

reasonable and noble, if they desire to be so. It will prepare the soil for the coming of the epoch of justice, abundance, peace and happiness, which Christ told His disciples of.

Let us suppose that in a certain place all land belongs to two owners—one very rich, who lives far away, and another, not rich, living and working at home—and to a hundred of small peasants owning a few acres each. Besides these there live in that place some scores of people who own no land—mechanics, merchants, and officials.

Now let us suppose that the people of that community, having arrived at the conclusion that the land is common property, decide to dispose of the land according to their new conviction.

What would they do? Take all the land away from those who own it, and give everybody the right to take the land he desires? That could not be done, because there would be several people who would want the same ground, and this would lead to endless quarrels. To form one society and work all things in common would be difficult, because some have carts, wagons, horses and cattle, while others have none, and, besides, some people do not know how to till the soil, or are not strong enough.

To divide all the land in equal parts, according to its value, and allow one part to each is very difficult, and this would, besides, be impracticable, because the lazy and poor would lease their property to the rich for money, and these would soon again be in possession of it all.

The inhabitants of the community, therefore, decide to leave the land in the possession of those who owned it, and to order each owner to pay into the common treasury money representing the revenue which had been decided on after appraising the value of the land, not according to the work or the improvements made on it, but to its quality and situation, and this money was to be divided equally among all.

But as it was difficult first to take this money from all those who held the land, and then divide it equally among all the members of the community, and as these members, besides, paid money toward the public needs—schools, fire departments, roads, etc.—and as this money was always needed, they decided to use all the money derived from those who had the use of land, for public needs.

Having made this arrangement, the

members of the community levied the tax for the use of land on the two large owners, and also from the small peasants, but no tax at all was imposed on those who held no land.

This caused the one landowner who lived far away, and who derived little income from his property, to realize that it did not pay to hold on to land thus taxed, and he gave it up. The other large owner gave up part of his land, and kept only that part which produced more than the amount of the tax.

Those of the peasants who held small properties, and who had plenty of men, and not enough land, as well as some of those who held no land at all, but who desired to make a living by working the land, took up the land surrendered by its former owners.

After that all the members of the community could live on the land and make a living from it, and all land passed into the hands of or remained with those who loved to work it, and who made it produce the most. The public institutions flourished and the wealth of the community increased, for there was more money than before for public needs; and the most important fact was that this change in the ownership of land took place without any discussions, quarrels or discord, by the voluntary surrender of the land by those who did not derive any profit from it.

This is the project of Henry George, which, if tried here, would make Russia wealthy and happy, and which is practicable all over the world.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF PUBLIC UTILITIES.

Substance of a lecture delivered by John Z. White, of Chicago, before the Los Angeles (Cal.) Real Estate Board, June 15, 1905, and the Puyallup (Wash.) Board of Trade, August 12, 1905.

Controversy over the question of public ownership of public utilities is becoming more and more heated. Those who oppose public ownership insist that it is nothing more nor less than a decided step toward socialism—in fact, that public ownership is socialism. Those who favor public ownership argue that this is the only measure whereby individualism can be maintained; that private ownership of these utilities is steadily crushing independent industries. Where opinion is so widely separated it is probably needless to say that there is plenty of room for argument. Argument, however, is not common in dealing with public questions. Declamation is easier.

It is claimed by advocates of public ownership that the railroad is a public function. This claim is scouted by others as only the expression of a theory and a demand is made for something practical. Barely stopping to note that a theory is but an explanation, the other side retorts that, outside of the United States, about two-thirds of all the railroads in the world are publicly owned. But this fact has little effect on the average practical American. He is confident that our way is the best way. He is as sure of this as a voodooist is of the efficacy of charms.

Besides all the railway experts so declare, and they know. Of course they know. When we wish to learn about groceries, we ask grocers; when we wish to learn about stocks, we ask brokers. And so, if we want to know about railroads, we should of course ask railroaders. Looks reasonable, doesn't it? What is wrong with this idea?

