

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 23, 1904.

Number 316.

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.

Whether were it best to have a candidate like Parker, getting his campaign fund through August Belmont from financiers who never give something for nothing; or one like Hearst, who furnishes his own campaign fund; or again to take chances of success with one who goes to the people without a campaign fund?

If Judge Parker ever had the least chance of being nominated by the Democrats for President, his chance has been frittered away; and a definite movement for the nomination of Miles, Garvin, Shepard, Folk or John Sharp Williams would almost certainly meet with instant success.

Williams would probably be most available, because the supposed weakness of his being a Southerner would really augment his strength. His name would doubtless concentrate the support of both the Parker and the Hearst following in the South. Neither of these men is popular enough in that section to hold their own against a movement for the distinguished Mississippian; and as to the objection that Williams comes from a State that rebelled against the general government before he was born, that is mere pandering to a Northern prejudice which no longer exists. The Civil War ended nearly forty years ago, and the "bloody shirt" was buried in the '70's by President Hayes.

In saying that Judge Parker has now lost every chance he might possibly have had, we allude to the movement in his behalf

which has culminated in his forced endorsement by one faction of the New York convention. A situation has been thus produced which makes his election impossible; and a candidate who cannot be elected is not the candidate that politicians who merely want to "get in" will be in any hurry to nominate.

Judge Parker has never had anything to recommend his nomination except the concealment of his political principles, if he has any, and the fact that in 1897 he carried the State of New York for chief justice of the court of appeals by 61,000 plurality after Bryan had lost it for President in 1896 by an adverse plurality of 286,000. From this showing it has been hastily assumed that Judge Parker is so tremendously popular that he could carry his State for President at the coming election. Such figures appeal with great force to hungry politicians who have long been "out" and are insanely eager to "get in." But in fact, Parker's popular vote in New York in 1897 rose only 3,500 above Bryan's in 1896, notwithstanding the enormous disparity in pluralities. It fell 123,000 below Bryan's vote in 1900. And this in spite of the fact that Parker's vote was abnormal. It is fully accounted for, with thousands of votes to spare, by the peculiar local conditions in 1897 in the politics of the city of Greater New York. Mr. Low was running that year for mayor of Greater New York on a bi-partisan ticket, the sponsors for which flattered his Democratic support by endorsing the Democratic candidate for chief justice of the State, who happened to be Parker. Consequently a large proportion of the Republicans who supported Low for mayor voted with their Democratic associates, and with Tammany hall, for Parker for

chief justice. This peculiar as well as local and temporary condition gave Parker the phenomenal vote in Greater New York of 278,031—a plurality in that city of 65 per cent. of the total vote there. To that result in New York city, and to that alone, Parker owed his State plurality. Outside of New York city he polled 276,649—an adverse plurality of 77,000, and only 42 per cent., of the total in that part of the State. To the hungry politician there is nothing especially inviting about vote-getting ability of that accidental sort, and as the facts get out Parker's availability wanes among them.

But that alone is not what has absolutely killed Parker off as a candidate. David B. Hill, August Belmont and Grover Cleveland have produced that result between them. When Cleveland endorsed Parker, he shocked every voter who distrusts Cleveland as a tool of the Wall street conspirators. When August Belmont came upon the scene the fears Cleveland had awakened that another Wall street tool had been found as a substitute for Cleveland were confirmed. Finally, when Hill "jammed" through one of his "snap" endorsements, riding rough-shod over a large minority of delegates to do it, he not only completed the confirmation but he also threw a wet blanket upon the enthusiasm of honest but misguided Cleveland men, who, while they trust Cleveland, distrust and despise Hill. John McCutcheon fairly describes the present situation when he pictures Parker with one hand in Cleveland's, the other in Hill's and all three dancing, and describes the cartoon as "the latest razzle-dazzle trio in the Democratic party." The rank and file of the Democratic party want no more Wall street "razzle-dazzles."

Some good Democratic speeches were made at the Jefferson banquet of the Iroquois Club in Chicago on the 13th, but the affair itself seems to have been a pretty thorough-going Cleveland demonstration. This is not remarkable, considering the personnel of the wealthier members of the club and the fact that the banquet was of the expensive order. Gen. Miles, however, was recognized with as much enthusiasm as the mention of Cleveland's name invoked; but the little boom attempted for Judge Parker had a comparatively frosty welcome. A mention of Bryan's name was received in dead silence. Bryan had been invited to attend and had written a letter which the managers refused to have read at the banquet, although they had given copies to the press and did have the following letter from Mr. Cleveland read to the company:

I very much regret the necessity which compels me to decline your courteous invitation to attend the celebration of Jefferson's birthday under the auspices of the Iroquois club. It is especially fitting at this time of confusion in political ideas and misapprehension as to the meaning of true Democracy that the character of the great exemplar of Democracy should be fully appreciated and that his political opinions should be better interpreted and understood. His devotion to the interests of the people, his wise conservatism and his constant adherence to the public good, always the guiding star of his career, commend his acts and his beliefs to the careful study of those who in these days patriotically seek the welfare of our country through the ascendancy of safe and sane Democracy. Trusting that the celebration of the birthday of this great leader will prove to be both a source of pleasure and profit to those who participate, I am very truly yours.

We append Mr. Bryan's letter, which was suppressed:

I am just in receipt of your invitation to attend the twenty-third annual banquet of the Iroquois club, to be held on the 13th inst. I thank you for the invitation, and regret to say that I shall not be able to attend. I trust, however, that those present will take advantage of the occasion to present to the country the importance of maintaining democratic principles as they were set forth in the platforms of 1896 and 1900. The merger decision shows how closely the Supreme Court is divided and how easy it is for those who sympathize with cor-

porate wealth to find plausible reasons for staying the hand of the law when it attempts to rebuke those who exploit the people. Under our Constitution the President appoints judges, and those who have watched the decisions in the Hayes-Tilden contest, in the income tax case, in the trust case, and in the cases involving the policy of the government in the Philippines cannot doubt that it is as important to have judges who sympathize with the people as to have judges learned in the law. In the present struggle between plutocracy and democracy the corporations are seeking to control the Supreme Court, and if they can do that the House of Representatives, the Senate and the President will be powerless to protect the public. I trust that those who are honored with an invitation to speak at your banquet will raise a note of warning against the attempt now being made by the money magnates to control the Democratic convention and to secure the nomination of a Democratic candidate who will be obligated in advance to betray the hopes of the democratic masses.

It is not easy to understand why such a letter should have been suppressed at any gathering professing democracy. Those who see it in print, however, will have no difficulty in discerning its superiority to Mr. Cleveland's as the deliverance of a democratic statesman with something vital to say and the candor to say it in unmistakable terms.

The Hill-Cleveland-Parker organ, the Brooklyn Eagle, boasts that the supporters of Parker in the Democratic party are of the better element, while those who oppose him are of the lower classes. But if it is with the "better elements" the Eagle wishes to associate politically, why be satisfied with the Democratic grade. At the best that is only fair to middling. The Republican party is par excellence the party of the "better elements." It is composed pretty much altogether of "better elements;" and the really and truly "better element" go into it as a haven of refuge from vulgarity. No Democrat can be a first rate "better element" where Republicans abound. Even the best Democrat can no more be a "better element" in comparison with a Republican than an industrious and honest day laborer can be respectable

in comparison with an undetected confidence operator.

Congressman Baker has several times succeeded in getting before Congress and into the Congressional Record a provision for securing the President from the indignity of being "deadheaded" by railroad corporations; but he has not yet been able to get the provision enacted. His Republican colleagues, with their pockets lined with railroad passes, are not disposed to pay Mr. Roosevelt's traveling expenses out of the public purse. They prefer to let him suffer as a "deadhead" the same as they do themselves. We quote the clause Mr. Baker has unsuccessfully tried to include in appropriation bills:

To reimburse the great railroads for the cost of supplying the President of the United States with special trains, food, cigars, wines, liquor, etc., during his trip about the country last year, \$50,000, provided no railroad shall share in the appropriation unless it shall, within ninety days, furnish an itemized list of what was supplied the President of the United States; and, provided further that the President shall not contract any further expense similar to this without the express consent of Congress.

A remarkable instance of abuse of a sound principle appears in the final sentence of the following resolution adopted by the Republican convention of Massachusetts last week to head off a growing free trade sentiment in that State which is manifested in demands for reciprocity with Canada:

Reciprocity with Canada is a mere phrase until the concessions offered on one side and demanded on the other are stated in detail. No administration and no party can legislate or negotiate a mere catch word into substance. Those who demand reciprocity with Canada should furnish details if they desire action, always remembering that no trade can be a good trade unless both parties are benefited thereby.

"Always remembering that no trade can be a good trade unless both parties are benefited thereby." No principle could be sounder than that, and it is gratifying to find a protection convention endorsing it. But their common acceptance of that principle does

not by any means bring protectionists and free traders together. What separates them is not the principle, but their radically different ways of applying the principle. Free traders contend that the only thing that can be trusted to determine as to any trade whether or not it benefits both parties, is the mutual agreement of the parties themselves. But protectionists go upon the theory that traders cannot be trusted to decide whether their trades are mutually beneficial, and that therefore government must interfere. In a word, protection is paternalistic while free trade is individualistic.

The Pall Mall Gazette has queer notions about economic phenomena. It is quoted as having said, apropos of the recent action of Parliament in the land value taxation bill (vol. vi, p. 793), that all taxation, according to the free trade fiscal theory, falls eventually upon the consumer, and then to have made the following sapient comment:

The consumer of land values is, of course, the tenant.

