The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy & A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR
ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR

Vol. XII. CHICAGO, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1909. No. 599

Published by Louis F. Post
Ellsworth Building, 357 Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents Yearly Subscription, One Dollar
Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898 at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:
The North Pole Controversy....913
Some New Jersey Politics....914
The Coming of a Central Bank....915
Are They Siamese Twins?....915
The White Man's Country....915
Simple and Equitable Taxation....915
The Conservationists....916
Is the Love of Freedom Lost? (V. S. Y.)....916
The Modern Attitude Toward Crime (Griffith J. Griffith)....918

NEWS NARRATIVE:
President Taft's Journey....919
President Taft and the Water-Power Trust....920
Coal Lands of Alaska....921
Conservation of National Resources....922
The British Land Question....923
The Irish Land Bill....923
Convention of German Socialists....923
The American Bankers' Association....924
William J. Bryan on Democratic Treachery....924
Death of Governor Johnson....924
Street Car Strike in Omaha....924
Impending Chicago Traction Strike Settled....925
The Grand Junction Charter....925
Municipal Campaign in New York....925
The Arctic Explorers....925
News Notes....926
Press Opinions....926

RELATED THINGS:
"Be of Good Cheer" (R. W. Emerson)....928
The British Fight for Democracy....928
Another Great Churchill Speech....930
Boom-a-Looma (E. V. Cooke)....932

BOOKS:
The Golden Season....933
Death and Victory....933
A Laugh....933
Pamphlets....933
Periodicals....934

EDITORIAL

The North Pole Controversy.

The further the Cook-Peary controversy (pp. 895, 925) goes, the more does it take on the appearance of a quarrel between sports. Its scientific phases are obscured by this unseemly brabble for the mere sporting honors of "first at the goal."

✣

We are not of those who regard Polar expeditions as valueless. One of the duties of the human race is to learn all that can be known of the surface and substance of the planet upon which they live. Every waste place, even, like every useless substance—if there really be waste places and useless substances in this earth of ours—is a legitimate object of scientific search and field for scientific exploration. The unknown regions of the Poles, and the very points of the Poles themselves, are high objectives of scientific adventure. And this regardless of whether or not they prove commercially valuable, or may be expected to. Commercialism is not the only nor the highest of ideals, indispensable though it be to all progress. Nor is the expenditure of large sums of money for Polar expeditions to be deprecated. They are petty in comparison with the cost of a battleship or a palace of a scion of privilege. Even the loss of life on Polar expeditions is slight when measured by the loss of life we enthusiastically invite or soberly endure for objects comparatively trifling. And while scientific adventure occupies this exalted place among human functions, sporting ad-

venture is not excluded from the category of honorable enterprise. The sporting adventurer who makes "a dash" to the Pole in order to be there first, is no more to be despised than the scientific adventurer who increases the sum of human knowledge with reports upon Polar conditions. But sporting adventure and scientific adventure are different things.

✣

Commander Peary appears to have confused this difference. He seems to have made the mistake of supposing that the purpose of Polar expeditions of the scientific kind is sport; that the object is to get there first. And this mistake of Commander Peary's is apparently giving Dr. Cook his growing advantage in the controversy. Dr. Cook is frankly a Polar sportsman. He makes no pretensions to scientific adventure. His ambition was to be the first civilized man at the North Pole, and then to get back into civilization alive in order to claim sportsman's honors. It was a legitimate ambition, and if he satisfies the world that he really did reach the Pole, he will doubtless receive and be entitled to receive the sportsman's medal of "first at the goal." This is the honor for which Commander Peary also contests, not as a sporting adventurer but as the leader of an expedition of scientific adventure. Thus far he makes no scientific report. On the contrary his report is surprisingly like Dr. Cook's—the report of an adventurer whose primary purpose in making a dash to the North Pole was to be the first person on the spot. He left every other scientific man of his expedition behind him, so that he could claim this one merit personally. And so far as the controversy has gone, it indicates that if this sportsman's honor falls to either it must fall to Dr. Cook.

✣

But suppose that Peary, when he came back into civilization, had been able to say and had said that his expedition—whether he himself or not, but at any rate his expedition—had penetrated to the Polar point and brought back scientific reports of all the observations that time, equipment and Polar conditions permitted. Suppose when confronted with Cook's story he had said it might be true or it might be a mistake, a problem which further details might solve; but that at best it only affected the honors of an achievement which he and the members of his expedition regarded as secondary. Suppose he had said something like that, who would have cared whether Cook had got to the Pole first, or whether Peary in person had got there at all. The great honor would have been Peary's as the responsible leader of a scientific expedition, and all the more certainly if he had made the scientific object of the expedition his first consideration. His reputation as the greatest Polar discoverer in history would then have been secure, not only as a scientific adventurer no matter how Cook's claims come out, but also with reference to the minor honors of sporting adventure if Cook fails to prove that he is right in supposing that he was first at the Pole?

✣

Something like that is what Commander Peary would have been able to say and would have said had he been animated by the zeal of scientific discovery. As it is, he has precipitated a trivial but bitter controversy over mere sportsman's honors, which seems to be going against him, and which threatens to engulf and sweep away from him the scientific honors he may really have earned.

✣ ✣

Some New Jersey Politics.

Certain mild yet desirable amendments to the State Constitution were voted down on referendum in New Jersey last week. They were supported by the State bar association, by Gov. Fort, by "new idea" Republicans, and by many democratic Democrats. But, in the exultant language of a triumphant opposition, they were "beaten decisively." Both machines, the Democratic and the Republican, were against them; and these machines were, as the party machines there and everywhere else always are, loyally supported by Big Business.

✣

Although the proposed reforms were as mild as a Boston blizzard in June, they might have served for an "entering wedge," and no "entering wedge" is to be tolerated as long as the Interests can prevent it. These are somewhat like the Western drummer who was asked at a revival whether he would rather go to heaven or to hell, and replied that Chicago was good enough for him. So with the Interests: the going game with its existing rules is good enough for them.

✣

In New Jersey the Republican machine has a "cinch." During the last session of the New Jersey legislature, when a particularly flagrant violation of public rights was going through the legislative mill with a patriotic Republican whoop, Senator Osborne, a democratic Democrat of Newark, who had won his nomination and election against the "Jim-Jim" machine, controlled by James Smith and James Nugent, turned to the

Republican Senator at his side and asked how his party dared do such things. "Why not?" was the response. "Haven't we been doing them for years?" So they have, and not in New Jersey alone.

✣

But why are they able to? Because "Jim-Jim" machines cover the Democratic party all over with political filth. When the Democrats controlled the lower House in New Jersey two years ago, "Jim" Nugent sat in a room at the State House, and dictated his and "Jim" Smith's policies to the Democrats on the floor, from A to Zed. It is no sweet fragrance that enables Republican machines to outrage public rights when in power, for they really are not sweet; it is the foulness of the Democratic machine, which is so excessive that it smothers the Republican stench. When these two machines work in partnership, the "Jim-Jim" Democrats furnishing mystifying and poisonous odors, while the Republicans "take the trick" and divide the plunder, they are as effective in politics temporarily, as masked batteries and stink-pots used to be in war.

✣ ✣

The Coming of a Central Bank.

Whoever read the newspaper reports of the bankers' convention at Chicago last week, must have been interested in the agitation for a big central bank, and impressed with the progress the proposition made. A strong movement for this new mechanism of monopoly is doubtless under way. For a long time sporadic suggestions along this line have been noticeable, but the time seems now to be near when Big Business will demand the central bank with an open mouth and reach for it with an outstretched hand. There is reason to believe that a definite program has been under discussion by the Interests for more than three years. Their plan seems to contemplate the centralization of all the banking interests of the country in the National City Bank of New York, of which Frank A. Vanderlip is president. It is generally known as "the Standard Oil bank."

✣ ✣

Are They Siamese Twins?

President Taft says that he stands with the men who stand with him. Specifically he meant Congressman Tawney, the only Minnesota Congressman who lined up with Cannon, Aldrich, and Big Business at the recent session of Congress. So Mr. Tawney stood not only with Big Business but also with Mr. Taft, which is Mr. Taft's reason for standing with Mr. Tawney. And is this likewise his reason for standing with Senator Aldrich? Was it President Taft as well as Big Business that Senator Aldrich stood with when he forced through his upward revision of the tariff? It would seem so. For isn't President Taft acting as advance agent for Senator Aldrich's forthcoming swing around the circle in the interest of Wall Street buccaneers? Isn't he giving Senator Aldrich a certificate of good character as a patriot? Aren't they swinging around the circle together, as it were—two minds turned on Big Business thoughts, two hopes that yearn as one? In this union there is danger for President Taft. A Siamese twinship is an uncomfortable connection at best; and when one of the twins is diseased, danger is added to discomfort. If Mr. Taft unifies the circulation of Senator Aldrich's political blood with his own, an amputation may be necessary to save him, and even that may fail.

✣ ✣

The White Man's Country.

If this is "a white man's country," where is the Negro to go? Africa used to be recommended; but now Africa also is a "white man's country." None but "persons of European descent" are to have political rights there. If white men are not more careful, black men will begin to regard their good faith with suspicion.

✣ ✣

Simple and Equitable Taxation.

The scintillant Elbert Hubbard throws a flash of white light upon questions of taxation, when he advocates the Henry George idea. "To tax land values," he says, "would be the simple, easy and common sense plan. Land lies right out under the sky. You can locate it and appraise it. The only objection to taxing land values is the fact that big land owners oppose it. The plan offers no chance for concealment or evasion. A tax law that admits of evasion—aye! that invites it—is a wrong to everybody. We may want to be honest, but when everybody dodges taxes we fall into line and say we have to dodge too. A good law is one that makes it easy for us all to obey it. The man who owns a little home is the only man who now pays his full quota. He can't hide his house and he has no influence in the senate. If he paints his house or puts on a veranda, the tax gatherer knows all about it, and raises the assessment. To let the little home go free, encourage home making, and tax the men who own big and valuable tracts of land is the equitable plan."

The Conservationists.

In the midst of all the turmoil over high-class stealing of public lands—water power, coal deposits, etc., etc.—it may be as well to reflect that this kind of stealing can make little substantial difference to the people. It is bad in one way for the thieves, since their character must be more or less degraded by it. And it is bad in another way for unsuccessful competing thieves, since they lose the plunder. But what difference can it make to a plundered people whether they are plundered by thieves larcenously or by good people legally? None at all. Fifty years from now the relation of the public to their lost lands will be precisely alike regarding those that are grabbed and those that are granted. The owners will have a mortgage upon the work of the producers of their day, unlimited in duration and crushing in weight. For this reason one may take very little interest in the National Conservation Association whose organization we report in our news columns this week. But its idea of conservation does ring truer than some of our friends might expect. Its declarations though not radical enough to frighten the timid are suggestive enough to attract the aggressive. These ponderously conservative movements, when headed in the right direction, even if they move slowly, and throw out no brilliant bunting, are among the most gratifying signs of radical progress. They mark the beginning of the advance from a period of agitation to one of action.

✣ ✣ ✣

IS THE LOVE OF FREEDOM LOST?

We do not go for exact and clear thinking, or for careful expression, to writers who delight in paradox and extravagance, who would rather say a thing brilliantly and strikingly than say it truly. Still, when men like Bernard Shaw and Gilbert Chesterton seriously declare that the love of liberty is dead, even those who habitually make all the necessary allowances for these erratic philosophers are impressed. They pause and ask whether the charge is well founded. And they do it the more since occasionally an American radical gives utterance to the same sentiment.

