

# The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 30, 1903.

Number 269.

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.

By an unfortunate oversight the paging of last week's issue of The Public duplicated the paging of the week before. This makes no practical difference, except to subscribers who keep files of the paper; and we will furnish without charge a corrected copy to any such subscriber, upon request made within two weeks.

So much deference has been paid by statesmen and journalists both here and in England to the political opinions of "the man in the street," that it is refreshing to see Lloyd-George, the able and conspicuous Radical-Liberal member of parliament, unceremoniously throw him overboard. In a speech at Newcastle last month Mr. Lloyd-George described this infallible political deity known as "the man in the street," as "the man who gives neither time nor serious thought to politics."

Those shallow minded employers of labor who have been assiduously sowing the wind of fake prosperity, are now reaping a whirlwind of labor strikes. There has in reality been no great prosperity for employers in competitive lines. Though they have done a livelier business, they have not been getting a much greater aggregate of profit. The extra profit has been going to employers who have some kind of monopoly. Consequently, when workingmen, inspired by the constant cry of "extraordinary prosperity," demand a share of this prosperity in the form of higher wages or shorter hours or both, employers in competitive businesses find them-

selves not only unwilling but unable to concede these demands. It is an awkward position to be in, but some of them are beginning frankly to admit that this so-called prosperity is a hollow sham; that it means for them, as it means for most workingmen, more work and less pay in the face of higher living expenses.

The Department of Agriculture is furnishing more census statistics for the use of prosperity editors. According to one of its estimates, as stated by the Chicago Daily News of the 18th—

the amount of human labor required to produce a bushel of wheat from beginning to end is on an average only ten minutes, whereas in 1830 the time was more than three hours.

How pleasant it would be if some of these experts would now figure out an explanation of where all that advantage in wheat production has gone to. Here we find that a given expenditure of human labor will now produce 18 times as much wheat as the same expenditure would have produced seventy-odd years ago. But what becomes of it? Working farmers are not 18 times as well off. Farm hands do not get 18 times their old wages. Middlemen do not get 18 times as much for handling. Millers do not get 18 times as much for grinding, nor bakers for baking. What becomes, then, of all this difference between the productive power of labor in producing wheat in 1830 and now? It is an advantage which somebody gets, if the Department estimate is correct; but who is that Somebody?

Organized workingmen were sensibly warned last Sunday by the Hon. Clarence S. Darrow, who represented the coal miners last winter. In a speech before the Henry George association of Chicago, he pointed out

the dangers that threaten trades unionism in these days of multiplying membership and multitudinous strikes. This danger consists in the disposition of labor unionists to hold trades unionism down to mere business levels, regardless of political, economic and ethical questions. The essence of the lecture, which is reported to have been of exceptional merit, is phrased as follows by one of the news reports:

Any permanent advance in the condition of the workingman must come from two causes. First, a creation of natural conditions that will cause increased production; second, a natural condition that will cause a more equitable distribution of wealth.

These are indeed the conditions of permanent improvement for what is called the labor class. They are, moreover, the conditions of all wholesome advance. Labor can make no permanent advance by means of strikes against employers and treaties with them, so long as production is held in check and distribution is unbalanced. Until trade unions give at least as much consideration to the economic conditions that divert wealth from its producers as to the possibilities of hectoring employers, workingmen will remain poor men.

Not often is a primary for nominating a party candidate for a seat in a State legislature, of national importance or interest. There was, however, an exception to the rule last week in Ohio. What makes this exception important is the fact that it marks the first pronounced victory, outside of Cuyahoga county, for the novel methods with which Tom L. Johnson, the new Democratic leader of Ohio, is renovating and strengthening his party.

The novelty here referred to does not consist in the use of a tent and

an automobile, as sensational reporters and light-headed editors would have it, but in holding party candidates strictly to their responsibilities to the rank and file of the party. Last Fall eight Democratic members of the legislature, all pledged against corporation rings, joined the Hanna and the Foraker members in voting for a corrupt bill which saddled a 50-year street car franchise upon the people of Cincinnati. Johnson notified them all that he would exert his influence with their constituents to prevent their reelection. This gave them little concern at the time. With the support of the railroads, of the Republican bosses, and of the little bosses of their own party at home, they felt secure. But by direct and open appeals to the constituents of these Democratic "black sheep," Johnson has driven them all out of public life.

The only real fight he had to make was against William H. Earhart, of Richland county. Earhart was defiant. So were all the local Democratic leaders. When Johnson had the situation looked over, there seemed no possibility of securing the nomination of C. K. Hershey, who had entered the lists against Earhart almost without local political backing. Then Johnson scattered literature over the county, and from the 20th to the 23d, both dates inclusive, he made a rushing automobile campaign, speaking in every town, village and hamlet. He spoke wherever he could get an audience, and that was everywhere.

To make a contest for a party nomination is, of course, not a novelty in politics. But it is a novelty for the State leader to do this openly, and to do it for the express purpose of purifying his party and with the avowed intention of campaigning for the candidate of the opposite party should his own party insist upon nominating a man whose only offense—usually considered venial in politics

and not infrequently applauded—consists in a record of official treachery to public interests.

The spirit of Mayor Johnson's campaign against Earhart may be seen from this interview with him, published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

I informed Earhart immediately after he voted for the Cincinnati curative act that I would fight him to the last ditch, and I am going to do it whether I am beaten in the attempt or not. I will go into Richland county prepared to meet hisses or any other kind of treatment. If I am hissed I will be there when the hissing is over. I believe the defeat of Earhart to be a matter of vital importance to Democratic principles. A traitor should find no place in the Democratic party of this State. If Earhart did not intend to stand upon the principles of the party he should have told the people so before they elected him. If I knew that the vote of one legislator at the next general assembly would decide the senatorial election and send Mr. Hanna back to the Senate I would work just as vigorously for the defeat of Earhart, for the reason that I believe his defeat under the circumstances is of more importance to the people of Ohio than the election of a United States senator. If Earhart should be nominated I will continue the fight against him up until the day of election. I will go into Richland county with the tent and work with all my might for his defeat.

At all his meetings, says the Plain Dealer,—

Mayor Johnson prefaced his address by inviting anyone who wished to speak or ask questions to divide time with him on the platform.

And in answer to the complaint that in campaigning outside of his own county he was violating his principle of home rule, he was accustomed to say, in varying terms but without change in substance:

The principal charge made by some is that I'm violating the principle of home rule in coming here. I believe I'm not. I stand for home rule. If I advocated the election of a county officer whose jurisdiction was confined to county lines I might be open to criticism, but I'm here to give reasons why a legislative candidate should not be elected. The legislature is a State office, in which the legislators pass laws for Cuyahoga county as well as for Richland. The situation is not so secret or so sacred that it should not be open to the people to hear about it.

If a Richland county man were to come to Cleveland with any valuable information against one of our candidates he would be accorded a respectful hearing. We want to know who the crooks are in Cleveland. I would not treat Earhart badly if I had the opportunity, but I want to criticize his public acts and not dictate or request anything.

In the best of senses this was not a partisan campaign. So far as Johnson spoke in behalf of success for the party he appealed to the people to make it successful by making it worthy of success. On that point we find such quotations from his speeches as these:

The Democratic party will remain the minority party in the State as long as a handful of boodlers are permitted to parcel out second terms to such men as Earhart. It is worth much to the Democratic party to punish one who has betrayed his trust.

I charge Earhart with voting for unjust corporation privileges, against two platforms and a caucus of his party.

I'm not for every man that marks himself a Democrat. I'm not with every local or national leader. The mission of the Democratic party is to advocate principles that will bring victory to liberty-loving people of all parties.

When a handful of men distribute the local offices, when Democracy sinks to that level, it doesn't deserve success, and I hope it won't get it.

The steam roads don't pay one-third as much taxes as you men who pay rent. You are taxpayers three times as much as the steam roads. I preach a Democracy of equality, justice, home rule, and equal taxation, and am not for legislators who ride to Columbus on passes and when there remember the passes and forget their constituents. When the principles of equality, justice and home rule bring success to your party you bring success to Democrats and Republicans as well.

It is impossible to give more than a faint picture of the dashing work Johnson did in this house-cleaning campaign. The Cleveland Plain Dealer's correspondent described it from Mansfield on the 23d as follows:

When the mayor and his automobile came down into Richland county last Wednesday, against the will of the Democratic leaders, things began to happen rapidly. Such swift campaigning has never been seen in this county before, and the "automobile

in politics" when a man like Johnson is steering it, has shown itself to be a power. The original plan was to hold about a dozen meetings in the county, but once he had entered into the work, he carried it forward with cyclone rapidity, speaking not only in Mansfield, in the opera house and in the union depot, at Shelby and other towns throughout the county, but in front of village stores wherever even a few people were gathered to hear what he had to say. Johnson's circulars were soon broadcast over the county, and when he came to the villages news of his mission had preceded him. His workers did double duty during the campaign and when the mayor left Mansfield at 4 o'clock this morning in his auto, accompanied by Salen and Charlie Gongwer, for a final round up of the county, he soon found affairs so satisfactory to him that he steered his course for Cleveland.

Nor was he disappointed. Although Earhart and the other local leaders, who had refused to come out into the open but had made an industrious "gum shoe" campaign—although they were confident of victory until after the primary polls had closed, they were defeated by a majority of 245. Even the boss-ridden town of Mansfield was lost to them by a majority of 10 for Hershey.

Commenting upon this result, the Plain Dealer's correspondent in his Mansfield dispatch of the 23d, said:

It is a great victory for Johnson. He has made good his promise to defeat Earhart for the nomination because Earhart voted for the curative act. When he was here at the tent meeting last fall he announced what he intended to do, and the results to-night show that he has made good. Mr. Hershey's strength will be with the labor people.