Simply this: The question is not of railroads, but of government. Work it out. As I have suggested, the railroad is a public function. Now, apply the rule to that idea. When we would learn about government, we seek governors; and who may these be? There is an old-fashioned, maybe obsolete, notion to the effect that the people rule—that they are in very truth governors. And what say the people? Why, the people are not of one mind—are divided. Hence the arguments. And these are made to the people. For the people, not any particular set of experts, nor all sets, but the whole people, are to deal with and settle this question.

One thing is beyond dispute. If private ownership is the better plan, we are now getting its full benefit—the best possible. Strange as it may seem, however, not only Populists and Democrats, but prominent Republicans—even the President—are insisting that something must be done. Imagine! Something must be done to relieve the best possible condition! Curious, isn't it?

Yes, something must be done. The question of public ownership of public utilities is up, and full and fair discussion will sooner or later compel an equitable settlement.

What fundamental principle supports the claim that railroads are public utilities? Simply this, that each individual has a natural right of highway. That is to say, in order to live we must produce food, clothing and shelter. We desire, and have a right

to produce these in the most economical way known. The basic law in economics is that "man seeks to gratify his desires with the least exertion," which is but a recognition in human nature of the physical fact that all forces flow along the line of least resistance. This desire to produce in the most economical way leads to subdivision of labor. That is, one man or a group of men produces one form of wealth, while another man or another group produces another form. Then they trade portions of their products. This process of trading gives rise to a certain physical necessity—namely, a path or highway.

Men produce wheat in Dakota. Other men produce cotton in Mississippi. They wish to trade; they have a natural right to trade. To trade they must cross the land. Other men wish to produce corn and other varieties of wealth in localities between Dakota and Mississippi. These also have a desire and a right to trade. Is it not perfectly clear that the establishment of the necessary paths, or highways, will lead to conflict if left to individuals? Will not one man wish to make a path where another will wish to grow corn?

Right here a distinction should be noted: Each individual has a right to cross the land—a right of highway. So, also, each has a right to the use of air. In the latter case, however, each can use the air without interfering with his neighbor, but in the case of the highway this is physically impossible. It is this physical condition that compels a community to act as a unit in establishing highways. And when a community acts as a unit the majority must rule. It not only can rule, but it must—either positively or negatively. If the minority rule, is it not because the majority refrains from exercising its power?

This physical necessity distinguishes the public function. Therefore has the right of highway always been a matter of public law. The community—the public—must act. Even our present railroad systems rest on this communal or public action. The right-of-way is the public thing—the common right. It is therefore asserted by advocates of public ownership that when any public body grants a right-of-way to a group of individuals it thereby gives to this group a power that properly inheres in the whole people. Further, that the power of the whole people is sovereign, and that therefore such a grant is a partial abdication of sovereignty.

An argument so simple, and seemingly so conclusive, would undoubtedly re-

sult in public administration of public utilities, were it not for the fact that a wrong disposition of social forces, while injurious to the community as a whole, is financially beneficial to a few who control by virtue of mistaken law. A generation or two ago wolves were numerous in northern Illinois. Some localities began to give bounties for their destruction, and almost immediately some of the farmers began breeding wolves. It paid better than breeding hogs. Many things can be done through legislative stimulus; even wolf culture is thereby possible—graft culture as well.

Because of this private profit we find all manner of reasons advanced against the policy of public ownership of public utilities. First it is claimed that public operation is wasteful; that private profit is the only incentive that will insure careful and economical management. There is just truth in this contention. Private management does tend toward economy in management. But who gets the resulting profit?

If a given service can be produced under private management at a cost of 10, while under public management the cost is 12, but is rendered to the people at cost by public producers, and at a profit of 50 per cent. by private producers, or an expense to buyers of 15, which is the greater economy? Or, if public producers make the same charge, namely, 15, will not the profit of 3 inure to the people instead of being a private gain? It would seem that all that can be fairly claimed on behalf of the economy of private management of public utilities may be freely granted without loss to the argument for public ownership.