Tenants will be pleased to know this, for they have been under the impression that it is the landlords who do the consuming of the food, clothing, etc., that go to make up the item of land value in the distribution of products.

Judge Grosscup's efforts to manage some of the most important legislative affairs of the city of Chicago through the Federal courts have encountered a merited rebuke from the Federal Court of Appeals to which an extraordinary decision of his in this matter was carried for review. We had occasion last Summer (vol. vi, p. 242) to criticise Judge Grosscup's apparent policy in connection with the Chicago traction question. At that time we referred to the indications that some of the traction litigation in his court appeared to have been brought there by collusion, nominally to conserve traction property for the benefit of New York

creditors, but really for the purpose of securing the aid of a national court in forcing the city to extend the terms of local traction franchises. Judge Grosscup's action in connection with this subject has certainly been interesting. He has talked more like a traction manager than a judicial conservator of assets; and judicially he has gone to the extent of issuing injunctions forbidding legal proceedings in the State courts in a collateral controversy. It was from this decision that the appeal in question was taken, and we are glad to be able to say that the higher court has not only reversed Judge Grosscup, but in respect to the contention in his behalf that he is endeavoring to make a complete street cars system for Chicago, has administered this rebuke:

Without question the combination of all the railways under one management and control is an imperial scheme, possibly conducive to the public welfare, possibly beneficial to the three companies interested, and possibly lifting the Union Traction out of its insolvent condition; but the property was not taken by the court to carry out grand schemes founded on supposed future benefits. It has the property simply to conserve it in the interests of creditors, caring for it, indeed, with due regard to public interests, because it is impressed with a public service. But a scheme like that proposed should be entered upon and carried out by those interested and whose money is at stake, and should not be imposed upon them unwillingly through the action of the court.

Judge Grosscup announces in a newspaper interview that he will instruct his receivers to appeal. That is doubtless not an improper thing to do. But were he to take the hint of the court above him, no just private interest would suffer and the traction question in Chicago would be greatly simplified.

In saying last week (p. 19) that Frank Stephens and Samuel Milliken were "attendants" at the Emma Goldman meeting which the police of Philadelphia arbitrarily suppressed, we did not mean that they were attendants in the more common sense of serving the meeting in any capacity, but that they were in attendance

with the design of becoming auditors. They were not promoters of the meeting. They were simply private citizens, who, attracted by the advertisements of the meeting, were attempting peaceably to enter the hall. Following is Mr. Milliken's account of the exasperating affair:

Desiring to hear Miss Goldman, we tried to enter the hall, but found policemen barring the way. We did not attempt to force a passage, but courteously inquired for the lieutenant in charge. We were pushed back to the middle of the pavement, where we again made inquiry for the lieutenant. We were then pushed into the street, and upon repeating our inquiry were seized and taken to the police station. We had no connection with the meeting, nor with anarchism, we being single taxers of long standing. The people of Philadelphia have been described as "Corrupt and Contented." If they can calmly stand such outrageous violations of the rights of free speech and peaceable assemblage, their Liberty Bell should be sold for junk.

A complaisant police magistrate imposed \$5 fines upon Stephens, Milliken, and three others similarly related to the affair, and from his decision an appeal has been taken.

Americans who are jealous of the good old American doctrine of free speech and free assembly will be glad to know that this outrage at Philadelphia is not to be passed over in silence. Besides the pending legal proceedings, free speech societies are organizing, and on the 17th a large meeting was held at Odd Fellows' Temple, Philadelphia, to protest against the tyrannical action of the police authorities. This meeting was presided over by George Brown, and the principal speakers were Hugh O. Pentecost and George Gluyas Mercer. Resolutions were adopted which we reproduce:

Whereas, On April 10, 1904, a public meeting was called to listen to an address by Miss Emma Goldman in Odd Fellows' Hall, Philadelphia, her subject being "The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation;" and, whereas, the police, acting under orders from the Director of Public Safety, forcibly prevented an exercise of the rights of peaceable assemblage and free speech, arresting five men who attempted peaceably to enter the hall. Resolved, That this meeting

of citizens of Philadelphia denounces this lawlessness of officials sworn to protect citizens in their rights. Especially does it condemn Mayor Weaver and Director Smith, principals in this wrong. Resolved, That this meeting requests its managers to reengage Miss Goldman to deliver in this hall the prohibited lecture. Let the lawlessness of the Mayor and his Director be further tested and exposed. The rights of free speech and peaceable assemblage must not be surrendered.

Not all the Philadelphia papers take sides with the Russianistic police of that city in this matter. The Record, the North American, and the Public Ledger are united in condemning the dangerous outrage. Says the Record, for example, "the police in Philadelphia will find full employment at all times in dealing with actual law-breakers without themselves being employed to break the law under pretense of preventing unintended crime."

When John Turner, the English anarchist whose case under the deportation law is pending in the United States Supreme Court (p. 26) spoke to a Chicago audience on the 17th, his sentiments were so lofty, his language so promotive of peace and good will, that the Chicago papers were at a loss for blood-curdling material. One of them impudently twisted Turner's meanings to serve its own malignant purposes; while others hinted that he has usually been violent in his speeches but on this occasion had played in a peaceable role because there were disguised policemen in the hall. The truth is that Turner's speeches have always been of a kind to make for peace and order; any impression to the contrary has been manufactured by the non-yellow sensational press. Whatever we may think of the soundness of anarchistic philosophy, it does not involve disorder; and the attempts to prohibit thinking and speaking about it are as lawless in their purpose as the worst thing that is charged to anarchists. To kill free thought and free speech should rank in every free country in the highest grade of crime. There is encouragement in the

fact, in circumstances like these, that such a man as George Gluyas Mercer, who spoke at the protest meeting in Philadelphia, and such a man as Western Starr, who presided at the Turner meeting in Chicago, are ranging themselves publicly, and at the risk of professional sacrifice, in favor of free speech, free thought and unmolested assemblage in behalf of men and women whose opinions they do not accept. It is easy to sacrifice for freedom to propagate one's own pet views; it is a different matter to stand up for an equal right for opposing views.

Some editorial criticism has recently been made by a writer who charges the managing men on newspapers, not those on "yellow journals" alone, with publishing false news. One of the critics protests that—

editors of large newspapers do not order "fakes," but take pains to keep them out. They are sensitive to the reputation of their papers for truthfulness; they have the caution that goes with responsibility, the experience that enables them to discriminate with a precision that would be absolutely impossible to an inexperienced critic, who would go wrong ten times to the veteran's once. Newspapers run as adjuncts to stock jobbing operations form an insignificant percentage of the press of the country. Deliberate lying in news reports for the purpose of misrepresentation is not the practice of newspapers of standing.

This is both true and untrue; true in a minor sense, untrue in a major sense.

It is true that as a rule responsible editors do not order "fakes" and do try to keep them out of their papers. Nevertheless, the "spirit of the office" in every newspaper is such as to encourage "faking" by reporters and correspondents. When the reporter learns that only "interesting news stories" are acceptable, he is apt to take pains to make his news "interesting" whether the facts warrant it or not. When he learns that news stories so told as to harmonize with "the policy of the paper" yield laurels to the writer, while the unvarnished truth is put

to shame, he is apt to fall into the habit of writing up (or down) to "the policy of the paper." And in this tendency he is not discouraged provided he "turns in good copy." Again, it is true that only a few newspapers are run as adjuncts to stock-jobbing operations. But the more important fact is also true, that most newspapers can be influenced by subtle and secret though well known coercive methods to respond to the demands of stock-jobbing whenever occasion requires. How many of the Chicago papers, for instance, could escape the ramifying "business" influences of the Chicago banks, if any stock-jobbing scheme in which the Chicago banks are interested were at stake? Yet only one Chicago paper is actually run by a banker. Deliberate lying in news reports for the purpose of misrepresentation is indeed not the practice of newspapers of standing. But it is the history of most newspapers of present standing—and every newspaper man of experience knows it—that they do promote policies and objects surreptitiously by means of fanciful descriptions, ingenious insinuations, and deliberate suppressions. There are very few newspapers in the United States that can be depended upon in emergencies to direct their course by journalistic considerations—not even by the low ideals of the business office; much less by the higher but less profitable ones, it may be, of the editorial chair. When great interests are at stake, almost any newspaper in the country must yield to influences entirely alien to the primary obligations which every newspaper owes to its readers.

One of the best citizens of Chicago is William Kent (a man of rich endowments, not only as to private fortune but also as to private character and public spirit), who recently delivered an uplifting lecture on civic duties before the City Government Club of Yale University. Mr. Kent once served the city of Chicago courageously and efficiently as an alderman, and

he continues to serve it as a thoughtful and watchful citizen who peculiarly deserves the title of "Man-not-afraid." In his Yale address he disclosed a good deal of social philosophy that would be distinguished for "scatter," were that vice distinctive in these days of induction worship; and he was not as careful as he might have been, and as we are sure he would wish to be, about some of his facts. His "scatter" was quite altruistic, however, and by no means wholly devoid of good sense; for he urged his youthful hearers to find the good in such discordant things as socialism, anarchism, the single tax idea, etc., and advised them "at any rate to go at them all open-mindedly and work with the good they found in each."