Mr. Shaw recently said in an address:

> The English people has lost its tradition of liberty. . . . If the Star Chamber were revived tomorrow I do not think there would be a single protest in London. The Press and the public would take no notice of it whatever, until Dr. Clifford had been put in the pillory with his ears cut off. Then the political side of Nonconformity would make a tremendous outcry against putting Dr. Clifford in the pillory instead of the Archbishop of Canterbury or Lord Hugh Cecil, and there would be a tremendous protest in the Times; but there would be no protest on the grounds of principle.

Of course, Mr. Shaw, to drive his point home, deliberately exaggerates. He knows perfectly well that "the press," even the part of it he dislikes, *would* take notice of such a thing as the revival of the Star Chamber, and that there would be not one protest but thousands of protests, against it.

What he means to say is that the protests would be too feeble to accomplish anything, for the great majority of Englishmen would be indifferent, or insufficiently interested. The *principle* of liberty, he thinks, has lost its hold.

✣

Chesterton also believes that the Briton has morally degenerated and become a slave. The sentiment of freedom has, in his opinion, declined along with the idea or principle of freedom, and the result is given graphically as follows:

> Political liberty, let us repeat, consists in the power of criticising those flexible parts of the state which constantly require reconsideration, not the basis but the machinery. In plainer words, it means the power of saying the sort of things that a decent but discontented citizen wants to say. He does not want to spit on the Bible or to run about without clothes or to read the worst page of Zola from the pulpit of St. Paul's. Therefore the forbidding of these things (whether just or not) is only tyranny in a secondary and special sense. It restrains the abnormal not the normal man. But the normal man, the decent discontented citizen, does want to protest against unfair law courts. He does want to expose brutalities of the police. He does want to make game of a vulgar pawnbroker who is made a peer. He does want publicly to warn people against unscrupulous capitalists and suspicious finance. If he is run in for doing this (as he will be) he does want to proclaim the character or known prejudices of the magistrate who tries him. If he is sent to prison (as he will be) he does want to have a clear and civilized sentence telling him when he will come out. And these are literally and exactly the things that he now cannot get. That is the almost cloying humor of the present situation. I can say abnormal things in modern magazines. It is the normal things that I am not allowed to say. I can write in some solemn quarterly an elaborate article explaining that God is the devil; I can write in some cultured weekly an aesthetic fancy describing how I should like to eat boiled baby. The thing I must not write is rational criticism of the men and institutions of my country. The present condition of England is briefly this: That no Englishman can say in public a twentieth part of what he says in private.

All of which is very grave indeed—if true. But there is scarcely a word of truth in it. What men or institutions are above criticism in England? The land reformers are attacking the monopoly of

the soil; Lloyd George is hitting from the shoulder at the ducal and other beneficiaries of privilege; the socialists are fighting the whole existing order; the Tories are calling the Chancellor of the Exchequer "a second-class Jack Cade;" there is nothing to prevent any one from advocating republicanism, the abolition of the peerage, the ending of the lords, the adoption of the referendum and recall.

Perhaps Chesterton finds that certain organs which enjoy his fooling and clowning have no interest in his "normal things." But there are other papers which have such an interest and would allow him to say anything on any man or institution. Shaw has been saying things normal and abnormal about every existing institution and relation, yet he is still at large, as is Hardie, as is Hyndman.

✣

But Chesterton, like Shaw, though unsuccessful in expressing his thought, *has* a thought. He agrees with Shaw that love of freedom has declined, that principles are no longer cherished, and that the people are indifferent to invasions of their ancient liberties.

Is this true? Is society being rebarbarized, as Spencer savagely and gloomily charged, and reenslaved? If so, where is the evidence?

Spencer's evidence was—the growth of trade unionism, socialistic legislation and state interference with contracts and industry. This would not be evidence at all to Shaw and Chesterton. Is it evidence to sober-minded libertarians? If not, is there any other evidence?

There is not.

There never was a golden age of love of freedom in the abstract, of devotion to principle. There has been no retrogression therefore. As Walter Bagehot said, the human mind is "factish"; concrete, specific things alone really lay hold upon it. A few thinkers generalize, and a little larger group will clothe the generalizations in rhetorical, eloquent formulas; but the overwhelming majority are conscious only of particular abuses, particular grievances, particular nuisances, as well as of particular benefits they would secure.

The American Revolution was not a revolution in the interest of freedom and principle; it was a revolution against practices and methods which irritated and offended the Colonists. Some of their spokesmen "generalized" about the rights of men and essential principles, but the indictment of King George was concrete and definite. It was a bill of particulars, and these particulars would have "done the work" if no formula or brilliant generalization had occurred to the orators and authors of the period.

Again, take the French Revolution. Was it the result of a popular devotion to the principle of freedom? No; it was the explosion of wrath, bitterness, hatred accumulated during centuries of cruel wrong and oppression, of insolence, tyranny, outrage. The Revolution was not caused by philosophers and men of letters; but the latter, watching events and drawing inspiration from them, found generalizations which reflected the passions, the aspirations of the masses. The love of freedom in the abstract had very little share in the historic upheaval. It did not prevent the excesses of the Terror, nor the reaction which followed them.

The lovers of religious liberty who sought refuge in America in order that they might worship in their own way, did not consider it necessary to grant religious liberty to those whom *they* considered heretics and apostates. The constitutional guaranty of religious liberty was a necessity, not a virtue; not respect for principle, but the desire to avoid strife, dictated it.

The love and appreciation of freedom and of principles generally develop with extreme slowness. To regret this would be idle, for we must deal with human virtue as it is. On the whole, humanity is advancing, for is not constitutionalism gaining ground even in the Orient? Are Britons and Americans losing love of freedom just as Persians, Turks and Chinese are acquiring it? There is no foundation for any such pessimistic conclusion.

✣

The explanation of the Shaw-Chesterton error is simple. They hear little talk about personal or political freedom; and much about opportunity, equality, equity, justice in wealth distribution. Men are demanding industrial insurance, shorter hours, steadier employment, comfort and more of the joys of life. They have found that "freedom" under monopoly and plutocracy is a mockery. They have acquired political *power,* and are beginning to use it, with such intelligence as they possess, for certain purposes. What they are fighting now is poverty, plunder, privilege; and their absorption in these vital and urgent issues, tends, perhaps, to render them indifferent to echoes of former cries, to old issues that have lost either their significance or their primacy.

Let us not exalt and idealize the past at the expense of the present. We, too, are living in stirring times, and the struggle we are witnessing or participating in is also a struggle for liberty, for progress, for justice.

V. S. Y.

THE MODERN ATTITUDE TOWARD CRIME.

The struggle of the masses for physical and mental freedom, the incessant push of countless individualities all eager to obtain larger opportunities, have produced changes of thought the magnitude of which perpetually eludes us. Painting, perhaps, gives the surest reflection. One notes at a glance that while the artists of the Middle Ages ignored the common man, he holds today the center of the picture.

In my own special study, criminology—which arose naturally out of my detention in a California penitentiary—the inroads made by modern thought on ideas that reigned almost unquestioned for untold generations have impressed me greatly. This has been more particularly so since the publication in the Cosmopolitan magazine of the articles in which Harold Bolce has set out the existing conflict between theological orthodoxy and the doctrines taught from the scientific chairs of American universities. I am of the opinion that a corresponding investigation of the views on crime and criminals, held respectively by the old and modern schools, would show a conflict fully as intense and, it may be, even more important. I am anxious for that investigation, for it would help the cause of progress.

✣

The crime problem goes to the roots of individual and social life, since it not only shows us the workings of our economic and political system but also directs its finger unerringly to the point at which the machinery most conspicuously breaks down. It is the breaking of the weaker links that proves how worthless is the chain. We may be sure that Tolstoy understood this when he wrote "The Resurrection."

The distinction between the old and new schools lies precisely in the fact that the former considered only one factor in the problem—the crime, the outrage committed on the dignity of the state. The modern school, on the other hand, insists on two other factors as even more important: the criminal, and what made him so. This constitutes an enormous departure, pregnant with most vital consequences.

✣

Viewing only the outrage on the state the old school could think only of punitive revenge and repression.

Studying the criminal and the reasons for his being such, the new school found itself launched on a voyage of sociological discovery, the end of which is by no means yet.

It became clear, whatever the truth may be as to the existence of "born" criminals, as indicated by the tables compiled by Lombroso, Ferri and others, that by far the larger class of criminals—and especially those convicted of minor crimes—is composed of the "occasionals," whose troubles are due more to external causes than to innate tendencies. Thus the study of economics and the various factors that make up the social environment becomes imperative on the adherent of the new school.

Since crime is a topic of never failing interest, always occupying much space in the daily papers, it follows that as the new school wins its way to the front the causes of crime will receive more and more attention. It is even conceivable that the growing influence of the new and scientific school may force the press to depart from its time-honored policy of dealing only with effects. This, it is needless to say, would be a veritable and far-reaching revolution.

✣

The new school has all the argument and, having for its object the discovery of facts, is always open for more.

The old school is not open to argument, but, buttressed by power and sheltered by the strong arm of politics, has the incalculable advantage of being in possession. Nevertheless concessions of enormous value have been wrung from it.

It still hangs, but by stealth. It still tortures, but behind the silence of the prison walls. Professing to believe in the power of its deterrents, it shrinks from all logical application of them, not daring to execute and punish in the open, as did our forefathers, who honestly thought that drastic punishments deterred.

When the new school forces the adoption of such measures as probation and the indeterminate sentence it wins far more than a victory for humanitarianism, and secures far more than recourse to a palliative. It establishes a principle of the first importance—that society's right to restrain the individual is based solely on the ground of social self-defense — the fundamental right of self-preservation.

The old school has as its tap-root the theological conception of sin having been committed by a freely working individual will, that could have chosen the better part and has merited not only punishment but the customary homily from the bench and the moralizings of the prison chaplain.

The new school is founded on the conviction that effect follows cause, and that crime-breeding conditions inevitably beget criminals.

✣

It is my hope that the Prison Reform League, setting the facts on both sides impartially before the public, may give impetus to a literary movement that will generate substantial thought. And I repeat that the social machinery must be examined first where it has broken down most conspicuously; where the victims are most visible and the spectacle presented most pitiful.

There is but one living creature so helpless as the discharged convict—penniless, will-broken, and with every man's hand against him—and that is the unfortunate who is caged and at the mercy of his keeper's every whim. It is in his case that liberty and the other high-sounding phrases with which society cloaks its short-comings, become the most transparent mockery, and this special branch of sociology demands, therefore, the closest investigation.

GRIFFITH J. GRIFFITH.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, September 21, 1909.

President Taft's Journey.

Before the Boston Chamber of Commerce on the 14th, upon the eve of his "13,000-mile swing around the circle" (p.867,) as the news dispatches call it, President Taft outlined its object. It is on the one hand to get a "more accurate impression as to the views of the people in the sections he visits," thereby making him "a wiser man and a better public officer;" and on the other "to explain to the people some of the difficulties of government and some of the problems for solution from the standpoint of the Executive and the legislator as distinguished from that of the honest but irresponsible critic." One of these problems is the monetary subject, respecting which the President's speech indicated a favorable attitude toward "some sort of arrangement for a central bank of issue which shall control the reserve and exercise a power to meet and control the casual stringency which from time to time will come in the circulating medium of the country and the world." And in this connection he stated that the Monetary Commission, of which Senator Aldrich is chairman—

> intend to institute a campaign of education in order to arouse public opinion to the necessity of a change in our monetary and banking systems, and to the advantages that will arise from placing some form of control over the money market and the reserve in the hands of an intelligent body of financiers responsible to the government.