Mayor Johnson's own estimate of the victory appeared in an interview as follows in the Plain Dealer of the 24th:

The result in Richland county is certainly a stern warning to officeholders who hold what they can get out of their offices higher than the principles of the Democratic party. In the future I believe that any handful of officeholders who want to override the principles of the party will stop to think. The defeat of Earhart, of course, means the utter annihilation of the eight "black sheep." Earhart has been beaten, "Bill" Gear is absolutely out of the race in Wyandot county, and the other six have

not dared to show their faces. But the result is of more far reaching importance than the mere defeat of Earhart and the other black sheep. It will have a most salutary effect over the entire State. It will give the Democratic party a chance from now on to move forward and accomplish results. A note of warning has been sounded to the effect that treason to democratic principle in the Democratic party in Ohio will not be tolerated by Democratic voters. Another thing has been conclusively demonstrated by the result, and that is that some of the old leaders of the party in the State have got to take a back seat. Earhart himself may not have been a bad sort of a fellow, but the men that he was training with had to be taught a lesson. I look for great results because of the action of the Democrats of Richland county.

Leadership like this which Johnson has brought to the Democratic party in Ohio, will soon redeem that State from the domination of plutocracy in both parties. In putting party principle high in authority, and party politicians with their gum shoes and whisperings out of power, he is rendering an inestimable public service.

President Roosevelt has the newspaper credit of having got the best of Senator Hanna in the Republican squabble in Ohio; but his advantage is not quite distinguishable to the naked eye. Senator Hanna disputed with Senator Foraker the advisability of endorsing Roosevelt's candidacy at the coming Republican State convention. Mr. Foraker wished to make the endorsement; Mr. Hanna opposed it. The latter gave as his reason, not that he was unfriendly to Roosevelt—"not by no manner of means,"—but that it was too early to select a Republican candidate for the presidency, to be voted for 18 months hence. Mr. Hanna doubtless felt the force of the Wall street sentiment against Roosevelt's antics.

When it began to look as if Mr. Hanna might win in this contest, Mr. Roosevelt himself took a hand in the Ohio fight. He first gave out this significant newspaper interview: "I have not asked any man for his support. I have had nothing whatever

to do with raising the issue as to my indorsement. Sooner or later it was bound to arise, and inasmuch as it has arisen, of course, those who favor my administration and nomination will indorse them and those who do not will oppose them." That was plain enough talk. Those who stood with Hanna were to be Roosevelt's enemies; those who stood with Foraker were to be Roosevelt's friends. But lest this electric hint might not effect its purpose, Mr. Roosevelt telegraphed to Mr. Hanna himself, "intimating," says Mr. Hanna, "his desire to have the endorsement of the Ohio Republican State convention of his administration and candidacy." Mr. Hanna thereupon withdrew his opposition, and the papers say he "had to lie down."

But did Hanna "have to lie down"? On the contrary, may he not have scored a point? Suppose it should seem desirable next year, for party reasons, to advocate the nomination of another man than Roosevelt, of what use to Roosevelt would be this premature endorsement, given perfunctorily at his own personal and pressing request? Neither Hanna nor his party in Ohio could be held in line by so slender a thread if they had reasons for getting out of line.

The Nebraska (Lincoln) Independent assumes responsibility for the following astonishing explanation of the manner in which the expenses of President Roosevelt's vacation tour are met:

A quarrel having resulted among railroad officials out in San Francisco, one of them, while in angry mood, told some things that will enlighten the said farmer and many others as to who pays the expenses. This railroad man, Mr. Kruttschnitt, of the Southern Pacific, having for that road refused to contribute anything toward the local expenses of entertaining the President, put up as an excuse that the Presidential train was being hauled free, as well as the junketing train of the local politicians who go out to meet the Presidential party, and that the company hauled the trains containing the militia companies free also, and further that the road would not contribute. Mr. Wat-

kings, who had the entertainment of the President in charge, said that he replied to Mr. Kruttschnitt "that, as the President is the representative of a client of the Southern Pacific which pays to that corporation between \$2,000,000 and \$3,000,000 annually for hauling troops, freight and mail, a free ride to such a customer was not an extraordinary courtesy."

So the railroads are giving Mr. Roosevelt a free junket, because, as President of the United States, he is the representative of a good customer. In other words, this junket is in the nature of commissions. Isn't this position somewhat humiliating for a President on a campaign tour for reelection? Or is Mr. Roosevelt proof against humiliation?

Mayor Harrison's message to the Chicago aldermen on the traction question is an able and reassuring document. It is not over-modest, to be sure, in the claims it makes for Mr. Harrison and his tactics; as, for instance, when it asserts that the "public policy" referendum law would not have found its way to the statute books of Illinois, "had the tactics of handling the traction question been other than those employed." The "public policy" referendum law had no connection whatever, in its origin, with the traction question. It was drafted by Allen Ripley Foote and piloted through the legislature by Mr. Foote and Clayton E. Crafts, then a member of the Illinois legislature. These gentlemen were forced to accept the 25 per cent. petition, instead of the ten per cent. they proposed, in order to get the measure through at all. But nobody connected with the Chicago traction agitation took any part in proposing or securing the adoption of this measure. And so far as its subsequent use in promoting the municipal ownership movement is concerned, the chief credit belongs, without doubt, to Daniel L. Cruice. Both with reference to this wholesome law and to some other matters, the mayor's message would have been stronger if his personality had been kept more in the background. But

after all this is said, the message is entitled to rank high as a public document.

Nothing but accusations of the lowest order of bad faith can now be urged against Mayor Harrison's policy by those who believe in municipal ownership, and that order of bad faith on his part is not to be presumed. The mayor has committed himself, both by solemn pledge and strong argument, to insistence upon the abrogation of the 99-year charter; upon a provision in the extension of existing charters, for municipal ownership at the earliest feasible time; and upon referendum authority for any extension at all. Nothing more could be asked. But it is not to his bare pledge alone, that we allude. We also refer to the document itself, as one which sets forth a correct policy (with the exception of its uncertainty as to lower fares or taxes on receipts), and does so with consummate ability and in sympathetic spirit.

What Mayor Harrison says in this same message on the subject of the use of the police in times of strike disorders (quoted in our news columns), also clearly propounds an uncontestedly sound policy. It is the duty of the police to preserve public order. If this happens to interfere with the success of a strike, that may be unfortunate but does not alter the obligation. On the other hand, it is not the duty of the police—it is distinctly otherwise,—to assist employers in winning strikes. They have no right to do strikers' work, to intimidate strikers who keep within their rights, or in any other manner to serve the personal ends of employers. It is the business of a policeman on such occasions to be a non-partisan peace officer, and nothing else. This is the view Mayor Harrison expresses. If he requires the Chicago police to live up to that view, no good citizen will condemn him.

John D. Rockefeller has been heard from on the subject of Miss Tarbell's

historical articles in McClure's Magazine. By an interesting coincidence it is a socialistic magazine, Wilshire's, that becomes his mouthpiece. Mr. Rockefeller explains, according to Wilshire's:

The McClure Magazine articles on Standard Oil are all without foundation. The idea of the Standard forcing anyone to sell his refinery is absurd. The refiners wanted to sell to us and nobody that has sold and worked with us but has made money. The refineries were only too glad to come in. Natural conditions would have ruined us all if we had not formed a combination. I thought once of having an answer made to the McClure articles, but it has always been the policy of the Standard to keep silent under attack and let our acts speak for themselves. No doubt the refiners wanted to sell to the Standard. Rockefeller's railroad companies had them in a corner, where they had to sell or perish. The "natural conditions" to which Mr. Rockefeller refers were natural enough, to be sure—as natural as the combination of a burglar and a "jimmy." His policy of saying nothing and letting his acts speak for themselves, is admirable. How plainly those acts do speak. So plainly that although Miss Tarbell has merely recited them, without the least approach to hostile comment, Mr. Rockefeller calls the recital an "attack."

At the Presbyterian General Assembly last week the careful and strenuous maintenance of the sacred character of the Sabbath, at whatever sacrifice of personal desire and material and secular interests, was solemnly urged. By "Sabbath" this body of religionists means Sunday. But what authority they have for regarding Sunday as a sacred day it would probably puzzle them to explain. From this dilemma they cannot escape by any such plea as that it makes no difference what day of the week is set apart for religious observance, provided one day be so distinguished; for they attribute sacredness to this particular day. For giving that attribute to Saturday the Jews and other seventh-day worshippers have biblical authority, but

what authority is there for disregarding the sacred character of Saturday and setting up Sunday as the sacred day? What religious sanction is there, for instance, for approving baseball on Saturday because that day, once sacred, is so no longer, and condemning baseball on Sunday because that day, once secular, is sacred now?

Much ado is made in some quarters over the fact that Prof Andrews has abandoned the "silver heresy," which got him into trouble as president of Brown university during the first Bryan campaign. But it is very difficult to discover any "gold bug" capital in Prof. Andrews's recantation. He does not repudiate the quantitative theory of money, which is the crux of the silver question. All he does is to say that the unexpected supply of gold has furnished the additional quantity of money for which the coinage of silver was needed. So far from repudiating Bryanism with reference to the money question, Prof. Andrews confirms Bryan's position.

The density of the average mind whose possessors pride themselves upon standing for "sound money"—"sound money, sir, and respectability;" also the main chance—is one of the wonders of creation. To these minds the question of monetary soundness seems to have nothing whatever to do with the question of quantity. Whether or not the quantity of money makes any difference in the great problem of wealth distribution makes no difference to them. They are fetish worshipers all, to whom gold is a god and silver a devil. Now it is quite easy to understand why a man should oppose bimetallism if he does not believe in the quantitative theory of money. If he believes that the value of money is not increased by a small supply, provided it is large enough for the few transactions that are made in actual money, his opposition to bimetallism is comprehensible. Upon that theory, the

most general single standard may well be regarded as the best standard. The gold monometallist, therefore, who rejects the quantitative hypothesis is at any rate an intelligible opponent of abundant money. But the position of the quantitative theorist, when he opposes money abundance, is explicable only upon the suspicion that he is a creditor and expects to profit at the expense of the debtor, by a decline in commodity values. It certainly cannot be explained by any other logical process.