It would be interesting to know why Mr. Kent clings to the perverted meaning of "laissez faire," which implies that legal privilege must be let alone. Manifestly the true meaning of the principle is to abolish legal privilege and then let things alone—in other words, to remove artificial economic obstructions and let nature take her course. Even more interesting would it be to know what Mr. Kent alluded to when he said that in parts of Russia land tenures are adjusted on the single tax basis. Probably this allusion was to some of the Russian communes where a primitive land communism persists. But primitive land communism is no more like the single tax than a locomotive is like a baby's go-cart. Locomotives and go-carts move upon wheels, but there the resemblance ends; primitive communism and the single tax recognize equality of right to the soil, but there their resemblance ends. Evidently Mr. Kent has not thought enough of the single tax, of anarchism, or of socialism to warrant his talking out in meeting very often about any of them. But he does aim to be fair, and that is much. His admonition to the students to avoid fear of names, was excellent; and there was courage as well as wisdom and fairness in

his condemnation of the current ignorant and malevolent attacks upon anarchism as a propaganda of high crimes. Crude, also, as is his conception of the single tax idea, he nevertheless exhibited a tolerant disposition by acknowledging that equal rights to the earth are inherent rights, even though he did tack on the questioning proviso of the University cult, "if there are any such things as inherent rights."

But there are worse failings in the active public men of our time than crudity of thought, and Mr. Kent is singularly free from most of them. However crude and superficial he may in some respects have been in his somewhat immature Yale address to minds not altogether mature nor exactly well informed, his face is turned in the right direction. He looks toward the rising sun of democracy, and for that attitude much of defective-detail may be forgiven. It is with great satisfaction that we quote his opening sentence:

There is no more tiresome platitude urged by those who expound government than that democracy is on trial. Besides being a platitude, it is a falsehood. For democracy is no more on trial than the law of gravitation. It is the ultimate truth. And just as the child may come to grief in his experiments with the law of gravitation, so we may come to grief in trying, in our unripeness, to practice democracy. It is we who are on trial, and not the only theory of government that can long subsist.

There is more sound social philosophy in that compact paragraph of Mr. Kent's than in a whole college course of what sometimes passes for sociology.

THE NEW YORK PLATFORM.

Judge Parker's platform, adopted by the New York convention this week, is a marvel; it says so little in such few words. Bourke Cockran calls it "a string of platitudes." But that is not wholly just, for each platitude is a gem after its own kind. Not a solitary one could excite hostility in the most discordant company. Abounding in generalities and abhorring specifications, its im-

portant words are weasel words which may mean anything you want or nothing at all, as you please. One writer describes its brevity well as the brevity not of wit but of dodge.

Nothing is so significant of poverty as to policies of the Democratic party in New York, as Judge Parker's teeter-totter platform. Its true inwardness is more than hinted at by Mr. Bryan when he refers to it as an attempt to work "a confidence game upon the public."

Perhaps a brief consideration of the planks seriatum of this "razzle-dazzle" platform may be worth while.

The first plank is refreshingly brave in stating what nobody denies:

1. This is a government of laws, not of men; one law for Presidents, cabinets, and people; no usurpation; no executive encroachment upon the legislative or judicial departments.

Excellent. But with whom will that declaration raise a political issue? Who has usurped, and how? Who has encroached, and when? While men of all parties agree to the principle, all might not agree as to the application of the principle to specific controversies. But no specific controversies are named.

Next.

2. We must keep inviolate the pledges of our treaties; we must renew and reinvigorate within ourselves that respect for law and that love of liberty and of peace which the spirit of military domination tends inevitably to weaken and destroy.

Precisely. Likewise we must be good and true and beautiful in our lives. But who denies any of it? Where is the issue?

Next.

3. Unsteady national policies and a restless spirit of adventure engender alarms that check our commercial growth. Let us have peace, to the end that business confidence may be restored, and that our people may again in tranquillity enjoy the gains of their toil.

"Restless spirit of adventure" is probably a veiled allusion to Roosevelt; but you can't make an issue of that. Roosevelt's own party would agree to the sentiment; but they would see nothing in it condemnatory either of them-

selves, of their candidate or of their policies.

Next.

4. Corporations chartered by the State must be subject to just regulation by the State in the interest of the people; taxation for public purposes only; no government partnership with protected monopolies.

But what would be "just regulation"? What are the non-public purposes for which taxation is objected to? What is meant by government partnership with protected monopolies? Anybody may have his own opinion about it, but how can he tell from this vague general declaration that Judge Parker's opinion is the same as his?

Next.

5. Opposition to trusts and combinations that oppress the people and stifle healthy industrial competition.

That plank reads as if it had been written by one of Hearst's editors and revised by one of Rockefeller's lawyers. But what does it mean? Opposition to an evil without method of opposition, amounts to nothing even when sincere. When insincere it is bunco.

Next.

6. A check upon extravagance in public expenditures, that the burden of the people's taxes may be lightened.

What is meant by extravagance? Who has been extravagant and how? Is it, for instance, the Republican party? The platform does not say so. Does it consist, for instance, of collusive transactions with railroad monopolies, of river and harbor appropriations, or of army and navy and pension expenditures? The platform does not say so.

Next.

7. Reasonable revision of the tariff; needless duties upon imported raw materials weigh heavily upon the manufacturer, are a menace to the American wage earner, and by increasing the cost of production shut out our products from the foreign markets.

What is "reasonable" revision of the tariff? What are "needless" duties? Why confine the abolition of needless duties to raw materials? Is it the McKinley and Dingley idea of reasonable revision and of what is needless in the way of duties? Or is it Henry George's? If it is Judge

Parker's, pray what may be his idea of a "needless" duty and a "reasonable" revision?

Next.

8. The maintenance of State rights and home rule; no centralization.

State rights! Home rule! About what? Everyone favors State rights and home rule, except in so far as they are inconsistent with his own idea of the sphere of national rights and the scope of central authority. Where do these office-hungry platform builders draw the line?

Next.

9. Honesty in the public service, vigilance in the prevention of fraud; firmness in the punishment of guilt when detected.

Why not continue with "love of the neighbor, obedience to God and abhorrence of the devil and all his works"? When platform-makers are generalizing with a view to avoiding friction, they ought to take advantage of the opportunity to make their creed as comprehensive as is consistent with the greatest harmony.

Next.

10. The impartial maintenance of the rights of labor and of capital; no unequal discrimination; no abuse of the powers of law for favoritism or oppression.

That word "unequal" appears to have the lonesome merit of really meaning something. It must mean something, or it wouldn't have been used to qualify "discrimination." We are unable, however, to guess what it does mean unless it implies that Judge Parker stands for "equal discrimination," which is all the more commendable for being difficult. But with that flash of meaning the platform is enveloped again in the darkness of undisputed and indisputable generalities. Who is there that does not favor "impartial maintenance of the rights of labor and of capital"? Who that does favor "abuse of the powers of law for favoritism or oppression"? On that plank all the hostile industrial forces might indeed gather in perfect harmony, but only to begin quarrelling at the first inquiry as to what are the rights of labor and of capital and what is abuse of law in labor matters.

All things in general to all men

and nothing in particular to anybody, those declarations are what Bryan intimates, an alluring "ad." for a confidence game. Under the circumstances of the great issues that confront the American people, it is an insult to the most ordinary intelligence of citizenship to offer them as a political platform. The man who, under those circumstances, could stand upon such a platform without uneasiness and loss of self-respect, must be as little in moral dignity as the men who could be fooled into supporting him with their votes must be lacking in common sense.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

AUSTRALIA.

Melbourne, Victoria, March 3.—We have passed through the throes of our Commonwealth election and are now just approaching the State elections. Our leader in Victoria, Mr. Max Hirsch, was defeated, as you know, for the Federal House of Representatives, though he did remarkably well against a fairly strong local opponent and sitting member, and we think would have been returned but for the fact of it's being harvest time—and this a very heavy one. That prevented the farmers from voting, as they would have done at any other time of the year. It was, of course, foreseen by our Protectionist ministry and arranged accordingly. Mr. Hirsch depended to a great extent upon this vote, and it failed him for the reason stated.

Many single-taxers here (myself among the number) were sorry that he should deem it necessary in the interest of the Free Trade party to throw up his State representative and seek the suffrages for the Federal House, especially so as the State House is the body which will have to bring in land values taxation if it is to come.

I say "if it is to come," for we have many times thought it must, but still it has not. For the first time it is now placed in the programme of one of the parties—the Opposition. When it passed the House under Sir George Turner's premiership it was not a Government proposition until forced on in the House, and of course our upper (or landlord's) House threw it out. It is now undoubtedly ripe for the position it holds in the platform of the Opposition, as there is scarcely any one except the large landed proprietary who does not advocate or agree that it should be given a trial. But of course the aforesaid landlords' House stands in the way, and we yet lack a majority willing to fight for right against might.

Qualifications for the lower House have been lowered, and this renders the

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, April 21.

probability of passing measures demanded by the people much greater than before. There is also a clause in the new constitution providing that if certain legislation is twice demanded by the people as shown by the return of a majority of men pledged to a programme, then in the event of the Upper House still refusing, there shall be a joint sitting and on failure to agree a double dissolution and appeal to the country.

In the Federal House a great number of the members are single-taxers or strong advocates of land values taxation. Their policy is to endeavor to cause a shortage in the State revenues so as to compel a resort to direct taxation, and with this object they have prevented the Commonwealth from going into the loan market. Of course the fiscal issue has been the burning question since the foundation of the Commonwealth, and through the overwhelming Protectionist vote in Victoria that party has managed to secure a working majority in the House of Representatives—the House of initiative—though in the present parliament as a whole the Free Trade party have a majority.