Enlarging upon this statement the President further said:

> I am told that Mr. Aldrich will "swing around the circle" in the present fall and will lecture in many of the cities of the middle West on the defects and needs of our monetary system. I cannot too strongly approve of this proposal. Mr. Aldrich, who is the leader of the Senate, and certainly one of the ablest statesmen in financial matters in either House, has been regarded with deep suspicion by many people, especially in the West. If, with his clearcut ideas and simple but effective style of speaking, he makes apparent to the Western people what I believe to be his earnest desire to aid the people and to crown his political career by the preparation and passage of a bill which shall give us a sound and safe monetary and banking system, it would be a long step toward removing the political obstacles to a proper solution of the question.

The President did not discuss the new tariff bill in his Boston speech, further than to say that it "has removed a disturbing element in business." He announced that "we are, I believe, unless all signs fail, on the eve of another great business expansion, an era of prosperity," and asserted that "it is already here in many branches of business." But he discussed none of the problems he alluded to.

✣

The President's first stop in his "swing around the circle"—indeed his starting point, for the Boston speech was described as preliminary—was at Chicago on the 17th. Here his principal speech was made at Orchestra Hall under the auspices of the Hamilton Club. His subject was trade unionism, although no provision had been made by his hosts for any trade union representation in his reception. It was exclusively a business men's demonstration, except for the turn-out of the public school children. This feature was managed with remarkable skill by the architect of the Board of Education. In the course of his speech on trades unionism the President said:

> I know there is an element among employers of labor and investors of capital which is utterly opposed to the organization of labor. I cannot sympathize with this element in the slightest degree. I think it is a wise course for laborers to unite to defend their interests. . . . I think the employer who declines to deal with organized labor and to recognize it as a proper element in the settlement of wage controversies is behind the times. There is not the slightest doubt that if labor had remained unorgan-

ized wages would be very much lower. It is true that in the end they would probably be fixed by the law of supply and demand, but generally before this law manifests itself there is a period in which labor, if organized and acting together, can compel the employer promptly to recognize the change of conditions and advance wages to meet a rising market and an increase in profits; and on the other hand can delay the too quick impulse of the employer, facing a less prosperous future, to economize by reducing wages. . . . Nothing I have said or shall say should be construed into an attitude of criticism against or unfriendliness to those workingmen who for any reason do not join unions. Their right to labor for such wages as they choose to accept is sacred and any lawless invasion of that right cannot be too severely condemned. All advantages of trades unionism, great as they are, cannot weigh a feather in the scale against the right of any man lawfully seeking employment to work for whom and at what price he will. . . . One notable defect which has been pointed out has been in the disposition of the majority of members in labor unions to reduce the compensation of all men engaged in a particular trade to a dead level and to fail to recognize the difference between the highly skilled and very industrious workman and the one only less skilled and less industrious. I think that there is a movement among trades unions themselves to correct this leveling tendency, and nothing could strengthen the movement more than the adoption of some plan by which there should remain among union workmen the impetus and motive to be found in the greater reward for greater skill and greater industry.

I need not point out the deplorable results in this country if trades unionism became a synonym for socialism. Those who are now in active control, the Federation of Labor and all the great railroad organizations, have set their faces like flint against the propagandism of socialistic principles. They are in favor of the rights of property and of our present institutions, modified by such remedial legislation as to put workingmen on equality with their opponents in trade controversies and trade contracts and to stamp out the monopoly and the corporate abuses which are an outgrowth of our present system unaccompanied by proper limitation; and I think all of us who are in favor of the maintenance of our present institutions should recognize this battle which has been carried on by the conservative and influential members of trades unionism and willingly give credit to these men as the champions of a cause which should command our sympathy, respect and support.

Passing then to the complaints that trade unions make against the courts for decisions in injunction cases, the President remarked that this suggested to him "a larger field for complaint and reform" and thereupon proceeded to discuss delay in the administration of the law by the courts. His speech on this phase of his subject favored more authority for judges over juries, and greater limitations of appeals in cases involving small amounts.

✣

The next speech of Mr. Taft's tour was at Milwaukee, where on the 17th he advocated postal savings banks.

✣

At Winona, Minn., on the 17th, President Taft declared himself against the Minnesota "insurgent" Republicans who voted against the Aldrich tariff bill. Congressman Tawney, the only Minnesota Congressman who voted for that bill, presided at the meeting, and the President opened his speech in these significant terms:

I came to Winona because James A. Tawney comes from Winona. Mr. Tawney and a good many other Republicans and I stand for the present tariff law, and when a man stands with me I stand with him.

Proceeding then to read a carefully prepared speech, full of detail, the President stated his position with reference to his and his party's promises of downward revision of the tariff, as follows:

In order to determine whether a bill is a compliance with the terms of the platform, it must be understood what the platform means. A free trader is opposed to any protective rate, because he thinks that our manufacturers, our farmers and our miners ought to withstand the competition of foreign manufacturers and miners and farmers, or else go out of business and find something else more profitable to do. Now, certainly the promises of the platform did not contemplate the downright revision of the tariff rates to such a point that any industry thereby protected should be injured. Hence those who contend that the promise of the platform was to reduce prices by letting in foreign competition are contending for a free trade, and not for anything that they had the right to infer from the Republican platform.

✣

Although the President made a speech at St. Paul and one at Minneapolis on the 18th, neither was upon subjects of general interest.

✣

At Des Moines, Iowa, on the 20th, he was the guest of Senator Cummins, and his speech dealt principally with the subject of anti-trust and inter-State commerce laws.

✣

In Omaha, also on the 20th, he was the guest of a secret organization of business men, the Knights of Ak-Sar-Ben, and made no speech of importance.

✣ ✣

President Taft and the Water-Power Trust.

Just before leaving Boston on the 15th for his "swing around the circle," President Taft made public his views on the Pinchot-Ballinger controversy (pp. 797, 826) regarding the water-power trust and public lands. He did it incidentally in a letter to Secretary Ballinger written for the purpose of exonerating him on other

charges. The letter bears date September 13, at Beverly, Massachusetts.

✣

Regarding the water-power charges the President writes to Mr. Ballinger:

The persons responsible for the circulation of these charges have done you cruel injustice. The fact was that in January, 1909, in the last Administration, Executive orders were made withdrawing from public settlement 1,500,000 acres at the instance of the reclamation service, for conservation of water power sites. Soon after you became Secretary of the Interior you brought this order to my attention and said that it included a great deal of land that had not water power sites on it, running back many miles from the rivers, and that it included much land which ought to be opened to public settlement; that you had applied to the reclamation bureau to know whether it was desired for reclamation purposes, and what the bureau's recommendation was in the premises; and that they recommended that it be returned to the public domain. You also advised me that it was possible to procure from the Geological Survey an accurate statement of the water power sites which were available, and which might be subjected to private ownership, and that you would direct the geological survey to make such statements, and that then there could be made temporary withdrawals of the land needed to preserve these water power sites until Congress could act. The order revoking the withdrawal of the million and a half acres was made in April. Sufficient information was procured from the Geological Survey to permit an order withdrawing the land upon which were water power sites in May, and this withdrawal covered about 300,000 acres, instead of a million and a half. The form of the new order of withdrawal was such that it set aside all filings and entries of any kind which had been made prior to its going into effect and, as a matter of fact, not one single filing has been attempted on any of the water power sites since the original order of withdrawal in January, 1909. The story as to the 15,000 acres in Montana circulated by publication in the newspapers, when presented by Gov. Pardee, was reduced to 158 acres near the Missouri river in Montana, or four tracts of 40 acres each, and it now turns out from examination of the records that these filings were refilings of entries made ten years before; that the refilings were made on the 11th of June, 1909, more than two weeks after the withdrawal of the water power sites in Montana, and that the four tracts of 40 acres each filed upon had no water power sites on them at all. It further appears from a report of the director of the geological survey that the order of withdrawal of January, 1909, was hastily made by townships and by reference to inadequate maps, that it included large areas not within miles of any river or stream, and that it failed to include many valuable water power sites in the immediate vicinity. From the same reliable source it is learned that under the withdrawals made by your Department from time to time, beginning in May last, there are now withheld from settlement awaiting the attention of Congress 50 per cent more water power sites than under previous withdrawals, and that this has been effected by a withdrawal from settlement of only one-fifth of the amount of the land.

✣ ✣

Coal Lands of Alaska.

The other charges against Secretary Ballinger to which the President's letter quoted from above related, had been made to the President by L. R. Glavis, a field division official in the Land Office and therefore one of Secretary Ballinger's subordinates. Mr. Glavis had, to quote from the President's letter, "by insinuation and innuendo, as well as by direct averment," charged Secretary Ballinger and others with taking steps, while public officers, to aid a group of Alaska coal land claimants (p. 800) known as the Cunningham claimants, to secure fraudulent patents to public coal lands. Upon receiving the Glavis charges the President sent copies to the officials accused, who made answers verified by exhibits from the records of Secretary Ballinger's department—the Department of the Interior—and also by private letters. The President, in announcing his conclusion, writes in the letter mentioned:

The case attempted to be made by Mr. Glavis embraces only shreds of suspicion without any substantial evidence to sustain his attack. The whole record shows that Mr. Glavis was honestly convinced of the illegal character of the claims in the Cunningham group, and that he was seeking evidence to defeat the claims. But it also shows that there was delay on his part in preparing the evidence with which to bring this, with other claims, to hearing; and that justice to the claimants required more speedy action than the Department, through Mr. Glavis, seems to have taken. Mr. Glavis seeks by quoting from a single telegram in the department to show that at one time the department wished to delay him in his investigations of the Alaska claims, and at another time unduly to hurry him; and he attempts to prove those two circumstances by citing telegrams and correspondence without disclosing other circumstances and correspondence which he knew or had under his control, and which do show an entirely proper reason for the action which, in each case, was directed to be taken.