At a recent session of county auditors in Cleveland, assembled for the purpose of assessing railroads for taxation (p. 99), an attorney for one of the railroads, opposed to increasing its tax an objection which is really meritorious. Said he:

In all the 20 years of its existence this road never earned a cent, but lost thousands of dollars a year, until it was bought up by the B. & O. in 1895. Since then, by the hard work, industry and genius of those in charge of it, it has managed to come out a little ahead each year. Are you going to tax that genius, that industry? The road is worth no more than it ever was, practically, except that its earnings have increased.

If only the State of Ohio would agree to the righteous principle of taxation suggested by that railroad lawyer, how quickly Mayor Johnson's campaign for just taxation would come to an end. It is entirely true that industry, genius, earnings, ought not to be taxed. Only monopoly ought to be taxed. But there's the rub! However true it may be that the value of the particular railroad here in question is due to earnings, the fact is that a much smaller proportion of the value of most railroads is due to earnings than to monopoly. It is the right of way and terminal rights that usually count more than industry or genius (except the genius that conspires and the industry that grabs) in the value of railroad properties. And railroad monopolists are extremely solicitous to evade taxes on that kind of value. Those are the kind of taxes Mayor

Johnson is trying to increase upon them, and right well they know it.

There is a significance in the centenary celebration of Ralph Waldo Emerson which ought not to pass unnoticed. It has been said of him that in a materialistic age he recognized the pervasiveness and dominance of spirit. But our own time is more consciously and aggressively materialistic than his; and the sympathetic celebrations of his hundredth anniversary are by that much more significant of resistance to materialism than were his life and his work. This indirect acknowledgment of the supremacy of the ideal and the spiritual is only one of many gratifying evidences of the declining tendency of that materialistic philosophy which came to us out of the prattle of modern science in its infancy and has done so much toward making greed respectable and commercialism sordid.

One of the bequests of Emerson to mankind is very generally overlooked by those who sing his praises. It is not remarkable, perhaps, for he had many sides without much correlation. An admirer of Emerson may, therefore, very easily overlook gifts of his, which, had he been a man of brilliancy less divergent, could not possibly escape attention. The particular bequest here alluded to was finely described by William M. Salter in a paper read by him at the Emerson centennial of the Chicago Literary club on the 25th. Mr. Salter's subject was "Emerson as a Social Reformer." Anything like full quotations from Emerson on social questions would be too voluminous for our space, but a few brief ones may be given to indicate the direction of his mind on these matters, so much more momentous now than in his day.

When Emerson wrote of "property," it is evident that his thought turned, like that of the farmer or the real estate dealer, to "real property," and that his imagination, like theirs,

comprehended only the land and not its improvements. "I find," he writes in "The Conservative"—"I find this vast network which you call property, extending over the whole planet. I cannot occupy the bleakest crag of the White Hills or the Allegheny Range, but some man or corporation slips up to me to show me that it is his." In the same essay he makes the conservative say: "Touch any wood, or field, or house lot on your peril; but you may come and work in ours for us, and we will give you a piece of bread." In his "Man the Reformer," Emerson brings this thought to the logical and moral climax, for there he says: "Of course, while another man has no land, my title to mine, your title to yours, is at once vitiated." And in his essay "On the Times," he prophetically wrote of the spirit of progress as looking into the legal network of landed property and accusing "men of driving a trade in the great, boundless providence which has given the air, the water and the land to men to use and not to fence in and monopolize." In this connection four lines of Emerson's "Boston Hymn" must be forever memorable. They address themselves to that species of conscience before which hoary wrongs masquerade as "vested rights," that disordered conscience which protests in the name of justice against governments ceasing to do evil until the beneficiaries of the evil are compensated for the pecuniary loss they may suffer. Emerson wrote of chattel slavery, but his sentiment applies as well to the question of compensation for abolishing any other communal wrong:

Pay ransom to the owner  
And fill the bag to the brim.  
Who is the owner? The slave is  
owner,  
And ever was. Pay him.

"You think the manager is inconsistent, do you?"

"Why, yes! He tells the public he has the greatest clown on earth, and he tells me I'm not worth my salt."—Puck.

### IMPERIALISM AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

There seem to be many who have failed to recognize any practical connection between imperialism and the internal social problems of a country. We are apt to think of imperialism as affecting only the foreign policy of the nation, and thus we fail to see its relation to home affairs, except, of course, as it increases government expenditures.

If we seek to get below the surface of vanity and hurrah, and try seriously to discover the real philosophy of the imperialistic movement, what, let us ask, is the impelling motive? Think of what England has added to her territory since 1870: an area of 4,754,000 square miles and an estimated population of 88 millions! Why this immense expansion? What strong forces are back of it? Manifest destiny and Anglo-Saxon push are words: what is the thing? Mr. Hobson, an English writer, in his book, "Imperialism: A Study," has given the answer.

"It is not too much to say," he writes, "that the modern foreign policy of Great Britain is primarily a struggle for profitable markets of investment. To a larger extent every year Great Britain is becoming a nation living upon tribute from abroad, and the classes who enjoy this tribute have an ever increasing incentive to employ the public policy, the public purse, and the public force to extend the field of their private investments, and to safeguard and improve their existing investments."

In other words it is in the growth of concentrated capital and the consequent desire for profitable foreign trade and investment that we find the explanation of colonial expansion. It is for foreign markets and the exploitation of weaker peoples that battleships are multiplied, taxes increased, expenditures quadrupled, lives sacrificed, and principles trampled under foot. It is for extending trade influence at the behest of financial rulers that the natural spread of civilization and self-government is disregarded and a domineering tyranny established over unwilling subjects.

All this has become as true of

America as of England. We have not an equal necessity of looking abroad, because of our larger home market; but we are looking ahead. It may be that the home market of America still takes 96 per cent. of all manufactured articles, only 4 per cent. going to foreign markets; but already we find that the extension of foreign trade and the competition in foreign markets are begetting and fostering our imperialism. And at the same time, as has been the case in England, they are beginning to be used as an argument for resisting the demands of laborers for better pay and shorter hours. This argument is being dinned into the ears of British workingmen, and in due time it will be dinned more and more into the ears of American workingmen. Furthermore, the same argument is used to excuse the monopolistic methods of trusts. In an article, for example, in one of the current reviews, a writer concludes a lengthy discussion of the Standard Oil Company by telling how this company sells about 60 per cent of the oil exported, how its power at home enables it to compete in foreign fields, and how it sells abroad at a lower price than at home only where it comes into competition with Russia in the eastern market.

But in a still more intimate way the purpose and methods of imperialism connect themselves with social problems at home. Readers of *The Public* may, perhaps, remember a book on Poverty reviewed some time since in these columns. It was a minute study of the English city of York, in which place the author found that over 40 per cent. of the population were virtually paupers. Now suppose England, instead of overwhelming the Boers, had given her thought and effort to enabling these people to become purchasers of her goods! Well does Mr. Hobson speak of the "absurdity of spending half our financial resources in fighting to secure foreign markets at a time when hungry mouths, ill-clad backs, ill-furnished houses, indicate countless unsatisfied material wants among our own population." Imperialism turns its back on these conditions in the home market. It does not seek to increase this market by

a better distribution of wealth at home. It goes about, at the cost of the nation's revenue and lives, seeking foreign markets and foreign investments.

Imperialism talks much about the spread of civilization. When we shall have attended better to social conditions at home, then and then only shall we have a civilization worthy to spread. But imperialists do not think so; the present civilization is good enough for them, and they want more of the same kind. So the great financial forces that in both England and America, through the Tory and Republican parties, are whistling patriotism and prosperity to the neglect of the conditions of ill-distributed wealth at home, are the same forces that are backing the policy of Imperialism.

Let us recognize the fact that there are many good men in these parties who have not considered the full purport of this policy. There are others who have been carried along by the impulse of a mistaken patriotism, or by the force of cleverly manipulated public opinion. To all these we must appeal to pause and think how false the policy of Imperialism is both in spirit and in method. Its spirit is driving us to acts of cruelty and to the sacrifice of the optimistic principles of democratic government. Its method is to divert attention and to turn away from the betterment of social conditions at home, while it seeks new fields to exploit abroad.

J. H. DILLARD.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, May 28.

Mayor Harrison has submitted to the Chicago city council a comprehensive and thoughtful message on the traction question (p. 102), wherein he specifies the terms upon which he, as mayor, will consent to an extension of existing street car franchises. His three principal demands are as follows:

1. Provision for public ownership at the earliest feasible date.
2. Submission of the proposed extension ordinance to popular vote under the "public opinion" referendum.

3. An express and unequivocal waiver of all rights claimed by the companies under the so-called "ninety-nine-year" act.

In addition to these principal terms or conditions, Mayor Harrison also demands—

4. An improvement of accommodations which will do away with the present uncomfortable, unwholesome and indecent overcrowding of cars.

5. Adequate compensation for the privileges granted; either in the form of a percentage of the gross receipts paid into the city treasury as a trust fund to be expended solely upon the public streets, a reduction of fares, or a combination of both forms.

6. The simultaneous expiration of all franchises on or before 20 years after the date of grant, and the express prohibition of the transfer of a franchise to a foreign corporation.

7. The use of the underground trolley within a certain district bounded by North avenue, Twenty-second street and Western avenue.

8. The realignment of terminals, that transportation may be rapid and street congestion as far as possible avoided.

9. The use of modern grooved rails in all paved streets, and the paving of the rights of way by the traction companies with asphalt or dressed granite blocks.

10. A universal system of transfers.

11. Full publicity of accounts.

12. The establishment of a system of arbitration for the settlement of disputes arising between the traction companies and their employees.

