

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 9, 1904.

Number 314.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

The Mueller law (vol. vi, p. 823), which was submitted to the people of Chicago for referendum vote at the municipal election, has been adopted. This enables the city to establish municipal ownership and operation of the local street car system.

But as the Mueller law also continues the power of the city to grant franchises to private corporations, two other questions were submitted on referendum (vol. vi, p. 823), one advising the city council to proceed without delay to establish a system of municipal ownership and operation under the Mueller law, and the other advising it to grant short or revocable licenses to the private corporations, pending the perfecting of the municipal system. The latter two questions were on advisory referendum only, under the "public policy" initiative and referendum law of Illinois, and the result is not binding upon the city government. They also were adopted, by smaller yet emphatic majorities.

A peculiar attitude toward the three questions was assumed by the local press. Hearst's papers alone excepted, and by Mayor Harrison. They urged an affirmative vote on the question of adopting the enabling act, but a negative one on the question of proceeding without delay to utilize its powers. This is like the position of the so-called "socialists of the chair" in European universities, who are described as being "in favor of socialism, but opposed to putting it in practice."

With the exception of Hearst's

papers, which strenuously supported all three propositions, every Chicago daily that did not oppose the enabling act did oppose the policy of proceeding under it. The only consistent paper among them was the Inter Ocean, which opposed enabling act and all. The Mayor's straddle was not remarkable; he always does straddle. Neither, perhaps, was the straddle of the papers. They are controlled by financial interests that are opposed to municipal ownership altogether, and favored the enabling act only as matter of tactics, in the expectation that the defeat at the polls of the advisory policy of proceeding under it without delay would render it harmless to franchise investments. Under these circumstances the large majority which the immediate ownership proposition received is peculiarly gratifying. The vote was manifestly discriminating and intelligent. It cannot be ignored as in any wise careless or perfunctory. It must be reckoned with. And it gives strong testimony in favor of the referendum principle, while it indicates with great distinctness that the people are learning to think for themselves on public questions. The meetings in support of the immediate ownership policy were small, so small that they were sneered at; the opposition of the newspapers was pretentiously non-partisan and very vigorous; and the hostility of the leading politicians of both parties and of the "better element" was scarcely concealed. Yet the vote was large and the negative minority very small.

A Washington correspondent tells a story which is supposed to be a joke on Congressman Baker. Asked why the Republicans are in a hurry to adjourn, a Republican leader in Congress replied: "Because we are tired of Baker of Brooklyn." And well may they be tired of Baker of Brooklyn; for in

his speeches he wastes no time in humor or eloquence, but hits a bull's-eye every time he takes aim. In one of his recent speeches, one of those that make the Republican members tired, he brought the distinguished Mr. Olmsted, of Pennsylvania, all fluttering to the ground. Mr. Olmsted had silenced a prominent Democratic member with the bald assertion that under the Dingley tariff wages are higher, and steel rails are higher, and yet railroad rates are lower, than before. That was Baker's opportunity (see Congressional Record, March 30, p. 4146). He produced leading newspaper reports of wage reductions all over the country; he referred to Dunn's Review for evidence of increase in living expenses; and he quoted a statement of the Interstate Commerce Commission to prove that railroad rates have enormously increased. If there were more Democratic members with the will to make the Republican members as tired as Baker does, and for the same reason, it would be money in the pockets of the people. But the trusts would suffer.

John Moody's new book, "The Truth About the Trusts," although intended especially for the information of investors, is invaluable to public men of every shade of opinion on the trust question; for it is precisely what it purports to be, a complete and trustworthy story, partly narrative and partly statistical, of the whole American trust movement, with all its ramifications, from its inception to the present time. The book (which is published by the Moody Publishing Company, 35 Nassau street, New York, and 79 Dearborn street, Chicago), is an expensive one (five dollars); for it is a fine piece of the bookmakers' art, and is intended primarily for persons to whom accuracy and

completeness are of supreme financial importance. It is chiefly a technical reference book for such persons, and its comments are all written in conservative strain. But for those very reasons it must be a welcome addition to the libraries of speakers, writers and professional men, who are more and more clashing with or puzzled by trusts interests, maneuverings and sentiment.

It appears from Moody's book, that the American trusts now number 440, with a total floating capital of \$20,379,162,511—an average of over \$40,000,000 each. Among the greater trusts of which a full financial history is given in the book, are the copper trust, the smelters' trust, the sugar trust, the shipping trust, the oil trust, the steel trust, and the telegraph, the telephone, and the railway trusts. Mr. Moody has indicated his special fitness for the preparation of such a book, by classifying industrial trusts in one general category and franchise trusts in another. His explanation of the futility of mere repressive laws is significant of a point of view to which the people themselves must come if they would really kill off the trust evil. "The weakness of all this legislation," he writes, "lies in the fact that while it pretends to aim at the 'regulation' of monopoly, it really never touches the monopoly."

A diagram of "The Rockefeller-Morgan 'Family Tree,'" which accompanies the Moody book, exhibits on a single page an impressive birds'-eye view of all the connections of the two great dominating factors in the American trust systems—the Rockefeller group and the Morgan group. It may be interesting to know that of the twenty billion capital of these two groups, the capital of the railroad and other franchise trusts amounts to \$13,000,000,000, while the "industrials," which however, own large interests in mines, etc., have but little more than \$7,000,000,000. It is a fair guess that if the values were dis-

tinguished—land and other franchise values from product values—fully three-fourths of the property of all the great trusts would fall into the category of land, and hardly one-fourth into the category of products. The Wall Street Journal is probably not far wrong in its expectation when it says of Moody's book, "a book that is opened by the Standard Oil view of the trust movement as voiced by Mr. S. C. T. Dodd, solicitor of that company, and which concludes with an extract from an article written by Thomas F. Ryan, vice-president of the Consolidated Tobacco company, cannot be regarded as an anti-trust campaign document, although it is likely that scores of the opponents of the trust will consult this volume for information which they may use in their political crusade against them." The Journal adds, and in this every candid reader of the book must agree, that "in publishing the facts as he has so fearlessly Mr. Moody has performed a public service."

Wilshire's Magazine, which was bereft of second-class privileges in the American post office, ("subsidies," as the Department calls them), has had those privileges restored and is about to come back from Canada to New York. This magazine is devoted to socialism. Its editor and owner, Mr. Wilshire, established it for the purpose of propagating socialist doctrines, in which he believes. The Department withdrew (vol. iv, p. 596) its second-class license (postage rates at 2 cents a pound, payable in bulk and without stamps), and forced Mr. Wilshire to pay about four times as much and to pay with a stamp for each subscriber on every issue. The reason given by the Department was that the magazine existed primarily for "advertising purposes"—a sufficient reason if warranted by the facts. But upon being pressed for an answer as to what kind of advertising purposes the magazine was primarily established for, the astute bureaucrat

who had the matter in charge in Washington was forced to explain that it was for advertising Mr. Wilshire's ideas. So this magazine owner was denied the postal "subsidy" that goes to Harper's, the Century, newspapers, etc., because his magazine was published primarily for the purpose of advertising its editor's ideas!

Mr. Wilshire then tried Canada, and the post office department there admitted his magazine to the regular periodical class with a half cent instead of a cent rate per pound. And inasmuch as the United States must by treaty deliver Canadian mail matter without charge, Wilshire's magazine has for more than two years been carried through the United States mails from Canada for nothing, just because the officious bureaucrats at Washington wouldn't let him send it from New York at a cent a pound. Nevertheless the publisher wished to establish his magazine at New York, and has been pushing his case in the Department and before the President. His experience has been interesting. The President referred his petitions to the very bureaucrat against whose acts he petitioned for redress. An attorney offered to secure for him what he wanted for \$5,000—the same attorney who, it has since been learned, made a business of effecting results in the Department for magnificent fees, the altitude of which was accounted for with a wink—and by results. This offer was refused. But at last our socialist publisher fell back upon the potent Senator Platt, of New York,—or rather, a New York printer did it for him, so as to get the job of printing the magazine, which had to be printed in Canada to secure privileged admission to the Canadian mails,—and through the Senatorial munificence of Mr. Platt, who had been dumb when appealed to on the principle of freedom of the press, Mr. Wilshire now obtains the "subsidy," of which for more than two years he has been arbitrarily deprived. Wilshire's Magazine

again acquires the pound-rate privilege at Washington, notwithstanding that it is still published "primarily for the purpose of advertising" its editor's ideas. No wonder the Republicans in Congress are so shy of an investigation of the Post Office Department.

When the New York Times tells its readers that the Democratic party "was sick unto death" for "four years, from 1896 to 1900," implying that it fell sick under the leadership of Bryan, having theretofore and under Cleveland's leadership been of sound and disposing mind and memory, the Times displays the same symptoms of malignant groverclevelanditis with which the Brooklyn Eagle suffers. If the editor of the Times were to examine his political almanacs he would find that the Democratic party fell deathly sick under the leadership of Cleveland. We have advised our readers of the affliction in this respect under which the Eagle suffers (vol. vi, p. 785); but the Eagle's symptoms were more localized than are those of the Times. The Eagle pointed only to Illinois, where it found Democracy in fine feather in 1892, but observed that it began to droop in 1896 and has continued to droop ever since. The Times, however, implies that Bryan demoralized the Democracy of the whole country in the years running from 1896 to 1900. Yet the fact is, and all political almanacs prove it, that the Democracy was demoralized in 1894 not only in Illinois but all over the country; not in 1896 under Bryan, mind you, but in 1894 under Cleveland.

After our disclosure of this fact with reference to Illinois and in answer to the Brooklyn Eagle, the daily Banner, of Nashville, Tenn., came to the Eagle's support. In its issue of April 2d it pointed out the unwisdom of relying upon political almanacs, and went behind the statistical returns to show that really it was not Cleveland's fault that the Democratic party became so sick in 1894. We

are very much at one with the Banner regarding statistics in general, although for election returns we have never been able to find a satisfactory substitute. But when the Banner undertakes to explain why its party collapsed in 1894, it begs the question; or, as it would doubtless prefer to express it (in keeping with its "suppressio veri" and "expressio falsi"), it is guilty of a "petitio principii." The point the Eagle made, the point the New York Times makes, the point Mr. Cleveland himself made in a public speech about a year ago, was this: that the Democratic party was in healthy condition until Mr. Bryan took it in hand in 1896, and that from that time on it has been sick. Our answer is that the Democratic party was sicker in 1894, under Cleveland, than in 1896 under Bryan. It is a transparent evasion to meet that answer, as the Banner assumes to do, with any explanation whatever, either good or bad, of why the fact was so. The issue is the fact itself, not the reason for it.