But the parties are so close in the representation that nothing can be done. There is a triangular duel between the Ministry, the Opposition, and the Labor party—all fairly equal in strength. What the outcome is to be is just now of special interest. My own opinion is that if a coalition takes place between the Ministry and the Opposition (as the papers are advising), as against the Labor party, there will be defections from both sides which may give the Labor party a majority.

W. M. TRUEBRIDGE.

Sydney, N. S. W., Mar. 17.—Although Max Hirsch was defeated in Victoria for a seat in the Commonwealth parliament, we of New South Wales elected three single taxers: Edmund Lonsdale, for the New England Electorate; W. E. W. E. Johnson, for Lang, and W. H. Lee, for Cowper. In this State the free-traders simply swept the polls, returning 19 out of 26 for the Commonwealth House of Representatives, and 6 out of 6 for the Senate. The Commonwealth elections generally resulted in decidedly nailing down Chamberlain's coffin. The Opposition are against him because he is a protectionist, and the Labor party because he is an imperialist "Jingo." And these parties together form about a three-fourths majority.

J. R. FIRTH.

The real heroes do not always wear solemn faces, and do not generally deal in big words. A soldier going into battle (he was doubtless a Frenchman) found his knees trembling under him. "Shake away, old legs!" said he, "you would shake worse if you knew where I'm going to take you!"—Springfield (Mass.) Republican.

Since the sinking of the Russian flagship Petropavlovsk, with Admiral Makaroff and nearly all his officers and men on board (p. 24), there have been news dispatches in abundance regarding the Russo-Japanese war, but they have transmitted very little news. It appears to be certain that Verestchagin, the famous peace painter of war pictures, who was at the time a guest of the Russian admiral on board the ill-fated flagship, went down with the rest. But there is no certainty that the rumors of other disasters to the Russian fleet are true. From St. Petersburg it is reported with a strong show of probability that the Russian viceroy, Alexieff, who is said to have been chiefly responsible for plunging Russia into the war, has asked to be relieved. The reason given is that his bitterest enemy, Admiral Skrydloff, was appointed to succeed Makaroff in supreme command of the Russian fleet in the East.

Russia has become involved in further international difficulties by notifying neutral governments that newspaper correspondents who report movements of Russian warships and troops by wireless telegraphy will be shot as spies. The notice as received at Washington is reported from there as follows:

In a case where neutral steamers having on board correspondents who might communicate war news to the enemy by means of perfected apparatus not being yet foreseen by existing conventions, would be arrested near the coast of Kuantong or in the zone of operations of the Russian fleet, the correspondents will be looked on as spies and the steamers furnished with wireless telegraphy seized as prizes of war.

This is regarded as a direct menace to the corps of the London Times, whose chief makes the following declaration from Weihaiwei on the 18th by wireless telegram:

I possess a system of wireless telegraphy which, even if messages were not veiled by cipher, neither a Japanese nor Russian instrument could record. Messages go to the central cable office, thence to London, no one having access to them. I have never yet sailed in Russian

waters. All my messages are sent from the high seas and neutral waters. All fighting on shore which was witnessed could have been placed with neutral cables after five hours' steaming. Information has been conveyed to me that Russia threatens to treat correspondents using wireless telegraphy at sea as spies. As the London Times is the only journal which employs this means of communication, this is a direct threat upon the ship system directed by me. It behooves me, therefore, to inform the world at large of the course I am pursuing and call upon the several governments interested to protect their citizens who are in the employment of the Times. The definition of a spy in international law is one who disguises his true identity and insinuates himself within hostile territory for the purpose of communicating with the enemy. If I had insinuated myself in Russian waters and I had communicated with the Japanese I might come within this category, but I am guilty of neither.

News of American politics (p. 26) for the week relates chiefly to the Democratic convention of New York, which met at Albany on the 18th. The convention was securely under the control of David B. Hill. Only routine business was done at the day session, but in the evening a platform was adopted and the delegates to the national convention were placed under the unit rule and "instructed to present and support Alton B. Parker for the Presidential nomination. No opposition was made to the platform nor to the unit rule, but the instruction for Parker was opposed vigorously. A minority of the committee on resolutions offered an amendment recommending Judge Parker, but leaving the delegates "free to take such action at St. Louis as a majority thereof may consider most likely to insure the success of the candidates selected by the national convention." Speeches in support of this amendment were delivered by Senator Grady and Congressman Bourke Cockran. It was opposed in a speech by Senator McCarren, of Brooklyn, the chairman of the resolutions committee. When David B. Hill arose at the close of Mr. Cockran's speech the crowd supposed he intended to reply, but he merely moved that the vote be taken. This was promptly ordered, and the instruction for Parker came off victorious, the amendment being defeated by 301 to 149. There was no motion to

make the result unanimous. The delegates at large are David B. Hill, Edward Murphy, Jr., James W. Ridgeway, and George Ehret, the latter being a Tammany man.

An effort to secure instructions for Parker from the Pennsylvania convention failed. It was made and fought out in the committee on resolutions at Harrisburg on the 19th, the day the convention met. But the committee rejected the instruction clause, and there was no attempt to override their report in the convention. The same disposition was made by the Oregon convention on the 19th of a resolution instructing for Mr. Hearst. In New Mexico, however, the delegates were instructed for Hearst on the 15th by a vote of 79 to 77; and in Nevada on the 20th the State central committees of the Democratic and the Silver Republican parties perfected a Democratic fusion, and, deciding to hold no convention, chose delegates to the national convention and commended Mr. Hearst "as the champion of true Democracy." West Virginia did not instruct on the 20th, and refused to adopt the unit rule, which result is favorable to Hearst, who has a minority of the delegation.

For New Jersey the Democratic convention was held at Trenton on the 14th. After electing delegates and adopting the unit rule, a motion commending Judge Parker to the support of the delegates was offered. It was met with a substitute declaring that the delegates be not instructed, and during the consequent excitement the convention adjourned. On the question of contested seats all decisions were against the Hearst delegates, and these thereupon withdrew and organized a convention which named contesting delegates at large to the national convention and ordered an address to the people of the State. The regular delegates at large are James Smith, Jr., Robert Davis, Johnston Cornish and Howard Carrow. The contestants are Joseph R. Buchanan, Joseph Nowrey, E. L. Price and J. Clark Andres.

The situation with reference to the Democratic nominee as re-

vealed by the action of the States is now as follows:

	Delegates.
Hearst—New Mexico.....	6
South Dakota.....	8
Nevada.....	6
Total.....	20
Parker—New York.....	78
Total.....	78
Uninstructed—Pennsylvania.....	68
New Jersey.....	24
Oregon.....	8
Kansas.....	20
Rhode Island.....	8
West Virginia.....	14
Total.....	142

The action of Republican conventions up to the present date may be tabulated as follows:

Whole No. delegates.	No. elected.	For Roose-velt.	Uninstructed.
Alabama.....	22	8	4
Delaware.....	6	6	..
Florida.....	10	10	..
Georgia.....	26	26	..
Illinois.....	54	12	..
Iowa.....	26	2	2
Indiana.....	30	20	..
Kansas.....	20	18	..
Louisiana.....	18	2	..
Massachusetts.....	32	32	4
Michigan.....	28	2	2
Maine.....	12	12	..
Minnesota.....	22	20	..
Mississippi.....	20	10	2
Missouri.....	36	22	4
Montana.....	6	6	..
Nebraska.....	16	6	..
New York.....	78	50	28
North Carolina.....	24	2	..
Nevada.....	6	6	..
Ohio.....	46	22	..
Oregon.....	8	8	8
Pennsylvania.....	68	40	28
South Carolina.....	18	14	..
Tennessee.....	24	16	8
Texas.....	36	12	4
Utah.....	6	6	..
Virginia.....	24	24	..
Vermont.....	8	8	..
West Virginia.....	14	14	..
Wisconsin.....	26	2	..
Alaska.....	4	4	..
Arizona.....	6	6	..
New Mexico.....	6	6	..
Oklahoma.....	6	6	..
Indian Territory.....	6	6	..
Total.....	798	536	96

A significant episode in the Massachusetts convention of the Republicans was the disposition made of a resolution favoring commercial reciprocity with Canada. Eugene Foss has become widely known in New England as a Republican favoring this policy, which, though limited in concrete application, is advocated upon broad free trade principles. Before the convention Mr. Foss announced his purpose of offering a resolution in support of this policy and of becoming a candidate before the convention for delegate at large to the national convention upon the issue so raised. In carrying out his purpose he argued that the Republican party in Massachusetts is in danger of defeat unless something is done to satisfy Republican senti-

ment regarding tariff obstacles in the way of trade with Canada. A decrease of 5 per cent, he said, in the Republican vote of the State would place it in the Democratic column, and he contended that Canada reciprocity would avert this danger. At one time, say the dispatches, he appeared to have secured a large following among the delegates; but at the critical moment Senator Lodge took the platform, and, by an eloquent address urging harmony, stemmed the tide and carried many of these delegates with him. The resolution was overwhelmingly voted down, and Mr. Foss was defeated by a vote of 178 to 1,161 for his weakest competitor.