13. A single-car service instead of the present train service.

In the course of his extended discussion of the three principal conditions enumerated above, Mayor Harrison says, with reference to the popular demand for municipal ownership:

I fail to agree with those who claim to find the sole moving cause of the general desire for public ownership in the execrable service the people of this city have been subjected to for the last six years. In all likelihood general attention to the theory and desirability of public ownership was first directed by the outraged sentiment of the public, aroused by the intolerable service rendered by the local traction companies. It had its origin perhaps in the failure of the traction companies properly to recognize and appreciate the responsibilities and obligations assumed by them together with the franchises, from which, with such slight regard for the public rights, such tremendous financial benefits have been obtained. To-day the desire for and belief in public ownership has gone further than a mere wish for decent and comfortable facilities. The

great mass of our citizens has been educated to the idea that in public ownership lies the sole fair, just and reasonable method of handling all those utilities for the operation of which the practically exclusive use of public property is required. Public ownership is desired as something more than a mere means to an end—obtaining of satisfactory service. It is based on the belief that the profits accruing from the use of the property of the public properly belong to the public; that the granting to individuals of the right to enrich themselves at the expense of the many by the exclusive use of the public's property is as unfair in practice as false in theory, and as demoralizing in its results as was the habit of despots of the olden days, who farmed out the levying and the gathering of the taxes as individual perquisites to profligate favorites.

With reference to all three of the principal demands, the mayor concludes:

The waiver of the 99-year act, the reference of extension ordinances to popular vote, and the enactment of municipal ownership enabling legislation, prior to the extension of the franchises, are three demands which I have personally injected into the discussion and which have been so thoroughly debated and considered that more than 80 per cent. of the voters declared in favor thereof, when the questions of municipal ownership and the referendum were submitted to a popular vote. I can hardly think it conceivable that your honorable body would deliberately fly in the face of public opinion so unmistakably expressed, by ignoring these fundamentals in any extension of the franchises you may see fit to pass. Personally, I take it, I have entered into a contract with the people to secure these conditions. The platform upon which I was nominated explicitly stated these terms as absolutely essential to the consideration of extensions; in my public addresses to the voters I reiterated these terms and pledged myself unequivocally and emphatically to stand out against any extension ordinance which failed to protect the public along these lines. In so doing a contract was made and now exists between the voters and myself, and as far as I am concerned I shall live up to the very letter of it.

Regarding the 99-year act, of which Mayor Harrison speaks, an additional and significant move has been made. The receivers for the street car companies, appointed heretofore by the United States Circuit Court (p. 40), having applied to the court for instructions relative to the waiver of supposed rights under that

act, Judge Grosscup formally advised them on the 27th that they must not make a waiver unless requested to do so by the stockholders and bondholders. Judge Grosscup states his present understanding of the matter as follows:

I have gone far enough into the subject to have ascertained that the first street railways of Chicago were sought to be installed under an ordinance of the city granting franchises in the streets, passed in 1858; that the power of the city to grant such franchises being questioned, an act was passed by the legislature in 1859 validating such ordinance, and that the act of 1865 amended this act of 1859 in no respect other than to enlarge the franchise from one running for 25 years to one running for 99 years.

As to the power of waiver he says:

Of course the stockholders can, if they choose, relinquish their rights to this, as to any other claim of property; so also the bondholders, so far as it constitutes a part of their securities, but the bondholders cannot relinquish for the stockholders, nor the stockholders for the bondholders; nor—and this is the point that concerns you—the court for either or both. Only in case the act is invalid, or is no longer applicable, can the court disregard it as an asset, along with other assets, to be conscientiously conserved.

On the point of invalidity Judge Grosscup lays down the following instructions to the receivers:

The contentions that the act is unconstitutional, and that, assuming its constitutionality, it has been waived by the street railway companies in their former dealings with the city, are subjects for legitimate and controlling inquiry. The questions thus raised lie at the basis of the court's duty respecting the property intrusted to its care. They must be settled, in the mind of the court at least, before the full length of its protecting arm can be intelligently used. I therefore instruct you to prepare a petition bringing to the court all the facts respecting this issue. I instruct you also to invite the bondholders, the railway companies and the city to supply such facts as they may think helpful, and to take part in the discussion which I set down for June 18 next, at ten o'clock a. m. I will hear all or either of these interests without the entry of an appearance, and with the stipulation that no jurisdiction to enter any order shall be predicated upon their participation in the discussion. I will make it an occasion simply of the court seeking for its own guidance light from every source from which light is obtainable.

Meantime Judge Grosscup recognizes

the embarrassment, due to Mayor Harrison's expressed determination that there shall be no extension of franchises by the city while the 99-year act is asserted in behalf of the company; but as to this he instructs the receiver that it is primarily—

the concern of the city on one side and the bondholders and shareholders on the other, and unless invited into it, in the belief that the court might aid in bringing about a just and prompt settlement, you will not intrude.

Other parts of Mayor Harrison's message, quoted from above as to traction questions, relate to the financial condition of the city, to street paving, to the substitution of day labor for the contract method, to subways and track elevation, to the strike situation, and to the use of the police in strikes. On the latter subject he says:

A strike is industrial war. War hardens the conscience, crushes the finer sensibilities, benumbs the better emotions, induces a temporary anaesthesia of the higher qualities of human nature. In an industrial war, as in real war, men do things, men are swayed by impulses and motives, which they would repudiate and disown in normal circumstances. When a strike is on, the radical element comes to the front. As the struggle lengthens, the number of radicals in both camps increases. With this increase the struggle grows more and more imbibited, the combatants less and less open to reason. It is the radicals in the opposing camps who inaugurate and institute unlawful methods. There are those on the side of capital, few indeed though fortunately they may be, who at the very outset clamor for the officer with his club, the militiaman with his rifle, the regular with his machine-like obedience to orders, be the orders what they may be; the radical capitalist asks nothing, is satisfied with nothing, but broken heads and flowing blood. In the hosts of labor are those, few in number, thank God, who believe in the law of force, can see nothing beyond it, recognize no other agency worth invoking. Peaceful picketing, resort to argument and persuasion, are too mild mannered, too milk and watery for their disposition; they are devotees of the law of violence, and to their way of thinking the duty of the police is to turn its back at critical moments and remain blind to the application of the arguments of the fist and the bludgeon.

By the very nature of things the police in times of labor difficulties are between two fires. On the one side is heard the voice of the radi-

cal whom nothing will satisfy but a succession of police charges with swinging of clubs and breaking of heads; on the other side the equally intemperate radical clamors, if not for open aid, at least for acquiescence on the part of the police in his peculiar tactics. They forget that the duty of the police is the preservation of the peace, the enforcement of the law. It is not for him to decide, or even to speculate, on which side is right, which side wrong. Capital is not justified in asking the servant of the people, employed and paid for by the wage-earners as well as by the employers, to win its battles for it. Labor is not justified in expecting from the sworn officer of the law anything beyond absolute and exact neutrality. If capital would pay heed to the laws of humanity, if labor would curb the impetuosity of its radical adherents, or, failing in curbing it, relegate them to the rear ranks, and finally, if the public would stifle its curiosity and leave the scene of action to the participants, the way of the policeman would be plain and easy to follow.

No change has taken place in the Chicago laundry strike (p. 88). Except for some work which is being done surreptitiously by employers of non-union labor, the Chicago laundry business is at a standstill. No collections and deliveries are made, the strength of the strike lying in the loyalty or the fears of drivers.

It is reported from New York that a meeting of large employers was held there on the 22d, to perfect measures for counteracting the strikes which are now prevalent in most industries all over the country. Details of the organization and its purposes are not given extensively, but it appears to be laid upon trade union lines.

Labor organizations in the Philippines appear to have troubles peculiarly their own. A dispatch of the 21st from Manila tells of the seizure there, by the attorney general, of the records and accounts of the Workingmen's union. The formal charge is non-compliance with the provisions of an act or decree of the colonial government which requires all societies and associations to submit annual statements to the colonial treasurer. But the dispatch implies that the real offense in this case is political, for it reads:

It is probable that the investigation of the books will disclose the fact that there has been gross mis-

management of the funds of the organization. It is believed that the money of the union has been diverted from its regular purpose by Gomez, the president of the union, who is also the head of the Nationalist party, and was recently accused of furnishing funds to the ladrones in certain provinces. Gomez is now on a tour of the provinces, where he is holding meetings and agitating questions which border closely on a violation of the sedition act.

Later dispatches from the Philippine island of Cebu (p. 102) confirm previous reports of an insurrection there. A press message of the 26th from Manila tells of a battle between the colonial constabulary of Cebu, under Lieut. Javier, and 200 insurgents, in which 68 of the insurgents were killed and 29 captured. No statement is made of American losses. The fight occurred in the mountains near Tabogan.

Insurrection in Croatia is making trouble for Hungary. Croatia was annexed to Hungary prior to the 14th century, at which time it became more completely incorporated with that kingdom, passing with it in the 16th century to the Austrian House of Hapsburg. But Croatia is Slavic while Hungary is Magyar, and a race bitterness has existed in the province throughout all these centuries. It precipitated an insurrection against Hungary during the Hungarian revolution of 1848-49, which contributed materially to the triumph of Austria. At present, although Croatia is an integral part of Hungary, under the Austro-Hungarian federation, its local government is to a certain extent autonomous. Among other concessions the people are entitled to use the Croatian language for official purposes. But the Hungarian authorities have recently been forcing the use in Croatia of the Magyar language. They have also placed the Hungarian coat of arms on Croatian railroad stations, official buildings, letter boxes, etc., instead of the combined Hungarian-Croatian emblem. This policy has provoked riots in Agram, the Croatian capital, and other towns, by awakening the Croatian race spirit. Economic causes have also been at work. Intense poverty being suffered by the working and agricultural classes. These provocations have been supplemented by the suppression of Slavic newspapers, inhibitions upon public meetings, and government in-

terferences with elections. In consequence, the whole province is reported to be in a revolt which threatens to extend into the neighboring province of Dalmatia. On the 20th a fierce conflict with the police occurred at Agram, in which many persons were wounded and 350 prisoners, including students and women, were taken. Under the cover of martial law, which has been put in force, fully equipped troops are under orders, and over 2,000 people have been arrested. It is reported that 38 have been summarily hanged. Further conflicts are reported as having occurred on the 23d. From Potsused, near Agram, comes the story of a dramatic incident. Upon the arrival of the soldiery to quell a disturbance, all the rioters fled, except one. Being challenged, he answered: "I am a Croat!" and then, tearing his shirt open and baring his breast, he defiantly exclaimed: "Shoot, cowards, if you dare!" Immediately a shot rang out, and the Croat fell dead.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—New York city celebrated her 250th birthday on the 26th.