But the Banner's reasons are exceedingly poor. It explains the 1894 reverse in Illinois on the ground that under Altgeld the people of this State had become strongly antagonistic to Cleveland. But that couldn't have been so, let us remind the Banner, if Cleveland had commanded their confidence. Moreover, the collapse of 1894 was not confined to Illinois. It was general. Even New York and New Jersey voiced their condemnation of Cleveland in that fateful year. The Banner may amuse itself at explaining this; but the more it explains the plainer it makes it that it was Cleveland who demoralized the Democratic party.

Thus far the Nashville Banner shows no symptoms of groverclevelanditis. It honestly admits that the collapse did occur in 1894. But now some symptoms of the malady that has attacked the Eagle and the Times begin to appear in the Banner. Possibly this

may be attributed to its method of ignoring election statistics and roaming around its editor's brains for facts. That is convenient, no doubt; but with reference to reputation for veracity it is somewhat risky. Of 1896 the Banner says: "But as bad as the reverse of 1894 may have been, it was nothing compared with the crushing defeat of 1896, when Bryan had obtained full control of the Democratic party." The fact, however, is quite otherwise. We are obliged to go to election statistics to prove it, and therefore cannot hope to convince the Banner; yet the election statistics do testify most impressively that at the elections of 1896 the Democratic party regained to a considerable extent its Congressional losses of 1894. In the Congress elected in 1894, under Cleveland's leadership, the Democrats had only 93 Representatives; in the Congress elected in 1896, under Bryan's leadership, the Democrats had 130 Representatives. In the former, the Republican majority was 74; in the latter, it was only 24. And in the Congress elected in 1900, also under Bryan, the Democratic representation had risen to 153 and the Republican majority had fallen to 20. We fear that the Nashville Banner, like the Brooklyn Eagle and the New York Times, may indeed be suffering with an attack, temporary we trust, of groverclevelanditis.

DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT.

In considering the present situation in Democratic party politics, it is folly to deny the fact of an irrepressible conflict inside the party. Without entering at this time upon any discussion of the causes and merits of this conflict, we may say, with no possibility of a reasonable contradiction, that upon the whole Grover Cleveland personifies one side of it and William J. Bryan the other, and that it is absolutely irreconcilable.

In contrasting Cleveland and Bryan in that way we do not mean to be understood as intimating that the conflict is personal. It is in fact the least personal of any

factional fight in the history of party politics in the United States.

Doubtless Cleveland numbers among his ardent supporters many who are actuated primarily by personal friendship or admiration. Doubtless the same thing is true of Bryan. Probably, also, each entertains a personal dislike for the other; and certainly the friends of each entertain toward the other most cordial sentiments of personal animosity. It may be said, moreover, that among the personal supporters of both—those of Bryan especially at the South and those of Cleveland especially in the East—are many whose fundamental political views are at variance with the tendencies of Bryanism in the one case and of Clevelandism in the other.

But all that is only incidental to the conflict of opinion over the opposing party tendencies which the two men personify. These factional differences are at bottom differences as to political principle, and not as to preferences for public men. Nor do they relate to principle in the sense of mere party policy. They relate to principles that are vital.

It should be plain, therefore, that neither Cleveland nor Bryan can be nominated for President by the Democratic party without driving from their allegiance to it most of those Democrats who approve the tendency which the other personifies. It should be understood, also, that the nomination of either would tend to draw to the Democratic party from other parties the support of men who prefer the principles of Cleveland or of Bryan, as the case may be, to those of their own party.

For instance, it may be conceded, as Cleveland's friends put it, that Bryan's nomination would drive out wealthy and conservative Democrats, would keep out wealthy and conservative Republicans, and would bring in and keep in only Populists pure and simple, populist Republicans, populist Democrats, and the rag-tag-and-bobtail generally of American political life. But then the converse must also be true, namely—to change synonyms to suit the change in view-point—that Cleveland's nomination

would drive out democratic-Democrats, would keep out democratic-Republicans, and would bring in and keep in only plutocrats pure and simple, plutocratic Republicans, plutocratic Democrats, and wealthy parasites upon industry generally.

Should either Cleveland or Bryan be nominated, then, the Democratic party would gain in distinction, one way or the other—either as a contestant with the Republicans for the honors and comforts of conservatism, or as a representative of radicalism,—but it would certainly be defeated. Either side would be able to defeat the other at the polls, and no compromise could prevent it.

It is very doubtful if even a truce between Cleveland and Bryan themselves could hold the party together, were either nominated at this time, if such a truce were possible. But such a truce is not possible. Cleveland's friends make no concealment of their intention to bolt again if the convention goes Bryan's way; and Bryan, with all his personal popularity, could not stem the tide of defection were the convention to go Cleveland's way.

Those are the plain facts of the case, so far as the possibility of nominating Cleveland or Bryan comes into the question. At present, however, Cleveland and Bryan do not come into the question as nominees, except upon the possibility, which may occur, of a life and death struggle in the convention between the two party tendencies they respectively represent. In that case the final blows would doubtless be struck under the supreme leadership on either side. But, apart from that possibility, neither is to be considered as a candidate, for each has positively declared himself out of the running.

What, then, of other men?

Tom L. Johnson would have been far in the lead for the nomination—regardless of his own desires, which hold him to the municipal work to which he is devoted,—had he materially reduced the Republican majority in Ohio last Fall. But the large majority against him in his own State has ruled him out, according to the conventional tests of party availability. This is a stupid test, of

course. But that probably makes no practical difference; for the hostility to Mr. Johnson, viciously displayed by the organs of Mr. Cleveland's faction all over the country during his campaigns in Ohio, goes far to show that the controlling elements of the Cleveland faction would not harmonize upon Johnson as the national candidate.

Then there is Gen. Miles. He is a Democrat both in party affiliation and in democratic principle. He used to wear a military uniform and was accounted, somewhat vain of its decorative possibilities; but underneath the finery and flummery of his soldiers' coat he carried a democratic heart which beat for men regardless of race, and for peace instead of war.

Then there is Congressman Williams, of Mississippi, whose only offense is that he was born in the South,—an objection which is hollow unless we are to have a revival of the race issue.

Another worthy candidate is District Attorney Folk, of St. Louis, who has made a record for cleansing the Democratic party, by sending some of its powerful criminals to jail.

Gov. Garvin, of Rhode Island, is another. His ability and integrity have been proved by 20 years of service in public life, and he has twice carried his own State notwithstanding that it is normally Republican.

Edward M. Shepard is still another; and he would be as likely to carry New York—if that is what is wanted,—as any other candidate the party could name.

All these are good men personally. They are all Democrats of as pronounced national repute as anyone except Cleveland whom the conservative faction suggests. None of them is identified with Bryan personally; and none are in accord with him on the money question. On that question Shepard is positively opposed to him.

Yet we look in vain for any sign of approval of any of these men from the newspaper organs or other representatives of the Cleveland faction of the Democratic party. The indications are that all are opposed by that faction as positively as it opposes Bryan perennially and as it opposed Johnson in the Ohio campaign.

An exception might possibly be made in favor of Folk, because in national politics he seems to be colorless; or of Shepard on account of his business environment. But Shepard offended the Cleveland faction when he voted for Bryan in 1900, and has repeated his offense by publicly acknowledging Bryan's abilities and integrity. He has probably thus ruled himself out irrevocably.

The Cleveland leaders propose one candidate other than Cleveland himself. With some reluctance they are rallying to the support of Judge Parker, a man who is less known nationally than any of the persons we have so far named, except as he has recently been advertised by his local friends. He is a man whose political sentiments are a profound secret; he is one whose only recommendation for the nomination is that he once carried New York State by a large majority as a candidate on a bi-partisan ticket—a candidate without serious opposition; and he is one who has what the Southern Negro would call a "powerful weakness," in that he has become known as a special political protegee of David B. Hill.

As the matter stands, then, the two leading candidates are Judge Parker, urged as representing more or less correctly the party tendencies which Cleveland personifies, and known only through advertisements put out for him as a candidate; and William R. Hearst, who is announced by his friends as representing those which Bryan personifies, and who also is known chiefly through his advertisements as a candidate. Mr. Cleveland and Senator Gorman have now identified themselves, along with Mr. David B. Hill, with the Parker movement.

Whether or not Mr. Hearst really represents the Bryan tendencies in the Democratic party is of little importance to most people in that trend, as compared with the fact that his principal competitor, Judge Parker, is believed to represent the opposing tendencies. It is this that explains the disposition of so many active and representative men who belong on the Bryan side of the approaching contest, to come to the support of Hearst.

They do not like Hearst. They

realize that entirely apart from the personal charges against him—charges which it is due him to say that he denies, but which if they were proved in the campaign would precipitate complete and scandalous disaster—entirely apart from these charges, Bryan men realize that Hearst is upon the face of his own public record an imperialist, a militarist, and a protectionist. He is, therefore, not their choice. But they regard the proffered alternative of Clevelandism, whether with or without a Hill attachment, as worse; and in this view many democratic Democrats who are not Bryan men are at one with them. Regarding Hearst as the only serious opponent to Clevelandism now available, these men have joined the Hearst movement.

In point of strength it must be conceded that that movement is no longer to be ignored. It is a factor and one of growing importance in the Democratic problem. This is not to imply, however, that there is as yet a probability of Hearst's nomination. All sorts of unforeseen obstacles may loom up when the convention begins its work, and the probability is that both the Hearst movement and that which it opposes (probably the Parker movement), will fall to pieces after the first shock. Should that collapse occur, out of the wreck and ruin may come a nomination which the genuine Democrats in both parties may welcome.

For, let it not be supposed that all the men who are counted with Cleveland are in sympathy with what we of the other side regard as the plutocratic tendencies of Clevelandism. Many Democrats who are hostile to Bryan on the money question, and find themselves allied, loosely and protestingly allied, to the plutocratic supporters of Cleveland, are at heart as thoroughly democratic as the Bryan faction, and more so than many of that faction. They are hostile to plutocracy, but they do not fully realize that Clevelandism tends toward plutocracy. As is always the case in periods of political upheaval, the lines of cleavage in the Democratic party are not simple but complex. Consequently in both factions of that party, as in both the Democratic

and the Republican parties, there are democrats and plutocrats. So it may be that the preliminary clash between Hearst on one side and Parker or some one like him on the other, may help to reveal the democrats on both sides to one another, and thus bring about the nomination of some man who would truly and with dignity represent the democratic Democracy, and who, however objectionable to the plutocrats of all factions and parties, would be acceptable to all who are really opposed to plutocracy. In that view of the matter, there is not so much to deplore in the large radical support Hearst is now commanding as a Hobson's choice. It may turn out to be a saving remnant should the Hearst movement become strong enough to hold the plutocratic wing in check, but not strong enough to win.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Washington, April 3.—How completely the law making branch of the government has abdicated its functions is shown in the action of the Republican leaders in reference to the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill. It is customary when such a bill is introduced for the chairman of the committee to make a more or less extended speech reviewing its provisions, indicating what general changes, if any, have been made as compared with previous years, and explaining more or less in detail its more important provisions, especially any new clauses. It is also customary to set apart two or three, or even several, days for what is known as "general debate." Under "general debate," members have the opportunity to review the general scope of the bill, not being confined to specific paragraphs. The wide latitude for debate also affords an opportunity for members to discuss any subject upon which they wish to voice their opinions, and it is under these circumstances that most of the political speeches which are subsequently distributed wholesale over the country by Congressional committees as well as by individual members, become part of the permanent record and are thus made "frankable."