But the practical man is never content with argument. He wants facts. Well, facts can be furnished to him in great abundance. For instance, Hugh H. Lusk of Australia tells us this: In proportion to population that country has nearly six times as many miles of telegraph lines as any other country in the world, excepting New Zealand. It has one telegraph station for every 1,300 people. We have one for every 3,000. Australia sends two and one-half messages per year per inhabitant. We send one. Our rates are from two to three times higher than those of Australia. The Australian lines make three per cent. above cost of operation and maintenance. This rate of profit would hardly satisfy Mr. Gould. The post office and telegraph is administered by the public as one system, and in small places the postmaster and operator is the same person. Of 6,000 post offices, 3,000 are tele-

graph stations. And with it all the population of Australia is only about one-twentieth of that of the United States.

United States Consul Charles N. Daniels reported on public ownership of the water system at Sheffield, England: Charges had been reduced 25 per cent. All expenses were met, including sinking fund, and a good profit secured. Profit in 1887 was \$29,058; in 1904, \$361,231. Improvements in plant and reduction in cost to consumers had been made by the city, and yet gross and net revenues had increased under the despised public ownership system. In 1904 the city began furnishing water for free public baths, and for other purposes, by which the expenses of the health department were reduced \$13,140.

United States Consul Hamm, Hull, Eng., reports that the private telephone company charged nearly \$50 per year for telephone service to a private family. The public establishment renders like service for a little less than \$25, thereby forcing the private company to do likewise. A curious fact is that the private company is under contract to render as cheap service in all cities, as in any, for unlimited service. If our public officers knew how to bargain as well as the British we might fare better—or if we were a little more careful in selecting public officers. Gas is also under public management in Hull; also water; also electric lighting; also street cars. In each department a profit is shown, with the following low prices to consumers: Street car fare, two cents; exclusive telephone service in private house less than \$25 per year; in business office, \$30 per year; gas, 48 cents per thousand feet. Consul Hamm says the object is not to make profit, but to furnish citizens with the service. That policy may have its advantages.

In Glasgow, street cars were placed in possession of the public in July, 1894. Fares have been reduced 30 to 40 per cent. Drivers and conductors were required to work 12 and 14 hours per day. Under public management they work ten hours. Meanwhile the concern is making money for the city, after meeting all obligations.

Dr. Hugo R. Meyer, lecturer on political economy at Harvard, tries to counteract the influence of the facts of public ownership in Glasgow, and to this end makes comparisons between conditions in the United States and Britain. That is not a fair comparison. The true method is to compare Glasgow under private management with Glasgow under public management. He makes much of the fact that some car fares in Glasgow are six cents, but fails to tell us that 18 per cent. of total re-

ceipts is from one cent fares, and 67 per cent. of total receipts is from two cent fares. He tells us the average length of ride in Boston is estimated to be between three and four miles. But how the estimate is arrived at he leaves us to guess. It seems to be assumed merely from the fact that in some of our cities street car lines are longer than in Glasgow. Railroad lines in the United States are also longer than in Great Britain, yet Prof. Emory R. Johnson quotes Dr. Weyl, of the University of Pennsylvania, to show among other things that the Briton travels 244 miles to the American's 209. He takes three and a half trips to the American's single one.

Dr. Meyer tells us that it is as easy to earn two cents in the United States as to earn one in Glasgow, as if the ease or difficulty with which we earn should determine to what extent we shall be robbed.

Gas in Glasgow was \$1.14 per thousand before public ownership. It is 54 cents now. Water was 14 pence per thousand gallons; now it is six pence. We are told that in Manchester for a morning or evening street car ride workmen are charged two cents without regard to distance; that Huddersfield has public ownership of water, gas and electric plants, and street cars, while rates are much lower than any in this country; that a Belgian workman living 42 miles from his place of employment can buy a ticket good to go and come six times a week, for 57 cents; that in Berlin like tickets on suburban lines, some of them running ten miles into the country, are sold for 17 cents a week; that in the same city a yearly ticket, good for an average ride of five miles in and out as often as you please, on any train, is sold for \$4.50; that as far back as 1894 Russia reduced passenger rates to three-fourths of a cent per mile for distances under 106 miles, and for 2,000 miles the fare was \$6; that this paid so well a farther reduction was made; that in Victoria publicly owned railroads earned enough revenue to pay all the Federal taxes. In 1903 the Municipal Year Book of Great Britain showed that 56 cities give a profit of over \$5,000,000 on municipal lighting, which under our management would have gone into private pockets, with undoubtedly as much if not twice as much more: The average fare on railroads in Switzerland is 1.55 cents, in France 1.21 cents, in Germany 1.1 cents, in Austria-Hungary 1 cent, in Belgium 0.88 cent, in the United States 2 cents. It would be more here but for deadheads.

