no business nor proper place in a joyous civic show. Why, the dickens, don't they turn out the hearses, too, if they want it real cheerful!

There never was any sense, anyway, in turning my nation into a war camp, like Europe. The old signers of the Declaration tried to get away from that. But my capitalists conspired together for imperialism, bought up all the great papers, and set them to teachin' it, and now they are carryin' it into the common schools. The Democrats are noticin' the first, but they have not caught onto the school dodge yet; but all the school papers in America (papers to instruct teachers how and what to teach) are loaded with imperialism and militarism.

I'm havin' some fun, though, in my politics. My Republicans and gold Democrats are naming presidential candidates for the Democratic party, and running them fiercely in the *Republican* newspapers. It's great

sport, but I guess the Democrats have the young mother's cinch on the situation. It was this way: The young mother had named the first baby herself, and was satisfied with the job; but the mother-in-law did not like the name.

"The next baby Harry has," says the mother-in-law, in a condescending and retrieving tone, "the next baby Harry has, I will name it."

"Well," said the young mother, "the next baby Harry has, you can name it, or the next baby you have, you can name it; but the next baby I have, I shall name it myself—as I did this one."

And I guess the Democrats, too, will name their own man.

UNCLE SAM.

### SCIENTIFIC TAXATION.

Portions of an address delivered by the Hon. L. F. C. Garvin, Governor of Rhode Island, before the Rhode Island Business Men's Association in Providence, May 15, as reported in the Providence Journal.

A system of taxation that is unjust should be looked upon as unscientific. A system that is extremely burdensome should be looked upon as unscientific. Our present system is flagrantly unjust and extremely burdensome.

There are in the community two classes of property—personal property and real estate. They could really be divided into four classes, the former being divided into credits and chattels and the latter into improvements and land. The credits which the law attempts to tax are not wealth. They can be increased indefinitely in amount. You can quickly double intangible property in the community. It hides itself and remains practically untaxed. When it is found in some cases it is unjustly treated because the neighbors of the person so taxed are not so treated, and it is double taxation. This is recognized in some States, and mortgages are exempt from taxation.

Tangible personal property also is unequally taxed. The assessors are unable to determine the value of the contents of a building. There is a great deal of personal property in stores on Westminster street that is not taxed because it is held by corporations. But suppose we could put them on the tax book? Could they be taxed equally? It is a great work to ascertain the value of the stock in a department store. Could the assessors get anywhere near the value? It is utterly impossible. They might get the information from the owner if the latter were willing, or they might guess

at it. They usually guess, and guessing is usually unscientific.

Improvements can be estimated, you say? But they cannot be with any certainty. There are some dwellings where \$20,000 is put into the front entry and close by there will be a building of which the whole cost was \$20,000. The assessors cannot tell about those things accurately. They usually undervalue such buildings. So here we find a great degree of inequality.

Besides it is burdensome, even if it were levied carefully and equally. The burden of paying the tax is so great that people hide their personal property when they can. The tax on improvements is really a fine. The persons who improve the appearance of the community are subjected to an annual fine.

Is there any system of taxation that is equal and not burdensome? That system is one which exempts personal property and improvements from taxation and increases the tax on land. Philadelphia is a city that exempts personal property from taxation and the benefits are evident.

It is only the tax on land that is levied equally. Land cannot run away. The burden of other forms of taxation is often escaped by tax dodging. It is often said that nothing can be taxed which can run away or stay away from the city. Land cannot run away. The value of land can be ascertained, so there is no inequality. It is a simple matter and a just matter to tax it and it is not burdensome. Every individual already pays a ground rent, but instead of being paid to an individual it should go to the state. The tax on improvements is paid by the poor and those who can least afford to pay it and is burdensome.

This single tax is practicable. People often say it would be very fine if it were begun with a new community. But we're only at the beginning now. The Ford law in New York, which has just been pronounced constitutional by the State court unanimously, is in line with this system. It taxes as real estate all the difference between the tangible property of quasi-public corporations and the market value of their stock. There is a practical example of a tax on land values.

You will see how this works if we say that anything produced is divided into three parts. Take a load of coal. One part of the value goes to the landlord for rent, one part to capital for interest and one part to labor for wages. That part which goes to the landlord should go to the State to sup-

port the government. We are having strikes. Men strike and think they are not getting what they ought to get. They are not. What they earn is taken away in the form of a tax. The present system is an injury to labor and indirectly an injury to capital. What is produced goes to the monopolists. They can't consume it, and what is produced is called in part overproduction. The laborer cannot buy as much as he produces. The effect of the transfer of all taxation to land values would be to double wages. The cause of low wages is competition with persons out of employment. So much of the land is kept out of use by reason of the system of taxation that it prevents the employment of both capital and labor. Taxation of land values would increase interest and increase wages. It would increase interest because there would be more purchasers of things produced by capital.

\* \* \* \* \*

If this change were made instantly all over the United States, or even Rhode Island, there might be some hardship. The price of land would fall, but that doesn't vitiate the principle. If the increase of land value belongs to the people, while there is some hardship in establishing this system there is no injustice in it. The people would all be better off. As a landlord a man would lose, but as a capitalist or a laborer he would gain. It would stop speculation, and if it were done by local option there would be general improvement in the community accepting it owing to the influx of population.

### LESSONS FROM WAYSIDE SCENES.

An extract from a sermon delivered at the Vine street Congregational church, Cincinnati, O., May 17, by the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow.

On an accommodation train going east from Pittsburg, I was seated behind what appeared to be a traveling salesman, a decidedly "chesty" individual, who soon got an opportunity to exhibit his character to the passengers.

A company of Greeks boarded the train. Among them were two peasant women with nursing babes in arms. The car was well filled, and one of these mothers proposed to sit down with the salesman. The salesman motioned to the rear of the car, telling the woman that there was plenty of room back there. The woman looked, but saw no vacant seat. Therefore she started to take

possession. The salesman refused to remove his hat and coat, declaring to the woman that he would be — if she should sit with him. Then one of the men among the Greeks, possibly a husband of the woman, entered into the altercation.