Although the sundry civil bill related to hundreds of items and covered 148 printed pages, no explanation of its provisions was made on the floor by the chairman of the committee on appropriations. He contented himself with stating he would print his remarks thereon in the Record. Members, therefore, had no opportunity of questioning him as to the general scope of the bill. Instead of agreeing to three or five days

for general debate the Republican leaders at first only offered one hour to each side. Notice being served upon them by Mr. Williams, the Democratic leader, and Mr. Benton, that unless a reasonable time was given for debate the Democrats would avail themselves of their right under the rules to debate every paragraph, and would also raise points of order against every new provision and demand a division thereon, the Republican leaders "came down" and agreed to a ten-hour debate.

How stringent and yet how in an open and farcical manner the rules governing the House are violated is shown in the matter of the consideration of this bill. Under the rules no new legislation nor any legislation contrary to existing law, nor any provision for an appropriation other than to carry out existing law or continue an appropriation already determined on, can be incorporated in an appropriation bill. And yet this very bill contained a score or more of such provisions. Formal notice was served upon the Republicans that points of order would be raised against all of them if they persisted in refusing an opportunity for "general debate." It is inevitable that legislation enacted in such piece-meal, disjointed and unrelated manner as necessarily follows from incorporating a paragraph here and there in such bills, results in nothing but confusion amounting almost to chaos. This is particularly noticeable in the present Congress, as no general legislation has so far been attempted and there seems slight prospect of any being enacted during the remainder of the session.

I suppose there is nothing that more clearly distinguishes the difference between the two parties than the attitude which even the most inconspicuous Republican adopts towards his Democratic colleagues (and which is reflected more or less in the conversation of Republican citizens with Democratic citizens everywhere), in incessantly asserting that the Democratic party is "incompetent." Every cross-roads orator who comes to Congress seems to feel it his duty to get up on the floor and not merely assert the complete superiority and entire efficacy of Republican measures to bring about the millennium, but insolently taunts even the leaders on the Democratic side with their "incompetency" to properly conduct a government. In this respect the members of this Congress are in no wise different from their predecessors, and this in face of the fact that the 58th Congress—if we are to judge by what it has already done or what there is any prospect of its doing—is far and away the most incompetent Congress for decades. How completely it has abandoned its law-making functions, and how fearful it is of touching any subject lest it may be "loaded," are shown in the fact that the session is absolutely barren of legisla-

tion, if we except the appropriation bills, which have been rushed through with a haste rarely if ever previously shown. How this incompetency—or fear—affects the majority is shown in their determination not to touch in any way the "sacred" tariff system. They are fearful no doubt, that the "Iowa" idea and the New England demand for reciprocity would rend the party in twain. They are equally afraid of and determined not to touch the currency question. And the Smoot matter is to be allowed to drag on without a decision, so that the party can be able to say privately to the leading representatives of the anti-Smoother, "We stand for the home and the ten commandments," while in the ear of the Mormon oligarchy they whisper, "Never fear, the contract we entered into with you through Hanna and Perry Heath will be lived up to!"

The one disturbing element they have to contend with is the matter of the impeachment of Judge Chas. Swayne. Two influential Republican members of the Judiciary Committee have "broke away" and joined the solid Democratic minority in demanding Swayne's impeachment. With the country becoming more and more restive over the post office scandal, and more and more disposed to believe that fraud thoroughly permeates that department, and that a Republican President and a Republican Congress are determined to "nail the lid down" until after the election, the party confronts a ticklish situation in this Swayne matter. If they refuse to impeach him, or attempt to defer action until December, those wicked and "incompetent" Democrats will assert that the Republican party is protecting Swayne from the results of his alleged misconduct and will go up and down the country coupling the Swayne proceedings with the post office scandal and demanding that "the rascals be turned out" in order that the country, through the Democratic party, may become fully informed as to the extent to which fraud and graft run riot under this Republican administration.

The expunging from the Record of the matter I quoted from the Milwaukee Free Press, together with the accompanying affidavits in regard to the shipping of tons of obsolete books into Mr. Babcock's Congressional district during the last four-year weighing period, is not the only thing that has been done to prevent the public learning of the matter. One of the men who, I am informed, was employed by Hanna during the campaigns of 1896 and 1900 in secret missionary work in Ohio, became so worked up over these charges against the chairman of the Republican Congressional committee that he not only took occasion to express himself vigorously against his reelection to that position in the corridors of the House of Representatives to leading Republicans, but called at the White House to present a peti-

tion upon the matter to the President pointing out the un wisdom, not to say wickedness of the party's continuing Mr. Babcock as chairman of the Congressional committee. The petition, which, as I am informed, reached the President through his secretary so roused the ire of the Chief-Magistrate of the nation that he sent out orders to "arrest that man, he is crazy." The significant feature about the whole matter, however, is that although arrested and locked up for 7 hours—from 1 to 8 P. M.—during which time physicians examined him as to his alleged insanity and declared that he was of sound mind, not one line has yet appeared in either of the three Washington papers; the reason assigned, at least by one of the reporters, being that "it would hurt the President." It was only as a result of the strenuous efforts of the relatives of this man (Andrew O. Nash) that he was finally released. Nash belongs to a well-known Washington family, his father being donor of the large building to the leading Protestant charity here for philanthropic work, while his brother owns considerable real estate and, therefore, from the standpoint of "superior" people, has a "stake in the country." The incident, only a week old, has aroused great feeling among the members of the organization to which Nash belongs, an organization which is believed to have ramifications in other States besides Ohio.

That Mr. Nash has been prominent in citizens' associations of the District of Columbia as an opponent of railroad "grab" legislation; that he was for years connected as a contractor and otherwise with the post office department, had an inside knowledge of its "graft," and that he worked to bring about the investigation which has exposed so much corruption there; that he has also been opposing legislation which would swindle the Stockbridge and Menominee Indians, are at least interesting facts as indicating the cause of the animus against him.

I quote from a letter received to-day from a gentleman well acquainted with this victim of the President's ire, as follows: "Mr. Nash is a prominent citizen of Washington. His father was a man of wealth and a philanthropist. His brothers are among the foremost business men of the city and he is himself a man of means and great public spirit. The indignation aroused against the President by this event wherever Mr. Nash is known has been such that the President's friends are trying to suppress the matter. No such outrageous violation of the right of petition ever before occurred in this country. No such total disregard of the feelings, honor and liberty of an honorable man ever before characterized an occupant of the White House. This incident gives a better insight into the despotic and vicious instincts of Roosevelt than the flag incident or the Panama affair."

In view of the complete suppression of the fact of this man's arrest (after sending in a petition and an accompanying note explanatory of some of the post office grafting methods) it would be interesting to learn whether anyone else has suddenly "dropped out of sight" in this city, and it might be well for the friends of those men who are known to have ideas and who have visited Washington during recent months, but who have disappeared, to start an investigation to learn whether they have been "rallroaded" to prison as Nash was, without any mention of the fact appearing in any of the newspapers.

The desire on the part of President Roosevelt to ape the crowned heads of Europe, which I have before alluded to, is shown in the demand for an appropriation of \$90,000 to build another stable for the President. This was first formulated in the book of estimates submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury, Dec. 7, 1903. It was reiterated in a letter from Secretary Taft on Feb. 25, transmitted to the Speaker by the Acting Secretary of the Treasury Feb. 26.

Col. T. W. Symons, the military attache of the Executive Mansion, on being questioned by the committee on appropriations as to the need for this appropriation and as to the number of horses to be stabled, said: "We have to provide for 30 horses and vehicles." On being asked by Mr. Gillett, "How many horses do you have?" Symons said there were 7 or 8 "now," but they were increasing all the time.

Because of the newspaper comment which this extravagance excited not only is the request now withdrawn, but we find the apologists for the administration attempting to prove that the President not merely has no desire for these additional stable accommodations, but that he had no knowledge that such a demand had been made, although the land for same was to be purchased "in a location and at a price to be approved by the President, \$90,000." Having spent \$600,000 to "improve" the White House, surely \$90,000 is not too much for another stable to go with it!

When the great corruptor of national politics was in command of the Republican organization the policy was to "keep on standing pat." Now, in response to White House orders, it is "keep on 'doing nothing' and go home."
ROBERT BAKER.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, April 7.

At the municipal election in Chicago on the 5th the immediate municipal ownership movement scored a pronounced victory. To begin with, the Mueller law (vol.

vi, pp. 458, 705, 755) was adopted by a large majority. This result enables the city to proceed at any time to arrange for the establishment and operation of its own street-car systems, or for their establishment and leasing, as may be preferred. Full power over the matter is now vested in the city; subject, of course, to such obstacles of vested rights and financial difficulties as may be encountered. On the advisory question, that the city proceed immediately with the policy of establishing and operating under the Mueller law (vol. vi, p. 823), the affirmative majority is 69,851. A slightly larger majority was cast in the affirmative on the third advisory question (vol. vi, p. 823), which proposed licenses instead of franchises to private corporations pending the consummation of the municipal ownership programme. On this question the majority is 72,125. The votes may be tabulated as follows:

Affirmative on Mueller law.....	152,434
Negative on Mueller law.....	30,104
Total on Mueller law.....	182,538
Majority for Mueller law.....	112,330
Affirmative on immediate steps under the Mueller law.....	120,744
Negative on immediate steps under the Mueller law.....	50,893
Total on immediate steps under the Mueller law.....	171,637
Majority for immediate steps under the Mueller law.....	69,851
Affirmative on licensing.....	120,181
Negative on licensing.....	48,056
Total on licensing.....	168,237
Majority for licensing.....	72,125
Total vote for aldermen.....	230,771
Total registration.....	359,937

The total vote is reported as very heavy for an off year. Only about 50 per cent. of the registry was expected to vote, but 64 per cent. of the registry was cast. To secure action by the city council in accordance with the referendum vote, the Municipal Ownership committee met on the 6th and appointed a committee on "transportation," composed of William Bross Lloyd, C. L. Bonney, Daniel L. Cruice, E. H. Nockels, and George J. Thompson. Its function is to cooperate with the transportation committee of the city council.