—The 73d General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church met at Nashville, Tenn., on the 21st.

—The treaty between Cuba and the United States (vol. v, p. 822) was finally signed at Havana on the 22d.

—The Reformed Episcopal Church of America met in triennial General Council at Chicago on the 20th, Bishop Samuel Fallows presiding.

—The German naval ensign who recently murdered an artilleryman from a sense of military obligation (p. 34), was sentenced at Kiel on the 26th to four years' imprisonment and degradation from rank.

—The Republican convention of Pennsylvania met at Harrisburg on the 27th for the nomination of minor State officers. Its platform pledged the State to Roosevelt for 1904 and absolutely opposed general revision of the present tariff.

—President Roosevelt (p. 102) arrived in Portland, Ore., on the 21st. After speaking there he went on to Washington, and was in Tacoma on the 22d, Seattle on the 23d, Walla Walla on the 25th, Spokane on the 26th, and Butte, Mont., on the 27th.

—Owing to the number of fatal accidents caused by an automobile race from Paris to Madrid, beginning on the 24th, Premier Combes issued an order forbidding the continuance of the contest on French territory and the Span-

ish government forbade the racers to cross the frontier.

—Paul Blouet, the author, traveler and lecturer, who is best known as "Max O'Rell," his platform name, died at Paris on the 24th of cancer, at the age of 55. He was a pronounced democrat and a believer in the single tax principle regarding rights to land.

—Judge Boardman of the United States Circuit court at New Orleans, has sentenced to three months' imprisonment in the parish prison there eleven street car men who were convicted of interrupting the progress of mail cars during the recent street car strike (pp. 439, 451) in that city.

—Three small uninhabited islands in the Pacific ocean, near Pitcairn island, were recently appropriated for England by the English resident on Pitcairn, under instructions from the British consul at Tahiti. The appropriation was announced on the 16th, by mail advices from Tahiti received at San Francisco on the 27th, to have been approved by the British foreign office.

—As the result of a long legal fight between the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Western Union Telegraph Co., the former began the destruction on the 21st of the poles and wires of the latter along the railroad right of way east of Pittsburg. The Pennsylvania road has made a contract with the Postal Telegraph Co., but the aggressive action of the Pennsylvania road is attributable to the war between the Vanderbilts and Goulds.

—The Presbyterian General Assembly met at Los Angeles, Cal., on the 21st. Dr. Robert F. Coyle, D. D., was elected moderator to succeed Dr. Van Dyke. On the 22d it was officially announced that the explanations of the confession of faith, adopted by the General Assembly at New York last year (vol. v, p. 122), had been approved by the presbyteries by an almost unanimous vote, only three presbyteries voting against it, and not more than 9 negative votes nor less than 195 in the affirmative being cast by any of the approving presbyteries.

#### PRESS OPINIONS.

##### JOHNSON'S LEADERSHIP IN OHIO.

Cleveland Recorder (Dem.), May 26.—There is probably no other man in the State who would have dared do what the Mayor did in this case. The man who is looking forward to something for himself in the future almost always gets timid and fears a "rumpus in the party." But Tom is absolutely fearless along these lines. He sees that there has been no success in Ohio because of the sort of tactics which returns such men as Earhart to the legislature after they have shown that they are unworthy. He appreciated that it is necessary to make the fight, and knowing that his cause was just and that he had nothing to conceal and nothing to explain, except that Earhart had betrayed the people, he went into Richland county, and by such organization and such

campaigning as has won in Cleveland so often, he defeated Earhart and has taught a lesson to the men who sell out their principles which ought to last for a long while. It is now appreciated that there is a new and vital force at work. Ohio is to be regenerated. It may take some time, but it will win out finally in such a way that it will count. There are plenty of good people everywhere who will delight to come into a new and earnest Democratic party.

#### THE WAY OF THE REMORGANIZERS.

Bryan's Commoner (Dem.), May 22.—In their efforts to control the government, the representatives of the trusts and the syndicates appreciate the importance of "keeping everlastingly at it." In season and out of season, these people see to it that newspapers over whose business office they exercise control cultivate false impressions, misrepresent the policies of their opponents, and seek to create, in many instances, the notion that the whole country is aroused in support of the plans and the candidate having the favor of the representatives of special interests. In this work Republican organs and so-called Democratic newspapers controlled by the reorganizers work as a ruse shoulder to shoulder.

#### THE CAUSE OF BRIBERY.

Cole County (Mo.) Daily Democrat (Dem.), May 24.—Every bribe that has come to light, either in St. Louis or in Jefferson City, was offered to create, protect or perpetuate some monopoly. Did that ever occur to you? Don't forget it, please. Monopoly is the primary and producing cause of about all of the political corruption that exists in the United States or elsewhere. We must eradicate monopoly along with the boodlers.

#### CAPITAL AND LABOR.

Cleveland Waechter und Anzeiger (Dem.), May 8.—That capital and labor must stand or fall together, as Andrew Carnegie said in closing his inaugural address as president of the Iron and Steel Institute, of Great Britain, is a piece of wisdom for which one does not need million dollar libraries; for capital and labor are not only "Siamese twins," as he termed them in symbolic phrase, but they are in reality one.

## MISCELLANY

### SUCCESS.

For The Public.

And these succeeded? Who shall say, indeed,  
Of some, they fail; of others, they succeed?

Perhaps their aim was loftier than those  
Whom Victory's chaplet crowned at battle close.

Failure, indeed, is God's mark of the  
Truth—

His honors are for those who take in  
youth

The cross of some despised work, and  
move

Pierced with our arrows, to His endless  
Love.

How shall we judge him—he who nobly  
fails

At task before which weaker spirit quails;  
Fights and succumbs for Truth's sake—  
who shall guess

The splendid measure of his ill success?  
JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

## UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL.

Printed from the Original MS.

Dear John: About this Russian massacre of the Jews—I see you are justly indignant, John, and a lookin' my way for help, but I don't see how I can do any good by talkin'. I'm a world power now, and no better than the other thieves; and I don't have the credit I used to have when I was the leadin' republic of the world, settin' a high example.

Suppose I should say to the Czar: "Nick, stop this killin' of Jews! My people don't like it!" What do you suppose Nicholas could say to me?

Why, he could say: "Sam, you hoary old villain, look at home! Where are the half million Filipinos you've destroyed? You are up to your elbows in blood yourself, and still a slayin', without compunction. Less than a hundred of my Jews have been killed, but you have killed and destroyed, your own men admit, 600,000 innocent Filipinos. What had they ever done to you? You talk to me of morality? Why, you perfidious old scoundrel, you fired on your own allies! Never was anything in history so low down before! Your nation ain't half civilized. And after firin' on your own allies, you took their country and ravished it with fire and sword, and did such deeds of murder and arson and worse that the President of your United States, for fear he won't be reelected, hides from the people the report of Gen. Miles of what was done.

"Your people don't like it? Don't like killin', don't they? I never heard them make any objection while they were at it themselves. Your church societies that talk of me have been very quiet before. My people killed Jews in a riot; yours killed Christians by the thousand in cold blood, and your churches never peeped. Your Daughters of the Revolution, now so merciful, where, oh, where were they when the Filipino women wailed? Go way back, Sam, where you belong, and sit down!"

And I vum, John, I'd feel like doin' it; I would so. Darn this modern Republican party, anyway. It's got me into lots of disgrace. It has lowered my ideals, ruined my reputation, destroyed my force of example and put an end to my power of doin' good by friendly suggestion. I vum I don't keer sometimes whether McKinley gets a monument or not.

UNCLE SAM.

P. S. Come over to the fair at St. Louis, John. They have the yellow

dog there that bit Corbin, and showed him what real war is.

U. S.

## THE MUNICIPALLY OWNED STREET RAILWAYS OF LIVERPOOL, ENGLAND.

The following statement by C. R. Bellamy, superintendent of the Liverpool street railway lines, is reprinted from the Detroit Tribune of April 20.

In 1897 a company was renting the tramway lines of Liverpool, which belonged to the municipality, under an expired lease of 17 years. The service was inadequate, the fares were high and there were loud complaints as to the conditions of labor of the employees. It was felt that mechanical should supersede horse traction, that the system should be largely extended and fares reduced. The company was not willing to make these changes and negotiations were opened, resulting in the purchasing of the stock and shares of the company at a price slightly in advance of the then market value, which was well above par. The total agreed sum was about \$2,800,000. At that time the system consisted of 68 miles of single track worked by 267 horse cars, which were carrying 38,000,000 of passengers over 6,000,000 car miles per annum, with a revenue of \$1,400,000.

It was at once arranged to scrap the entire undertaking and to adopt electric traction. Within three years after its acquirement, the whole of the 68 miles of track were reconstructed, together with 40 miles of additional new track, which were equipped with 400 regular cars. The total carrying capacity was quadrupled, the fares reduced by nearly one-half (the fare now being one penny, or two cents), the wages of the employes largely increased, their hours of labor reduced and all were supplied with uniform clothing.

It was a bold, forward movement and was considerably criticised, but the response of a grateful public to the facilities afforded made it at once evident that the success of the new scheme was assured.

The population of Liverpool is now 700,000, and 55 times that number were carried in the last year under the company's system, and 160 times under that of the municipality in 1902, at about half the old fares and with much greater speed and comfort.

Reviewing the position as between company and municipal control in the case of Liverpool, which may be taken as typical of the large British towns, it may be pointed out, first, that no

one is suffering by the change. The share and stockholders, directors and officials, were bought out on ample terms. The principal advantages may be summarized:

(1) The gain to the traveling public during last year amounted to \$1,500,000 as a result of lower fares. This is the first and principal form of profit to the community and is always entirely ignored by the anti-municipalists.

(2) The employes gained \$200,000, with free uniform clothing.

(3) Notwithstanding these important concessions, the gross profits amounted to nine and one-half per cent., after maintaining the rolling stock, permanent way and machinery in the highest state of efficiency. Six per cent. of this amount has gone to interest and sinking fund, two and one-half per cent. to a general reserve or depreciation fund, and the remainder, amounting to \$125,000, was transferred to the relief of the local taxes.