Such figures as we are permitted to

examine by the kindly owners of the United States reveal a worse condition than that of Europe. Ex-Gov. Larabee of Iowa places the average cost of railroad construction at \$25,000 per mile, and the water in the capitalization at \$38,000 per mile. C. Wood Davis says many lines have been built for \$8,000 to \$15,000 per mile; that the Kansas Midland cost \$10,200 and was capitalized at \$53,024 per mile; that the superintendent of the St. Louis & Iron Mountain Railroad swore before the Arkansas state board of assessors that he could duplicate that road for \$11,000 per mile, but it was capitalized at five times that sum. Poor gives the railroad capitalization for 1890 at \$63,600 per mile, and says it was 50 per cent. water. This leaves cost a trifle over \$30,000 per mile; but the estimate evidently was not intended to be exact, and besides we all know Poor.

Floyd W. Mundy says the New York, Ontario & Western has 480 miles of track, while the Chesapeake & Ohio has 1,500 miles. The earnings for 1901 were about \$10,000 per mile on each road, but the capital stock on each road was about the same in spite of the difference in length.

The railway capitalization for 1903 is given by the Inter State Commerce Commission at \$63,186 per mile. The chairman of the Inter State Commerce Commission, speaking to the Senate committee, said:

It costs about one-fourth of what the wheat sells for to get it to the sea board market. The freight on a train of 40 cars, with 20 tons to the car, making 1,200 tons, from Chicago to New York, at 20 cents a hundred, would be \$4,800, yet the bare cost of hauling that train is not much over 50 cents a mile. That is, a train which earns nearly \$5,000 is moved at an expense of about \$500.

The large capitalization is primarily for the purpose of concealing as far as possibly the unreasonably large profits, although it often serves other ends, especially in stock jobbing schemes, and indirectly aids in the advance of rates.

Passenger rates vary from two to four cents per mile. In Europe first-class fare is three cents, and is paid by the aristocracy, the fools and the Americans. Second-class is one and one-half to two cents, and is used by the well-to-do middle class people. Third class varies from one-half to one cent a mile, and accommodates more than two-thirds of the passenger traffic. In the United States the rich pay little or nothing; ordinary people who travel much, pay two cents—the "mileage" rate; the poor and others who travel but little (the

third class in Europe, which travels at one cent or less), pay three cents or more. This result of course flows from the fact that we have no classes in our democratic republic where every man is the perfect equal of his fellow before the law!

An oil refiner writes under date of October 4, 1899, that he "manufactures 35,000 barrels of oil per month. Seventy per cent. is marketed in Europe, and 90 per cent. of that in countries where the railroads are controlled by the governments. We have no difficulty in competing with the Standard Oil company in those countries." He further says that he is a "believer in government ownership of the transportation lines of this country." Now can we help inclining to agree with his view, when we remember that all honest men have always been opposed to interference with the highway—even by Dick Turpin.

Those who oppose public ownership of public utilities seem to be animated by the same idea of business relations that controlled a book agent who on dropping into town learned that it was the day of Smith's wedding anniversary. He called on Smith and suggested that he present his wife with a bible, and offered a handsome \$15 article for five dollars. Smith bit. The agent at once proceeded to Smith's home and suggested to Mrs. Smith that she should make Mr. Smith a present of a handsome \$15 bible which he would sell for five dollars. Mrs. Smith bit. Smith came home. The bibles were presented. Tableau. Smith called on the 'phone for his friend Brown to hurry down to the train and catch a book agent, and hold him till Smith arrived. Very important. Brown complied, found the agent, and said: "Smith must see you—says it's important." "Sorry," said the agent, "it's impossible. Got to leave on this train, but I know what he wants. He was to let me know if he wanted one of my \$15 bibles at five dollars. If you care to take it to him?" Brown bit.