Still another advisory question was voted on at this election (vol. vi, pp. 486, 697), namely, whether the school board shall be elected by the people. On this question the affirmative vote is 115,553 and

the negative 58,432, a majority of 57,121 in the affirmative.

Apart from the referendum voting at this election the most significant events were the defeat (chiefly through the activity and influence of Wm. R. Hearst) of Mayor Harrison's Democratic candidate in a Democratic ward, and the defeat (chiefly through the activity and influence of the Municipal Voters' League) of Congressman Lorimer's Republican candidate in a Republican ward. Mr. Harrison's candidate was defeated by a Republican and Mr. Lorimer's by an independent.

The aggregate Socialist vote at this election was 14,762, about 6½ per cent. of the total. We append a table of Socialist party votes (vol. vi, p. 6) in Chicago for purposes of comparison:

	Vote.	P. C.
For mayor, 1901.....	3,166	2 2-3
For state treasurer, 1902.....	20,162	6 1/4
For mayor, 1903.....	12,293	4 1-3
For alderman, 1904.....	14,762	6 1/2

The political complexion of the board of aldermen is now as follows:

Newly elected Democrats.....	16
Newly elected Republicans.....	18
Newly elected Independents.....	1
Holdover Democrats.....	15
Holdover Republicans.....	18
Holdover Independents.....	1
Holdover Socialists.....	1

Of these, 27 of the newly elected and 26 of the holdover aldermen are endorsed by the Municipal Voters' League. The League condemns 6 of the new ones and 7 of the holdovers. As to 2 of the new and 2 of the old the League commends but does not endorse.

In one voting precinct a voting machine was used for the first time in Chicago. The voters of the precinct were allowed the option of voting by ballot or by machine, and every one chose the machine. Its use was entirely satisfactory, no difficulties whatever occurring. The complete result in that precinct was ascertained within three minutes after the polls closed.

Another municipal election of special interest was that of the 5th in Milwaukee, where David S. Rose, the present mayor, was re-elected by a plurality of 5,912—about 1,000 less than he received two years ago. This will be Mayor

Rose's fourth term as mayor of Milwaukee. There was great excitement during the campaign over the growth of socialism locally. The candidate of the Socialist party was Victor L. Berger, and Mayor Rose made his campaign for reelection upon the declared and widely advertised assumption that the election lay between himself and Mr. Berger. He thereby, as the returns indicate, drew away from the Republican candidate a large support, composed of voters who fear socialism. The city council has a clear Democratic majority—26 to 20. Of the minority 11 are Republicans and 9 are Socialists.

The trend of national Democratic politics during the week has been in the direction of settling upon Wm. R. Hearst and Alton B. Parker, both of New York, as the leading rival aspirants for the Democratic nomination for President. On the side of Judge Parker, ex-President Cleveland authorized a statement on the 5th in which he is reported by the New York World to have said:

Although I deeply appreciate the very kindly sentiment that prompted my Democratic neighbors in their action of last night at the Princeton primary election, it is a fact that I have but just learned of it through a social visitor. This may be taken as an evidence of how entirely disconnected I am with the organization activities of politics. The recent movement looking to a concentration upon Mr. Parker's candidacy afforded me the greatest possible relief and satisfaction, not only so far as my personal comfort is concerned, but as a Democrat anxious for my party's supremacy and delighted with the prospect of its return to sanity and patriotic effort. I do not see how anyone professing to be a real intelligent Democrat can hesitate to accept Mr. Parker, if he should be nominated, as a fit representative of safe and conservative Democratic principles, entitled to hearty and unreserved Democratic support. Some of us may have been of opinion that another nomination might be more expedient. But that should be a mere matter of opinion which should pass out of sight immediately if the choice of the convention should fall upon Mr. Parker. Feeling assured, as I do, that a nomination will be made representing true Democratic principles, I am only concerned about the platform which will be presented to the people with our candidate. It should be remembered that the more unobjection-

able the candidate we select the more will our opponents be driven to search for campaign material in our platform declaration. I do not believe that I can be mistaken in my conviction that in this campaign, of all others, our platform should be short and to the purpose. There have been campaigns in which platform makers have indulged in useless, foolish vagaries in safety. There may be such campaigns again, but I know this is not one of them. There are certain Democratic doctrines believed in by that conservative element of the party which will control at St. Louis. These doctrines should in no event be evaded. Such of these as appear to furnish at this time the most vital campaign issues should be given the greatest prominence, and should be announced in such a way as to exclude all doubt as to their meaning and all appearance of compromise. In other words, there are certain lines of battle which promise, better than others, successful results. These lines, having been carefully selected and plainly marked out, should be followed persistently and with faith and enthusiasm. I earnestly hope that our platform will be short—so short that the voters of the land will read it. I hope in this platform our party will say precisely what it means, and that every word it contains bear its share of meaning in a declaration of principles free from doubt, evasion or disingenuous compromise.

The same dispatches that announced this formal endorsement of Judge Parker by Mr. Cleveland also contained a similar endorsement by Senator Gorman. From Washington on the 5th he is reported to have said to three of his Democratic associates:

I cannot secure the nomination. Go to work for Parker. I would prefer that my friends favor him to the exclusion of any other candidate. Let no other man step in and beat him. If the convention should decide that I should be nominated, then well and good, but otherwise I would prefer to see Parker our next President.

Judge Parker's campaign is under the management of ex-Senator David B. Hill, formerly governor of New York, whose announced purpose is to secure from the New York convention a delegation instructed for Parker. Tammany Hall opposes instructions, its leader, Mr. Murphy, declaring that he stands for Cleveland.

Meanwhile Mr. Hearst continues pushing his campaign with

vigor through his papers and at the primaries. His managers claim to have added Arkansas to Rhode Island (vol. vi, p. 792) and South Dakota (vol. vi, p. 823) as States pledged to his candidacy, and to be confident of Kansas and Illinois, while hopeful even of New York.

Some of the prominent features of the contest between Hearst and Parker are described with substantial fairness by the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Tribune in his dispatch to that paper's issue of the 5th:

There is a good deal of interest here in the possible effect of the decision in the case of the anthracite coal roads upon the political prospects of William R. Hearst, who instituted the suits. Mr. Hearst's lieutenants here are wildly excited over the decision, and seem to believe it will bring him in a large number of delegates who otherwise would have gone to Parker. They hope to spread the news throughout the country, not only through Mr. Hearst's own newspapers but by the circulation of millions of copies of the decision of the Supreme Court itself. In this way, it is said, an official record can be presented to the country, by means of which William R. Hearst will appear to be the only individual trust buster in the United States. President Roosevelt has enjoyed some reputation in that line, but he is an official, and it was his duty to act as he did, whereas Mr. Hearst can and will lay claim to special consideration on the ground that he himself instituted the suits to compel the anthracite coal roads to make an exhibition of their books. The United States Supreme Court has decided that the contracts which the coal roads refused to produce should have been exhibited, and this, of course, sustained the position taken by Mr. Hearst. An effort accordingly will be made in all probability to contrast the records of Hearst and Parker on the trust question. On one side will be put the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, making an official exhibition of the efforts of Mr. Hearst, who brings to terms the most obnoxious monopoly in the country. In contrast with this a distinct campaign will be carried on showing that Judge Parker is being pushed by the greatest corporate influences in the United States. The visit of August Belmont here the other day on behalf of the party is to be taken as the text, and Hearst boomers believe they will have little difficulty in showing that the Democratic Wall street influence which was originally behind Cleveland is now booming Parker.

The Supreme Court decision mentioned in the foregoing dispatch related to the refusal of the combination of coal-carrying railroads involved in the arbitrated strike of a year and a half ago (vol. v, p. 807), to submit their records to the Inter-State Commerce Commission. Mr. Hearst had instituted proceedings before the Commission in 1902, charging that the Philadelphia and Reading, the Lehigh Valley, the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western, the Central railroad of New Jersey, and other railroad companies were in an illegal combination to fix and control the price of anthracite coal. At the hearing the railroads refused to place in evidence their coal contracts, as demanded by Hearst's lawyer. These contracts were made with coal companies owned principally by the railroad companies and fixed the price of anthracite coal shipments to be made as called for by the purchasers. On application to the United States Circuit Court Judge LaCombe, of the New York Circuit Court, sustained the railroads, holding that the Inter-State Commerce Commission had no right to demand the contracts. The Supreme Court of the United States now reverses Judge LaCombe's decision. It holds that the railroads are all engaged in inter-State commerce, and into their affairs and methods of doing business the commission sought to and is lawfully authorized by the commerce act to make investigation," and that "the commission has the right to know how inter-State traffic is conducted, the relations between the carrier and its shippers, and the rates charged and collected." This decision was made on the 5th.

Another decision by the Supreme Court, also on the 5th, has an important bearing on the monopolies of public service corporations. It affirmed a decision by Judge Grosscup relative to the gas companies of Chicago. All the gas companies of Chicago were merged into a new corporation by an act of the legislature of Illinois in 1897, the merger act authorizing the new company to charge \$1 per 1,000 feet for gas. The decision now rendered by the highest court determines that an act of merger did not make a bind-

ing contract, and that the dollar rate can be reduced by law. Whether this can be done, however, by city ordinance or only by act of the legislature, is not decided. That question is involved in another case which Judge Grosscup has decided against the city, but upon which the Supreme Court has not yet passed.

Out of the decision of the Supreme Court in the railroad merger case some three weeks ago (vol. vi, pp. 791, 801) has grown a new litigation between the parties in interest in the merger, over the question of restoration of stock of the two merged companies. This stock had been given to the Northern Securities Company of New Jersey, the "holding" company, for its own stock upon a certain agreed basis; and now that the "holding" company is under injunction as an unlawful conspiracy to destroy competition, the Hill-Morgan interests have proceeded to return the stock of the two merged roads in such manner, so the Harriman interests allege, as to "vest a majority of the stock of both the Great Northern and the Northern Railway Companies in the same individual stockholders of the Great Northern Company who originally cooperated in the promotion and organization of the Northern Securities Company, and who are still cooperating and acting in concert and combination, and would continue the common management and direction of said two competing railway companies, and render the decree" of the court "ineffectual and defeat or evade its true intent and purpose." Harriman and his associates have therefore brought a suit in the Circuit Court of the United States at St. Paul against all the companies, together with Hill, Morgan and others, to compel the Northern Securities Company to return to the plaintiffs the identical stock of the Northern Pacific Railway Company which was received from them by the New Jersey Company. On one hand it is reported that this suit is a friendly litigation for purposes of adjustment; on the other it is declared to be the beginning of a gigantic fight for control.