✣

Following is President Taft's recital in the Ballinger letter of the circumstances of Secretary Ballinger's private connection with the Cunningham claimants:

By appointment of President Roosevelt you became Commissioner of the General Land Office in March, 1907, and resigned the position in March, 1908, and then returned to Seattle, your home, to resume the practice of law. In March, 1909, I appointed you Secretary of the Interior and you assumed the duties of your office on the fifth day of that month. In the interval, when you were not holding office, one of the Cunningham coal claimants consulted you in regard to the prospect of securing a patent upon the claims, and invited your attention to the character of certain evidence which was being used to impeach the validity of the claims

by Special Agent Glavis. You accepted the employment; visited Secretary Garfield and Commissioner Dennett; presented the question to them in respect to which you had been consulted; found there was no probability of securing a patent of the claims without presenting them under recent remedial legislation imposing conditions which the claimants were either unwilling or unable to meet. You so advised your clients. To pay your traveling expenses and for your services you received $250 and no more. The inference which Mr. Glavis seeks to have drawn to your discredit in this connection is that you, while Commissioner of the General Land Office, came into possession of facts concerning the so-called Cunningham group of coal land claims which made it improper for you to use such facts after your resignation in the course of securing the patents. I find the fact to be that, as Commissioner, you acquired no knowledge in respect to the claims except that of the most formal character, and nothing which was not properly known to your clients when they consulted you. The evidence in respect to which you were consulted professionally was not secured by Mr. Glavis until after your resignation as Commissioner of the General Land Office. A second inference sought to be drawn by Mr. Glavis against you is that you have acted improperly since becoming Secretary of the Interior in reference to the consideration of the Cunningham cases and have used your influence to interfere with Mr. Glavis' efforts to defeat the claims. Your only action which could in any manner affect the Cunningham group of claims was an order made by you soon after assuming office, that the 30,000 claims pending and undisposed of in the land office should be pressed to final hearing, and disposition as rapidly as possible consistent with justice, and these included the 931 Alaska coal claims, of which the Cunningham group numbered 33. As such expedition was essential both in the public interest and in that of the claimants, it could hardly be said to be action taken in the Cunningham claims. The record overwhelmingly establishes that, expressly because of your previous relation as counsel to one of the claimants, from the time you entered upon the duties of the office of Secretary of the Interior until the present day, you have studiously declined to have any connection with the Cunningham claims or to exercise any control over the course of the Department in respect to those claims; that you have said so in written and verbal communications to your subordinates and to the claimants themselves. Moreover, in May last you came to me and made a similar statement to me of your course and intention in respect to these claims. The statement made by Mr. Glavis that while you did thus formally withdraw from any official connection with the Cunningham claims, you nevertheless continued to exercise your influence in regard to them is not sustained by any evidence in the records produced.

✣

Secretary Ballinger having in his answer requested authority to dismiss Mr. Glavis from the service for disloyalty to his superior officers in making a false charge against them, the President authorizes him to make the dismissal "for filing a disingenuous statement, unjustly impeaching the official integrity of his superior officers." Mr. Glavis wrote the President on the 20th, saying that as there is now even greater danger than before that the title to the Alaska coal lands will be fraudulently secured by the syndicate, he intends to publish the evidence upon which he based his charges against his official superiors.

✣

There is nothing in President Taft's letter to show that Mr. Glavis was afforded an opportunity to reply to Secretary Ballinger's answer.

✣

Estimates of the value of the Alaska coal lands referred to in the President's Ballinger letter vary from 75 million dollars to 1,000 million dollars.

✣ ✣

Conservation of National Resources.

Out of the Conservation League of America (vol. xi, p. 579) of which Walter L. Fisher of Chicago is president, there has developed the National Conservation Association, the president of which is Charles W. Eliot, president emeritus of Harvard University. The announcement was officially made by Mr. Fisher to President Taft on the 1st, and approved by the latter on the 12th. The new association pledges itself to co-operate with all other bodies striving to effect the conservation of the natural resources of the United States. Membership is open to any citizen, and there are four classes—common, contributing, life, and patrons. A common member pays $2 a year in dues; a contributing member is a common member who makes an additional contribution; a life member pays $100, and a patron is a member who contributes $1,000 or more.

✣

The reported statement of principles is as follows:

Believing it to be of the utmost importance that the natural resources of the nation shall be comprehensively and vigorously developed and utilized for the promotion of the public welfare, without waste, destruction or needless impairment, and subject always to their intelligent conservation and the consequent preservation of the rights and interests of future generations; and in order to secure the recognition and support of these principles by the people and their representatives:

We agree that the land should be so used that erosion and soil wash shall cease, and that there should be reclamation of arid and semi-arid regions by means of irrigation and of swamp and overflowed regions by means of drainage; that the waters should be so conserved and used as to promote navigation, to enable the arid regions to be reclaimed by irrigation and to develop power in the interests of the people; that the forests which regulate our rivers, support our industries and promote the fertility and productiveness of the soil should be preserved and

perpetuated; that the minerals found so abundantly beneath the surface should be so used as to prolong their utility; that the beauty, healthfulness and habitability of our country should be preserved and increased; that sources of national wealth exist for the benefit of the people, and that monopoly thereof should not be tolerated.

✣

In order to carry into effect those principles a number of public measures are urged, such as the following:

The protection of the source of waters of navigable streams.

The enactment and enforcement of effective laws to prevent the spreading of fire in all forests.

The reasonable but effective public regulation of timber cutting on forest land.

The separation, for purposes of taxation, of the timber from the land on which it grows, and the support and extension of practical forestry.

The preparation, by a commission appointed by the President of the United States, of a comprehensive plan for water way improvement, and the immediate undertaking and continuous prosecution of works clearly necessary under such general plan.

The incorporation into all future grants of water power rights by State or nation, of provisions to secure prompt development.

Payment of reasonable compensation for the benefits granted by the people.

The limitation of all such grants to periods not exceeding fifty years.

Recognition of the right of the appropriate public authorities to make reasonable regulations as to rates and service.

The termination of all existing permits or grants for the development of water power and the substitution of new grants involving the foregoing principles.

The retention by the government of the title to all lands still in public ownership which contain phosphate rock, coal, oil or natural gas, and the development of the same by private enterprise, under conditions that will prevent extortion and waste.

The enactment of appropriate legislation to prolong our coal supply, to reduce waste in mining and to establish efficient safeguards against the loss of life in mines.

✣

An addendum declares the purpose of the Association "to further all legislation which is wisely designed to diminish sickness, prevent accidents and premature death, and increase the comfort and joy of American life," in the belief "that human efficiency, health and happiness are natural resources quite as important as forests, waters, lands and minerals."

✣ ✣

The British Land Question.

Mr. Asquith, the British Prime Minister, spoke at Birmingham on the 17th in behalf of the budget. The final sentences of his speech, "in which," cables T. P. O'Connor to the Chicago Tribune of the 19th, "bidding defiance to the Peers, Asquith took his place by the side of Lloyd George and Winston Churchill, who represent the fighting section of the cabinet, will silence the timid section of the Ministers and Liberals who, from the fear of losing their seats or salaries, deprecate any attempt to force the Lords into such a revolutionary course as the rejection of the budget." Mr. O'Connor adds that while "the situation remains where it has been for several weeks," there is "perhaps a bigger expectation that the budget will be accepted" by the Lords.

✣ ✣

The Irish Land Bill.

The "Birrell" Irish land bill introduced in the British Parliament last March by Augustine Birrell, chief secretary for Ireland, passed its final stage in the Commons on the 17th by a vote of 174 to 51. It goes now to the House of Lords.

✣

Under this bill the landlords would be compelled to sell to tenants as if the land were condemned. The courts would be empowered to fix a fair valuation on the land and the landlord compelled to accept that valuation and dispose of his holdings to his tenants. The Irish leaders are reported as regarding the passage of the bill as a signal victory, and as saying it is the greatest reform the government has yet tried in dealing with the land question in Ireland.

✣ ✣

Convention of German Socialists.

Inadequate and confused newspaper reports from Leipsic indicate that at the annual convention there of the Social Democratic party of Germany, a stronger tendency than usual was shown toward opportunistic policies such as Bernstein (vol. vi, p. 392) represents. The convention adjourned on the 19th, and according to the dispatches the debates had shown that—

the Socialists are growing more willing to accept a programme for the gradual transformation of society through co-operation with the Government and the existing parties. The debate on the course taken by a Socialist member of the Reichstag in voting in favor of an inheritance tax showed that the convention favored this action, whereas the traditional tactics of the Socialist party had been to refuse all possible taxes to the Government as it is now constituted. Herr Bebel, the Socialist leader, astonished his oldest friends in the party by declaring that he had been willing to vote for the inheritance tax, even at its third reading. The convention voted down a resolution which sought to commit the party against any form of co-operation with the Liberals, an action which the Berlin radical organs hail as foreshadowing a Socialist-Liberal alliance.

Whether there is any important significance in these reports cannot be determined with certainty without fuller information and from other sources.

The American Bankers' Association.

At the opening of the 35th convention of the American Bankers' Association, at Chicago on the 14th, the president of the Association, George M. Reynolds, in the course of his opening address, advocated the establishment of a central bank with at least 100 millions capital, empowered to issue currency in times of financial stringency, and in the profits of which the Federal government should share. The proposal evoked strong opposition from country bankers. It was not adopted, but the legislative committee reported upon the subject as follows:

The question of some form of a central bank, with exclusive note-issuing powers, may come up; also the possibility of authority being given to create branches in various cities to afford redemption facilities, etc., and the membership of this Association should be alert to this situation. With you rests the solution of this problem. Your committee has been opposed to any form of a central bank yet suggested by legislators, and particularly to branch banks. We believe the individuality of our banks should be preserved and that it is essential and fundamental that any plan for the issuance of currency to prevent and dispel trouble should be such as would enable individual banks to meet such conditions within themselves, at least with a minimum of inconvenience which would afford a maximum of security.

✤

There was much discussion of the question of postal savings banks, all of it hostile. The committee having the subject in charge reported unanimous opposition in banking circles over the country, and on the 17th the Association adopted the following resolutions:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this Association that we should condemn in unqualified terms the proposition for the establishment of postal savings banks, or any other system by which the government enters directly into banking relations with the people.

Resolved, That the American Bankers' Association is opposed to any financial legislation based upon the argument that it was a party pledge and should be redeemed.

Resolved, That we believe the proposed plan to invest postal savings bank deposits to the extent of six or seven hundred million dollars in United States bonds simply to maintain such bonds at par is unsafe and unwise legislation, and if enacted would ultimately lead to lack of confidence in our national credit.

✤

Louis E. Pierson, president of the Irving National Exchange Bank of New York, was elected president of the Association and Los Angeles selected for the next convention.

✤ ✤

William J. Bryan on Democratic Treachery.

William J. Bryan spoke at Dallas, Texas, on the 14th, in criticism of Democrats who, like Senator Bailey of Texas, had voted with the protection wing of the Republican party, on the new tariff bill, in violation of Democratic party pledges. His subject was "Democracy and the Tariff." He is reported as "denouncing those who violate a party pledge ratified by the voters of their party, as 'embezzlers of power.'" Meager dispatches report him as saying:

If all the Democrats in the Senate and House had voted against every proposed increase in the tariff, and for every proposed decrease, we might have made our fight next year upon the party's record without making a specific declaration on items or schedules. But in view of the fact that Democrats in both the Senate and the House differed as to the interpretation of the Democratic platform and as to the rates that should be imposed under the various schedules, I believe that it is necessary for our platform to be specific and emphatic. If we expect to secure control of Congress we must convince the public that we will, if intrusted with power, favor material reductions. Unless our candidates for Congress can agree before the election, they are not likely to agree after the election. If each Democratic candidate will state his position the voters can select a Representative who will give expression to their views, and I am much more anxious that the Representative shall reflect the wishes of his constituents than I am that he shall agree with my opinions.

Mr. Bryan is reported as having concluded his address with an extended argument in favor of free raw materials.

✤

Senator Bailey, assuming that Mr. Bryan's address was leveled at him, replied in Dallas on the 18th, arguing that free raw materials with a tariff on finished products benefits the manufacturer and not the consumer.

✤ ✤

Death of Governor Johnson.

John A. Johnson, Governor of Minnesota, died on the 21st from the effects of a surgical operation. He was born July 28, 1861, and although a Democrat in party politics, had been three times elected Governor of the Republican State of Minnesota. Lieutenant Governor Eberhart, a Republican, and 38 years of age, took the oath of office as Governor, immediately upon being informed of Governor Johnson's death.

✤ ✤

Street Car Strike in Omaha.