"You don't pay for two seats. You move over. We pay as much as you," said the Greek. At that the American offered to "spoil the face" of the Greek, whereupon the son of Athens replied in kind.

While the passengers craned their necks, and the two men glared at each other, the woman with the baby edged her way in and sat down. The fort was taken. "You don't pay for two seats." That argument was unanswerable.

One passenger in the rear said: "I don't blame him. I would not sit by that garlic."

But the public sentiment of the car was voiced by another, who declared: "That's right. Their money is as good as anybody's."

The Greek had justice on his side. That is a mighty advantage in an argument. There was nothing left for the salesman but to gather together the fragments of his dignity and depart, which he did in high dudgeon.

Now, immediately in front of the Greek woman there sat an American woman, who also had a child, perhaps three years of age. While the salesman was walking through the aisle, cooling down, the two children were taking each other in.

The American child looked over the back of the seat at the newcomer. In those frank blue eyes there was no disdain; on the contrary, they danced with happy interest. And the Greek baby cooed and kicked and reached out its chubby hands toward its American brother.

Soon the American child was ringing a bell which hung around the neck of the Greek baby, and both were lost in delight.

This contrast between the democracy of the children and the snobishness of their elders recalled those immortal words of Jesus, about the children: "Of such is the kingdom of Heaven."

The other mother I invited to share my seat. At first she seemed more astonished at my respect for their rights than by the salesman's disrespect. The infant she carried was fast asleep. Now and then a smile would flit across its face, one of those mysterious gleams of sun-

shine that attend the slumber of a child, and which some mothers say are caused by the whisperings of the angels.

The mother noticed my interest in her babe. We exchanged smiles. That was the only language in which we could converse. The sleeping child was our interpreter. I think she understood that the love of some little child had taught me to honor all mothers, and to wish that each child of the human family might have the same freedom of opportunity and the same rights on the earth, that I ask for my own.

A few days after this I was riding in a Pullman car by the side of a man whom I took to be a strict church man, and a man of wealth. "Pharisee is written all over his face," said I to myself. Then I thought of the Greek serf, and I realized that I entertained some of the same unbrotherly feeling toward the pious rich man that the traveling salesman had shown toward the poor man. Conscious of my guilt, I resolved to try to be a brother to the rich as well as to the poor. So I began to probe for some good in this rich man's heart. If I had once mentioned the name of Henry George, probably our conversation would have proved fruitless. But his suspicions were not aroused by learning that I was a preacher. I had to find some theme of interest to him. So I said:

"I have just been reading with considerable interest, Mr. Carnegie's London speech on Capital and Labor."

"Yes," said he, "Mr. Carnegie is a great man." I could agree to that with a good conscience.

"It was wonderful," said he, "how many millionaires in and about Pittsburgh Mr. Carnegie has made."

"Yes," I said, "that is astonishing," as he named over the list.

From this there was an easy transition to the subject of the trusts.

"I have very little sympathy with laws aimed to prevent large combinations of capital," I ventured.

"It's all tommy-rot," said he.

"The chief element of danger, I see, is in some of these combinations getting a monopoly of raw materials, and thus killing wholesome competition." He assented to this, and I was encouraged to cite the steel trust as an example, with its monopoly of the Connellsville coal fields.

I took a great chance. If he had

had stock in that corporation I would have been lost. But just the reverse was true. He had suffered by reason of that same monopoly.

He told me that he was in the iron business. He said that he had purchased his coke of the Frick company for nine years; that \$2.30 a ton had been the customary price; and that the first of the year the price had been forced up to five dollars a ton.

As if turning the subject, I asked him if he could tell me how those coal lands were assessed for taxation. He said as a rule they were assessed as farm land, but that often the most valuable holdings were put on the tax duplicate at a nominal figure.

"What do you think would be the effect," I inquired, "if the steel corporation's 60,000 acres of Connellsville coal lands were put upon the tax duplicate for anything like their actual value?"

"Why, he said, "that tax would go a long way toward absorbing the dividends of the corporation."

"Do you think that would break up their monopoly of the raw material?" I asked.

"Undoubtedly it would," he replied. Then he thought a moment, and his face lit up, and he exclaimed, with some enthusiasm: "That would lessen my taxes and cheapen my coke, would it not?"

"Yes," I said, "but what appeals to me most of all is the ideal justice of the plan. It prevents the lucky or the cunning or the strong from taking an unfair advantage, by monopolizing the common gifts of God."

Just then my friend's station was called, and he shook my hand warmly. He did not know that he had given assent to the principle for which Henry George contended.

That principle, understood in its fullness, would redeem the soul of the traveling salesman, and make of him a Christian, that is, a democrat.

Henry George would have said to the United States Steel corporation what the Greek said to the salesman: "Move up, gentlemen. You don't pay for so many seats." Rich and poor alike can be made to see the justice of that demand. Abolish monopoly, and there will be found room enough for all. Let down the bars to idle capital and underpaid labor, then even the serfs of Europe will be welcome.

SPEECH OF LOUIS F. POST AT THE  
DINNER OF THE ST. LOUIS SINGLE  
TAX LEAGUE, MAY  
16, 1903.

This dinner, given at Schrap's cafe, was brought to a successful conclusion by the untiring efforts of L. P. Custer, the president of the St. Louis Single Tax league. It was attended by more than 200 guests, and presided over with great good humor and sparkling wit by William Marlon Reedy, editor of the St. Louis Mirror. Stirring short speeches were made by the Rev. Frank G. Tyrrell, N. O. Nelson, Hon. Richard Dalton, the Rev. W. F. Peck, and the guest of the evening, Dr. William Preston Hill, of Tucson, Ariz. A letter from District Attorney Folk was read, and the ceremonies concluded with a bright and thoughtful little speech from Master Webb, of the East St. Louis high school. The subject of the following speech was "The Cause for Which We Labor."

It is peculiarly appropriate, my friends of St. Louis, that the cause we work for should be called to the attention of your community at this centennial time.