The Socialist party of Illinois met in convention at Peoria on the 17th and nominated a full State ticket, with John Collins at the head as candidate for governor. A struggle for the adoption of opportunist or immediate demands tending toward socialism, which failed in the convention of two years ago, scored a victory on this occasion by the close vote of 60 to 58.

An advance has occurred in the Colorado conflict between the militia and the judiciary (p. 25) over the military arrest of Charles H. Moyer, president of the Western Federation of Miners. The militia having refused to obey the writ of habeas corpus issued by an inferior judge, application for one was made on the 15th to the Supreme Court of the State. In issuing this writ the court announced that it did not thereby commit itself on the question of conflicting jurisdiction between the courts and the military, but would listen to argument on that point upon the return of the writ, the 21st. But Gen. Bell, in command of the State forces at Telluride, who has Moyer in custody and to whom the writ is addressed, made a formal statement on the 16th that unless specifically ordered by his superior military officer to do so he will absolutely refuse to produce Moyer before the Supreme Court. He contends that the military authorities are supreme in San Miguel county, and that neither the District Court nor the Supreme Court of the State can compel him to obey their mandates. An intimation

from the chief justice, however, that it would be wise to obey the writ, has resulted in Gen. Bell's producing his prisoner.

NEWS NOTES.

—Samuel Smiles, the celebrated author of "Self Help," died in London on the 16th at the age of 82.

—Charles B. Spahr, heretofore one of the editors of the Outlook, has become editor in chief of "Current Literature."

—A fire which swept the wholesale district of Toronto on the 20th is reported to have destroyed \$12,000,000 of property.

—Mrs. Sara Jane (Clark) Lippincott, famous as Grace Greenwood, died at New Rochelle, N. Y., on the 20th at the age of 80.

—The thirteenth annual continental congress of the national society of the Daughters of the American Revolution met at Washington on the 18th.

—William J. Bryan is to speak at the Second regiment armory, Washington boulevard and Curtis street, Chicago, on the 23d, his subject being "The New York Platform."

—An attempt on the part of the heirs of Philo S. Bennett to oust William J. Bryan as executor of the Bennett will (p. 9), was balked on the 15th by an adverse decision of the probate judge of New Haven.

—A dispatch of the 20th from Manila reports the sentence to five years' imprisonment of Vincent Lucban and his brother Cayelano Lucban, charged with conspiracy to overthrow the American government in the Philippines in 1900.

—Owing to the heavy demand upon the San Francisco Star for its trenchant articles on the Hearst candidacy, the publishers announce their issue of the 23d as a "Hearst number," of which they propose to print 50,000 extra copies.

—George Boeck, well known in Nebraska as a single-tax advocate, died in Kansas City on the 8th. The funeral services at Plattsmouth, Neb., were in charge of Judge J. C. Point, of Omaha, in compliance with Mr. Boeck's request that they should be conducted by a single-tax man.

—James H. Dillard, whose name has long been familiar to readers of The Public, has been offered the presidency of the State Industrial School at Ruston, La., an institution with about 800 students. Mr. Dillard has for many years occupied the chair of Latin literature at Tulane university, New Orleans.

—At the tenth annual meeting of the National Municipal League, to be held in Chicago April 27 to 29, the evening of the 27th, beginning at eight, is to be devoted to the subject of municipal taxation, with Lawson Prudy, of New York, as principal speaker. The meetings are

to be held at the Northwestern University building, 87 Lake street.

—A strike on the Hungarian State railways began on the 19th and on the 20th all traffic was consequently at a standstill. Railroad stations are guarded by troops and within a few hours after the strike began 950 railroad employes had been arrested. The strike is for an increase of wages claimed to have been promised by the Hungarian premier.

—The monthly statement of the United States treasury department (see vol. vi., p. 798) for March shows on hand March 31, 1904:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash.....	224,689,995.95
Total.....	\$374,689,995.95
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1903.....	384,394,275.58
Decrease.....	\$9,694,279.63

—John Turner, the English anarchist and labor unionist (p. 26), lectured to a large audience in Chicago on the 17th and has lectured at trade union meetings every night since. His engagements for the remainder of this week are at Workingmen's hall, Blue Island and W. 12th street, at eight on the 22d, and at Union hall, 55 North Clark street, at eight on the 23d.

—The British budget presented to Parliament on the 19th by Austen Chamberlain, chancellor of the exchequer, shows an increase of expenditures over estimates of \$15,035,000 and a shrinkage of receipts from estimates of \$13,620,000, making a gap of \$28,655,000 between the expectation and the realization for the year. It is proposed to meet this by an increased tax on incomes, tea and tobacco.

—The monthly treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government (see vol. vi., p. 794) for the nine months ending March 31, 1904, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff.....	\$199,495,446.63
Internal revenue.....	175,621,208.35
Miscellaneous.....	34,966,693.91
	\$410,082,748.89
Expenses:	
Civil and misc.....	\$104,371,627.68
War.....	88,060,168.35
Navy.....	75,000,187.54
Indians.....	8,119,943.03
Pensions.....	108,460,608.18
Interest.....	18,130,759.29
	\$402,143,334.07
Surplus.....	\$7,939,414.82

—"Theodore Denker," says the Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), "the last of the men who served on the jury which convicted the Haymarket anarchists, died April 8, an inmate of the State insane asylum at Elgin. The fact of Denker's death was kept a secret for several days by relatives. The other members of the jury are all dead, several of them, it is said, having met death under strange circumstances. Denker was sent to the insane asylum shortly after the anarchist trial. After being treated a year he was discharged, but

later developed signs of insanity and was again taken into custody."

—A favorable report was made on the 16th by the foreign relations committee of the United States Senate, upon the pan-American arbitration treaty, which obligates the United States, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Peru, Colombia, Argentina, the Dominican republic, Mexico, Hayti, Uruguay, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Chili, Ecuador, Salvador, Paraguay and Honduras, for the term of five years, to submit to arbitration of the court at The Hague all claims for pecuniary loss or damage which may be presented by their respective citizens and which cannot be amicably adjusted through diplomatic channels when such claims are of sufficient importance to warrant the expense of arbitration.

PRESS OPINIONS.

FREE SPEECH IN PHILADELPHIA.

(Phila.) North American Review (Ind.), April 13.—With the theories and utterances of the Goldman woman no intelligent person has any sympathy. When, however, the mere advertisement of her appearance is made a pretext for assaulding and humiliating law-abiding citizens, her views become innocent by comparison. The duty of the police is to preserve order and uphold the law. Neither one nor the other had been even threatened, and the arrests constituted an indefensible attack upon privileges guaranteed by the Constitution.

(Phila.) Inquirer (Rep.), April 13.—In preventing a known anarchist from inflaming an audience, possibly encouraging some half-crazed brain, to assassination, the cause of free speech does not suffer. No advocates of violence should be permitted to voice his or her views anywhere.

(Phila.) Public Ledger (Ind.), April 13.—Our social organization is not so insubstantial that it can be imperiled by a few visionary enthusiasts discussing "woman's emancipation" in the intervals of a Sunday evening concert. It is much more imperiled by the arbitrary exercise of power and the forcible suppression of that sense of liberty and of individual responsibility on which our existing institutions rest.

(Phila.) Record (Ind.), April 12.—Emma Goldman may be a dangerous person carrying about with her in her progress through the country an assortment of explosive beliefs which are liable to bring on mischief; but as long as Emma Goldman behaves herself and commits no overt act which should bring her within the reach of the criminal statutes, she is entitled to the exercise of free speech and to go about her business undisturbed.—[14th.] The best way to fight the anarchists is to give the people such fair, free and stable government as to do away with all sources of reasonable discontent. Anarchy is impossible where the inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are assured.

(Phila.) City and State (Ind.), April 14.—The masses of the people are gradually coming to understand what the educated classes have always known: that anarchism does not necessarily mean revolution by violence, and that by far the greater number of its advocates are peaceful people whose beautiful ideal of absolute individual liberty and self-government would, if ever attained, obviate the necessity of force. Emma Goldman is a trained nurse when at her home in New York, and her friends claim that the propaganda she preaches does not promote disorder or advocate the violent overthrow of present forms of government. Whether or not this claim is true, is not pertinent to the

present case. The lecture announced for last Sunday evening was not on the subject of anarchism, and, when the authorities prohibit a discussion of a harmless subject simply because the lecturer holds views on another subject which they think is wrong, they commit an act contrary to the fundamental principles of human liberty as embodied in our bill of rights. It is by such methods that the police of continental Europe have turned the peaceful propaganda of such men as Proudhon and Tolstol into the bomb-throwing anarchism which has taken the lives of rulers and is believed to threaten the stability of existing governments. If our free institutions are ever to be seriously threatened by this revolutionary element, it will be because American officials follow the example of the Philadelphia director of public safety in his efforts to suppress free speech. This is "Philadelphia Anarchy" in its most abhorrent form.

THE PRESIDENCY.

The Commoner (Dem.), April 15.—No wonder Judge Parker has remained silent. It is not a question of judicial ethics that restrains him; it is the fact that he cannot discuss the great questions now pressing for solution without alienating either the voters upon whose suffrages he must rely, or the financiers from whom his campaign fund is to come. It would be a reflection upon the intelligence of the party to think that its members could be brought to the support of an aspirant who not only refuses to give utterance to his opinions, but places his campaign in the hands of men known to be hostile to the interests and rights of the common people.