Across the ocean the Russo-Japanese war (vol. vi, p. 822) is

still the principal subject of interest, although no important news regarding it is at hand, other than reports, more or less trustworthy, that the Russians have withdrawn from Korea across the Yalu river into Manchuria, and that the Japanese are in control of the mouth of the Yalu on the Korean side.

Deeper in the heart of Asia, over the Indian frontiers which have hitherto separated the British from Tibet, a clash has now occurred between British troops and Tibetans. It was expected after the recent interview (vol. vi, p. 696) between Col. Younghusband, of the British army, and a force of Tibetans. They warned him then to return to British territory with his troops or serious trouble would result. He did not return, but proceeded with road-building work within the Tibetan domain. The clash came on the 31st near Guru. The Tibetan loss is put at 400 and the British at "about a dozen."

NEWS NOTES.

—Frances Power Cobbe died in London on the 4th at the age of 82.

—The Steel trust declared the regular 1½ per cent. quarterly dividend on the preferred shares on the 5th, and again passed the dividend on the common stock.

—United States Senator Burton, of Kansas, convicted at St. Louis of selling his official influence (vol. vi, p. 823) was sentenced on the 6th to imprisonment for six months in the Iron county jail and a fine of \$2,500.

—A woman suffrage resolution before the Iowa legislature was defeated in the house of representatives on the 5th by a vote of 42 to 39, the resolution failing of passage on account of the lack of a constitutional majority.

—In the trial of William J. Bryan's trustee claim under the late Philo S. Bennett will (vol. vi, p. 768) at New Haven on the 31st, Mr. Bryan's claim was defeated and the case was appealed to the highest court of the State.

—The President of the Mormon church issued a proclamation on the 6th declaring that no marriages violative of the law of the land have been solemnized by that church since 1890, and announcing that all such marriages are prohibited under pain of excommunication.

—On the 31st the first civil tribunal of the Seine, at Paris, decided the case of the Republic of Colombia against the Panama Canal Company in favor of the company, thus removing the legal ob-

stacles in the way of transferring the Panama canal pursuant to the American Panama treaty (vol. vi, p. 758).

—Poulney Bigelow, author of "The German-Struggle for Liberty," has just been appointed a lecturer on foreign and colonial matters at Boston University Law School. Mr. Bigelow is a son of John Bigelow, former minister to France. He was a close friend of the German Emperor's, and one of the earliest supporters that Henry George drew around him on the Atlantic coast.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE "LITTLE BALLOT" IN CHICAGO.

Chicago Daily News (Ind.), Apr. 6.—While yesterday's vote in favor of immediate municipal ownership reasonably may be regarded as representing practically the full strength of that sentiment in Chicago, it is surely large enough to show that this community will tolerate no arrangement which will put it at the mercy of the traction interests for another term of years. At least a large measure of municipal control guaranteeing good service must come out of the present agitation.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind. Rep.), April 7.—The people have given an impressive demonstration of their distrust of private street railway management as illustrated in this city. For the traction interests the lesson is very plain. It ought to mean better service at once. It ought to mean a disposition on the part of the traction companies to assent readily and willingly to any reasonable terms for the settlement of the traction question which the city may decide to be necessary to protect its interests and to secure an adequate up-to-date street car service. Will the traction companies heed the lesson?

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Apr. 6.—In the light of the second "academic referendum," the traction companies should realize the inexpediency of resisting a fair proposition from the city council. In the long run the majority rules and must rule, and if the people continue to demand municipal ownership the politicians will yield any promise to do their bidding. Further controversy spells danger and grave risk. Both sides should now make an earnest attempt to reach an agreement and save the public utility from private enterprise duly regulated in the interest of the community. This, we hold, is the wish of the majority of Chicago's citizens.

Hearst's Chicago Examiner (Dem.), Apr. 6.—We earnestly congratulate the citizens of Chicago on this great victory for progress and governmental sanity. We congratulate them on the prospect that a way opens before them of having a street car system adequate, modern, cheap and operated for their benefit instead of for private profit. Still more, we congratulate them on the significance of this election as showing their determination to manage their own affairs and preserve popular government. They had every temptation to swerve from the true line and play into the hands of the traction trust. There never was an issue of this kind more cunningly befogged. The people had been systematically annoyed by a very bad street car service in the hope of driving them into any bargain with the companies that would promise immediate relief. They were told that the unexpired franchise were an impossible barrier. Arguments of the most specious kind were circulated to show the advantage of the franchise system. All the newspapers of Chicago except the Hearst papers fought for the street car companies and opposed immediate municipal ownership. The people saw through all this humbuggery. In spite of all the ingenious campaign made to delude them they went to the polls and voted three to one for immediate municipal ownership.

CONGRESSMAN BAKER.

Nebraska Independent (Pro.), March 31.—Baker, that Congressional crank from Brooklyn, who wouldn't receive a railroad

pass, has been kicking up another row in the House. He declared that certain members who carried railroad passes had been influenced thereby in favor of legislation to benefit the railroads. The chair gave him a severe rebuke and made Baker take his seat. The independent can't help speculating on what would happen if there were fifteen or twenty such cranks in Congress.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Apr. 1 (weekly ed.).—Mr. Baker, of New York, was suppressed. But the point he raised, whether or not germane to the postal bill, is one that Congress should meet. The President of the United States should not ride "deadhead" when he makes trans-continental tours. He should pay for the trains out of his salary, or Congress itself should defray the expense. "Deadheading" by a government official is contrary to law, and bad in its effect upon the morals of public life. But the free-pass evil runs so far through Congress that no hearing can be obtained for a member who attacks it boldly in the open.

Johnstown (ra.) Democrat (Dem.), Apr. 5.—The people of the United States, and especially the Democrats, are under obligations to Mr. Baker for his courage and persistence in trying to uncover official corruption. The Republican majority in Congress tread his honest efforts for reform, and are now trying to curb him by refusing, whenever possible, to give him a chance to expose their alliance with the railroads and corporations. The Democratic leaders, however, are standing by Mr. Baker, and time will be given him before Congress adjourns, in spite of the Republicans, further to show up the graft of the railroads and the complicity of the Republican leaders.

Clinton (Ind.) Saturday Argus (Dem.), Mar. 26.—At the very first of his career and before Congress had assembled, he surprised the country by openly refusing to accept free railroad passes. Since Congress has been in session Mr. Baker has proven himself to be a host in himself, so well grounded is he in fundamental democracy, so clear of perception, so ready to take advantage of the crooked deals and so courageous and prompt in making his attack. The demands for his great speech on the "Compensatory Wage," in reply to the prosperity claims of Congressman Hepburn, have been enormous, and it is being circulated by the Democratic Congressional committee.

OBJECT OF THE BOER WAR.

Toronto Weekly Sun (Goldwin Smith), Mar. 23.—The real object of the South African war, known from the outset to some, must now be patent to all. It was not to extend British liberties or to redress the political wrongs of British subjects that all those solemn covenants were broken, that all that blood was shed, that all those homes were burned, that all those stains upon national character were incurred. It was to satisfy the ravening greed of the cosmopolitan capitalists of Johannesburg, who wanted to import slave labor instead of paying free labor a fair wage for the working of their mines. For this Great Britain is being made to sacrifice the brightest gem in her crown of peaceful glory, the abolition of slavery.

CHRISTIANITY AND CITIZENSHIP.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Mar. 12.—The refined Christian gentlemen whose devotion to eternal things on Sunday seems to lead directly to a devotion to perpetual franchises on week days will begin shortly to realize that the street car passenger is a citizen with a vote as well as a customer with a fare.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of Congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 38 of that publication.

Washington, Mar. 28—Apr. 2, 1904.
Senate.

The 28th was spent partly in considering the resolution of Mr. Carmack (p. 3978) relative to the order of the Interior Department allowing pensions for old age as an infirmity, and partly in disposing of the District of Columbia appropriation bill (p. 3985), which was passed (p. 3995). Nothing of general interest

was done on the 29th. On the 30th consideration of the post office appropriation bill began (pp. 4127, 4136), and was continued on the 31st (p. 4202). The question of renewing the Chinese exclusion treaty was brought up on the 1st (p. 4282), and there was some discussion of the Carmack resolution (p. 4286) on old age pensions; after which consideration of the post office appropriation bill was resumed (p. 4287). Nothing of general interest was done on the 2d.

House.

Consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill was resumed on the 28th (p. 3995), and continued on the 29th (p. 4091), the 30th (p. 4141), and the 31st (p. 4215), when the committee reported the bill back to the House with a favorable recommendation (p. 4240), but the House failed to act. On the 1st (p. 4255) the bill was passed. Only private and local matters were considered on the 2d.

Record Notes.—Letter of Edward B. Whitney, assistant attorney general under Mr. Olney, in answer to the assertion in Congress that the anti-trust law remained a dead letter during the Cleveland administration (p. 4091). Speech of Representative Emerich on justice to postal employes (p. 4121). Speech of Representative Robert Baker on ship subsidies (p. 4171). Text of opinion of Raiston & Siddons on the Chinese immigration treaty (p. 4282). Speech of Representative James R. Williams on tariff question (p. 4298).

MISCELLANY

THE QUESTION.

For The Public.

The city was still, but the river flowed ever
And midnight had wrapped its cold shadows
around;

While life that was death, in one wild endeavor,
Was seeking escape from the shackles
that bound.

The dark hair was streaming o'er brow and
bosom;

The dark eyes were gleaming in agony
wild;

And ere the cold waves of the river entomb
them,

The lips move in pleading: "God, pity
Thy child!"

No tales are those dark, sulien depths ever
telling,

And the white lips forever and ever are
still.

All secrets are safe in that comfortless
dwelling,

While time and the river flow onward at
will,

But ye who sit careless at ease in your
Zion,

Surrounded by riches of love and of
gold,

To you comes no want, like a famishing
llon,

Whose victims by sin are bought and are
sold.

You may keep far aloof from the low world
around you,

Care not for its sorrows, weep not for its
pain;

But when He who levels distinctions, hath
found you,

You must answer the question: "Oh, why
were they slain?"

ALICE M. SMITH.

I love Life. Also, I love Righteousness. I would have both; but if I must choose between them, let me rather lose Life than live without Righteousness.—Mencius.

A NEGRO STREET RAILWAY COMPANY.

From the Literary Digest of October 17, 1903.