With an industrial and art exposition commanding world-wide interest, your delightful city is soon to celebrate the century-old purchase by the American people of a veritable empire in territory adjacent to what was once the western boundary of our Republic, an empire of which St. Louis has grown to be the metropolis. Extending from the Gulf of Mexico at the south, along the course of the Mississippi to the Canadian border on the north, and westward to the Rocky Mountains, this vast region of half a billion acres has been carved into eight States and part of four more, besides two Territories which ought to be States. With scarcely any population, either civilized or savage, at the time of its acquisition, it is now inhabited by nearly 15,000,000 people, all of whom possess or may easily obtain the prerogatives of American citizenship. Our solemn pledge of government by consent of the governed, which was inserted in that treaty of purchase, has been for the most part redeemed. Even the Territories as yet denied Statehood are accorded a degree of self-government not far below what the States themselves enjoy. Within this empire, of whose acquisition and development we are all proud, various nationalities and even races are being welded into political homogeneity. Magnificent industries have here been shaped in harmony with the marvelous revelations of our industrial era. Such progressive cities as New Orleans, Minneapolis, Omaha and Kansas City, not to mention St. Louis, the largest of them all, have risen into towering prominence. Their names have be-

come household words all over this land and wherever else the pulsing activities of trade are felt. This great wilderness of a hundred years ago, this waste of prairie and desert, washed on one side by the treacherous currents of the Father of Waters and guarded on the other by the rugged Rockies, snow capped and forbidding, this fertile feeding ground for wild buffalo and natural hunting park for beasts of prey, has now become a part, and an extremely important part, of what we call the region of civilization. Such a victory of progressive man over resisting nature, Americans may be pardoned for celebrating with effervescent enthusiasm.

In that celebration single tax men and women everywhere will heartily join. For single taxers feel the inspiration of it all, even if they are not the loudest shouters. They realize the glory of it with a greater keenness of appreciation, with a larger grasp of what has been done and what is yet to do, than any mere shouter can know.

It is because single tax men and women understand that the work of civilization in the old Louisiana Purchase has only begun, and will not go on of its own momentum, that this single tax gathering is so peculiarly appropriate in point of time and place. In the splendid display which the St. Louis exposition is preparing to make, the American people will celebrate with enthusiastic pride what has been so far accomplished; at this modest dinner we single taxers suggest with thoughtful solicitude what must yet be achieved. This is the optimistic spirit which inspires all I have to say to-night.

It is the spirit, also, in which I hope you will consider every utterance that may sound like criticism. To criticize is farthest from my intention. It is, in fact the very opposite of my purpose. I would not reverse the past if I could. The work of civilization in the old Louisiana Purchase is good—good as far as it has gone. What I am urging is not that we go backward, but that we go onward. If I could, I would shout it from your house tops—Go on! Go on! Go on! Not with new acquisitions, not with further territorial expansion, not with the colonial policy that destroyed Rome and is enervating England; but on, on, on, in the further development of the Louisiana country toward the highest ideals of civilization. What I shall attempt is to draw your minds away for a moment from the work behind us to a consideration of the work before us, this great work

of perfecting the civilization of the vast region that Napoleon relinquished to Jefferson.

And may I not speak with freedom, even if I do come from across your border? You need fear no comparisons. I assure you that I find quite as high a degree of civilization here in the old Louisiana Purchase as in the old Northwest territory where I live. I might be gracious enough to admit that Chicago is even less civilized than St. Louis, but I have to go home again. Yet this much is undeniable, that there is no lack of civilization in the old Louisiana Purchase—none to which I shall refer, at any rate—that does not exist in every other section of our common country and among all the civilized peoples of the earth. I have no invidious distinctions to make. If I refer to your section in particular, it is because it is a convenient example, a familiar object lesson, for the time and occasion. I ask the liberty merely of speaking in terms of intimate friendship, as one American to other Americans about a matter of common interest, as one of the English tongue to others whose native tongue is the same—aye, upon that broadest and best basis of all human intercourse, that platform where sectional and national prejudice are obliterated, where race lines are forgotten, where all men are kin and the tongue speaks the language of the heart.

Let me ask each of you, then, to survey with the impartial eye of your better self, this historic section of which your own city is the metropolis. Large as is its population, there is abundant room for millions more. The average is less than 15 people to the square mile. Even the Russian empire, with all its uninhabited wastes, has as large a population as that. The United States as a whole, including this territory and much more as sparsely settled, has over 20 to the mile, while Great Britain rises above 300 and Belgium to 550 or higher. In the light of those comparisons the population possibilities of this region challenge the liveliest imagination.

Do you recoil from the thought of a larger population? Do you think that, as most of the inhabitants already have a hard struggle to live, a larger population would make the struggle more intense by producing a greater pressure upon the natural sources of supply? That is the same economic quicksand in which Malthus floundered, but which Henry George turned into solid ground.

There is nothing of that kind to fear which cannot be easily prevented. The experience of a century has demonstrated what common sense would suggest in the first place, that the larger a population, the more wealth is it capable of producing per capita. Not only do large populations produce more wealth per capita than small ones, but they produce it less laboriously. When that seems not to be the case it is because abnormal conditions interfere; and the reason must be sought in bad human institutions and not in natural law.

He who imagines that increase of population does not mean increase of wealth per capita, fails to take all the facts into account. He does not consider the productive power that specialization of work generates. He forgets the phenomena of what is called division of labor.

Specialization, or division of labor, operates in two ways. We find in one of its manifestations that a large number of men may do together what a smaller number would be physically incapable of doing at all. In the other we find that many men cooperating may increase the capability of each when the work to be done consists of various details each requiring many repetitions but falling short of the capabilities of individual effort. For illustration: one man could not build a locomotive, nor utilize one if he had it; but many men can, by combining their efforts, both build and utilize locomotives. Conversely, one man, having many small packages to carry in different directions, would find his time occupied with less effect if he did all this work for himself than if he swapped work with other men having the same kind of work to do. By arranging with them to carry all but one of his packages to their various destinations on condition that he carry all their packages having the same destination as the one he carries for himself, a great gain for each is secured without the expenditure of any more time and without any additional drain upon their energies. This double aspect of industrial specialization is the secret of all progress. Not only does it in itself multiply industrial power, but by promoting special knowledge and special skill, it multiplies that power incalculably more. Put an end to division of labor and you put an end to society.