(Newkirk, Oklahoma) Democrat-Herald (Dem.), April 15.—The West will do well to support Hearst in preference to Judge Parker. Hearst may not be strong enough to capture the nomination, but his friends could compel the convention to accept a compromise candidate.

Cole County (Mo.) Daily Democrat (Dem.), April 19.—We should greatly prefer a democratic Democrat like Tom Johnson, of Ohio, or Lucius F. C. Garvin, of Rhode Island—or even Edward M. Shepard, of New York. But as between "Hot-time" Hearst, Putty Parker and Teddy of the Tombstone Teeth, we believe the nation would do about as well with Hearst as any of them, and a whole sight better. But at the present writing we are for Cockerell, of course. And, after Cockerell—may the Lord give us strength to bear it, whatever it may be!

THE SINGLE TAX IN GREAT BRITAIN.

London Daily News (Lib.), March 12.—The great thing is that the principle of the assessment and rating of land values has been affirmed by the House of Commons, and from this point there can be no going back. Yesterday's vote is, to our thinking, comparable in importance with the historic vote that swept away the Corn Laws. It marks the beginning of a new chapter in the handling of the land question, and the land question goes down to the very roots of the question of the condition of the people.

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. 36 of that publication.

Washington, April 11-16, 1904.

Senate.

Consideration of the post office appropriation bill was continued on the 11th (p. 4870) and 12th (p. 4872), when the bill with amendments was passed (p. 4877). On the latter day the Senate bill for the temporary government of the canal zone of Panama

was considered (p. 4882). Its consideration was continued on the 13th (p. 4943), 14th (p. 4991), and the 15th (p. 5066), when it was passed (p. 5079). The sundry civil bill was then taken up, but was not under consideration on the 16th.

House.

River and harbor improvements were under consideration on the 11th (p. 4828), and the bill was passed (p. 4846). No business of general interest was transacted on the 12th; but on the 13th the bill for the civil government of the Philippine Islands was discussed (p. 4972). Its discussion being continued on the 14th (p. 5113), when it was passed (p. 5018). Thereupon the general deficiency appropriation bill was taken up (p. 5024), and was further considered on the 15th (p. 5095) and 16th (p. 5151).

Record Notes.

Speech of Representative John Lind on shipping between the United States and the Philippines (p. 4798). Speech of Representative Granger on the cost of living and the condition of labor (p. 4855). Text of Senate bill for temporary government of the canal zone at Panama (p. 4881), and of majority and minority reports thereon of the committee on Inter-oceanic canals (p. 4881). Speech of Senator Patterson on Chinese exclusion (p. 4927). Text of exonerating report on charges of corruption against Senator Dietrich, of Nebraska (p. 5000). Speech of Senator Gorman on post office appropriation bill (p. 4658). Speech of Representative Cockeran on pensions to veteran soldiers (p. 5040). Speech of Representative Baker on who has the prosperity, the President's railroad accommodations, etc. (p. 5055). Speech of Representative Williams, of Illinois, on civil government of the Philippines (p. 5112). Speech of Representative Goldfogge on Russian abuse of American passports (p. 5115). Speech of Representative Emerich on Russian outrages on Jews (p. 5121). Text of minority and majority reports of House committee on post office scandal (p. 4912). Representative Baker's amendment providing to repay railroad companies for "deadheading" the President (p. 5153).

MISCELLANY

AN OLD-FASHIONED RHYME.

For The Public.

The following touching tribute to the virtues of a humble neighbor was composed by an English landlord about the middle of the last century. On account of the excellent moral conveyed, the verses had a considerable circulation in the Sunday school and other juvenile literature of that period. They were committed to the memory of John Hawkins' grandson in 1880 or thereabouts, from the pages of a small periodical called, if I remember correctly, The Catholic Youth's Magazine. In these days, when contentment and cheerful submission to the plans of Providence seem to be confined almost entirely to our upper classes, it is a pleasure to honor those shining traits which our progenitors were once proud to share with their betters without at the same time aspiring to share with them all the rest of creation. I should explain that my memory seems to be somewhat faulty regarding the latter part of the poem, and I am not prepared to say positively whether I read those last verses in the original lines or between them.

JAY HAWKINS.

There's honest John Hawkins, a hedger and ditcher,

Who, though he is poor, does not want to be richer;

For all such vain wishes in him are vented

By a fortunate habit of being contented.

Though cold be the weather and dear be the food,

John never is found in a murmuring mood; And this he is frequently heard to declare—

What he cannot prevent he will cheerfully bear.

"For why should I grumble?" he often has said,

"If I cannot get meat I can surely get bread,

And though fretting will make my calamities deeper,

It never will make bread and cheese any cheaper."

So he cheerfully toils at such tasks as are sent,

And whatever his fare he is always content.

O, I wish that some folks who are smarter and richer,

Would copy John Hawkins, the hedger and ditcher.

He lives in the village there on my estate, Whose improvement employs him early and late.

There live many other such people as he For whose livelihood they are indebted to me.

They have sense in their heads, they have strength in their hands,

But of what use would these be except for my lands?

So they humbly with me thank the Heavenly bounty

Which gave them stout muscles and me half a county.

They have built me a mansion with terraces fair

And towers rising gracefully high in the air;

To me every season they cheerfully yield Each man the first fruits of his flock or his field.

Their souls with mean envy are nowise distressed,

They just do the labor and I do the rest; No questions are asked how I came to be richer,

Thanks, largely, to Hawkins, the hedger and ditcher.

But soon in the future, a time I foresee, When this sweet state of things will far different be:

For Cobden and Bright and that pestilent crew

More mischief have done than they set out to do.

With specious pretense they encouraged the poor

To rebel against His God would have them endure,

And all the land over, wherever they went, They sowed the foul seeds of the weed Discontent.

Soon questions and arguments on every side

God's wise dispensations will boldly deride.

O, would that some folks who are smarter and richer

Were more like John Hawkins, the hedger and ditcher!

A DOLLAR REASON.

The taxation crank used to hold up a dollar to his audiences and say: "I will give this dollar to anyone who will give a good reason why you tax a man more for improving his lot than for holding it idle."

When the audience asked who was

to judge the goodness of the reason, he would say: "The man who gives the reason shall be the judge himself." Still nobody claimed the dollar, till one night a man said: "I can give a good reason."

"Give a good reason why you should tax a man more for improving land than for doing nothing with it?"

"Yes."

"Well, what is your reason?"

"We don't know any better," said the man.

"Here is your dollar."—Bolton Hall, in "Life" for Easter, 1904.

A BIG PROBLEM.

The entire East side in New York is in a state of rebellion against the landlords. This is the portion of the city in which the poorer classes live, and thousands of families are affected by the increased rates. Popular feeling against the landlords is so high that last week a mass meeting attended by more than 2,000 tenants was held for the purpose of discussing the question, and some very bitter speeches were made. Socialist agitators have taken advantage of the situation to prosecute a vigorous campaign in favor of their tenets, and the movement is rapidly gaining adherents. That the matter is serious is admitted by many conservative people, and Charles Sprague Smith, director of the People's Institute, calls for the creation of a municipal commission to inquire into the question of rents and suggest methods of ameliorating the condition of tenants.

The question naturally involves the whole problem of existence. It seems to be a fact that the condition of the common people in this generation is much superior to the conditions which prevailed in earlier times. Wages are higher, and people of the present day possess many more conveniences and comforts than were possessed by their ancestors. At the present moment, however, these conditions appear to be changing. There seems to be a retrogression. The cost of living appears to be increasing more rapidly than wages, and people in all ranks of life, the laboring classes most of all, but not alone, feel the effects. Some prices are high owing to temporary causes, but on the whole the tendency is upward, and it promises to continue.

There ought to be no halt in the steady improvement in the condition of the laboring classes, in which is included the larger portion of the race. If there is to be none, however, some means must be devised to counteract present tendencies. The problem is a great one:

and the situation of the East side tenants in New York shows that before a solution is obtained many are certain to suffer.—Editorial in Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of April 12.

HOW TOWNS DEVELOP UNDER OUR PRESENT LAND SYSTEM.

An extract from a private letter from a new town in the State of Washington, written under date of March 29, 1904.

One year ago in January last the first house was built here; the forest had just been cleared off. Now there are over 700 houses, six stores, one plumber's shop, one barber shop, two restaurants, one little church; also a school of 67 children (junior grade). All the older pupils for a distance of four miles go to —, where there are seven teachers. Mr. H—, who founded this town, owns all the land around here. He builds houses and sells on the installment plan—\$100 down, \$15 per month—city water, etc.

I began to talk single tax to him one day, and he said: "Why! I have some books on that subject. A friend who believes in it sent them to me. But I am so busy selling land I haven't time to read up the land question."

His office is near our house, and we see a crowd there from morning till night—Sundays especially—all coming to look for town and acre lots. Sometimes he opens up a tract with a big barbecue—roast ox, barrels of apples, bread by the hundreds of loaves, gallons of milk, and so forth, galore. There will be a crowd of 2,000 or 3,000, lots will go like hot cakes, and the next week the houses will begin to spring up.

It is just simply a kindergarten lesson on the land question, to watch developments in H— City, and it shows the hunger people have to own a bit of God's earth and a little home of their own.

The street car company is making a fine thing out of it. It is not the S— Electric that owns this line, but a Boston company, and they are very indifferent about the comfort and convenience of the people, simply because there is no opposition at present.

THE PROTECTIVE ARGUMENT.