The street car system of Omaha (Neb.) and Council Bluffs (Iowa), two neighboring cities separated only by the Missouri River, ceased operating on the 18th in consequence of a strike of the trainmen, for which the officials of the companies were unprepared with strike-breakers. No further explanation of the cause of the strike appears in the news dispatches than that it relates to working conditions, working hours, and wages, and is dis-

approved by the local business interests. Reports are made, however, of acts of violence by the strikers, and of anticipated violence when strike-breakers shall arrive. A parade of strikers on the 19th, numbering 330 and preceded by a band was cheered by crowds of sympathizers. The local federated labor organizations in session at that hour voted friendly and financial support to the strickers, but the Business Men's Association (bankers, jobbers, manufacturers and merchants) voted about the same time to sustain the street railways, and members offered their services to the authorities as special deputies. Strike-breakers began to arrive from Chicago on the 19th, and 150 more left Chicago the same afternoon in charge of two "overseers."

✣ ✣

Impending Chicago Traction Strike Settled.

The impending street car strike in Chicago (p. 827) has been settled. Since the conference in progress late in August there have been much negotiation, various suggestions, some referendums, a conclusion on September 10th that further negotiations would be ineffective, a probable arbitration, and finally a compromise. The compromise adopted at last was submitted to the men on the 14th. It was a contract for three years from August 1, 1909, on the following scale of wages per hour:

For trainmen now in the employ of the companies who have completed two or more years of service:

First year	28 cents
Second year	29 cents
Third year	30 cents

For trainmen who hereafter complete two years of service:

Next succeeding year	28 cents
At expiration of third year	29 cents
Thereafter	30 cents

For "new men" employed subsequent to Aug. 1, 1909:

First six months	23 cents
Second six months	25 cents
Second year	26 cents
Third year	27 cents
Fourth year	28 cents
Fifth year	29 cents
Thereafter	30 cents

This adjustment was not satisfactory to the men, but at two meetings on the 16th, one of the North and West Side men and one of the South Side men, it was agreed to by decisive majorities after the international president, W. D. Mahon, of Detroit, had explained, as reported in the Record-Herald of the 17th, that—

> the men could expect nothing more from the companies through negotiations, and that arbitration was out of the question, as it could not include the employes of the Consolidated Traction Company, which is in the hands of receivers appointed by the United States Court. He declared there was no alternative but to accept the agreement or go out on strike, and the international organization would not sanction a strike under the circumstances.

The whole controversy was ended on the 17th by the signing of this compromise agreement by the presidents of the companies, Mr. Roach and Mr. Mitten.

✣ ✣

The Grand Junction Charter.

At the special election in Grand Junction, Colorado, on the 14th, the Bucklin charter (p. 868) was adopted by a large majority in a small vote, the total vote being only 964. This small vote was due to the fact that local interests had made their fight on the election of charter convention members, and were so badly beaten then that they made no contest against the adoption of the charter which that convention framed. The vote for the charter stood 749 to 215, an affirmative majority of 534. The vote on the question of five commissioners or three, the charter being of the commission-government type, was 555 for five commissioners and 322 for three—a majority for the five-commission plan of 233. This is the most radical city charter yet adopted, and if successful in operation is not unlikely to become the American type. Its preferential voting system—whereby it is expected to secure at the election all the advantages of nomination by petition, direct primary, independent choice, and majority instead of plurality election—will have its first trial at the charter election in November.

✣ ✣

Municipal Campaign in New York.

William J. Gaynor, one of the Supreme Court judges of the State of New York, was nominated for Mayor of the City of New York, by the Municipal Democracy on the 20th, at a meeting over which Judge Samuel Seabury presided. The dispatches predict that the Independence League (Hearst) will endorse Judge Gaynor if Tammany Hall does not, and will nominate an opposing candidate if Tammany endorses Gaynor.

✣ ✣

The Arctic Explorers.

The statement in The Public of last week, that Commander Robert E. Peary had with him but one companion, an Eskimo, in his last dash to the Pole (p. 895), seems to have been incorrect. Later versions of his journey state that he was accompanied, after he sent Captain Bartlett back at the 88th parallel, by Matthew Henson, an American Negro, and by four Eskimos. In an interview at Battle Harbor on the 16th, Commander Peary admitted, according to the Chicago Inter Ocean, that a rival expedition might reach the Pole without his knowledge, even though he were in the Arctic regions at the same time, if

their paths lay far apart. Commander Peary arrived on the morning of the 21st at Sydney, Nova Scotia, where he was met by Mrs. Peary with their daughter and son. He was received with great enthusiasm by the friendly population of Sydney. Dr. Frederick A. Cook arrived at New York on the Oscar II from Norway (p. 896), also on the morning of the 21st. Mrs. Cook and their two daughters were taken down the Bay in a tug, that they might be among the first to greet him. Upon landing Dr. Cook received a tremendous ovation.

NEWS NOTES

—A hurricane has been devastating the Gulf States. Five lives lost and a million dollars of damage, were reported from New Orleans on the 21st.

—A total of approximately $1,100,000 is reported to have been accumulated by the receivers of the Cleveland traction system (p. 897), and the Federal Court has ordered the distribution of $800,000. Of this, the Cleveland Railway Company will receive $600,000 to be applied to its floating debt, and most of the remainder will be expended for new cars.

—At Henry George's seventieth birthday celebration (p. 897), at Spokane, on the 2nd, the Rev. A. C. Grier presided. C. B. Kegley spoke on "The Conservation of National Resources," William Blackman on "Free Trade," William Mathews on "The Single Tax," and the Rev. W. J. Hindley on Henry George. Miss Maude E. Taylor sang and Prof. F. A. Schroeder gave a piano solo.

—New York has arranged for a week of festivity in commemoration of Henry Hudson's notable voyage of discovery in September, 1609, up the river which bears his name, and of Robert Fulton's practical use of steam for vessel propulsion, as demonstrated by the trip of the Clermont from New York to Albany, August 11, 1807. The celebration will open with a gigantic marine pageant on the Hudson River on the 25th.

—A revival of the McKee's Rocks (or Schoenville) strike (p. 900) occurred on the 15th, the workmen asserting that the company officials had broken faith. On the 16th a break between American and foreign workmen was reported, the former opposing the revival of the strike; dispatches stated that the Americans marched through the mass of twice as many foreigners, carrying the American flag, and threatening to kill any one who molested them. No further difficulty is reported.

—John Z. White is to be tendered a farewell dinner at Chicago on the occasion of his departure upon an eight months' lecturing tour across the Continent. Hiram B. Loomis, principal of the Hyde Park High School, will preside, and S. Y. Gillan, of Milwaukee, editor of the Western Teacher, and of The American Journal of Education, is to be the principal speaker. The dinner will be given at Kimball's Cafe, La Salle and Monroe Streets, October 2, at 6:30 p. m. Places at table, 75 cents each, should be engaged in advance of F. H. Monroe, Palos Park, Ill.

—The 29th annual convention of the American Federation of Labor (p. 849) will meet at Toronto on the 8th of November. The basis of representation is as follows: From national or international unions, for less than 4,000 members, one delegate; 4,000 or more, two delegates; 8,000 or more, three delegates; 16,000 or more, four delegates; 32,000 or more, five delegates; 64,000 or more, six delegates; 128,000 or more, seven delegates, and so on; and from central bodies and State federations, and from local trade unions not having a national or international union, and from Federal labor unions, one delegate.

PRESS OPINIONS

Prosperity.*

Dun's Review (business) Sept. 18.—In spite of prevailing high prices, which in some lines work for curtailment of operations, the volume of trade continues not only largely in excess of last year, but is even approximating the records of 1907. Most noteworthy is the continuing expansion in iron and steel in which the position of producer and consumer has changed, the latter now displaying most of the eagerness to close contracts at prevailing rates.

✣ ✣

The Right to Work.

The (New York) Nation (ind.), Sept. 9.—In all disputes between employers and their men nowadays the right of the outside workman to take employment where he can find it becomes immediately involved. But the strikebreaker's right to work is seriously modified when his labor, as has been shown to be the case at McKee's Rocks, has been obtained by misrepresentation and not infrequently retained by force.

✣ ✣

The Protection Fraud.

The (Portland, Ore.) Journal (ind.), August 31.—The Pressed Steel Car Company is one of the especial pets of legalized privilege . . . According to protectionist doctrine, all the employes of such an industry should and do receive high wages, and they should be contented and happy. Moreover, they should be American workingmen. The claim is that protection protects American labor against cheap foreign labor. Why, then . . . did they strike? Why should they strike under a tariff law that "protects American labor and ensures every workingman good wages"—as we hear every four years?

✣ ✣

Johnson's Cleveland Fight.

(Chicago) Unity (rel.), Sept. 16.—Much is being made in some quarters over the defeat of Tom Johnson's plans. His heroic fight as mayor of the city of Cleveland has given him national publicity. His struggles for municipal ownership, or, failing that, municipal control, and for a three-cent fare,

*See pages 638, 685.

have been in the limelight for several years, and now when the capitalistic world is pointing its finger at his "failure," and saying, "It will not work," "I told you so," "He is a mere dreamer," "There is nothing practical about his scheme," it transpires that there is a party in Cleveland demanding that he should run once more for the mayoralty and be his own successor. The Republicans are strong in the hope that they can beat him this time, but a strongly Republican paper admitted that in order to defeat him that party has been obliged to promulgate a platform that is essentially the Tom Johnson contention. The cause of truth triumphs in many ways. Perhaps most principles triumph in the defeat of their friends. Well does a writer in La Follette's Magazine for August 21, say, "Tom Johnson needs the people far less than the people need Tom Johnson."

✣ ✣

To Kill the Tariff.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (dem. Dem.), September 1.—Tom L Johnson is a tariff killer. He would like to destroy every tariff that exists and to bury it beyond the hope of resurrection. There is no place in his politico-economic philosophy for Protection and none for any tax on labor, its products or its processes. What would happen therefore in relation to the parties and the tariff were he to loom large against the horizon as the coming leader of Democracy is not hard to imagine. It would mean an end to sham battles and the beginning of real war. The separation of the sheep from the goats would follow like a transformation scene. We should see a fight here such as that now in progress in Great Britain, and we believe that as it progressed the strength of Democracy would increase as we see the strength of Liberalism increasing with the pressing home of the revolutionary land value tax proposals of the budget.

✣ ✣

Disintegration of Parties.

Independence (Kansas) Times (dem. Dem.), Sept. 3.—When the time comes for a new deal and a square deal, a petrified party which has come to be the sanctuary of existing abuses has to be broken up. The Democratic party was crushed in pieces in 1860 for this reason, and the Republican party is now dissolving before our eyes for the same reason. It stands for the things that are, regardless of whether they are right or wrong, and hence it is doomed. And that is not to say that it will be defeated by the Democratic party . . . Out of the Republican party and the Democratic party now, as out of the Whig party and the Democratic party then, a new party is being crystalized that will set up a new milestone of progress in our land which will stand as conspicuous in the next fifty years as emancipation has in the last.

✣ ✣

President Taft's Protege.