But you do put an end to division of labor if you put an end to trade. Without trade there can be no specialization. All specialization would disap-

pear and society along with it, if trade could be abolished and were abolished. Is it not plain, for instance, that no sane man would continue to make shoe soles he doesn't want, if he couldn't trade them for what he does want. This fact, that specialization could not go on if trade were stopped, ought to convince every rational mind that specialization is obstructed when trade is obstructed. Surely, then, one of the necessary conditions of social progress is freedom of trade—the more complete it is in character and the wider in area the better.

To a degree hardly realized, we have freedom of trade in this country. Many people suppose that our national policy is a policy of tariff protection. But in fact the United States enjoy the largest measure of exemption from this kind of protection in the history of the world. The older nations had their own systems of protection. The robber chiefs of the Rhine had theirs; so had the barbarians who pillaged trade at the Pillars of Hercules, and from whose stronghold at Tarifa comes the name of the modern tariff. At another period the merchant guilds had systems somewhat more subtle. For the boldness of the pirate they substituted the cunning of the sneak thief. Upon these old time systems we of the 19th and 20th centuries have made some improvement; but in the mechanism only, and not in point of public economy or common morals. That is to say, we have imitated them in their treatment of foreign trade. With reference, however, to our inter-State commerce, the volume of which is vastly greater than that of our international commerce, we have freedom of trade. Goods are transported across State lines as freely as they may be carried across the street. Between our States we have—and it is the only instance in the world's history on so large a scale—between those States we have the sensible, the moral, the beneficent, the civilizing and the prosperity-making system of absolute free trade.

And, mark you, if this system had not been firmly imbedded in our national Constitution, there would be within the old Louisiana Purchase, in this year of grace 1903, nothing whatever to celebrate. Such progress as you have made you owe to the specialization of your industries in the center of an area of absolute free trade,—a free trade area that extends in length across the continent and which in breadth spans all the varying climates of the temperate zone.

Let the workers in your industries be free to specialize without restriction, let the currents of your trade be free to flow without obstruction, and you need have no fears, my friends of the old Louisiana Purchase, of danger from overpopulation. Reflection indicates that the larger your population the more extensive and minute will your specializations of industry become. And long experience confirms that inference. It is not in sparsely settled countries that we find most wealth per capita. And I am speaking of wealth per capita, mind you, and not of wealth per pocket. Wealth, may, in fact, be better distributed in sparsely settled places; but there is more of it on an average to each inhabitant where population is thick than where it is sparse. There is more per capita in the world now than there was a century ago, when the world's population was smaller. There is more in thickly populated Belgium than in sparsely populated Ireland. There is more in cities than in the country, and more in large cities than in small ones. We have no reason for doubting but every reason for believing that productive power, instead of being outrun by population, outruns population. Just as truly as two men can do more than twice as much as one, can two million do more than twice as much as one million, or 30 million more than twice as much as 15 million.

The only limitations are limitations of space. Not until population is so thick that workers physically interfere with one another's movements can increase in population naturally lessen the per capita increase of wealth. The man who imagines that this space limit would be reached in the old Louisiana Purchase with many times 15 million inhabitants, will have no business to be among the shouters next year at your centennial.

Along with the increased ratio in productive power that comes with increase of population—not only along with it, but as one of its effective methods—come labor saving machinery and discovery after discovery of Nature's hidden resources. The farther invention and discovery go, the farther seems to be their power to go. With "these powers born of progress," and in turn promoting progress, the possibility of supporting myriads of people within the region of the Louisiana Purchase comes to the imagination as a vivid and glorious reality.

It may be said, however, that the multiplication of inhabitants is so certain to be a reality that we need not

concern ourselves about it. But are you quite sure of that? If you are sure, let me beg of you not to base your inference upon anything I have said or suggested. I make no prediction of further growth; I have said nothing to justify confidence in further growth. What I have tried to show is that there is room in the Louisiana territory for a vastly larger population. I do not say that its population will in fact be very greatly augmented. Though more population will doubtless come, it will press more and more against ever-stiffening barriers. For there is a sense in which this territory is already overcrowded.

If that were not true how should we account for the tide of emigration that passes on to the still farther west? Do you believe that there would be less than 15 persons to the square mile in the Louisiana Purchase to-day if the people were not under some pressure to push on? And what is that pressure? It does not all originate in the itch for adventure. It is not all due to the hope of finding a pot of gold at yonder foot of the rainbow. Most people are not adventurous. Most people seek only to live out their lives in peace and comfort where they already are or at the first agreeable abiding place. When they go west, or farther west, or spread up into the north under another flag, it is not because they want to but because they have to. They are not drawn on, they are pushed on. They are not emigrants, they are exiles. They go, and they keep on going, to find room. They are crowded out and crowded on.

But what is it that crowds them, if the land is, indeed, still sparsely settled? A little candid reflection will furnish the answer. Instead of confusing your minds with the obscure facts and seeming complexities of continental movements in population, study the problem in its local manifestations with reference to your own city. When you get at the secret of movements of population in St. Louis, you will have discovered the principle of its movements upon even the largest and most extended scale. Your own city is a laboratory, as it were, in which you can bring the phenomena of social problems within a narrow enough field, both as to space and time, for intelligent observation and study. The modern city is the social world in miniature.

Now, the same paradox is manifest in your city that we have noted for the

whole Louisiana Purchase. Here we see the same conflicting phenomena of a congested yet sparse population. And not alone in your own city, but in all American cities, does this curious phenomenon appear. Isn't St. Louis a crowded city? Aren't Chicago and New Orleans crowded cities? Aren't Minneapolis and St. Paul and Cleveland and Cincinnati? Aren't Boston and New York? Yes, they are all crowded. If you don't believe it, look at the slums where men and women and children are herded like pigs in filthy sties. Look at the flats where the middle class are rounded up. Ask the reason and you will be told that the city is overcrowded. Yet the population in every one of these cities is sparse. In New York it is only 19 to the acre. In Philadelphia it is barely 18, in Chicago less than 17. And in your own crowded city of St. Louis, this dreadfully crowded metropolis of the Louisiana Purchase, the population is less than 15 to the acre. I wonder if it would comfort you to know that New Orleans is crowded with a population per acre of less than 3?