The railroad situation has its humorous phases, but it is a humor that has cost thousands of men and women years of heartache. It has destroyed, and is destroying, thousands of lives every year. Worse, it is corrupting the moral nature of an increasing proportion of our people. It is destroying popular government.

But it is objected that public ownership would so increase the number of public employes that the political supremacy of the party in power would be perpetuated. Is there anyone so innocent as not to know that these corporations are in politics now, are in fact the dominating influence in both par-

ties—both before and after elections, and that their influence is exerted secretly? If railroads are great forces, and therefore to be feared, shall we not be safer if they appear in the political arena openly? Will it not be much safer to have a government manager who can be called to account, than an irresponsible one who might carelessly remark: "The people be damned"? We had to indulge in strong language to get rid of Secretary Morton, but we did get rid of him; but Manager Morton violated our laws, and told us so, and for that it seems we are without remedy. We have trouble with the post office, but Machen didn't tell us to be damned. Mrs. Wilmans had to fight, but she won; while Armour appears secure. The "system" is doubtless annoyed by Lawson; but none of its votaries seems to expect a striped suit. When railroads go into liquidation, is it not our practice to place them in the hands of receivers, and has not such management been found to be as honest and efficient as that of the men appointed by the railroad corporations?

Grant all that may be claimed as to the dangers of public ownership of public utilities, and private ownership is many fold more dangerous.

"It is socialism, anyway," cry monopoly beneficiaries. No, it is not. Socialism is public ownership of private utilities.

Private utilities are those utilities that are naturally open to free competition. Lines of business that rest on a right of way do not fall within this definition. As I have already mentioned, the right of way is the common right. It is controlled by law, necessarily. We have developed a practice of abdicating this power, and thereby have placed in private hands what amounts to a power to tax. There is yet to be shown a group of men long in power who have not used such authority to enrich themselves by oppressing others.

At present the railroads can destroy or stimulate any industry in any particular locality. If the public owned the roads, how would the iced car trick of the beef trust work? Where would be the leverage of the oil monopoly? Who would get passes? Should we not save the whole cost of railroad solicitors, which C. Wood Davis places at \$20,000,000 per year? By using shortest routes we could save \$25,000,000; by consolidating depots and staffs, \$20,000,000; by refusing passes, \$30,000,000; by dispensing with useless officers, \$33,000,000, etc.

By earning instead of appropriating the money of the people, we could avoid killing one passenger in every 2,267,000 carried, while Germany kills one in 10,000,000; we could avoid injuring one in 170,141, while Germany injures one in 1,700,000. In ten years we killed over 66,000. As to employes, we injure one in every 28, and kill one in 447.

There is, however, a method by which the anxiety of those who fear socialism may be allayed, provided the so-called conservatives will undertake a vigorous corrective policy. This method involves genuine public regulation. Since the beginning of the agitation for the Interstate Commerce Commission we have had nothing but failure from any and all attempts a regulation, and it is now frequently said that the roads are stronger than the government. In a sense this statement is true, as our good President is likely to discover. But why is it true? The vulgar notion is that the monopoly companies corruptly influence elections and both legislative and judicial bodies. There is a large amount of truth in this same vulgar notion. But a much more potent cause for the failure of regulative measures, and one which influential advocates of regulation studiously ignore, is the doctrine laid down in the Dartmouth college case, by no less an individual than the celebrated tory, John Marshall, while chief justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. As was entirely fitting, the other political gymnast, Daniel Webster, appeared as counsel. In that case, without right or authority, but by usurpation (always agreeable to tories) Marshall held a corporation franchise to be a contract, and, therefore, under the protection of the clause in the Constitution regarding the inviolability of contractual obligations. This is the doctrine which makes regulation so difficult. It is contrary to all precedent. Contrary to all reason. It was, and is, pure usurpation. If you want regulation, instead of public ownership, you must get rid of that doctrine.

In a recent article in Tom Watson's Magazine, by Fontaine T. Fox, which might well be read by every intelligent citizen, other performances by this same tory are related. He decided that Congress has power to create a bank (and presumably other corporations), although Madison proposed in the Constitutional Convention to give to Congress power "to grant charters of incorporation where the interests of the United States require, and the leg-

islative provisions of individual States may be incompetent," and the proposal was defeated. Thus Marshall said Congress could do just what the Convention refused to permit. Fortunately, there was a man named Jackson.