"And now, fellow citizens," said the orator, "let me take up another question. They charge our protected industries with selling goods abroad at lower prices than they get for the same goods at home. They taunt us with this as though it were a crime. They challenge us to deny the fact. Why, gentlemen, we do not deny it. We admit it—nay, we boast of it! We glory in it!

"Consider the good we do in thus selling our goods abroad at the lowest possible prices. The poor, benighted pauper laborer of Europe, with wages cut down almost to the starvation point, is thus enabled to get some of the necessities and comforts of life of which he would otherwise be deprived. He could not afford to pay European prices, but he may possibly be able to pay American prices. Our policy, my friends, gives him a chance to live. It makes his unhappy lot a little brighter, tends to reconcile him to his situation, makes him less anxious to emigrate to America. By thus checking an influx of foreign labor to our shores, it diminishes competition here and enables us to keep up the high standard of wages now prevailing in our mines, factories and workshops. Is it not, therefore, a boon to American labor to sell the products of our protected industries cheaper abroad than at home?

"But they ask, if we can afford to sell goods in Europe, why do we need a tariff to sell them at home. Fellow-citizens, the answer is obvious. We need a tariff to keep these goods from coming back. Just suppose that some shrewd European operator, with hostile designs on American prosperity, should buy an enormous quantity of these goods at the low prices at which we sell them abroad and then send them back and dump them on our shores. What would be the result? American industries would be ruined. Mills, mines and workshops would be closed; millions would be driven out of employment and our people would be on the verge of starvation.

"But, fortunately, there is no danger of this. The size and enthusiasm of the audiences I have addressed in this campaign assure me that the magnificent system which permits us to sell goods at high prices at home and at low prices abroad will not be disturbed."

And when the speaker sat down he received an ovation.—William E. McKenna, in Puck.

TOM L. JOHNSON ON THE PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION.

Tom L. Johnson is emphatically and unequivocally not a candidate for the presidency of the United States. He made the announcement last evening and expressed the hope that it would not require repetition at any time during the campaign.

The impression had gone out that the peculiar resolutions adopted at the twentieth district convention Saturday were in the nature of an incipient boom for him, planned and executed by Charles

P. Salen. In these resolutions the candidacies of both Parker and Hearst were repudiated by the convention, and "one who truly reflects the Democratic conscience in both thought and action" was recommended for the "mantle of leadership." This veiled reference was taken by many of the delegates to mean Mr. Johnson, and the resolutions went through with a rush and hurrah.

But if the action was the result of Mr. Salen's zealotry in behalf of the mayor, it is certainly not appreciated at headquarters. In fact, Mr. Johnson is just a little resentful. "It is a positive injury to me to be mentioned in this connection," he said last evening. "I am quite sure that Mr. Salen understands quite as well as I do myself that I am in no sense a candidate, and it is foolish for anyone to believe that the passage of those resolutions bore any reference to me. If I thought they did, Charley Salen and I would fight right there. That's all there is to that."

"To whom do you take it that the resolutions refer?" the mayor was asked.

"To no one in particular, but in general to men who represent the true principles of Democracy. I do not consider that Judge Parker or David B. Hill or Grover Cleveland are in this class. They are imperialists and protectionists and would have the Democratic party as much like the Republican party as it is possible to make it and keep the two distinct."

"How about Hearst? He stands for the principles laid down by the last two conventions, doesn't he?"

"Possibly. But I do not care to discuss Mr. Hearst. I have said that I am not in favor of his candidacy, and that is as far as I care to go."

"Would you object to naming five or six men who come up to the requirements of the standard of Democracy as fixed by Mr. Bryan?"

"There are such men in the country, but I do not care to mention any of them at this time. There is one thing I will say and that is that I do not think the next nominee of the party should come from Ohio. This State has furnished enough presidential timber in the last twenty-five years. We should give some other States a chance. There are some good men in the West, who stand for right principles and have the nerve to put their theories into execution, who would invite the support of every conscientious and thoughtful man in the nation. We do not want a man who is playing hand in glove with the Republican party. We want a man who is a Democrat at heart and is the enemy of everything that tends to defeat or delay

the triumph of the principles of the party.

"They call us the 'radical' Democracy. That's the wing of the party I belong to, the 'radical' wing. But this wing, radical or not, happens to be in strict accord with the real principles of democracy as opposed to the doctrines of paternalism and imperialism. If this be 'radicalism,' then I am 'radical' and trust that I may always remain so. As I have said, the tendency of the Cleveland wing of the party is to drift away from these principles and embrace the very thing to which real Democrats stand unalterably opposed. Cleveland's indorsement of Parker should be sufficient to blast his chances of nomination in any Democratic convention. The Democratic party in its platforms of the last eight years has said for what it stands and to what it is opposed. The party at the convention at St. Louis should select a man who can stand flatly upon the platforms of '96 and 1900, and who measures well up to the requirements of the presidency of the United States. There are such men in the country, but they are not to be found among those who have, so far, been prominently named for the office."—Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 18.

LETTER OF ADVICE AND APOLOGY TO A CHICAGO CRIMINAL.

With apologies to the London Speaker of February 13, 1904, for liberties taken for purposes of local adaptation.

My Dear Ormond: Nothing was further from my thoughts. I had imagined you knew me well enough—and, for the matter of that, all your mother's family—to judge me better. Believe me, no conception of blaming your profession entered my mind for a moment. Whether there be such a thing as "theft in the abstract" I should leave it to metaphysicians to decide; in practical affairs everything must be judged in its own surroundings.

It was not stealing I denounced, or theft—I care not by what name you call it—it was not burglary (to give the matter a technical title); it was lack of judgment, sudden actions due to nothing but impulse, and what I think I may call "the speculative side" of our life.

You have not, as yet, any great responsibilities. No one is dependent upon you—you have but yourself to provide for; but you must remember that such responsibilities will arrive in their natural course, and that if you form habits of rashness or obstinacy now they will cling to you through life. We are all looking forward to a cer-

tain event when Anne is free again; in plain English, my boy, we know your loyal heart, and we shall bless the union; but I should feel easier in my mind if I saw you settled into one definite branch of the profession before you undertook the nurture of a family.

Adventure tempts you because you are brave, and something of the poet in you leads you to unusual scenes of action. Well, youth has a right to its dreams, but beware of letting a dangerous Quixotism spoil your splendid chances.

Take for example your breaking into Mr. Cowl's house. You may say Mr. Cowl was not a journalist, but only a reviewer; the distinction is very thin, but let it pass. You know and I know that the houses of none in any way connected with the daily press should ever be approached. It is plain common sense. The journalist comes home at all hours of the night. His servant is often up before he is a-bed. Do you think to enter such houses unobserved?

Again, in one capacity or another the journalist is dealing with our profession all day long. Some he serves and knows as masters, others he is employed denouncing at about five dollars the 1,500 words; others again it is his business to interview and to pacify or cajole in political combines and the social clubs—do you think he would not know what you were if he found you in the kitchen with a dark lantern?

There is another peril—I mean that of alienating friends. Mr. Cowl is an imperialist of a very unemphatic type, I know; he wears (as you will say) gold spectacles and has a nervous cough, but he is an imperialist. I never said that it was wrong or even foolish to alienate such a man. I said that a great and powerful section of opinion thought it a breach of honor in one of our craft to do it. Do not run away with the first impression my words convey. Believe me, I weigh them all.

There has been so much misunderstanding that I hardly know what to choose. Take those watches. I did not say that watches were "a mere distraction." You have put the words into my mouth. What I said was that watches, especially watches at a Democratic meeting, were not worth the risk. Of course, a hatful of watches such as your Uncle Robert would bring home from fires, or better still such a load as your poor cousin Charles, obtained upon Hamilton day last year, has value. But how many gold watches are there, off the platform, at a Democratic meeting? And what possible chance have you on the platform? Now church and

purses, that is another thing, but your Jackson Day adventure was simply folly.

Who is this Astor son-in-law? I never heard of him! For heaven's sake don't get caught by a family connection. Do you know any of the servants? His butler or his secretary? The fellow who catalogues the library is useful. Do recollect that lots of the ornaments in those Lake Shore Drive houses are fastened to the wall. That is where your dear father failed, over the large Chinese jar in Indiana Ave. . . . Your mother would never forgive me if you were to get into another of your boyish scrapes.

Ormond, my dear lad, bear me no ill-will. It is true of every profession, of bar and of politics, of homicide, medicine, the army and navy—everything, that success only comes slowly, and that the experience of older men is the key to it.

To-morrow I am at leisure. Come and dine with me at the Union League club at 8 for 8:15. I will show you a magnificent little mosaic I picked up yesterday, and we will talk about the new prospectus.

Good-by and God bless you. (Dress.)
Your affectionate uncle,

GEORGE.

DEMOCRATIC SUCCESS.

Address of Gov. L. F. C. Garvin of Rhode Island, delivered before the Iroquois club, Chicago, April 13, 1904, on the occasion of the club's banquet in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Jefferson.

What are the elements essential to Democratic success? In seeking to answer this question, it should be understood that by success I mean not merely victory in the coming Presidential election, but that highest success which is lasting.

It is quite possible that we might win this election by making a bid for monopolistic support, but to defeat Mr. Roosevelt by such means would give only a temporary success; the offices gained by Democrats would prove to be an injury rather than a benefit to the American people, and eventually to the party itself. It is worse than useless to have two parties resting upon the same foundation—that of special privilege. Happily the Democratic party, has not enough cunning to serve a moneyed aristocracy, and at the same time lead the people to believe that it is serving them.