Think of it. Consider it. Ponder on it and profit by it. There is room within the city limits of St. Louis for all the present population, allowing amply for streets and parks, and still giving to each family of five persons a space 100 feet square. Yet St. Louis is a crowded city! Why? Let us see.

Are there any vacant building lots here? You needn't answer. Even the stranger within your gates knows that this universal phenomenon of city life makes no exception of St. Louis. But why are those lots vacant if the city is crowded?

Another inquiry. Are there any improved building lots here which are improved inadequately? You needn't answer that question either. I can see for myself. But why are these lots not adequately improved if the city is crowded?

Why do people herd in your slums, why are they crowded in your tenement apartments, why are they jammed into four-room flats, why do they seek homes at long distances from their places of work—why all this cramping and crowding and exile if the improvement of poorly improved lots and those that are not improved at all would furnish such ample accommodation as we can easily see would be the case? Isn't the answer as plain as a pike staff?

What else can it be than that the building lots of your city are monop-

olized and that the monopolizers hold them at rack rent prices? This social blight has enormously reduced the population of Ireland, and made that unhappy country more and more crowded as the population has declined. That fact itself sufficiently indicates that it is not large populations that cause overcrowding. It is land monopoly. How blighting this may be in your city I do not know, but in Boston, the highest populated of all our cities, 56 per cent. of the land is vacant—56 per cent. There is your secret of overcrowding.

Just as a few families have crowded the Irish out of Ireland, even one family could crowd us all out of a city, or off the continent, or off the earth itself, if they were so disposed and we did not resist. Precisely this principle of crowding is operative in St. Louis. Not only as the population of this city increases, but as it seems likely to increase, the owners of the site of St. Louis are able to raise the prices of building lots.

Every improvement in the life of your city gives them a leverage for doing the same thing. Let business thrive, and land values go up. Let an exposition come, and land values rise. Let population move in one direction, and in that direction land goes up in price. Let it seek another outlet, and land prices go up there. If these prices rise so high that population makes a jump, then land goes up where the jump carries it, leaving over-valued vacant spaces between. Everywhere you look you find patches, and strips, and blocks of land, as vacant and unused as when the Louisiana Purchase was made; yet worth at any time in the market a price which speaks eloquently of desire to use it. It is held out of use by the owners' demands for prices higher than it is yet worth.

Your population is driven by these rack rent prices, by these "stand and deliver" demands, either to huddle in contracted quarters, or to pass by whole areas of good building lots, leaving them vacant, in order to utilize poorer and cheaper ones farther away. And so your city seems to be overcrowded when there is room in it to assign space to all who live here at the rate of a quarter of an acre to every family of five.

The same principle operates in the same way and with the same kind of result throughout the Louisiana Purchase. Pretty much all this territory is monopolized and he who would use any of it must pay more than it is yet worth or move on. While that le-

galized method of robbing the workers to enrich idlers is tolerated, neither your progressive city nor the magnificent section of country of which it is the metropolis and whose acquisition you are about to celebrate, can develop the best civilization of which the people are capable. Your growth of population will be checked. Your industrial specialization will be limited. Your wealth will be unfairly distributed. Your workers will continue to constitute your poor class and your schemers and idlers your rich class. If you would truly celebrate the acquisition of the Louisiana territory, you must resolve to put an end to its blight of landlordism wherever your influence extends.

That may seem a difficult thing to do. But its difficulties are not so great nor its consummation so far off as the thoughtless throng may imagine. The advance of this reform has been equal to that of most great reforms. Even now nearly 300 British cities have petitioned parliament for leave to adopt it, and the Conservative party majority against it in parliament has been reduced to 13, while the Liberal party is committed to it beyond recall. In New Zealand and Australia it has received legislative recognition and is forging ahead. For local taxation more than 50 municipalities in New Zealand have adopted it. In our own State of New York, a measure has just become law for the city of New York which takes the initial steps in the adoption of this reform. May I not also point to the evidence of its advance which is manifested by the fact that pronounced and well-known leaders in the single tax movement are also leaders in the public affairs of the country? I might give you a catalogue of these, but it will be enough for my purpose if I name Gov. Garvin, the chief magistrate of Rhode Island, and Tom L. Johnson, the mayor of Cleveland.

So far as the inherent difficulties of popularizing the single tax are concerned, it must be remembered that the abolition of landlordism does not involve the abolition of private tenures. The private possession of land for use is a good thing. The private monopoly of land for monopoly is a bad thing. What is necessary to do, therefore, is to regulate tenures so that private monopoly may disappear and private possession be made more secure. This is the cause that Henry George worked for, it is the cause that we work for, it is what the single tax would accomplish.

If land were taxed in the ratio of its value, regardless of whether the owner used it or not, and the tax were high enough to discourage ownership without use, by making it unprofitable, we should destroy land monopoly. No one would then wish to possess land or to control it in any way except to use it. But none would be discouraged from possessing land to use. The taxation of land values would furnish a public income so abundant that all taxes on the use of land could be abolished. Consequently possession for use would not only not be discouraged; it would be positively encouraged.

Can't you see it? If city lots were taxed heavily in proportion to their value, and houses were not taxed at all, isn't it plain that lots would tumble into the market and fall in price, and that houses would spring up where high priced vacant lots testify to obstructive land monopoly now? Isn't it true that then the unimproved lots would be improved, and the inadequately improved lots would be adequately improved. Your enterprising people would then make their money by putting city lots to their best use, and not by holding them out of use for higher prices.

The same kind of effect would under the same circumstances be produced throughout the whole Louisiana territory. There would be no sparseness of population, for the single tax policy would invite immigration, and would encourage people to remain, whether they came to you from Europe or from Heaven. There would be no crowding, for the single tax policy would make room for all until every possibility of further development had been exhausted.