It must be admitted on this statement that the present generation is vastly benefited by the municipalization of the tramways, and it only remains to inquire what are the risks, if any, to posterity. The capital expenditure of the complete undertaking has been shown to be \$9,160,000. In addition to the building up of the sinking fund, which will extinguish the debt within 25 years, a renewal or depreciation fund of nearly \$400,000 has been set aside, equal to 12 per cent. of the capital, which will continue to grow, and there can be no question that the undertaking is worth \$5,000,000 above the capital value.

These facts afford ample evidence that the interests of posterity are more than amply provided for, and, I venture to think, establish the proposition that the municipalization of tramways in large towns can be carried out with perfect security and to the great and lasting advantage of the whole community.

**THE ENEMIES AND THE FRIENDS OF THE WORKINGMAN.**

A portion of a sermon delivered at the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, May 24, by the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow.

Job had his comforters, and the workingman has his counselors. From this gratuitous advice the latter has profited as little as the former.

One of the most erratic of these friends of the workingman is the district attorney of New York. Recently he said to an audience of laborers:

"Don't accept any wishy-washy stuff about the brotherhood of man, or economic forces, or inherent rights. Ever since man has been able to stand on his hind legs he has been striving for all he can get. If you are strong, you win; if you are not, you lose. Distrust all men who come to you with broad schemes for settling all social and economic questions permanently. Can any scheme be invented which will be a cure-all for evils to come? Not on your life."

If Mr. Jerome were to get up in the night for medicine for a sick child, he would probably make it a matter of conscience not to mistake carbolic acid for castor oil. This advice which he offers so jauntily to the workingman is sheer poison. No doubt the doctor means well. But if men were held responsible for the character of their thoughts as for their acts, we should say this advice of Mr. Jerome were a case of malpractice. This advice has not even the merit of the Derbyshire charm for sick cattle, which was used with the words: "If it does thee no good, it will do thee no harm."

A noble sentiment this: "Away with wishy-washy stuff about the brotherhood of man. Stand on your hind legs and grab all you can. Might is right."

That is atheism at work. That is the doctrine that there is no God, applied to the labor problem. Too many men are guilty of this practical atheism who would resent the charge of being atheists. Fortunately not all acknowledged atheists are so thorough-going as Mr. Jerome.

No doubt there is enough latent political power in the hands of the laborers in this nation to take everything in sight. If they saw fit to use the strength they have, they could make New York in 1903 what Paris was in 1793. In a single night they could tear down the republic and erect the commune. Labor is Samson. If he were so minded, he could, with one sweep of his right arm, brush away the pillars of state and bring down to ruin the good as well as the evil in our social structure.

What is to hinder the working people, when they learn their power, from playing tyrant? This is what we might expect, if they were to take the advice of Mr. Jerome—to stand on their hind legs and take

all they have the power to take. But this republic is secure, and popular institutions are safe, just because the average man is controlled by his conception of what is just and right. Although the majority of the votes are and always will be in the hands of the so-called laborers, we need have no fear as a nation, because, notwithstanding the admonition of Mr. Jerome, brute force is not likely to take the place of ethical ideals as the controlling principle of conduct.

Mr. Jerome affects fine scorn for the economic reformer. There is nothing in his words to suggest that there are skilled physicians, as well as quacks, among economic reformers, as among doctors of medicine. One might infer from his language that it would be more profitable for the workingman to read the reports of the latest prize fight, than to waste his time on such books as "Progress and Poverty," or Shearman's "Natural Taxation."

It is quite the fashion to condemn all plans for economic betterment, as though they were all offered as panaceas. Doubtless the reformer, in his enthusiasm, expects too much from his plan. Republican institutions have not saved the world, as some expected, but that does not prove anything for monarchy. Some abolitionists thought the labor question would be settled by the emancipation proclamation. Was slavery made right by the fact that they expected too much from abolition?

To-day there are men like William Lloyd Garrison, Tom L. Johnson, Bolton Hall and Clarence Darrow, and a host of earnest and thoughtful people, who tell us that we would do much to unshackle labor if we were to take the unlearned increment of land value for public purposes, and thereby relieve personal property and improvements upon land from the burden of taxation.

Then some fellow, says, with a swagger: "Another panacea. A cure-all. Will it work? Not on your life."

Suppose Mr. Jerome's baby has the colic. The doctor prescribes castor oil. Will Mr. Jerome scout the idea and insist that if his baby is strong, it will get well, and if it is not, it will die? Will he say to the doctor: "Can any scheme be invented which will be a cure-all for babies, for all evils to come?"

"I take no stock in your theories." This is a customary remark with

which men who are supposed to be thoughtful and cultured dismiss the suggestions of the economic reformer. Suppose the man who planned the Brooklyn bridge had been as contemptuous of theories of mechanics as our vaunted statesmen frequently are of theories of political economy. No doubt Mr. Jerome would admit that it would be disastrous to construct a bridge on an incorrect theory. Now, there are good and bad ways of raising public revenues, just as there are good and bad ways of building bridges. What could be more reckless in a leader of public opinion than to advise people to give no heed to the theories for economic betterment, but to go blundering along in a blind, unreasoning and unethical contest of strength?

No doubt this is what Mr. Jerome would call a practical talk to workmen. Oh, these practical men! The practical people are now engaged in collecting fresh-air funds. A circular has just been handed me by the postman which contains an appeal for alms with which to send little children into the country. Among other things the circular says:

It behooves us to avail ourselves of the privilege of giving, for two weeks, the only breath of fresh air, with good food and beds, that many of these dwellers in the tenements receive during the hot summer months.

What a monstrous confession! What an indictment against our social conditions!

And what do these practical men propose to do for the society so disappointed that many, for even two weeks of fresh air, have to depend upon the alms of the favored few? Why, the practical suggestion is to select out of this multitude of "les misérables" a few hundred to be taken on a charity excursion. But if some one reminded us that half the land without our borders is unoccupied, and that our system of taxation puts a premium on vacant land and a penalty on improving land, and that by reason of this blunder homes are made dear, wages are reduced and the people are crowded, and if, to relieve matters, one proposes a sensible change in the method of raising taxes, then your practical man will declare in his omniscience: "Can any scheme be invented which will be a cure-all for evils to come? Not on your life." How enthusiastic some men grow in telling us what can't be done!

If the money contributed to fresh

air funds were spent in collecting and parading to public view the hundreds of dead babies that perish every summer for lack of fresh air, practical men might be moved to look into some broader scheme of social betterment and take less satisfaction in the absurd attempt to bail out the ocean of human misery with the spoon of charity.

#### "LOBSTERS" I HAVE MET. A STICKER WHO WAS STUCK.

For The Public.

One of the most enjoyable afternoons I ever spent was aboard a Big Four train recently. I was bound for Cincinnati, and went into the smoking-room shortly after leaving Chicago. I had been there some time when four gentlemen who had just finished luncheon came in. From the way they addressed each other I quickly inferred they were well acquainted.

"Well, Homer," said one natty looking fellow, as he lighted a cigar, "I suppose we'll all be millionaires in a year from now."

"We will, if we stick, all right," ventured Homer, reaching for the other's lighted match.

"Gentlemen," broke in another, "I'm convinced a man can make money out of most anything, if he only sticks to it."

"So am I," agreed the dapper little fellow, who had spoken first; "I'm thinking of starting a shooting gallery."

"Well, I mean it, Horace," insisted the other; "I believe a man can win out on most anything if he sticks to it."

"Put me next, Mort. What it is!" said Horace, incredulously.

"Did you read Miss Tarbell's account of John D. Rockefeller, and the part he played in the Standard Oil company?"

"No; I've heard of it though," said Horace. "Tell us about it."

"Well, you know," began Mort, pulling away at his cigar, "Rockefeller was in the produce commission business, in 1862, when a young fellow named Andrews got him to put a little money in an oil refinery. The business grew rapidly. He divided it into two departments—manufacturing and transportation—"

"He got special freight rates, didn't he?" inquired Horace.

"Yes," replied Mort, "and he got them proper too. After he had done that he began to regard his competitors as a lot of stiff who ought to

be in some other business. He organized the Standard Oil company in 1870—"

"And began to buy out his competitors in Cleveland," interrupted Homer.

"Yes, that is what it was organized for," went on Mort. "In fact he bought out 20, out of 26 refineries in Cleveland, the first year after the Standard was organized. Then he organized the South Improvement company, to buy up competitors outside of Cleveland. That was in 1871—"

"Then the railroads raised the freight rates on his competitors," put in Homer.

"Yes, they raised them 100 per cent." continued Mort, "and you bet there was something doing in the oil regions. They had been feeling the effects of railroad discrimination for some time, but this was a corker. The oil men got busy, the press got wise, and the people got next to the facts—"

"The joke of it was," interrupted Homer, "they trained their guns upon the South Improvement company, instead of the railroads that had granted the special rates."

"I don't remember that," continued Mort, "but Congress appointed a committee to investigate. The committee found the South Improvement company was shipping oil one dollar a barrel cheaper than their competitors. They found, also, that the difference between what the company and its competitors paid went, not to the railroads, but to the South Improvement company!"

"That was a hot tamale," put in Horace.

"It certainly was a peach of an arrangement," observed Homer.

"Like getting money from home," added the other friend.

"I guess that's what Rockefeller thought," went on Mort. "But the pressure was too great. The railroads withdrew their support, under fire, and the South Improvement company went up in the air. That was cause for great rejoicing in the oil regions. A great conspiracy had been stamped out, and Rockefeller had been made to bite the dust. That's what the people thought. But they had three more guesses coming. Rockefeller was no quitter. He stuck. The Standard Oil company inherited the South Improvement company's bunch of tricks—"

"And went on doing business at the old stand," interjected Homer.

"That's what it did," continued Mort. "That shows what nerve and determination will do. I'll bet there ain't one man in a thousand would have done it."