The Baltimore Sun (ind.), Sept. 16.—Mr. Taft has made an egregious mistake in certifying Senator Aldrich's character as a friend of the people. He has fallen into a palpable error of judgment in associating himself with Mr. Aldrich's aspirations to "aid the people." Recognition and laudation of Mr. Aldrich's work as a tariff expert may "go" in certain circles in New England, where many of the beneficiaries of Senator Aldrich's labors live and prosper exceedingly on the schedules made under his direction. But in the West, where the Republican masses are protesting bitterly against the discriminations in the tariff act in favor of New England, the President's indorsement of Mr. Aldrich as a statesman with an "earnest desire to aid the people" in any way will arouse more resentment than enthusiasm. . . . Mr. Taft has blundered. He is highly esteemed by his countrymen for his admirable personal qualities, but his judgment is gravely at fault when he gives his unqualified approval to Mr. Aldrich's leadership in the movement for banking and monetary reform. Why should the President proclaim his implicit confidence in this statesman, when the people have found him ever active in promoting the welfare of interests which have grown rich and powerful at the expense of the masses?

✣

The Cincinnati Post (ind.), Sept. 15.—Aldrich's reputation is made. Taft cannot remake it. Aldrich stands as the chief exponent of a robber tariff that has forced the people of the Middle West and Far West and North West to support the manufacturing trusts of New England, New York and Pennsylvania. He is known as the bellicose champion and pliant tool of the privileged interests, interests that have taken from the pockets of the common people to put into the pockets of billionaires. If, in all our history, there is one man more than another who has stood for caste, monopoly legislation, special privilege, corporation greed, concentrated oppression and a moneyed aristocracy, that man is Aldrich; and Taft isn't big enough to hide his horns, split hoofs and forked tail, or paint him a new complexion that will conceal his blackness. The American people know the devil when they see him, and are not colorblind. But Taft proposes to go further than start a reputation for angelhood for Aldrich, based on what Aldrich did to the tariff. He recommends that, under Aldrich's leadership, "a sound and safe monetary and banking system" be given to the country. It is a proposition that should properly be considered in some dark, underground room, with an accompaniment of billies, masks and bull's-eye lanterns. Let "the Interests" rob the people with tariff schedules, and then let "the interests" say what the people's money shall be worth! It is a great scheme. Heads, "the Interests," win; tails, the people pay. But it will not be popular in the West. There are honest patriots in the region west of Wall street and the Morgan-Rockefeller golf links, who will rise up and tell Taft to send this newest proposition back to Washington, to complete the fine collection of odors generated by the Aldriches, Ballingers and that Cabinet of third-prize corporation lawyers.

✣ ✣ ✣

"You waste too much paper," said the editor.

"But how can I economize?" asked the writer.

"By writing on both sides of the paper."

"But you will not accept articles when they are written on both sides of the sheet."

"I know it; but you'd save paper just the same."—Yonkers Statesman.

RELATED THINGS
CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

"BE OF GOOD CHEER."

Be of good cheer, brave spirit; steadfastly
Serve that low whisper thou hast served; for know,
God hath a select family of some
Now scattered wide thro' earth, of each alone,
Who are thy spiritual kindred, and each one
By constant service to that power and law,
Is wearing the sublime proportions
Of a true monarch's soul. Beauty and strength,
The riches of a spotless memory,
The eloquence of truth, the wisdom got
By searching of a clear and loving eye
That seeth as God seeth. These are their gifts,
And Time, who keeps God's word, brings on the day
To seal the marriage of these minds with thine,
Thine everlasting lovers. Ye shall be
The salt of all the elements, world of the world.
—Ralph Waldo Emerson.

✣ ✣ ✣

THE BRITISH FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY.

From Editorials in the London Nation of August 28, 1909.

The two sections of the forward army, Labor and Liberalism, which seemed to be growing farther and farther apart, have come together. Enthusiasm has revived, and with it belief in the future. The old grievance of the British people, their divorce from the land, has been presented in a simple, practical form. . . .

In the effort at self-justification, the great landlords have not only been guilty of acts or speech of revolting personal meanness, but they have made themselves ridiculous by asking a great industrial state to subscribe to the doctrine that the extent of their personal luxury is the measure of their public service.

The answer has been obvious. The nation has plainly intimated that it can do without its dukes, and that there is not a single useful function which they claim as their prerogative, from the maintenance of charities to the employment of labor, which it is powerless to provide for itself. Will the dukes discharge their aged servants? The state will look after them. Will they starve the hospitals? The richest of nations will not neglect its sick. Will they sell land? There will be plenty of bidders. Will they cease rearing grouse and pheasants? There will be more sheep and poultry. They can keep the neighborly feeling on which they pride themselves. They are not asked to play rural Providence any longer.

The heaviest blow which the budget has struck has been at the House of Lords and at tariff reform.* We doubt whether the friends of the latter cause will ever recover their attack on the land clauses. . . .

The worst embarrassment has been reserved for the Lords. The mask is now fairly off the special kind of political hypocrisy which treats the House of Lords as a disinterested organ of the national will. The Lords cannot conceal their immense prejudice in this matter, their private, personal stake in the budget; they have proclaimed it to all the world. And it is no longer possible for them to pretend that in passing outside the British Constitution and trampling on the privileges of the Commons, they will be acting as clear-sighted interpreters of the public mind, going behind the forces of democracy in order to get at its reality. Agitation against the budget, sustained with the unlimited cash which the Protectionists command, and regular appeals to promising constituencies, have equally failed. The budget is so popular with the masses that an unconstitutional check to it might arouse a sudden fury of demonstration and action such as our politics has not known since the days of Chartism or the first reform bills. The position, therefore, of the Government is peculiarly strong. The Lords may bow the neck and pass the budget, as they are constitutionally bound to do. Or they may act as the French nobility acted in the first phase of the great Revolution. Each kind of procedure makes for the triumph of Liberalism. . . .

We remember no Ministry that in its fourth year of office has rebounded so suddenly into popular favor. The advantage is not merely tactical. Not only have its opponents overreached themselves, but as sometimes happens amid the unrealities of politics, a shaft has been sunk into a deep and rich vein of popular interest. . . .

Three considerations seem to us of governing importance. The first is the duty of safe-guarding free trade. The second is the largeness of the social issues which the working out of the budget involves. The third is the necessity of coming to close grips with the Lords. Here it is a case of "Thy head or my head"—there is no third course for the Liberal party. . . .

If the budget passes, as in all probability it will pass, the question of the Lords presents itself again in a form intolerable to a great political organization, fresh from a legitimate triumph. We do not look forward with zest to another prolonged period of enfeebled compromises, or weaker surrenders, during which the Government will again be pushing bills up to the Lords, much as the attendant at a menagerie thrusts gobbets of meat

*In England "tariff reform" means the reverse of what the same words mean in the United States. The United States being a protection country, "tariff reform" is a movement toward free trade. England being a free trade country, "tariff reform" is a movement toward protection. —Editors of The Public.

between the bars of the lions' cages. We have come nearer the determination of the great quarrel than we have ever come before. We must note and make good our new ground. . . .

The great land owners continue to devote a considerable portion of their summer holidays to instructing the nation in the elements of political economy. . . . How we have wronged these noblemen! Too late, alas! they have been induced to lay aside their native modesty, and to declare themselves as they really are, no cold monopolists, using the great estates with which Providence has endowed them, for their own profit, enjoyment, and aggrandizement, but warm-hearted stewards, concerned only with the welfare of the tenants and retainers for whom they find land and employment. The arduous task of fox hunting they perform to protect their tenants from the devastation of such vermin, while they spend laborious days among their moors to shoot grouse for the sick poor. Malicious fiction-mongers have invented myths of crofters cleared out in hundreds to make way for deer, of miles of glorious scenery dedicated to grouse and pheasants and forbidden to man, of close villages where there is no liberty to live without the license of the squire, of holdings and allotments rented to working men at six or eight times their farm rental, of extortion practised upon municipalities and other public bodies needing land for parks or other public purposes. Read the Conservative press of England, and you will be staggered at the unscrupulous audacity of such inventions of Radical malice.

What are we to make of such a presentation? Reflection brings up several definite points of inquiry. Why are the great rural land owners so terribly perturbed that they bend their intellects to construct these naïve defenses? The budget does not threaten to break up the deer forests of Atholl for small holdings, or to tax Lord Londonderry's shootings, or to confiscate the 183,200 acres owned by the Duke of Portland. There is, we repeat, nothing in the budget to justify the suggestion that great rural land owners must retrench expenditure, dismiss their servants, and enter upon "a new way of life." Only so far as these persons own city and mineral lands are they invited to contribute more largely to the public revenue. If, indeed, they were so public spirited as individually they profess to be—they would willingly serve their country by this contribution, not out of their present but out of their prospective unearned wealth. But even this call of the Exchequer is a very gentle one. Allowing for the increase of death duties, it can amount to a very few millions out of the vast sum, about two hundred millions, which they take each year for owning the land which certainly they did not make, and to which the work and wants of the people have given value. No! It is not the present taxation that frightens them.

It is the valuation. If they could get the Lords to screw up their courage to the point of knocking out compulsory valuation, they would be quite content. Valuation is the enemy. Why ?

The answer is plain. Hitherto they have piled up rents and screwed up tenants in renewals of leases with impunity; they have reaped vast increases of income from public improvements, to the cost of which they have paid a mere pittance, with impunity; they have plundered railroad companies, municipalities, the state, by swelling the value of pieces of land, with the assistance of "experts" whose opinions could be put to no authoritative test, with impunity; upon these very lands which they sell so dear they have paid almost negligible rates by the connivance of a submissive rating authority, with impunity. All these highly profitable abuses, and many more, are bred of secrecy, and will disappear with publicity. Every land owner has hitherto been free to hold up the public in selling land, in almost every industrial and public capacity which the working community can assume, to fine his tenants, to escape his fair share of rates and taxes, because there has existed no authoritative valuation of his land whereby he might be convicted of his depredations. This will be no longer possible with full and frequently revised valuations set on public record. Square dealing will be compulsory. Only those who have made research into the early history of our railroads, or whose professional duties have brought them into close contact with public arbitrations for the sale of land, adequately realize the magnitude of these gains in the past, and the damage to the land owning classes which their stoppage in the future will entail.

But the formal register of land values is felt instinctively to be the enemy, not only because it checks these public wrongs, but because it ranks as the first step in a democratic finance which will gradually undermine the remnants of rural feudalism and the economic roots of the luxurious life of our great modern plutocracy. . . .

What they think themselves to be fighting is not merely this budget, but democracy beginning to seek definite realization in economic and social equality. Dives had not hitherto realized it possible that he might be called upon to make his reckoning with Lazarus in this world: the other he was always prepared to risk.

Nor is it merely the wild envy of the disinherited he is called upon to meet. The social conscience of the community is being stirred to a new realization of the facts of riches and poverty and the related degradation of the luxury and deprivation they involve. Never has this nation presented such a riot of sensuous extravagance as is seen everywhere today in our pleasure cities and our countryside, though in the dens and huts of industry millions of our workers are still short of

the opportunity to toil for a reasonable subsistence.

Growing numbers of sane, honest citizens are beginning to understand the nature and origin of this contrast, and to urge a determined course of political remedy.

✣ ✣ ✣

ANOTHER GREAT CHURCHILL SPEECH.

Principal Portions of a Speech by the Right Honorable Winston Churchill of the British Cabinet at Palace Theater, Leicester, England, Sept. 4th, Before an Audience of 4,000. From the Manchester (Eng.) Guardian of Sept. 6th, 1909.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen: You have very rightly said that the Budget League has very successful meetings. We have a great many of them, and, as you have said, there are a good many meetings of the Budget Protest League which are, in fact, little less than demonstrations in favor of the Budget. (Laughter and "Hear, hear.") But there is one great difficulty which confronts a speaker at Budget League meetings—he has nobody to reply to. (Laughter.)