And why should this policy not be adopted? What is land monopoly that we must be solicitous for the conventional rights of its beneficiaries and indifferent to the natural rights of its victims? Land monopoly is fundamentally unjust. It gives the earth to some of its inhabitants and denies it to the rest. It decrees that the disinherited shall work for the privileged. It reverses the ordinance that every man shall eat bread in the sweat of his own face. It is the thong which binds the masses of men in a newer slavery. Let us have done with it. The child of an Astor has no better right to a place upon the earth than the poorest babe that comes wailing into the world in the wretchedest slum of a New York or a St. Louis. More than that, every child has an equal right with every other to enjoy all the ad-

vances which society has thus far gained; and of these advances most children are deprived, wickedly deprived by monopoly of land.

It is not the greed of business men, it is the pressing want of the disinherited, that drives babies into factories. Of course these babies are not ours—not yours or mine. They are only abstract babies to us, and their misery does not pull at our heart strings. But imagine them for a moment to be yours. Imagine your little Mary, or your little Harry, or any other child of your own affections—imagine such a child, a concrete child of flesh and blood which you love, imagine that child wearing out its baby life in a dusty coal breaker or a roaring factory. Do that, and if the tears do not come, nor the righteous wrath of your soul boil over, you will at least have less respect for vested rights and more for human rights, than you ever had before. These child-labor children are disinherited children. They are denied their social birthright by an infamous system of land monopoly.

When the site of one city is worth more than that of another, when lots in one part of a city are worth more than lots in another part, when some farming locations are worth more than others, when some mineral deposits enrich their so-called owners while impoverishing their workers, and Nature's gift of oil ruins scores of thousands to make a billionaire—when these differences appear what do they mean? They mean that the more valuable places command greater degrees of control over social or industrial advantages. If one baby inherits a place on the earth that is valueless even though useful in a primitive fashion, and another inherits one that is not only useful but valuable, the latter inherits a larger share of common social benefits than the other. That is wrong and should be no longer tolerated. A fair field and no favor is the slogan alike of righteousness and of progress. It is such a field that the single tax policy offers.

The principle which animates the single tax policy is one of two forces that to-day are gathering for conflict. The other is the socialist principle. I do not allude to the Socialist party. That may or may not figure in the struggle before us as the representative of the principle of socialism. No one can tell. What I do allude to is the force of which the So-

cialist party is now an expression. Whether it finds ultimate expression in a party calling itself Socialist or otherwise makes no difference. So with the single tax principle. This raises no question of particular political parties or platforms or programmes. It is the vital principle of practical individualism. It is the principle with reference to property, not of "mine," nor of "mine and thine," but of the sacredness of mine, the sacredness of thine, and the sacredness of ours. In the conflict between these two principles, socialism and the single tax, every man who lives much longer will be compelled to choose.

The question he must sit in judgment upon is whether, on the one hand, he will promote a social principle the philosophy of which is economic fatalism and its ideal the making of society everything and of the individual nothing; or will, on the other hand, promote the principle which distinguishes social from individual functions, social from individual rights, social from individual duties, conserving them all by taking for society what belongs to society and leaving to each individual what belongs to him. This is the issue.

According to the socialistic principle the industrial change from the use of cheap tools to expensive machinery is a functional change completely revolutionizing the character of industry. According to the single tax principle this change is not functional but structural, making no revolution at all, though intensifying certain phenomena. Single taxers hold that the same functional adjustments exist that always have existed, that the same elementary principles apply that always have applied.

There never was a time when the things that men need could be produced otherwise than by human labor. There never will be. There never was a time when labor could produce anything, or even exist, without recourse to land. There never will be. There never was a time when the artificial implements of labor, whether tools or expensive machinery, were produced otherwise than by the application of labor to land. There never can be. There never was a time when labor in freedom with land unmonopolized could not and would not produce everything that is needed up to the limits of the existing accumulation of knowledge. There never can be nor will be.

There never was a time when control of the land would not give control of the men who have to use it. There never will be. Let me own all the land and I care not who owns the machinery. Give me the land and I could make slaves of you all.

In truth there are only two modes of slavery. One mode operates directly upon men themselves by the direct exercise of arbitrary power; the other operates upon them indirectly by the monopolization of the land they must use. In our day we have survivals of the former mode in our systems of taxing men arbitrarily, without regard to the service society renders them. A head tax, for instance, is to that degree chattel slavery. If it took all the man's earnings except a bare living, it would be chattel slavery complete. It is the same with taxes on houses. All these are arbitrary exactions, precisely alike in principle with the master's exactions from his slave. The other mode of slavery operates by withdrawing land from the worker which the worker needs for use. By that process the effects of slavery are produced. The only difference is that in the first mode of slavery the slave must be whipped to his task if he balks. In the other he never balks. He begs for a task. He blesses the man who gives him one. He damns the man who does his work for him. He organizes strikes and boycotts to make secure the very toil which a chattel slave would relinquish gladly but for the whip.

Do not imagine that we suppose work a thing to be avoided. We regard it on the contrary as a solemn duty and a sacred right. I agree entirely with that New York man of money and piety who has challenged labor unions to discuss the question of the right to work. I agree with him when he says that "it is just as immoral to keep a lot of men from working and thus cause great loss to other people and prevent them from earning money needed for the support of their families," as to steal property. I cordially agree with him in that. What I do not agree with him in, is his partial application of the principle. He thinks it immoral for workingmen to threaten other workingmen with violence if they take strikers' jobs. So do I. But he does not think it immoral to prevent men from working by keeping land out of use. I do. Like those men of

his kind down in Palestine 2,000 years ago he is straining at an immoral gnat and swallowing an immoral camel, hump and all.

The interference with labor of which trades unions are guilty is trifling in comparison with that which land monopoly causes. Moreover, if it were not for land monopoly there would be no interference by trade unions. Jobs would then be more plentiful than workers, and trade unions would be as useless and as scarce as refrigerators at the north pole. If natural opportunities for labor were not monopolized, every man would be his own trade union.