A new phase of the race question has developed in Jacksonville, Fla., out of the attempt to separate the races in the street cars there. When the attempt at discrimination was made, the colored citizens refused to ride in the cars, with the result that the restrictions were withdrawn. Even then the Negroes did not patronize the cars, but instead they raised the capital and organized a car line of their own. The Christian Recorder (Philadelphia, Negro), which supplies the above information declares that to-day the Negroes "are operating the finest and best patronized car lines in the city of Jacksonville, the line on its business thoroughfare alone possibly excepted." The company is made up entirely of Negroes, even to the motormen and conductors, and the line is patronized by the whites as well as by the colored. The Recorder continues:

The courage and self-sacrifice shown by these people as a whole during the contention for their rights was really remarkable. Women and children would walk miles day and night rather than submit to the outrage which was ratified by the city council. They were so wrought up over the indignity that they ceased to patronize the cars even after the offensive restrictions were withdrawn.

The success of this instance of overwhelming the "Jim Crow" infamy in the South will be hailed with pleasure by friends of the race and lovers of fair-play everywhere. To the race in New Orleans, Montgomery, Birmingham, Atlanta, Augusta, Columbia, and elsewhere, the actions of the Jacksonville people are commended as an object-lesson. In their case the discrimination was turned into a fortune, and the same use can and should be made of every phase of adversity suffered by us anywhere.

ERNEST CROSBY ON THE PANAMA QUESTION.

My own views of the Panama question are very simple. Twenty-five years ago one of the favorite questions propounded by the Middle-man to the Bones at minstrel shows was, "Why does a dog wag his tail?" After Sambo has made a number of futile guesses Mr. Johnsing would explain, in his usual sententious manner that a dog wags his tail because he is bigger than his tail. If the tail were bigger than the dog, it would certainly wag the dog, but the contrary being the case, it was a scientific necessity that the dog should wag the tail. Look at your map of North America and you will clearly see that the Isthmus of Panama is its tail, and that, roughly speaking, the United States of America

is its body. The United States wags the Isthmus, and not only wags it, but docks it, because it is bigger than the Isthmus,—and that is all there is of it, and when the President talks of "holding a mandate from civilization," whatever that may mean, he is trying to conceal the truth behind a mass of verbiage. And people say that the anti-imperialists are sentimentalists! Good heavens! if a Mandate from Civilization isn't sentiment, what is it?

My own chief objection to the Panama business is the way in which it was done. We expect nations to steal, and it would be rather Quixotic to object to it, but there is a decent way to steal and an indecent one. The old-fashioned highwayman was the plink of politeness, but we do our stealing like cad. If I wanted to buy my neighbor's horse for a thousand dollars and he asked fifteen hundred, and I was determined to have the beast on my own terms, surely the most vulgar way of annexing him would be to give his coachman five hundred dollars on the sly to put him in my stable. And that is practically what we did, even if the President and Mr. Hay never said a word on the subject, for the millions to be paid for the canal were dangling before the eyes of the Panamanians. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hay belong to the "silk-stocking element" in politics, but they have rushed into this business barefoot. I have no objection to the right of secession for good cause, but I object to the subordination of secession by the implied promise of moneybags. Suppose Great Britain were negotiating with us for the harbor of Portland, Maine, and we stood out for a big price, and the main legislature seceded on a basis of half-price, cash down, would it be an ordinary case of secession? I trow not. We are loyal and patriotic people in Dutchess County, and if you will give me ten million dollars in gold and lend me a couple of men-of-war in the Hudson, to prevent outside interference, I will undertake to have the county to secede from the Union in a fortnight, and establish a full-fledged government at Poughkeepsie in the hideous court house which we have just built there, and the women's clubs would soon be sitting up late at night to design and make a new nag and the school children would soon be busy saluting it. The right of secession should never be complicated with the cash question.—The Whim for March, 1904.

It is almost as difficult for a rich man to stay in the American jail as it is for him to enter Heaven.—Montreal Star.

AN EASTER SERMON.

In his Easter sermon, at the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, O., April 3, 1904, Herbert S. Bigelow discussed the question: "What Has Science to Say About the Hope of Immortality?"

Have we, as Paul so confidently affirmed, "a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens?" The confidence that we have, declares Mr. John Fiske, is "the one thing that makes this world inhabitable for beings like ourselves." Yet for many the progress of science has destroyed this confidence, and it is evident that the dreariness of life has increased with the waning of this hope. We may put on a bold front, but we cannot conceal our heaviness of spirit. Infinitely lonely is the universe from which God is banished. Melancholy is the life which looks forward to nothing but death.

Honest despair is nobler than dishonest hope. If science has destroyed the foundations of faith, let us know it. But has the hope of immortality been discredited? Does Truth call upon us to suppress the religious emotions, and resign our faith in God and in life eternal? This, as Prof. Tyndall says, is "the problem of problems at the present hour."

Infallibility has been routed out of several redoubts. It used to hold the Vatican. Later it was thrown back on the Bible. The higher critics assailed this defense, and it took refuge in the authority of Jesus. Now it is Science that is infallible. At least there is a common impression that Science has rendered an adverse verdict, and that Faith has no appeal.

This impression has been caused by the fact that many of the dogmas of the church have been utterly discredited by Science. Such valiant service has she done, and so often has the ancient theology gone down before her, that many have come to the hasty conclusion that there is nothing left of the old Faith. But just as a nation may be strengthened by the loss of its colonies, so Religion has been strengthened by the loss of her theological encumbrances. When we come out of this period of iconoclasm it will be seen that only the useless has been destroyed, and the way cleared for the marriage of Faith and Reason, for which the world has been waiting.

What has Faith learned from Science? Just this—that in all matters which lie within the range of human experience, the increasing knowledge of Science is our only guide. But immortality does not lie within the range of human experience, and, therefore, Science can neither affirm nor deny it.

"But," says the materialist, "to believe in anything which lies without the range of human experience is an absurdity." On the contrary, scarcely a year passes which does not give us proof of realities of which we had never before dreamed. There is no faith so unwarranted as that of the materialist who assumes that the soul is not a fact because no one has seen it under a microscope.

Mr. John Fiske, in his address, "The Life Everlasting," meets the materialist in his stronghold. He analyzes the doctrine which holds that consciousness, or the soul, is a result of molecular motion in the nerve centers. The materialist declares that the brain is like a harp; Consciousness is like the music. When the harp is broken, the music dies. Mr. Fiske, with his scientific attainments, defends, as no dogmatic theologian could do, the contrary view—"that the conscious soul is an emanation from the Divine Intelligence that shapes and sustains the world, and during its temporary imprisonment in material forms, the brain is its instrument of expression. Thus the soul is not the music, but the harper."

Science has no knowledge with which to challenge the conviction of Martineau, who declared that "a divine revelation is required, not to prove immortality, but to disprove it, if it be really not true."

We may have the comfort of knowing that the revelations of Science have greatly increased the presumption in favor of the belief that the soul survives the body. With more confidence than ever, we may say, with the venerable Martineau:

The scale on which we are made is conspicuously too vast for the short reckoning from mortal years. The profoundest feeling which possesses me at the end of life is that I stand but little removed from its beginning, schooled only in the mere alphabet of its attainable lessons!

THE UNPOPULAR RACE.

Extracts from an article with the above title, by Julien Gorçon (Mrs. Van Rensselaer Cruger), published in the *Cosmopolitan* for February, 1904.

A recent experience has given me food for reflection. The printed remark that if Mr. Booker T. Washington called on me he would be welcomed in the drawing-room, brought upon me from the Southern newspapers—many of them deemed reputable—a landslide of contumely, a torrent of vulgar abuse, as unexpected as it was astonishing. That merely for expressing an opinion, one's person, works, habits and family should be made targets for the lowest innuendo and the coarsest insult, might amuse,

were it not for the melancholy illumination that it casts upon depths of ignorance and of folly.

Apart from petty personal attack, entirely irrelevant to the subject in point, these journals asked whether social equality with the negro was desirable, and intermarriage possible. This sex question appeared peculiarly imperious and irritating—a question which had never crossed my imaginings. To the writer it seems as revolting that white men should have negro mistresses as that white women should have negro husbands. Yet if, indeed, race prejudice exists to the extent that we are told it does, how is it that the commingling of the races—which we are forced to observe—has been so general? Why has it not been more abhorrent? Is the hypothesis mere hypocrisy—cant, pure and simple?

The question of human equality it is futile to discuss except before the law. It has never existed; it cannot exist, either in the present or in the future. One does not ask one's Chinese laundryman to dine. But one would hardly invite a Confucius to sit in one's pantry.

A rabid Senator has lately announced that the negro, being absolutely devoid of moral fiber, must be denied education. He accuses him of bestial traits, but will not permit him such spiritual and educational advantages as might benefit his character and raise and restrain his brutal tendencies. Could one reach a darker nadir of unintelligence? When one hears such tirades, one realizes that selfish personal advancement does not depend on the possession of the reasoning faculties. Morally, the negro prior to education may be considered as about on a par with a type of bohemian Paris and intellectual London. The decadents may be less robust in crime, they are more deeply corrupt. Nobody can be quite so wicked as a certain brand of bohemian Frenchman and intellectual Englishman. From his debasement the Negro has got to evolve, just as other races have evolved. What he requires is what all other races have required—time. This is the day and hour of little nations. The trumpet of the downtrodden has sounded. The unknown and unheard are making themselves felt. Upheaval is in the wind. There are mutterings and stirrings—a low roar of mighty forces, resistless, pushing for light. These people want air, life, and, what is more precious, life's liberties. He who refuses to heed the warning is doomed to ultimate confusion. The boon of life may be doubtful, that of

liberty is positive. The love of life is temperamental, the mere matter of a high or low vitality, but the desire of liberty is universal. Liberty means opportunity. This race will have to work out a new and more valuable emancipation. The broad enlightened element among Southern men is willing and anxious that it should—has already accorded the help of generous words and practical aid. No assistance will be forthcoming from that army of professional sufferers who continue to poison the air with their obsolete grievances. Whether the victory came of God or of Apollyon—it was won. The wise bow to the decrees of fate. The weak beat against its fiat and bruise themselves.

In their own ranks, with such general as Booker T. Washington—of whom an exquisite woman once said that he had the soul of a Christian; the heart of a gentleman and the eyes of the jungle—they have their chance. With such men as T. Thomas Fortune, Paul Laurence Dunbar, Charles W. Chestnutt, Prof. Burghardt Dubois, Bishop Walters, John W. Thompson, and many other worthy and experienced teachers and clergymen to guide them—we do not forget that a late class orator at Harvard was a Negro—they are certain to solve their own problem. These things take much time—generations will be required.

Let us not quarrel with nature. The divinities are at work.

The Negro has aptitudes—special gifts. He is frequently dextrous and clever with his fingers. He has imagination, humor, a natural eloquence. He has poetic and musical gifts, and he has manners—manners which are extinct to-day, unless in Italy and China.