Marshfield then decided that a corporation is a person. Next, that a citizen can sue his own State before the Supreme Court of the United States, although before the Convention of Virginia, called to adopt the Constitution, he had said that such course would be incredibly absurd. James Wilson, one of the members of the first Supreme Court bench, in his lectures in defense of the Constitution, held that all government is the result of contract. This seems to have been Marshall's view. But is it so? No State adopted the Constitution unanimously. How many Congressmen or other officers of the government have since been unanimously elected? Where, then, is your contract? The truth is that government is dominion expressing the will of the majority.

If those who oppose public ownership on the ground that it is socialism, should substitute public regulation they would first be obliged to abrogate the John Marshall doctrines. Unless this can be done we must all be swept forward in the rising tide of public ownership sentiment. The condition of trade and labor calls for redress. The advantage of modern productive power is secured to those holding legal privileges. Industry—both capital and labor—is despoiled.

But the essential remedy is simple. Restore liberty to all men. We seek not property, but freedom to earn, and to keep what we earn. The spoliation of industry is increasing with even greater ratio than the power to produce. All available land is owned. Therefore the normal safety valve of our industrial population is closed. So long as there be available lands open for settlement, so long is abject poverty impossible. But with this avenue of escape shut off, beware.

Finally, hope not too much from the public ownership of public utilities. If railroads are placed in the hands of the public the farmer will be able to ship his produce more cheaply. The same is true of the manufacturer, and of all other producers. What then? As the farmer makes more profit, the value of his land will rise. As the manufacturer increases his profits, his site for business becomes more desirable and therefore more valuable. The same is true of all kinds of producers. It follows, then, that as we find relief from monopoly

charges by public utility corporations, we shall be met by increasing monopoly charges by land owners. What we save from the clutches of railroads we shall lose to the rapacity of earth owners.

Shall we therefore vote public ownership hopeless? By no means. We will declare that land owners are no more entitled to unearned wealth than are railroad companies. Tax no industry. Tax the value of land alone. We demand freedom from all monopoly.

The history of all countries where public ownership has been tried, without curtailing the landlord's power, shows no relief to the industrial masses. In Glasgow we find an increasingly emphatic demand that the British parliament give to the city permission to tax land values. We find the demand indorsed by scores of other municipalities in Scotland and England. Public ownership makes the truth very clear.

If we add all the earnings of public utility corporations together, we have a sum not much over one-half of the amount we pay in taxes, although the governments do not get all that we pay. Some one does. The total values of the country are probably not less than \$100,000,000,000. Subtract from this amount all public utility values and commodity and building values, and look carefully at the remainder—and name it.

Private taxation is the cause of all industrial troubles. Public taxation of private monopoly is the remedy.

Judge Grosscup, of the United States District Court at Chicago, says we must recast and regenerate the country's corporation policy. He thinks the general government should undertake this task. Has the general government's course thus far been such as to inspire confidence? It looks very much as though that same general government, as it appears in the guise of the Supreme Court, might be the cause of our difficulties. Still, the Judge makes a splendid presentation of the cause of private property, giving as his text: "In the beginning the Creator so conditioned mankind, that always underneath him would be the earth, always about him the air, always above him the sky. On this, as a dowry, he started us." But the Judge did not enlighten us as to who has taken possession of the dowry. Nor did he explain how it may be recovered.

Yet this is the question that all must face. Here is the task for "big hearts and big brains," and it is a task that big brains have heretofore been much more agile in dodging than courageous in meeting. What shall it profit us if we gain all public utilities and lose the whole world?

BOOKS

READABLE ESSAYS THAT ARE WORTH READING.

Most essays are not easy to read, and those that are easy are usually not worth reading. But Henry M. Simmons has given us a volume of essays (New Tables of Stone and Other Essays. Boston: James H. West company) which are well worth reading and so easy to read that they seem to read themselves into you as you turn the pages.

A truly religious book is this one, although it shatters many a religious idol. But for every idol it shatters it sets up a living God.