It is quite true that the small fry of the Tory party have been splashing actively about in their proper puddles. It is true that Mr. Balfour, however, the great leader who means to lead (laughter)—he has been meaning to lead for the last six years if he could only find out where on earth to lead to;—it is quite true that Mr. Balfour from time to time emits four or five columns of insipid equivocation which the newspapers whose proprietors he has taken the precaution to make into barons hasten to claim as "another epoch-making pronouncement." (Laughter.)

What I want to draw your attention to is the appalling lack of anything like a leader or a spokesman on the Tory side who is capable of commanding public attention, of conducting adequately this great controversy and debate upon which we are now engaged. The millionaire newspapers—do not forget that, although they are sold very cheap and sometimes play rather low, nevertheless they are the organs of rich gentlemen and are used in the interests of wealth as such,—the millionaire newspapers are painfully conscious of the absence of any popular and effective figure on their side. (A voice: "No, no.") The "Times" for some time made an effort to bring out Lord Rothschild as a "great" Tory democratic leader (laughter), but he retired hurt (laughter and cheers) after one round with Mr. Lloyd George. (Laughter and cheers.) The "Daily Mail" ("Oh, oh") was rather inclined to take up Lord Rosebery (a voice: "They can have him") if they only knew what he was going to say. (Laughter.) The "Daily Telegraph" holds up its hands in pious lamentation and says, "Oh, if we only had Mr. Chamberlain in his prime, how he would have answered that wicked Limehouse speech." (Laughter.)

I am sure that we are all very sorry that Mr. Chamberlain cannot take part in this controversy, and we all deplore the perverse misfortune which keeps him at once so near and so far from the fighting line. When the "Daily Telegraph" talks about Mr. Chamberlain in his prime, we are forced to remember that that would be the Mr. Chamberlain of 1885. (Cheers.) If we had the Mr. Chamberlain of 1885 with us today he would not have answered the Limehouse speech. He would have made it. (Cheers.)

And so in the absence of anything popular and effective, in the absence of any commanding voice, the Tory party have had to fall back upon the dukes. (Laughter.)

Do not let us be too hard upon them. It is poor sport, almost like catching goldfish. These ornamental creatures blunder on every hook they see, and there is no sport whatever in trying to catch them. (Laughter.) It would be barbarous to leave them gasping on the bank of public ridicule upon which they have landed themselves. Let us put them back gently and tenderly into their fountains, and if a few bright golden scales have been rubbed off in what the Prime Minister calls the variegated handling they have received, they will soon get over it. They have got plenty more.

But although there is very little to answer at the present time, and only the well-known arguments put in the well-known forms to refute, we must not forget the stubborn forces and heavy labors and serious hazards that confront us, and will do so, before the people's budget has become the law of the land. Do not let us underrate them. Let us survey the situation.

For good or for ill, we have the power today to choose our future, and I believe there is no nation in the world, perhaps there never has been in history any nation which at one and the same moment was confronted with such opposite possibilities. We are threatened on the one hand by more melancholy disaster, and cheered on the other by more bright, yet not unreasonable, hopes. The two roads are open. We stand at the crossways. If we stand on in the old happy-go-lucky way—the richer classes ever growing in wealth and in number, and the very poor remaining plunged or plunging ever deeper in helpless, hopeless misery—then I think there is nothing before us but savage strife between class and class, with its increasing disorganization, with increasing waste of human strength and human virtue; nothing but that dual degeneration which comes from the simultaneous waste of extreme wealth and of extreme want. (Hear, hear.)

We have over here lately Colonial editors

from all the Colonies of the British Empire. What is the opinion which they expressed as to the worst thing they saw in the old country? From every Colony they have expressed the opinion that the worst feature they saw was the extremes of poverty side by side with the extremes of luxury. ("Hear, hear," and some interruptions.)

Don't you think it is very impressive to find a statement like that, made in all friendship and sincerity by men of our own race who have come from lands which are so widely scattered over the surface of the earth, and are the product of such varied conditions? Is it not impressive to find that they are all agreed—coming as they did from Australia or Canada or South Africa—that the greatest danger to the British Empire and to the British people is not to be found among the enormous fleets and armies of the European Continent or in the solemn problems of Hindustan? It is not in the Yellow Peril, or the Black Peril, or any danger in the wide circuit of colonial and foreign affairs. It is here in our midst, close at home, close at hand, in the vast growing cities of England and Scotland, and in the dwindling and cramped villages of our denuded countryside. It is there you will find the seeds of Imperial ruin and national decay. The awful gap between rich and poor, the divorce of the people from the land (cheers), the want of proper discipline and training in our young people (hear, hear), the exploitation of boy labor (hear, hear), the physical degeneration which seems to follow so swiftly on civilized poverty, the awful jumble of an obsolete poor law (hear, hear), the horrid havoc of the liquor traffic (loud and prolonged cheers), the constant insecurity in the means of subsistence and employment which breaks the heart of many a sober, hard-working man (hear, hear), the absence of any established minimum standard of life and comfort among the workers; and the other end, the swift increase of vulgar, joyless luxury (hear, hear). Here are the enemies of Britain. Beware lest they shatter the foundations of her power. (Loud cheers.)

Then look at the other side. Look at the forces for good—the moral forces, the spiritual forces, the civic, the scientific, the patriotic forces which make for order and harmony and health and life, —are they not tremendous? Do we not see them everywhere, in every town, in every class, in every creed—strong forces worthy of old England, coming to her rescue, fighting for her soul? That is the situation in our country as I see it this afternoon. Two great armies, evenly matched, locked in fierce conflict with each other all along the line, swaying backwards and forwards in strife, and, for my part, I am confident that the right will win. (Cheers.) That the generous influences will triumph over the selfish influences, that the organizing forces will devour the forces of degeneration, and that the British people will emerge triumphant from their struggles to clear the road and lead the march amongst the foremost nations of the world.

I want to ask you a question. I dare say there are some of you who do not like this or that particular point in the budget, who do not like some particular argument or phrase which some of us may have used in advocating or defending it. But it is not of these details that I speak. The question I want each of you to ask himself is this: On which side of this great battle which I have described to you does the Budget count? (Loud cheers.)

I want to tell you about the meaning and the spirit of the Budget. Upon the Budget and upon the policy of the Budget depends a far-reaching plan of social organization designed to give a greater measure of security to all classes, but particularly to the laboring classes. (Cheers.)

The Budget and the policy of the Budget is the first conscious attempt on the part of the state to build up a better and a more scientific organization of society for the workers of the country, and it is for you to say at no very distant date (a voice: "We'll say it," and cheers) whether all this effort for a great coherent scheme of social reconstruction is to be swept away into the region of lost endeavors. (Cries of "Never," and a voice: "What are you going to do with the Lords?" and cheers.) That is the main aspect of the budget to which I wish to draw your attention.

But there is another significance of the highest importance which attaches to the budget. I mean the new attitude of the state towards wealth. Formerly the only question of the taxgatherer was: "How much have you got?" We ask that question still (laughter and cheers), and there is a general feeling recognized as just by all parties that the rate of taxation should be greater for large incomes than for small. As to how much greater, parties are no doubt in dispute. (Laughter). But now a new question has arisen. We do not only ask today: "How much have you got?" We also ask: "How did you get it?" (Cheers.)

Did you earn it by yourself, or has it just been left you by others? Was it gained by processes which are in themselves beneficial to the community in general? or was it gained by processes which have done no good to anyone, only harm? Was it gained by the enterprise and capacity necessary to found a business? or merely by squeezing and bleeding the owner and founder of the business? Was it gained by supplying the capital which industry needs? or by denying, except at an extortionate price, the land which industry requires? Was it derived from active reproductive processes? or merely by squatting on some piece of necessary land till enterprise and labor and natural interests and municipal interests had to buy you out at fifty times the agricultural value? Was it gained from opening new minerals to the service of man? or by sucking a mining royalty

from the toil of others? Was it gained by the curious process of using political influence and converting an annual license into a practical freehold, and thereby pocketing a monopoly value which properly belongs to the state? How did you get it?

It is just as well that you should keep these issues clearly before you during the weeks in which we seem to be marching towards a grave Constitutional crisis. But I should like to tell you that a general election consequent upon the rejection of the budget by the Lords would not, ought not, and could not be fought upon the budget alone. (Cheers.)

Budgets come, as the late Lord Salisbury said in 1894, and budgets go. Every Government has its own expenditure for each year. Every Government has hitherto been entitled to make its own provision to meet that expenditure. There is a budget every year. Memorable as the Budget of my right honorable friend may be, far-reaching as is the policy dependent upon it, the finance bill, after all, is only in its character an annual affair.

But the rejection of the Budget by the House of Lords would not be an annual affair. (Loud and prolonged cheering.)

It would be a violent rupture of Constitutional custom and usage extending over 300 years, and recognized during all that time by the leaders of every part in the state. It would involve a sharp and sensible breach with the traditions of the past. And what does the House of Lords depend upon if not upon the traditions of the past? (Cheers.) It would amount to an attempt at revolution, not by the poor but by the rich, not by the masses but by the privileged few, not in the name of progress but in that of reaction, not for the purpose of broadening the framework of the state but of greatly narrowing it. Such an attempt, whatever you may think of it, would be historic in its character; and the results of the battle fought upon it, whoever won, must inevitably be not of an annual but of a permanent and final character. (Cheers.)

The result of such an election must mean an alteration of the veto of the House of Lords. (More cheers.) If they win (Voices: "They won't" and "Never") they will have asserted their right not merely to reject the legislation of the House of Commons but to control the finances of the country. And if they lose we will smash to pieces their veto. (Loud and prolonged cheers.)

I say to you that we do not seek the struggle. But if it is to come it could never come better than now. (Loud cheers.) Never again perhaps, not for many years in any case, will such an opportunity be presented to the British democracy. Never will the ground be more favorable. Never will the issues be more clearly or more vividly defined. (Cheers.)

Those issues will be whether taxation which is admitted on all sides to be necessary shall be imposed upon luxuries, superfluities, and monopolies, or upon the prime necessaries of life; whether you shall put your tax upon the unearned increment in land or upon the daily bread of labor; whether the policy of constructive social reform on which we are embarked and which expands and deepens as we advance, shall be carried through and given a fair chance, or whether it shall be brought to a dead stop, and all the energies and attention of the state devoted to Jingo armaments and senseless foreign adventure. And lastly, the issue will be whether the British people in the year of grace 1909 are going to be ruled through a representative assembly elected by six or seven millions of voters and about which everyone in the country has a chance of being consulted, or whether they are going to allow themselves to be dictated to and domineered over by a miserable minority of titled persons (laughter), who represent nobody, who are responsible to nobody, and who only scurry up to London to vote in their party interests, in their class interests, and in their own interests.

These will be the issues of the struggle, and I am glad that the responsibility for such a struggle, if it should come, will rest with the House of Lords themselves. (Hear, hear.) But if it is to come we do not need to complain. We will not draw back from it. (Hear, hear.) We will engage in it with all our hearts, it being always clearly understood that the fight will be a fight to the finish (loud cheers), and that the fullest forfeits which are in accordance with the national interests shall be exacted from the defeated foe. (Loud cheers.)

\+ \+ \+

BOOM-A-LOOMA.