THE SINGLE TAX IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Following is the speech in Parliament of Mr. Trevelyan, condensed for the *London New Age* from the report of the *Manchester Guardian*, which Mr. Trevelyan delivered in moving the second reading in the House of Commons on Mar. 11, of the land values taxation bill, which passed the House on the 12th (see *Public*, vol. vi, p. 79) by a vote of 223 to 156. Mr. Trevelyan is a leading Liberal member. His bill was suggested by his own party and by a large number of Conservatives.

Mr. Trevelyan, who was received with cheers, moved the second reading of the Land Values (Assessment and Rating) Bill. He said the Bill was the result of prolonged, careful, and businesslike deliberation on the part of a conference of municipalities, directly representing some 150 local authorities, and including many of the greatest in the country.

As far as he knew, hardly any, if any, municipality had made any definite declarations against it. (Cheers.) They hoped the House would trust one of its Standing Committees to deal with the complications which necessarily surrounded so far-reaching a change, and there was only one thing for the House to do to-day. That was to give assent to the two underlying principles—first that in the case of undeveloped property the real selling value of the land should be the basis of taxation, and not the use value at which that land was at present let, and secondly that land values were a proper subject of separate rating from buildings and improvements. (Cheers.) The main features of this Bill and those which the House had previously discussed were the same, but there were several points of difference. The present Bill proposed to tax unoccupied land to the extent of the full current rate on its real value. This would mean a substantial increase of taxation where land was held out of use, as they thought, unsocially. (Cheers.) Another difference was that where land had been considerably developed, and the present assessment was greater than the new land valuation, there would not be any new rate at present. The relief of existing rates on such properties would depend upon the amount of land which was ready to be developed, and which had hitherto escaped taxation in the outskirts of the towns. But although the Bill would apparently make no difference in regard to properties already developed, it would in reality bring about a vital change. There would be a separate land column in the assessment book, and it would thus be possible to compare the taxation upon the proportion of the present assessment which represented land and the remainder which represented buildings. It would be open to Parliament, as in the case of Mr. Macnamara's Bill, to put in the future a higher rate upon the land assessment all over towns. Another feature of the Bill showed the spirit in which it was introduced. At present in arriving at the assessment of a hereditament deductions were made on the assessment for repairs and depreciation. These deductions obviously should be applicable to buildings only.

As showing the value of undeveloped land in large towns, Mr. Trevelyan mentioned the case of Bradford. The mover of a resolution in support of the Bill in the Bradford City Council stated that there were four estates in the neighborhood of the city, the total value of which at a very reasonable calculation amounted to upwards of £2,000,000, but the rates on which at present

amounted to only £761. In an arbitration between the Bradford Corporation and Lord Rosse, it was stated in evidence on behalf of Lord Rosse that he was the owner of 1,300 acres of land in Heaton and Shipley eminently suitable for building upon. At 2s. 6d. a yard the total value of that land for building purposes would be over £780,000. Yet in respect of that estate Lord Rosse contributed only £189 a year towards the upkeep of the city. (Cheers.) The same speaker in the Bradford City Council estimated that there were 4,500 acres of land in the city not built upon, and that if this was rated at its true value, it would bring in £41,000 a year to the city. Another effect of bringing such land under rating would be that landlords would be compelled to bring their land into use the moment it got any real value. That to his (Mr. Trevelyan's) mind was even more important than the increase in rateable value. Dealing with the objections to the Bill, he said it would be urged that gardens and private open spaces, the existence of which was a public advantage, would be forced into the market, but that danger could be avoided by giving the municipality power to regulate the development of land—a power which was already possessed by the great German towns. They were not rushing any proposal to put a large new tax on all land in relief of buildings, but they thought that when they had got a land valuation which would make patent the iniquity of the present system half their battle would be won. Upon houses raised on the outskirts of towns there was a tax often of one-third of their value. That meant a discouragement of the building trade, and one often saw this curious phenomenon in the building trade, while more and more the population was crying out for room to live. (Hear, hear.) All that the municipalities asked was to be allowed to make this great experiment with all the cautious competence with which it was their custom to move. (Hear, hear.) He hoped the Government would not frustrate their hopes. (Opposition cheers.)

EQUALITY OF RIGHTS IS ALL THE NEGRO ASKS.

A portion of a long and able article on the subject of Justice for Negroes, written by the Rev. Olympia Brown, of Columbus, Wis., and published in the Chicago Chronicle of Mar. 27, 1904.

"Social equality" is the great bugbear which frightens many people. It is said that we cannot speak to a man in the dining room without inviting him into

the drawing-room; "If you entertain a man socially, how can you resent his aspiration for your daughter?"

But in reality this alarm is needless—It is a figment of the imagination. There is, there can be, no "social indiscriminate equality" among all classes, either North or South. Mr. Dickens described what he saw and no more in his picture of what he called the "sanctuary of New York fashion," where the people were "the very bright particular stars of an exalted New York sphere—there were other fashionable spheres above them and other fashionable spheres below them and none of the stars in any one of these spheres had anything to say to the stars in any other of these spheres;" where Mr. Norris, the father, observed of the people next door that "they entertained religious opinions of which he could not approve and therefore he had not the honor of knowing them," and Mrs. Norris, the mother, said "they were well enough in their way, but they were not genteel."

Not only in New York city but in every country village there are spheres and grades and classes and groups the members of which have little, if any, social intercourse with each other. They are all free people, they do their own business, they respect themselves, the men cast their vote on election day at the same booth, the women do their shopping at the same stores, but socially each individual goes to his own place in the group where he feels most at home.

Social combinations are regulated by taste, by sympathy, by similarity of attainment—no law can adjust them, no determination on the part of any particular class can establish a social equality not warranted by character. Do the members of the old first families of Virginia affiliate with the poor whites of the mountain districts? Certainly not. Do the inhabitants of the slums enter the drawing-rooms of the richer people of our cities? By no means. There is no social equality among the white and black except as it is made by character. When it is said that "all are treated free and equal" or that "all are alike entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" or that "we have a government of the people, and by the people" or that "we, the people, do ordain and establish a constitution" or that "there shall be neither slavery and involuntary servitude" or that "a citizen's right to vote shall not be denied or abridged," no one understands that such statements are a declaration of equality in natural ability, education,

morality or spirituality or that all are on the same social plane. Not at all—only that as human beings all have a right to live and a right to protection, in person and property, from the government to which they render allegiance, and a right to share by their votes in the government which they help to support. Social life, its amenities, its hospitalities, its limitations, its requirements, must depend upon the culture, the taste and spirit of the people.

Each home must be a law unto itself; it is sacred ground to be guarded and watched over by father and mother: they alone must determine what guests shall be invited there and what spirit of peace and good will shall pervade it.

A genial and kindly hospitality will often welcome to share the social pleasures of the home those who are not eligible as lifelong companions or as desirable suitors for the hand of a daughter. Narrow, indeed, would be one's social life and lonely one's home if none could enter there except acceptable matches for one's daughter.

Dr. Ligon says [in Good Housekeeping]:

The greatest wrong ever done civilization was when thousands of beings only two degrees removed from naked barbarism were declared by law to be and taught that they were the social equals of a race which represents the refinement, the chivalry, the bravery of thousands of years of civilization.

What law is that?

There is no such law, there can be no such law; it is the inalienable right of everyone to choose his own associates. If the Welsh or the German people choose to associate only with those of their own nationality that is their privilege; if the Jew wishes to keep himself distinct from other people that is his right. On the other hand if Mr. Roosevelt wishes to invite a Negro or an Indian or a Hottentot or an orang-outang to dine with him he has a perfect right to do so, but he cannot require others to do the same. If Dr. Ligon desires to associate only with white people she can make her own choice, if others wish to confine their acquaintance to college professors or to artists or to musicians there is no law either to prevent or to compel them. There is only the divine law of peace and good will to men applicable alike to Jew or Gentile, bond or free.

Equally irrelevant are all discussions of the causes of slavery in this country, of the purposes for which the war was waged, of the influence of carpet-bag politicians or the doctrines maintained by the abolitionists; these things are "ancient history." Nor need we at this

time define the exact limitations of the capabilities of the Negro or speculate as to his future. The present only is ours. The Negro is here; he was born here and he is at home here; he is endowed with the attributes of our common humanity; he is therefore entitled to a fair field, to an opportunity to earn his living, to acquire knowledge and to gain, if he can, the wealth of the world and its prizes. He is a citizen of the United States and therefore entitled to his vote; if he violates the law or is guilty of gross offenses, he must be punished according to law; if white men are guilty, let them be likewise punished.

Justice, and yet more justice, is what we need. As Americans and Christians, north as well as south, we need to rise above narrow prejudices and be willing to allow to others the same rights, opportunities and privileges that we ask for ourselves. Let us have justice for all, special privilege for none. More righteousness among all classes is the need of this hour.

BY FEAR AND FAVOR.

Laws are to be enforced without fear or favor and without respect of persons. That is mere commonplacé, baldest of truisms—no room for difference on that proposition. To set up the opposite, that laws should not touch the rich, or should not restrain the good from doing forbidden things, or should not apply alike to all, small and great—to hold such a view of law would make a law no law at all, but mere vehicle of whim. The thing states itself.

Yet in this merger case, this maze of hysteria, the law and its majesty seems hardly involved.

What's Jim Hill's attitude? Why, that they're heaving bricks at the kind gentleman who built the northwest as a personal favor, when they ought to be grateful. The bare question of law does not enter into his head.

What does Van Sant think? Why, that he's vindicated, that he has won a fight by employment of the law as the most handy tool; not that he enforced the law just as he found it there, but that he made it serve some end beyond itself, as though without that end he had not invoked it.

As for the president, silent himself, except as he congratulates Knox on his victory—so etiquette demands—friends speaking for him

tell his intentions to press the law where he thinks good, and let it lapse where he thinks good to carry out good policies; no word of principle. As though law were nothing else than vehicle of whim.

And the supreme court itself which laid down this law as the law of the case, though by an half and half, half and a little more contrary to the law, half and a little less perfectly legal—what does Judge Harlan say with the majority? Why, that this thing was wrong, hurtful and dangerous, therefore against the law, whether 'twas or not illegal. As though they were to decide what's good and what is not, and fit the law to it; as though they had power to make laws as they went along.

And the people, whose servant is Van Sant, likewise the president, who set the court in place who made the law itself—hardly more clear are they than their creations. Halling this syllabus as though laws were but decrees given by their masters, as though courts had right to make laws just to suit themselves and this one time had bent to please the people. Scarcely a thought all through of the law's majesty made by the people's will to carry out their purpose. —Goodhue Co. (Minn.) News.

"Why, see here, you've raised the price of your bananas again!"