That most desirable condition, with its concomitants of continuous prosperity and advancing civilization, would be produced by the triumph of the single tax principle. Put this principle in operation in the old Louisiana territory, and at the next centennial there will be a degree of progress to celebrate, of which one may hardly venture to prophesy in these days of social disorder and sordid ideals. There would be no taxation of industry or thrift or enterprise; for the social increment of wealth that now excites the cupidity of land monopolists would then provide for public expenses. There would be no parasitical class; for individual earnings would then enrich the earners themselves, each in proportion to his usefulness. There would be no vacant land that was wanted for use; for then the monopolizer must annually pay to the public the annual market value of the privilege of keeping others off, and no one would do that on speculation, for it couldn't possibly pay. There would be neither strikers nor scabs; for jobs would then hunt for workmen instead of workmen hunting for jobs, and nobody would have any incentive to take work away from anyone else. There would be no involuntary poverty; for all who were willing to work would find abundance of remunerative work to do. There would be no hoboes at either extreme of the social scale. Meanwhile your city slums would have disappeared. Your homeless would have made homes for themselves. Your deserts would bloom, not only with wealth-making vegetation, but with wholesome men and women, neither over-rich nor under poor, who would earn their own living and get the living they earned. Then we should know for the first time what it means to have a responsible citizenship of free men, among whom, though some might lead and

many might follow, none could be master and none would be serf, none could command and no one would cringe. We should realize, too, the blessed import of those almost meaningless words, "our country," "our city," "our Louisiana Purchase."

This, my friends, is what our cause triumphant would do for your city. This is what it would do for the old French territory of which your city is the metropolis. This is what it would do for our common country. Who is there so sordid, so selfish, so unpatriotic, as to count the cost of such a consummation?

"You seem to be pretty confident of winning the race," said the sporting editor.

"Well, I think I ought to be," replied the owner of the automobile, as he examined the steering gear; "my machine used to belong to Tom L. Johnson."

G. T. E.

In Cincinnati when they drive hogs through the streets to the slaughter house they usually have following what I call the butcher's ambulance. If a hog is too weak to walk they are kind enough to put him in the wagon and give him a ride. But they take him to the slaughter house just the same. That is charity.—Herbert S. Bigelow.

"Is your son a busy lawyer?"

"Well, according to his sign board he is fighting all the time; it says he is an 'attorney at law.'"

G. T. E.

And Yawcob, observing his dog Schnitzel, spake unto him as follows: "You vas only a tog, but I vish I vas you. Ven you go mit your bed in you shust durn round dree dimes und lay down. Ven I go mit my bed in, I haf to lock up der place und vind up der clock und pud der cat out und undress myselluf und my vrow vakes und scolds, den der paby vakes up und cries und I haf to walk him mit der house around; den maybe ven I gets myselluf to bed it is dime to get up vonce more again. Ven you gets up mit your bed you shust stretch yourselluf, dig your neck a leedle und you vas up. I haf to light der fire und put on der kittle, scrap some mit my vife aletty und git myselluf breakfast. You blay mit der day all round und haf plenties of fun. I haf to vork all der day round und haf plenties of

drubble. Ven you die you vas dead. Ven I die I haf to go to hell yet."—Boompennickel Blatter.

"But you are certainly more prosperous now than you were five or six years ago," asserted the senator in a tone that precluded any denial.

"Yes," replied, in apparent acquiescence, the constituent who had been complaining of certain unsatisfactory conditions, "but I have to be more prosperous; it costs me so much more to live."

G. T. E.

### BOOKS

#### MORRISON DAVIDSON'S NEW BOOK OF KINGS.

We have just received a copy of the new (Coronation) edition of this book, noticed some months ago in these columns. It is issued either in paper at 1s., or in cloth at 2s., by F. R. Henderson, 26 Paternoster square, London. According to the publisher's announcement it is now selling in its one hundred and thirty-fifth thousand.

The last four chapters are an addition to the original edition. Three of these were written in 1887 at the time of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee, the last in 1894, on the occasion of a royal christening. The chapter entitled "Mene, Tekel, Upharsin" is an unusually strong piece of writing. Who that knows anything of the intimate and personal side of English history can deny the truth of the following?

"Nearly all the kings and queens of England have been criminals and reprobates of the deepest dye; yet we have pampered them with every luxury during their lives, and erected statues to their memory, and written fulsome eulogies of them after their deaths. Our historians, when they come to deal with a real royal monster, generally ascribe to him qualities the very opposite of those for which he was distinguished."

After all his terrible record, Mr. Davidson is willing to make some apology for the individuals. "It is not," he says, "that kings and queens are worse naturally than other men and women. It is the institution that corrupts and degrades them below the level of their fellows."

As was said in a previous review, this book will be an offense to many; but so long as historians gloss the truth for rank's sake, such books will continue to be written.

J. H. DILLARD.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

—An Essay on the Theory and Practice of the Christian Religion. By P. R. Benson. Published by the author, Anoka, Minn. To be reviewed.

—The Pilgrim of the Future; or, Outlines of Spiritual Philosophy. By Rev. Samuel

Well. Boston: Arena Publishing Co., Copley square. Price, 50 cents. To be reviewed.

—Modern Paradise. The Model Home.—Solution of the Social Problem. Future Greatness of Electricity.—Proposed Experiment in Social Science.—An Earthly Eden and How to Attain It. A Unique Power Plant. Wonderful System of Education. Elegantly Illustrated. Prof. Henry Olerich, author and publisher. Omaha, Neb. Price, 50 cents.

#### PERIODICALS.

In the Arena for May, B. O. Flower considers Jefferson's service to civilization during the founding of the American Republic. The number opens with a symposium on Mormonism, led by President Joseph F. Smith, of the Mormon church.

In the Craftsman for April (Syracuse, N. Y.), one of the finest specimens of elegant typography among American periodicals, Ernest Crosby begins a consideration of Shakespeare as a democrat, something which he does not believe Shakespeare to have been.