Horace was silent but a moment. He was thinking. Finally he blurted out: "The only man I know of that had as much nerve and determination as that is Tracy. I think Tracy has him beat." He took a fresh hold of his cigar and looked serious.

"What Tracy?" asked Mort.

"Why, the guy who broke jail out in Oregon recently; you know who I mean, the outlaw."

"What are you giving us?"

"I'm giving you straight goods. He had Rockefeller skinned to death on the nerve proposition. And he had more odds against him, too."

"There you go again; I suppose you're going to moralize now."

"No, I ain't; just hear me through, Mort," persisted Horace. "Tracy was a hot success while he lasted. When he broke jail he didn't have a respectable suit of clothes; and he couldn't get credit. Everything was against him; the judges, the preachers, the college presidents—everything. He didn't have even a senator with him. Yet in a little over six weeks he 'accumulated' several horses, a wagon, about two weeks' provisions, several guns, and a lot of ammunition. If he hadn't quit the game when he did, there's no telling what he might not have been."

Everybody laughed at Mort. After we became quiet he turned to one of the others and said: "Ben, I never told you about Horace's political opinions. He's a single tax man. You can't talk about anything, when he's around, without having a little single tax shot into you. That was single tax he was giving us then."

"Ah, cheese it, Mort," said Horace, laughing. "That wasn't single tax; that was only a little spiel on the strenuous life. You want to get wise."

Mort chewed his cigar as if he had a grudge against it. He seemed to be thinking of how to get even.

"It's up to you, Mort," said Ben.

"Look here, Mort," continued Horace, "I've been talking single tax to you a long time, and I'll bet you're as nutty on it now as you ever were."

Mort was all attention. "What'll you bet?" he asked, eagerly.

"Dinners for the crowd; I'll bet

you can't tell what Henry George proposed."

"That's a go," said Mort. "Who'll we leave it to?"

"Leave it to Henry George; wait till I get my copy of 'Progress and Poverty.'"

In a few minutes he returned with the book, which he handed to Mort.

"All right," said Mort, taking the book; "he proposed to make land common property, and have the government rent it out to the highest bidder."

"He did, eh?" cried Horace; "well, if you find that's right, I'll buy the dinners and pay your board for a year."

It was certainly interesting. Mort turned the pages for about five minutes, and finally gave it up, muttering: "I'm not familiar enough with this thing to locate it. Let's see you find it," passing the book back to Horace.

Horace found it in a jiffy, and pointing to it, said: "There you are; now read it out aloud."

Mort read:

"Now, inasmuch as the taxation of rent, or land values, must necessarily be increased, just as we abolish other taxes, we may put the proposition into practical form by proposing—

*"To abolish all taxation save that upon land values."*

"That's different, eh, Mort?" laughed Horace.

"Wait a minute," shouted Mort, excitedly, while we all laughed at the sober expression that came over him; "I know he makes use of the expression I quoted."

"So do I," said Horace.

"He says it would be *just* to have the government own the land and rent it out to the highest bidder; but he proposes a better way. If you were going to wash your face, or take a drink, it would be *just* to jump in the lake; but you'd adopt a more rational plan."

We all snickered again, while Horace paused as if waiting for Mort to say something. Mort was searching the book, however, and Horace continued: "You'll find also, he says, that to have the government own the land and rent it out, would unnecessarily extend the functions of government, and be impracticable to put in operation. Furthermore, you will find he says we can accomplish the desired result by leaving titles to land undisturbed."

Sure enough, Mort found this to be

the case. George had stated what he thought ought to be done; and proposed, as a working plan, to tax land values in lieu of all other taxes, for revenue.

"Well, I don't think much of it, anyway," said Mort, sullenly, amid great laughter.

"Of course not," said Horace; "you think we'd all be happy if we stopped smoking cigarettes."

"I wouldn't put it as strong as that on cigarettes," drawled Mort. "but I believe if the manufacture of liquor and tobacco was stopped it would come pretty near solving the problem."

"What problem?"

"The problem of poverty."

"If you go down in the coal regions you will find 125,000 men and boys who get from \$150 to \$400 a year; are they poor because they use liquor and tobacco?"

"Probably not, but—"

"If you go where the mine owners live you will find that, though they use liquor and tobacco, they are rich. How about it?"

"I suppose that's true, but that's an extreme case."

"Why don't you say it's 125,000 extreme cases?"

"The coal regions, I mean, is an extreme case; take something else."

"All right; let's consider the women and girls who make clothes for from three to six dollars a week. Why are they poor?"

"Seems to me if the ones that earn six dollars a week would save something, they'd soon be in shape to go into business for themselves."

"How much could you save out of a salary like that?"

"Probably not much," replied Mort with a grin; "I'm different."

"Oho!" cried Horace; "you're different, eh? How can you tell?"

The shouts of laughter that followed were fierce.

"Because it don't make him poor to use liquor," suggested some one.

"Because he chose a higher life," chirped another.

"Because he's a swell looker," put in a third.

"He ain't alone in thinking he's made of superior clay," broke in Horace; "he's got lots of company. And he isn't the only man that don't know the masses get it where the chicken got the ax." And then Horace proceeded to put Mort on the mat again. "Now, Mort," he began, "if you wanted to hire a man, and you had 20 boozers and one steady

fellow to choose from, other things being equal, you'd hire the sober one, wouldn't you?"

"Sure thing."

"The sober man would be practically without competition, wouldn't he?"

"He would with me."

"And you'd have to pay him better wages than if the others weren't lushers?"

"I think so."

"Well, now suppose the others spruced up, and became prohibitionists, you'd have 21 men to choose from, wouldn't you?"

"I suppose so."

"In a game like that you'd get your man cheaper, wouldn't you?"

"Y-e-s, I guess so."

"And there'd be 20 sober men, instead of 20 drunkards, looking for work?"

Mort discovered his cigar had gone out and had a hard time relighting it. Horace playfully punched him in the ribs and told him to "play ball." "Well," he said, "I don't see how your single tax would help matters any. Besides, I am not so sure you are right on the question of wages. An English statistician named Giffin, estimates that workmen now receive from 50 to 100 per cent. more money wages than 50 years ago, although the yield for capital is less now than it was then."

"The single taxer might agree with the statistician's figures," replied Horace, "but not with your conclusion. With modern machinery it is possible now for a man to produce from 10 to 50 times as much as he could in 1860. According to Giffin he gets from 50 to 100 per cent. more. If the return to capital is less now than then, where does the rest go?"

"Search me."

"Well, there are only three factors in production—land, labor and capital. If labor and capital don't get the increase, ain't it a cinch that it goes to the owners of land?"

"According to that, only the farmers are better off now than in 1860."

"Aw, chestnuts! Can't you ever get it through your block that farmers ain't the only land owners? If a man offered you a piece of land 100 feet square, for \$10,000, would you ask him if it was good grazing land?"

"No, I suppose not," laughed Mort.

"You remind me," continued Horace, "of a Cleveland priest who, in discussing the single tax question a

short time ago, said: 'Land owners in this country are chiefly farmers, and the farmers are certainly not crushing us down.' Now a Cincinnati sausage could do better than that. Ten acres of land in the heart of Chicago is worth more than all the farming land in Illinois; yet this chump couldn't see that a tax on the value of land would affect anything but farms."

"Well," said Mort, "to sum it all up, you admit that labor gets nearly twice as much now as it did in 1860, and you claim the increase goes almost entirely to the owners of land values."

"That's right."

"And what you want is to tax these values to the exclusion of everything else."

"Right again."

"What good would that do?"

"Make it unprofitable to hold land out of use."

"How would that help a coal miner?"

"Why, Mort," said Horace, rising from his seat, "there is only about 100 times as much coal land out of use as in use; if the unused coal land was thrown open, the miners could work it and keep all they produce."

"Wouldn't that be pretty tough on the present mine owners?"

"Yes, dearest, it would be real naughty," replied Horace, laying his hand on Mort's shoulder. "The miners would soon be potatoes au gratin with mine owners."

"You mean persona non grata."

"Something like that," replied Horace, as he locked arms with Mort.

And we drilled into the dining car, and did things to the meal that Mort bought.

M. J. FOYER.

George Francis Train sat one spring morning in Union square, New York, as was his custom, surrounded by children, to whom, contrary to his attitude toward adults, he was always affable and agreeable. On the outside of the group surrounding Mr. Train stood a small colored girl looking wistfully at the white children who were receiving all his attention and hearing his wonderful tales. After they had dispersed and Mr. Train was alone the black child advanced timidly and said to him: "Do you love children?" Looking at his questioner in some surprise, Mr. Train admitted that he did. Then in a low voice she said: "I am a child."—Chicago Chronicle.

## LIVE WELL.

For The Public.

Weep not! For weeping only wears  
The courage of the heart.  
Bring lightest laughter to the cares  
That only seem to smart.  
Live well to-day, to-morrow knows  
None of our rosy dreams.  
Find in your hedge the fairest rose—  
As fragrant as it seems.  
Live well! Live all, love all you can,  
Your day is short, at best.  
Live honestly whatever plan  
Your heart may come to test.  
No palsied purpose will succeed—  
Oh, let your passion give  
To life the fire it may need  
To nobly love, and live.

Be brave! To love or live your part  
None other can fulfill.  
Keep truly tuned your ready heart  
To find each sweetest thrill.  
And if you pray, oh, let it be  
A living prayer you give  
That leads you always to be free  
To bravely love and live.

GEORGE E. BOWEN.

"It was in this cell," said the guide, "that the duke was walled up and left until he starved to death."

"Or, in other words," remarked the visitor, who was a free trade politician from the United States, "the duke was killed by too much protection."

G. T. E.

"Are any of your prisoners anarchists?" inquired the curious visitor.

"Well," answered the penitentiary warden, "if the modern definition of the word anarchist is true, if an anarchist is a man who wants liberty, I think that nearly all of my prisoners are anarchists."