"Yes, yes. Me raisa price. Too mucha war."

"What's the war got to do with it?"

"War raisa price. Raisa price of bread. Raisa price of meat. Raisa price of banan'."

"Nonsense! Why should war raise the price of bananas?"

"War raisa price. Russia man, Japa man, buy aplenty banan'. Eata banan', throw skin down so! Long come greata general, step on banan' skin, whoof! He fall and breaka his head. All ze generals fall. Take much banan'. War raisa price."—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

BOOKS

CHESTERTON'S VARIED TYPES.

Some time ago a little volume on Robert Browning was reviewed in The Public. The originality and freshness of the book struck with surprise all readers who had not happened to become acquainted with the author's brief newspaper essays and reviews. Nineteen of these essays and reviews have now been gathered into a volume ("Varied Types," by G. K. Chesterton, Dodd, Mead & Co., New York, \$1.20). It is a clear-type, wide-

margin, attractive book of 269 pages, with a portrait of the author. There is one puzzling mistake; the top line of p. 233 should be at the top of p. 234, and vice versa.

The contents carry very truly a variety of types, such, for example, as William Morris, Francis of Assisi, Charles II., Tolstol, Savonarola, Bret Harte, the German Emperor, and Tennyson. About each of these and the others some new thought is suggested, some new light thrown on their work or their careers.

The first thing one feels like saying about Mr. Chesterton is that nobody is his master. He gives himself the privilege of thinking for himself, and takes the further privilege of saying his thoughts in his own delightfully fresh way. His style abounds in paradoxes, and in a less bold and candid writer would seem affected, but in him it is all right. Nothing could be less affected than his affectation — or perhaps he would say that there is no such thing as affectation, just as he says that "Nothing in the world has ever been artificial." Of course in a style like this we must not expect a verbal consistency. After denying artificiality, Mr. Chesterton will say: "Byronism was a revolt against artificiality." He might deny affectation, and still say: "The Byronite young man had an affectation of sincerity; the decadent has positively an affectation of affectation." But if you follow him closely he will clear himself of any real inconsistency.

He makes many upsetting statements, but the beauty of it is that he proves them. For example, to whom but Mr. Chesterton has it occurred to say that now-a-days "we are not generous enough to write great satire?" People do not readily associate generosity with satire. And yet he shows that effective satire presupposes a knowledge of the good points in the victim. We cannot satirize what we totally despise. "It is impossible to vanquish an army without having a full account of its strength. It is impossible to satirize a man without having a full account of his virtues." He aptly cites Pope's attack on Addison. "Pope," he says, "was not such a fool as to try to make out that Addison was a fool. He knew that Addison was not a fool, and he knew that Addison knew it. But hatred, in Pope's case, had become so great, and I was almost going to say, so pure, that it illuminated all things, as love illuminate all things." At any rate, Pope knew where Addison was weak, and where he was not, else he could not have hit him so effectively.

Thus and more fully Mr. Chesterton proves his points. We are convinced and grateful. So many paradoxical writers leave the reader dangling in the air, wondering whether he is a fool or not, because he cannot catch the author's drift.

Apropos of satire, and Mr. Chester-

ton's dictum of modern failure in that line, it would be interesting to know what he thinks of Howells. It seems to me that Mr. Howells is far the best of all modern satirists, for the very reason that he sees the good points in his characters. In fact, pretty near all he says of them is on the good side. The real satire comes when his victims themselves talk. They satirize themselves.

But to return to the essays; as I have said, each of them will be found to contain some fresh view-point of the subject. Take the essay on St. Francis, and we shall be told "that all true joy expresses itself in asceticism." We shall learn that religious asceticism is only "the repudiation of the great mass of human joys because of the supreme joyfulness of the one joy." We shall see, furthermore, that religious asceticism is by no means the only species. Or take the essay on Charles II., and we shall learn that man is too great to be satisfied with any cut-and-dried scheme, however rational it may be, or, to speak a la Chesterton, however satisfactory. "The puritans fell," he says, "not because they were fanatics, but because they were rationalists." They fell "through the damning fact that they had a complete theory of life." Or take the essay on Queen Victoria, who, he says, "for 70 years followed through every possible tangle and distraction the fairy thread of common sense." She was a great monarch by doing nothing in the traditional monarch line of business. Her strength was her "brilliant inaction." Her self-control and sense of proportion teach a good lesson, Mr. Chesterton thinks, at the present day. "In psychology," he says, "in sociology, above all, in education, we are learning to do a great many clever things. Unless we are much mistaken, the next great task will be to learn not to do them."

So we might go on from essay to essay; but enough has perhaps been said to give some idea of this little volume, which is both charming and thoughtful. Not that all the essays are equally satisfactory; those on William Morris and Tolstol seem to me least so, because he hardly touches upon what many consider the supreme service of these two, namely, their enthusiasm for better conditions of life among the masses of mankind. It is a pity that Mr. Chesterton skips this side of them, as he would surely say something worth thinking about.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Christ. By S. D. McConnell, D. D., LL. D., rector of All Souls' church, New York. New York: The Macmillan Company. To be reviewed.

PAMPHLETS.

"Lawson Purdy's "Taxation of Personal Property" (New York: Tax Reform Association, 52 William St.) is a reproduction, typographically very inviting, of Mr. Purdy's impressive argument against personal property taxation, which appeared

in Municipal Affairs. The text has been revised and the statistics brought down to date.

The printed argument of Clarence S. Darrow and Edgar L. Masters, of Chicago, in the Turner case (vol. vi., p. 810), before the Supreme Court of the United States, is a powerful Constitutional argument both in its purely legal aspects and in the broader and more important political considerations which it presents. One can hardly read this lawyers' argument without feeling very strongly with the able authors of it that the real danger which now confronts the people of the United States is not opinions in opposition to all organized government, but "the aggressiveness of government"—the disregard by the government itself of its own fundamental law.

PERIODICALS.

The paper on Thomas Nast, in Pearson's for April, stirs sleeping memories of life and cartoonist's art in New York nearly half a century ago.

If "Labor and Capital," a New York magazine of which the first copy is before us, keeps good its promise of maintaining the policy of establishing as far as possible "a forum in which the vital issues of social economics, as they exist today, can be discussed without one iota of bias," it will perform something like a miracle. Yet the experiment is well worth trying.

Chicago's aspiring magazine, the World To-Day, modeled upon the Review of Reviews, improves apace. Three articles of special interest in the April number deal with the Negro problem from the Negro point of view. One is by Booker T. Washington; another is by Prof. Kelly Miller, of Washington; the third is by Jesse Lawson, president of the National Sociological Society; the fourth is by Ida B. Wells-Barnett, chairman of the Anti-Lynching League; and the fifth is by Prof. W. E. Burghardt DuBois, author of the "Souls of Black Folk." These articles cannot be

IN PRESS.

"THE PROPHET of SAN FRANCISCO."

A MONOGRAPH

By LOUIS F. POST.

Originally prepared for and read at the Chicago Literary Club in its regular members' programme for 1902-03, Monday, November 17, 1902.

A resume of the work, and a character sketch of the life, of Henry George.

Price, 20 Cents.

SPECIAL PRICES IF ORDERED IN QUANTITY

Printed from good type, on high grade stock, and daintily bound in paper.

MOODY PUBLISHING COMPANY.

35 Nassau St., 1601 Unity Bldg., Chicago. New York.

Special Course of Lectures

FOR

The Henry George Association

Of Chicago, to be held in Hall 607, Handel Hall Building, Thursday Evenings, During March and April. Admission Free.

PROGRAM:

- April 14—Charles Zuehlke, "Aesthetic Poverty of Chicago." Illustrated with Stereoscopic.
- April 21—William D. Mac Clintock, "Readings from Whitman the Poet of Democracy."
- April 28—Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Ibsen's "Enemy of the People."



THE "CARELESS" HISTORIAN.

Truth—Hi, Mr. Eagle, you've dropped a leaf of History!
Brooklyn Eagle—Sh! Keep still, can't you?

passed over by anyone who would truly understand the so-called "Negro problem."

President Henry S. Pritchett, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in an address before the University of Chicago, published in the Technology Review, said something about what is called "college spirit" which is most true. "The scholarly influences," said President Pritchett, "in the college are, on the whole, relatively less, it seems to me, than in the college of 50 years ago. . . . That which we call

college spirit, that intangible something which gives color and direction to the influences of the college life, has no touch of scholarship in it. It is intensely local, and differs in no essential respect from the feeling which the boy entertains toward his preparatory school. It has no contact with the universal company of scholars." This criticism is worth noticing, because the colleges of the whole country are in danger of being too much dominated by this local, hurrahing, and, withal, narrowing, "college spirit." J. H. D.

The Public

is a weekly review which prints 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. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of radical democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to liability, 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 of original and selected miscellany, 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. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

TERMS:—Annual Subscription, \$2.00; Semi-Annual Subscription, \$1.00; Quarterly Subscription, 50 cents; Trial Subscription (4 weeks), 10 cents; Single Copies, 5 cents. Free of postage in United States, Canada, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING Co. Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

Published weekly by THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1641 Unity Building, Chicago, Ill. Post office address, THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

ATTORNEYS.

ERWING & RING,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
HOUSTON, TEXAS.
Presley K. Erwing. Henry F. Ring.

CONTRACTORS.

GEOERGE H. ATKINSON,
CONTRACTOR.
Telephone, Electric Light, Trolley Roads built
Trolley and Municipal complete and
Work. financed.
56 Liberty Street, New York.

The Truth About the Trusts

A Description and Analysis of the American Trust Movement

By JOHN MOODY

A COMPREHENSIVE WORK, embracing descriptions, histories and analyses of all the Great Trusts, Industrial, Franchise and Transportation, and full statistical facts regarding the entire Trust movement. About 445 Trusts are represented in the book with a total capitalization of \$20,379,162,551, and embracing more than 8,600 original companies.

"Even to those who have made a study of the trust question Mr. Moody's book is a revelation."—*New York World.*

A volume of 540 large octavo pages, beautifully bound in green buckram, untrimmed edges, gilt top, etc. A very handsome volume. For sale by leading booksellers, or will be sent to any address on receipt of price, \$5.00 NET (add 27 cents for postage), by the publishers,

MOODY PUBLISHING COMPANY

35 Nassau Street, New York

Chicago Branch, 79 Dearborn Street

Progressive Religious Literature free. Apply Mrs. C. F. Wetmore, 4432 Sidney Avenue, Chicago.



The Church of Divine Satisfaction

A composite picture of a great many popular churches, with a character sketch of their wise and prudent pastor, the Rev. J. Westminister Phrazer, D. D. Daintily bound, 10c. Straight Edge Press, 17th Ave., N. Y.