In the May Scribner Gen. John B. Gordon begins a series of articles on the civil war which promise to be of exceptional interest. In this number the Southern viewpoint of the cause of the war is put with unusual clearness and succinctness. Gen. Gordon begins by confessing "that had there been no slavery there would have been no war." Other interesting features of this number are Prof. Brander Matthews's account of "The Strangest Feat of Modern Magic" and a story entitled: "Where the Ways Crossed," which is far superior to the average magazine story. The poetry of this number is also much above the average. J. H. D.

How the whole world is kin appears in an article in the May Harper entitled: "A Strange People of the North." These people are the Chuckchee, inhabiting the extreme northeastern part of Asia. The author, representing the American Museum of Natural History, visited them in 1901, and one of the features of his entertainment was a spiritualistic performance, which was almost identical with the common performances given by mediums that may be seen almost any night in any American town. The question of lying, apropos of Mark Twain's story in the December number and a letter replying thereto, is discussed in a happy way by the editor in his study. "Truth," he says, "is too sacred to be trifled with; but it is possible that in the very fanaticism of our homage we may profane her." J. H. D.

The Lincoln (Neb.) Independent, easily in the front rank of the Populist papers of the country, has made of its issue for May 14, a single tax edition. Henry George, Jr., writes the biography of his father, and among the special contributors are Bolton Hall, A. C. Allison, J. B. Sharpe, Ralph Hoyt, L. P. Custer, J. H. Sheets, John Flirer, James Bently, Joseph Leggett, J. H. Dillard, Ernest C. H. Crosby, E. T. Weeks, C. F. Nesbit, C. B. Fillebrown, John B. Howarth, F. W. Maguire, Lawson Purdy, George B. Rounsevell, Florence A. Burrell, August Dellgren, J. Bellangee, W. H. T. Wakefield, W. L. Crosman, C. F. Shandrew, F. M. Marquis, Walter H. Roebuck, F. H. Augspurger, E. C. Clark and Speed Mosby. The issue of the Independent for June 11 is to be devoted to criticisms of the single tax.

The Spring number of the Single Tax Review (Quarterly, New York), is an exceedingly interesting issue of this publication. It contains a full report of the joint debate between Mr. Louis F. Post and Prof. John B. Clark on the single tax, held in Cooper Union, February 20. Other interesting features are "The Assessment of Real Estate" by Lawson Purdy, a speech by Congressman Robert Baker and "A Great American," by the editor. The great American of whom Mr. Miller writes is Gerrit Smith, the famous anti-slavery leader. It will be interesting to those who know of Gerrit Smith in other connections to learn that though he died in 1874, and therefore had never heard of Henry George, he said: "The right to the soil is as natural, absolute, and equal as the right to the light and air," and declared "land monopoly the chief cause of beggary." J. H. D.

Mr. Victor Rosewater, of Omaha, has an article in the current number of the Political Science Quarterly on Value in Tax-



TOM JOHNSON'S "WAY"!

ation. In conclusion he says: "From this discussion it might appear that an equitable assessment of property for taxation is an absolute impossibility." Certainly it does so appear. "But," adds Mr. Rosewater, "we need have no serious apprehension on that score." His consolation is that errors offset each other. Prof. Charles J. Bullock, of Williams college, has in the

same number a valuable article on the Growth of Federal Expenditures. Not the least important part of Prof. Bullock's paper is his showing of the burden of war. "As a matter of fact," he says, "it will probably startle the average reader to learn how little the federal government would cost were it not for war and its consequences."—J H. D.

# LECTURES

ON ECONOMIC SUBJECTS

At **HANDEL HALL**

40 EAST RANDOLPH ST.

SUNDAY AFTERNOONS, AT 3 O'CLOCK

UNDER AUSPICES OF THE

**Henry George Association**



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

**CLARENCE S. DARROW**

Will Lecture Sunday Afternoon, May 24, subject

"PERILS OF TRADE UNIONS."

**JOHN Z. WHITE**

Will Lecture Sunday Afternoon, May 31st, subject

"Questions and Answers on the Single Tax."

THURSDAY, MAY 28th

**EDGAR L. MASTERS,**

"The Constitutional March."

THURSDAY, JUNE 4th

**W. CHARLES TANNER,**

"RUSKIN."



## 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 Subscription . . . . .	.50
Trial Subscription (4 weeks) . . . . .	.10
Single Copies . . . . .	.05

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.

Houston.

**EWING & RING,**

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS.

HOUSTON, TEXAS

Presley K. Ewing

Henry F. Ring

## 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.**

### THE AUSTIN-HAAS DEBATE,

second edition, demonstrates irrefutably, or your money back, that the "Balance of Trade," boasting referred to by politicians, instead of enriching our country, is in reality a perpetual drain upon its resources. Ex-Senator Pettigrew says of it: "I have read with much interest your very conclusive argument that exports do not enrich our country."

Price, postpaid, 30 cents. Address

**A. C. AUSTIN, Hudson, S. D.**

### BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

Emerson Binding Covers in which THE PUBLIC may be filed away week by week, making at the end of the year a reasonably well-bound volume, may be ordered through this office. Price, 80 cents, postpaid.

### TO THE STOCKHOLDERS OF ELABORATED READY ROOFING COMPANY.

Gentlemen:—You and each of you are hereby notified that a Special Meeting of the Stockholders of the Elaborated Ready Roofing Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, is hereby called to be held at the office of the Company, Number Thirty-four (34) Wabash Ave., City of Chicago, State of Illinois, on the Thirtieth (30th) day of May, 1903, at the hour of Ten o'clock a. m. for the purpose of increasing the capital stock of said corporation from Ten Thousand (\$10,000.00) dollars to Twenty-five thousand \$25,000.00 dollars; and for the further purpose of enlarging the object for which said corporation was formed.

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 27th day of April, A. D., 1903.

M. B. BECKER, President.

H. D. COOK, Secretary.

JAY D. MILLER, Attorney, Attest.

**G. H. ATKINSON & CO., CONTRACTORS,**

JERSEY CITY, N. J.

Electric Light, Telephone and Municipal Work.

Trolley Roads Built and Financed.