G. T. E.

## BOOKS

### THE SOCIAL UNREST.

What constantly strikes one who knows anything of social problems and the social unrest is the ignorance of employers and capitalists in regard to these questions. They know in a vague way that there is considerable discontent among wage-earners. They cannot glance through the daily papers without knowing this much. Many also have some intimate knowledge of the nuisance, inconvenience and losses of strikes, which they generally attribute to the troublesome walking-delegate or to some unreasonable element among the workmen. But of the imminence of any great problem, and of the thoughts and aspirations and determinations of the great body of wage-earners, they are wilfully and wofully ignorant.

For such this book by Mr. John Graham Brooks, *The Social Unrest* (Macmillan Co., \$2), is one of the best ever written. It would be a good idea for some patriotic philanthropist to establish a fund for distributing copies

to all persons worth a quarter of a million or more.

"The perpetual astonishment of the student is," he says, "that business men know so little of those organs of opinion into which the wage-earner puts his most earnest and most honest thought." He quotes a member of the London county council, visiting this country, as saying: "I have found the pick of your labor leaders far better instructed upon all sides of the labor controversy than business men." The author gives, for example, an instance showing that working-men understand the policy of watered stock, a subject which business men, with their heads in the sand, seem to imagine to be still a sort of esoteric mystery, not understood of the people. The fact that knowledge of this kind is common among wage-earners, and that employers are ignorant of the fact that so many wage-earners are thinking and thinking intelligently on all such questions are signs of the times which it is indeed well to have noted in a book that seems destined to have a large circle of well-to-do readers.

I have dwelt on this feature of the book because this seems to me to constitute its most important service. But there is very much in it that will prove interesting to all students of social problems. Mr. Brooks writes in a very instructive and interesting way. He has much information to give, and gives it with clearness and simplicity. He gives us valuable information especially as to the real opinions of people about social problems. He found that "most men do not put their deepest opinions into print, or state them before the public." So he set himself to ascertain these deepest opinions by private intercourse, and these opinions, together with much scholarly research and many thoughtful comments of his own, he has given us in this book.

And yet, from one point of view, the book is disappointing. The reader is at times tempted to feel that the author has not himself always put his deepest opinions into print. He sometimes seems to be on the point of coming to some important conclusion—and somehow shies off at the critical point. There is a well-known textbook of economics, used extensively in universities, concerning which we have heard that some irreverent person has offered a reward for the discovery of a single conclusion between its covers. It would certainly be going much too far to speak thus of Mr. Brooks's book, for he certainly leads to some conclusions; but his conclusions are not clear and definite in regard to vital questions that go to the root of the social unrest, or else they are rather negative than positive. There are a good many "ifs" in the book.

"If," says Mr. Brooks, "the follow-

ers of Henry George are right in holding that the present forms of private land ownership constitute the supreme evil, they are justified in insisting upon 'the question' and upon 'the remedy.' The socialist who adds to the George evil the private control of the 'means of production' raises new complications for which a simple formula is more difficult. If the socialist has become confessedly 'opportunist,' the simple formula, for theory and its application, is still more inadequate." If it is not an "if," then it is in some such expression as "according to this view" that the conclusion rests.

The most positive conclusion in the book seems to be that unions must be recognized, that labor is more effective under such recognition, and that between representatives of the union and representatives of the capital there must be established fair working rules to govern employers and workmen for a definite term. This, with an undefined, conservative "socialism that is safe, if we do our duty," may be said to be the author's nearest approach to a solution of the social unrest.

There are three incidental points which we owe Mr. Brooks a debt of gratitude for emphasizing:

First, after speaking of the former opportunity of self-employment by taking up government land at a nominal price, he says: "Now that the public domain has been disposed of, this special avenue of possible chances is shut. For the first time in our history, the population turns back upon itself."

Secondly, in the exceedingly valuable and timely chapter entitled "Socialism at Work," he shows that rampant European socialists have frequently quailed before their own propositions, and have tended to become conservative, whenever they were really confronted with the chance of the responsibility of carrying out the socialist platform.

A third important fact which he emphasizes is that "education" and waiting for "changed human nature" are not a sufficient answer to the demands of the social unrest. "When," he says, "education is used as a stop-gap to every proposal, we shall, if we are intelligent, make objection. The hoariest commonplace ever used against reforms has the same character, 'You can't do anything until you have changed human nature.' What service this ancient saw has done from age to age against every hint of abuse to be overcome!"

In his introduction, Mr. Brooks says: "In these studies that have to do with the vastness and complexity of human society and its reorganization, the craving for literary and scientific graces has left a great deal of our printed sociology chillingly empty of result." Certainly a great deal of our

printed sociology is chillingly empty of literary and scientific graces as well as of result. Mr. Brooks's present contribution to this class of literature does not lack the former qualities; and it will, I believe, have a most stimulating influence in arousing the earnest attention of many minds to the pressing need of heeding the social unrest, and of seeking its cause and its cure.

J. H. DILLARD.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

—God's Children; a modern allegory. By James Allman. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company. Price 50 cents. To be reviewed.  
—Fuerbach; the Roots of the Socialist Philosophy. By Frederick Engels. Translated with critical introduction by Austin Lewis. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company. Price 50 cents. To be reviewed.

#### PERIODICALS.

The Nebraska Independent (Lincoln) having with its Henry George edition successfully inaugurated its plans for making of itself a paper of national scope and influence, is now conducting an Independent School of Political Economy as a regular department of the paper. Another department is an open forum for Single Taxers, in which that subject is to be debated by contributors.

The Nation of May 21 has an editorial combating Commissioner Ide's declaration that there should not yet be any talk of independence for the Filipinos. "There are some words," says the writer, "which, spoken in connection with the lives of people, have an irresistibly tonic and stimulating effect, and have done more to advance civilization than all the exchanges of the mart." Attention is called to Judge Ide's tribute—"The individual Filipino makes an excellent citizen, being peaceful, law-abiding, mindful of his own affairs, and considerate of others." J. H. D.

The Irish World (New York) of May 9 contains the address of Wm. O'Brien delivered at the recent Irish Nationalist convention held to consider the Wyndham measure for land purchase. A headline in the World tells the whole story. "The Irish will have to pay an extravagant indemnity to get back their plundered lands." In an able leading editorial the World shows that the claim of heavy financial sacrifice by the British taxpayer is an impudent statement, and that every dollar of the loan—principal and interest—is to be paid by the Irish purchasing tenants. Whoever pays, one thing is certain, the landlords get the money. J. H. D.

Mr. James L. Ford has an interesting and instructive article in the May Pilgrim on the Old-Time Journalist. Incidentally the great changes in New York life are brought to mind. "A Rip Van Winkle," says Mr. Ford, "awakening to-day from a twenty-years' sleep would find a great deal to wonder at besides the things I have mentioned. He would find a degree of extravagance and luxury such as he never dreamed of in all the years that he was asleep." It would be hard to find anywhere a more serious arraignment of the shallowness into which the American rush is bringing American civilization than in the writer's impressive remarks on the changes in Journalism. J. H. D.

Frances Power Cobbe, in her striking article on Woman Suffrage in the May number of the Contemporary Review, speaking of Queen Victoria, says "she was (quite indisputably) a first-rate statesman." One may question this proposition without interference with the argument, for she was certainly as first-rate a statesman as most of her masculine predecessors, and probably did less harm than any of them. Miss Cobbe enumerates the long list of famous women rulers, and then indignantly asks: "Where can be found any plea of justice for excluding our whole sex from the very simplest and smallest of political rights, when in that field at all events we have been proved to possess at least equal faculty with men?" J. H. D.

The Independent (N. Y.) begins a leading editorial with these words: "It is an interesting development of the political situa-



**DOMESTIC IMPERIALISM — "CHARITY" — NOT JUSTICE.**

"But still the Great have Kindness in reserve, — They help to bury whom they help to Starve."—Pope.

tion, although we cannot yet think it serious, which brings Grover Cleveland forward as a Presidential possibility." The writer seems to think that the South would welcome his candidacy. "Not in the West," he says, "but in the South is Cleveland acceptable, even in that South which was more Populistic than Kansas or Colorado or Iowa." It may be true that the South, if Cleveland should be the only Democratic candidate, would cast a solid vote for him by greatly reduced majority; but there is very insufficient evidence available to show that the South will favor his candidacy.

In this number Mr. Upton Sinclair, author of "The Journal of Arthur Stirling," pleads rather hysterically for "An American University of Literature." Mr. Upton makes some true accusations, but he ought to know that "Literature" cometh not that way. Some branches of education may be promoted by machinery, but not "Literature." What we do need for the promotion of literature and of all the good arts is better social conditions in general, so that there may be less of slavish grind and more feeling of freedom—freedom from the fear of not getting a living. J. H. D.

**LECTURES ON ECONOMIC SUBJECTS**

At **HANDEL HALL, 40 East Randolph Street**

**SUNDAY AFTERNOONS, AT 3 O'CLOCK**

UNDER AUSPICES OF THE

**HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION**

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

**JOHN Z. WHITE**

Will Lecture Sunday Afternoon, May 31st, subject

"Questions and Answers on the Single Tax."

THURSDAY, JUNE 4th,  
**W. CHAS. TANNER,**  
"Ruskin."

THURSDAY, JUNE 11th,  
**HON. JOHN J. McMANAMAN,**  
"The Grand Jury System."

THURSDAY, JUNE 18th,  
**GEO. A. SCHILLING,**  
"Twenty-Eight Years in the Labor Movement in Chicago."

THURSDAY, JUNE 25th  
**H. B. LOOMIS,**  
"The Single Tax."

THURSDAY, JULY 2nd,  
**HON. THOMAS G. McELIGOTT,**  
"The Torrens Land System."



**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.**

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

**FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,**  
COUNSELOR AT LAW,  
BENNETT BLDG.,  
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,  
Tel. Call, 404 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.  
NEW YORK.

**CONTRACTORS.**

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

**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.**

**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.

**HENRY GEORGE**

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

**MYSELF CURED** I will gladly inform anyone addicted to **COCAINE, MORPHINE, OPIUM OR LAUDANUM,** of a never-failing harmless Home Cure. Address **MRS. A. M. BALDWIN, Box 1212, CHICAGO, ILL.**