What's dat ol' Adam is a gwine foh to eat?
Hol' on, Adam, hol' on!
It ain't a hunk er bread, an' it ain't a hunk er meat;
Hol' on, Adam, hol' on.
Adam was de on'y man dat wasn't bohn en bred,
But I'se boun' foh to tell you dat po' Adam is dead.
Wif a boomalooma, boomalooma-oom.
Den it's men' my shroud
Wif a silver cloud,
Caze my ol' fren' Adam is a'waitin',
Dar's a silver spread
On a golden bed
Wha' I'se gwine to res' from Satan.

What dat ol' Ab'aham is gwine foh to do?
Hol' on, Ab'aham, hol' on!
He's a sharpenin' his knife on de sole er his shoe;
Hol' on, Ab'aham, hol' on!
Ab'aham was moughty proud en hol' up his head,
But it's mouhn, my chil'en, fo' po' Ab'aham is dead.
Wif a boomalooma, boomalooma-oom.
En my grave's done made
Wif a silver spade
Caze I'se gwine up to Ab'aham's meetin',
En we'll roas' dat ram
Dat'll tas' like ham,
En dey ain't no better eatin'.

What dat ol' Saul is a-tryin' foh to kick?
Hol' on, Tarsus, hol' on!
He's a-buttin' at de sperrit en he fin' dat it prick;
Hol' on, Tarsus, hol' on!
Paul was de smartes' man dat ever tuk a bref,
But I grieves foh to tell you dat he done tuk his def,
Wif a boomalooma, boomalooma-oom.
Den it's men' my wing
Wif a silver string,
Caze my ol' fren' Paul is a-waitin';
En we'll set right dar
On a golden star
En we'll chunk down a rock at Satan!
—Edmund Vance Cooke, in Puck.

BOOKS

THE GOLDEN SEASON.

The Golden Season. By Myra Kelly, author of "Rosnah," "The Isle of Dreams," "Little Citizens," "Wards of Liberty," etc., etc. Illustrated by R. M. Crosby, H. Heyer and W. Morgan. Published by Doubleday, Page & Co., New York. Fixed price, $1.20.

When Myra Kelly "broke into" magazine literature—for that is the way she got there,—she introduced a new and intensely interesting human type to magazine readers; and the farther she gets away from that type, the more does one wish she might come back to it, so charming was her work. Perhaps, however, we should all be disappointed if she did stick to that type, for the danger of monotony would not be light. At any rate, we must be satisfied with what she offers. This is easy enough with "The Golden Season," a breezy story of the escapades of a coltish college girl. Beginning in a glare of feminine bachelorhood, it ends all around in the soft lights of marital domesticity; and on the way, Myra Kelly's characteristic and irresistible humor meets you at every turn of the road.

✣ ✣ ✣

DEATH AND VICTORY.

Mors et Victoria. Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York and Bombay. Price, $1.00.

A love-drama in three acts, published anonymously, but privately announced as the work of Mrs. Spencer Trask.

It is the old legend of Huguenot lovers told with a sympathy and passion that annihilate time and space, and bring the actors of a dead past upon the stage of the living present.

Marguerite de Bonne-Grace, repulsing the suit of the Duke of Guise, flees to her tryst with her Huguenot lover, Vallon de Vallonbois, in two notable scenes in Act II, which hold passages well worth citing. And in Act III, where Marguerite pleads with Vallon to renounce his faith, or refrain from singing with the band of heretics, the psalm for which the Duke of Guise has threatened all with death, the scene is tense and strong with emotion. To Marguerite's entreaties and fears the lover replies:

And what is mortal death but life? It would, indeed,
Be death did we permit our souls to die
In ignominious fear and leave unscathed
A few more fleeting years our frames of dust.
If death comes, let it come; we all must die;
And how can we die better than to stand
Praising our God when we are called to God?

And still, pleading her own anguish, Marguerite cries at last:

Is this the end? And you will not be moved?
Vallon: Not unto sin, dear heart,
Marguerite: Love is not sin, for God himself is love.
Vallon: True, God is love and we can trust His love.
But nowhere has He told us love is God.

And with this cruel distinction the tragic parting passes, the massacre follows, and Marguerite after all dies upon her lover's breast with the words:

It is no dream; joy is the twin of love;
And love and joy are mine forever more;
Pain cannot touch their immortality.
Vallon—What was that word? The word is true!
Our God has taught us that love conquers death—
Love conquers death—love, Vallon—love.

All in all, the tragedy of the Huguenot lovers, treasured in the memory of poet and artist for more than three hundred years, has never been more eloquently and touchingly portrayed than in this little drama, "Mors et Victoria," by Katrina Trask.

A. L. M.

✣ ✣ ✣

A LAUGH.

Warrior, the Untamed. The story of an Imaginative Press Agent. By Will Irwin. Illustrations by T. R. Gruger. Published by Doubleday, Page & Co. Price, 50 cents.

This book is a laugh from cover to cover. To explain why, might advertise the book, but it would spoil the laugh.

PAMPHLETS

Property-Power and Economics.

Samuel B. Clarke's pamphlet examination of "Some of the Bases of Economic Theory" (32 Nassau St., New York), is what professional economists would call "unique" or "suggestive" or "startling," or the like, these being the usual professional epithets for polite disapproval. We should wish to be understood in the same way if we used the same or similar adjectives; as indeed we might, for Mr. Clarke's conclusions really are unique, suggestive,

startling, etc. They would topple over every economic theory that has or has ever had vogue. He makes "property power" the primary factor in production. "You must own before you can produce, just as you must own before you can eat;" and distribution is determined by pre-contract and not by contributions to production. The training Mr. Clarke has brought to his consideration of this subject is evident in his reasoning. A lawyer of vast experience in large things, his professional training takes him to property-power as the universal basis of industrial life, and confuses economic principle in his mind with legal principle. The fact that the latter is primarily conventional and the former primarily natural, eludes him. It may be conceded of course that conventional property-power does control economic phenomena; but this explanation of economic phenomena falls far short of explaining. Peculiarities of property-power may account, for illustration, for the inertia or activity of a machine, but they do not explain mechanics. So peculiarities of property-power (slave laws for example) may account for peculiarities of production and distribution, but they do not explain the natural laws of production and distribution. To the lawyer, intensely trained in conventional legal principles, it may indeed seem that property naturally precedes production and that contract naturally determines distribution. But back of the property-power which laws confer, it is evident that property in products (and this is the essential thing) cannot precede their production, and that contracts for distribution are merely speculative sales in advance. Nature gives to the producer: the produced object comes first into his possession. He may sell it, or give it away, after production or before, or have it taken from him by plunderers and in obedience to fear of pistols or to the coercion of conventional property-powers that override natural property-powers—as under slave systems or land monopoly systems. But by economic law (whatever your conventional law may be) production must precede property in products, both as a physical and an economic fact; and distribution is in the first instance directed with reference to productive forces, however it may be subsequently determined by pre-contracts, free or coercive.

PERIODICALS

The bulletin of the "International Labor Office" (3 New Road, Woolwich, London, quarterly, 8s per annum), in the third number of its second volume, offers a rich collection of information regarding labor legislation the world over. This periodical is published for the "International Association for Labor Legislation," which has its central office at Basle, Switzerland. The president is Sir Thomas Oliver, M. D., F. R. C. P., the president of the American section being Henry W. Farnam of Yale, and the secretary and assistant secretary, respectively, John R. Commons and Irene Osgood of Madison. The American membership fee is $1 a year, or $3 with the Bulletin, and the objects are: To serve as a bond of union to all who believe in the necessity for labor legislation, to organize an international labor office, to facilitate the study of labor legislation in all countries and provide information on the subject, to promote international agreements on questions relating to conditions of labor, and to organize international congresses on labor legislation.

✣ ✣ ✣

Uncle: "I hope you've been a good boy, Tommy."
Tommy: "Well, no—I haven't."
Uncle: "Dear, dear! I hope you haven't been very bad."
Tommy: "N'no! Just comfortable!"—London Opinion.

✣ ✣ ✣

"Ay tank Ay go across the street and get the tailor to mend my vaist," drawled the Swedish foreman, showing his employer a very ragged vest.

"All right, John."

In a few minutes the Swede returned with his vest untouched.

"Aren't you going to have it mended?" asked the boss.

"Ay tank not in that shop," replied the Swede. "Ay ask him vhat he charge an' he say, 'Two dollar.' Then Ay ask him, 'Vill you take the vaist in part

payment?' an' he wouldn't do it."—Everybody's Magazine.

✣ ✣ ✣

Tim marketed for his mess during the war. Cracked eggs used to be sold at half price at the canteen. Tim walked in one day with his market basket and said:

"Gimme two dozen best cracked eggs."

"Cracked eggs all out, Tim," said the sutler.

Tim nodded toward the egg crate in the corner.

"Well, crack us up some, will ye?" said he.—Washington Star.

✣ ✣ ✣

"What in the world have you got that bill framed up there for?" we asked.

"Oh, that," sighed the billionaire, "is the only dollar I ever earned!"

We understood.—Puck.

✣ ✣ ✣

Senator Taylor of Tennessee tells of an old Negro whose worthless son was married secretly. The old

Important Notice to Chicago Subscribers.

Since September 1, 1909, the renumbering of streets in Chicago is in effect according to an ordinance passed by the Chicago City Council. In order to correct our mailing list and have The Public going through the mail to subscribers in Chicago properly addressed, you are asked to kindly send us at once your full name and address, giving both old and new numbers.

The Public

The Public is a weekly review, giving in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value.

It is also an editorial paper, and, though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of fundamental democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without regard to any considerations of personal or business advantage. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both.

Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department entitled Related Things, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest in relation to the progress of democracy.

We aim to make The Public a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Published weekly by Louis F. Post, Ellsworth Bldg., 357 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Chicago, Illinois, Postoffice as second class matter.

Terms of Subscription

Yearly	$1.00
Half yearly	.50
Quarterly	.25
Single copies	.05
Trial subscription—4 weeks	.10

Extra copies in quantity, $2.00 per 100, in lots of 50 and upward; if addressed to individuals, $3.50 per 100.

Free of postage in United States, Cuba and Mexico Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week, or 50 cents per year.

All checks, drafts, postoffice money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of Louis F. Post. Money orders or Chicago, or New York Drafts, are preferred, on account of exchange charges by the Chicago banks.

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

Receipt of payment is shown in about two weeks by date on wrapper, which shows when the subscription expires. All subscribers are requested to note this date and to remit promptly for renewal of subscription when due or order it discontinued if the paper is no longer desired.

Advertising Rates

One page, each insertion	$20.00
Half-page, each insertion	10.00
Quarter-page, each insertion	5.00
One inch, each insertion	1.20
Half-inch, each insertion	.60

Two columns to the page; length of column, 8½ inches, width of column, 3 inches.

Advertising forms close on the Monday preceding the Friday of publication.

man heard of it and asked the boy if he was married.

"I ain't sayin' I ain't," the boy replied.

"Now, you Rastus," stormed the old man, "I ain't askin' you is you ain't; I's askin' you ain't you is?" —Troy Times.

✣ ✣ ✣

Examiner: "What is an alibi?"

Candidate for the Bar: "An alibi is committing a crime in one place when you are in another place. If you can be in two other places, the alibi is all the stronger in law."—Puck.

✣ ✣ ✣

She: "She told me you told her that secret I told you not to tell her."

He: "The mean thing! I told her not to tell you I told her."

She: "I promised her I wouldn't tell you she told me, so don't tell her I told you."—Unknown.