"The New Tables of Stone" gives a new and deeper meaning to the story of the tables of stone "written by the finger of God" and received by Moses on Sinai. The physical laws of geology are seen to typify moral law, and the correspondence is beautifully pictured. In foliage the author finds "New Leaves of Scripture;" and "The Cosmic Roots of Love" he traces down even to chemical affinity, which he describes as "at least prophetic of that which unites us in societies and families." The "Divinity of Man" and "The Book of Jonah" are especially interesting, though less so than "The Breath of Life;" while "The Sin of a Census," and "The Rise and Fall of Satan," are enlightening as well as pleasing. With these go such subjects as "The Water of Life," "The Enlarging Thought of God," "Various Meanings of Easter," "Christianity Then and Since," and "The New Year of Religion."

The distinguishing characteristic of the volume is a rational idealism poetically expressed in limpid prose.

THE STANDARD OIL CROWD.

In these days of exposure of Standard Oil iniquities, Gilbert Holland Montague's "The Rise and Progress of the Standard Oil Company" (New York: Harper and Brothers) is suggestive of a voice crying out in the wilderness. It is a defense of the Standard Oil "crowd," which that crowd has recognized as such

by distributing copies extensively, with the publishing house's compliments, especially among clergymen.

The work was begun by the author while "Ricardo Scholar in Economics" at Harvard, and is brought down to 1903. It is evidently the conscientious work of a student who honestly thinks it quite unnecessary to put his social ethics to any higher test, for business purposes, than business habits, customs, and efficiency. When he finds or thinks he finds that the Standard Oil people have won their way by superior ability and capital, he assumes that their plea of "not guilty" is sustained, no matter how their superior ability and capital may have been got or used.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—Municipal Ownership and Operation of Public Utilities in New York City. By Samuel Seabury, one of the Justices of the City Court of the City of New York: Municipal Ownership Publishing Co., 201 Duane St., New York City. Price, 25 cents. To be reviewed.

—The Quest of John Chapman. The Story of a Forgotten Hero. By Newell Dwight Hillis. New York: The Macmillan Company. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. The historical hero of this story is "Johnny Appeseed," whose true name was John Chapman. To be reviewed.

—Moody's Manual of Railroads and Corporation Securities. Sixth annual number, 1905. Moody Publishing Co., 35 Nassau St., New York; The Bookery, Chicago; Broad Exchange building, Boston, and 23 Fourth Ave., Pittsburg; also Wade Chance, Threadneedle House, 28 Bishopsgate St., London, Eng.; J. H. Le Bussy, Rokin 60, Amsterdam, Holland. Pages 2,640. Price, \$10. To be reviewed.

—"Glimpses of Universal Evolution," by J. J. Jewett (Los Angeles, Cal.: Baumgard Publishing Co., 116 North Broadway. Price 20 cents.) An ingenious versification of the ingenious scientific theory that matter and motion create mind and morals. It is prophetic, however, of a perception of a moral state when "men will have their equal rights obtained, and wonder how they were so long enchained."

PERIODICALS

The Springfield Republican is wrong in saying that Clarence S. Darrow's forthcoming book entitled "An Eye for an Eye," is his second. Two at least of his books have been widely sold and discussed, "Farmington" and "Resist Not Evil." Of the forthcoming work, which is to be published by Fox, Duffield & Co., the Republican says, "It tells the story of a murder and the murderer's explanation of his

I AM INTERESTED IN "THE PUBLIC" AREN'T YOU?

I Am Desirous of Increasing Its Circulation ARE YOU?

If you are you can get something of value for nothing, and no string to it.

Having come into possession of a number of authenticated maps of the United States (including all its possessions) mounted, measuring 7x5 feet, valued at four dollars each, I will send one to each of the first fifty who will send in five (5) yearly or ten (10) half-yearly subscriptions to THE PUBLIC, as per its offer of furnishing these at the yearly rate of \$1.20. These maps are especially valuable to schools, clubs, hotels, offices, etc., as also in homes. Who Will Win First One? Single Taxers can bulk their subscriptions and so get one for their club rooms.

DANIEL KIEFER, 530 Walnut St., Cincinnati, O