In other words, the Democratic party cannot succeed permanently upon dishonesty. This does not seem to be true of the Republican party. In Rhode Island the Republican State boss sold out the people to the principal street rail-

way of the State, of which Senator Aldrich was president, granting all that the corporation asked in the form of irrepealable laws, fixing the State tax forever at one per cent. of the gross receipts and the fares forever at five cents, and yet against this recreancy there has been no popular revolt. A similar union between the Republican party and the monopolistic corporations has long existed in the nation, and the people so far have done nothing more than grumble.

The Republican party has been likened to a shrewd knave who does things; and the Democratic party to a well-meaning blunderer. There is too much truth in this description. But there is more hope that a man in adversity will correct his blunders than that one who is prospering by his villainy will reform himself.

The Democratic party without a moral issue is helpless. This was our great difficulty in 1896. The common people, influenced by the talk of a 50 cent dollar, were led to believe that the moral side of the paramount issue was held by the Republican party.

And under any circumstance the money question is likely to be a losing one for Democrats. The people cannot understand it. The comparatively few who have an acquaintance with its practical phases are the bankers and other beneficiaries; and they, as members of the Republican party, can persuade and, when necessary, coerce, the multitude to take their view of the pending financial issues.

For the Democratic party to attempt to imitate Republican methods is to fail; and this accounts in a large degree for our past defeats. Where our opponents depend for their success upon the expenditure of money legitimately and corruptly, we must rely upon the enthusiasm of the people in behalf of the principles we expound.

Upon the foundation of honesty in all our dealings with the people we must lay the corner stone of Jeffersonian Democracy—which is equal rights.

The principle of equal rights, when applied to the obstruction of trade by tariff taxes, means in practice under present conditions:

First, an enlargement of the free list. All articles sold abroad at less prices than at home must be admitted free of duty. Along with this, in order that no manufacturing industry may be handicapped, raw materials must also enter free.

Secondly, a Democratic reciprocity should be invited between this country and all other parts of the Western Hemisphere, by the passage of a law open-

ing our ports to any and every American country at the moment of its reciproca-tion.

The Jeffersonian principle of equal rights applied to the trusts means not merely publicity, or national license for interstate trade, or other attempts at restriction, but deprivation of all monopoly. In addition to the removal of tariff monopoly it means the repeal of all laws, both State and national, which grant special privileges, and the substitution for them of a few simple and just enactments which shall leave to everyone what he earns.

The same Jeffersonian doctrine, set forth by the founder of our party in the great Declaration, should be applied to our foreign policy. So applied it means peaceful and friendly relations with other nations, and the right of self-government to other peoples—especially to those Islanders whom we are treating as subjects and dependents.

President Roosevelt, aside from his horrible foreign policy, his reckless disregard of national and international law, and his apparent ignorance of the laws of political economy, seems really desirous of serving the people of the United States. He is the idol of that majority of the Republican party which at heart is democratic. But these, his ardent Republican supporters, have nothing to do with the policy of that party, which is determined by the trusts and their "general managers of the United States," many of whom are to be found in the national Senate. However well intentioned the acting President may be, he is made helpless by his surroundings to protect the people, or to institute any real reform in their behalf. On the contrary, if his administration be continued for another four years, more and more will wealth in this country be concentrated in a moneyed aristocracy.

Only through the opposition party, the Democracy, whose leaders in the main are sincere opponents of monopoly, is there any hope of wresting our government from the control of the self-seeking and unscrupulous few, and restoring it to its original and intended function of serving all, and all alike.

The present duty of Jeffersonian Democrats in all sections of the country is, first, to make plain the common ground of principle upon which they stand, and then to act as a unit.

The diagnosis of an obscure disease in an extremely complex organization is beset with the greatest difficulty. It is essential to get to the root of the matter. The basis of society is

man, and land. When, therefore, we find society afflicted with ills, since it is not practicable to alter the nature of man or land, the conclusion must be that the laws of relation of the one to the other are not just.—Evelyn Ansell, in Westminster Review for March, 1904.

THE PRAYER OF WAR.

Lord, be on our side,
Where our war banner floats,
And help us cut
All our enemies' throats!

To dash out the brains
Of their offspring and then
Lay in ashes their cities—
Amen, and Amen!
—Atlanta Constitution.

The cost of building one battleship like the Oregon is equal to the value of all the land and all the 94 buildings of Harvard university, plus the whole endowment of Hampton Institute; and the average time of efficiency of a battleship is only 13 years.—Report of speech by Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead.

"What is your idea of a statesman?"

"Well," answered Senator Sorghum, "in my opinion, the successful statesman is the man who finds out what is going to be done and then lifts up his voice and shouts for it."—Washington Star.

"Although I have granted you this interview," said the pompous new officeholder, "I don't want people to think I'm in the habit of talking for publication."

"They won't," replied the reporter, "when they see these remarks in print."
—Philadelphia Ledger.

BOOKS

ETHICS OF DEMOCRACY.

The first of a series of articles on "Christianity in the Modern World," appearing in the Contemporary Review, was noticed in The Public several weeks ago. In the second article, which appeared in the January number of this review, the author, with the same clearness and candor shown in the first article, comes to the consideration of the ethical aspect of modern social problems. What he says on a certain point is full of interest and importance, because it expresses very fairly the present attitude of many, perhaps of most, intelligent men who are giving thought to the stage of development in economic thought at which we have arrived. The quotation is somewhat long, but it is worthy of close attention:

"We stand to-day, then," writes Mr. Cairns, "if the argument be sound,

in this position. The old régime of pure 'laissez faire' has been proved impracticable. Its intellectual basis has been undermined, many of its inevitable consequences have outraged the conscience of all civilized and Christian States, and all of them to a greater or lesser degree have set about the task of producing a better order by means inconsistent with its principles. But the opposing ideal of a cooperative commonwealth is also impracticable. Civilized man has got beyond 'laissez faire'; he is not ready for the cooperative commonwealth. Freedom is no solution, but force is no remedy; and therefore, as has been said, we find the same unrest and anarchy in the economic sphere as we have found in the religious world. Society in our time is—

'Wandering between two worlds, one dead,
The other powerless to be born,'

and experiences all the misery and unrest of such a state to the full.

"Shall it go back to the régime of pure competition with its enormous disparities of wealth, its women and child-slaves, its ruthless exploitation of the lower races? Surely to retrace its steps thus would not be to get any nearer to the City of God. Shall it plunge forward into a new social order in which the means of production are controlled by all, and each receives an amount of the proceeds in accordance with his 'needs,' and wealth and poverty are alike extinguished? Even those who feel most keenly the wrongs of the present order and the rights of the deserving poor may feel that such an issue would be fraught with more evil than good. Shall we then be content with the 'status quo,' with its 'submerged tenth,' its many millions who, as we have been recently told, live just above the hunger line, its increasing class antagonisms, its economic anarchy and instability? Surely none of these courses is possible, and yet it is difficult to see any other."

These serious questionings of an earnest mind as to the uncertainty of what is to be done are as earnestly and candidly answered in the book at present under review ("Ethics of Democracy," by Louis F. Post, Moody & Co., New York and Chicago, \$2). If Mr. Post had read this passage, and had wished to make answer to the difficulties of so intelligent a thinker as Mr. Cairns, he could hardly have replied more effectively and directly than he has done in the central and essential thought of this book. In its pages Mr. Cairns might see why the old régime of laissez faire has not brought success. When he says that freedom is no solution, he would see that we have never tried freedom. When he charges enormous disparities of wealth and ruthless exploitation

to the fault of pure competition, he would see that we have never had pure competition. When he dreads the plunge into a new social order in which the means of production are controlled by all and wealth is distributed according to needs, he would see that there is a more practical and a juster way out of our troubles than by any vague cooperative commonwealth, which would not be a commonwealth if it were forced. He would see that there is an ideal of genuine democracy which he has omitted in his analysis—a democracy which is an expression of righteousness, whose ethics are in harmony with that great order of things in which mankind must march upward and onward.

"The democratic idea," says Mr. Post, "as applied to government demands that equality of fundamental rights be recognized as a natural endowment to be protected as a public duty." When Mr. Cairns sees that we have never had such recognition of the equality of fundamental rights, he would see that there is one solution which has not yet been tried, namely, the application of this truly democratic idea, which is as simple and practical as it is just.

Emerson once said that "the essence of greatness is the perception that virtue is enough." Speaking in the same general way, may we not say that the essence of social ethics is the perception that justice is enough? To show and develop this idea may be said to be the central purpose of Mr. Post's book.

A book dealing with such a theme necessarily touches the most interesting and vital features of modern life and work. Individual life, business life, economic tendencies and theories, are all affected by the democratic idea, and fall naturally within the scope of the present volume, which in parts is in the nature of a series of essays dealing with separate phases of contemporary thought. The chapters on the "College Graduate," "Success," "Justice or Sacrifice," "Department Stores," "The Rage for Trusts," "Free Competition," "Trial by Jury," "Partisanship," as well as others, lose none of their force by being read as separate essays. One chapter, the sixth of Part V., entitled "An Economic Exploration and Survey," will be found to be a valuable vade mecum on economic terms. The student will find there definitions of Land, Labor, Wealth, Value, Money and other words which have been so copiously disputed over. This chapter is accompanied by a diagram, which may help some—and the rest may skip it. The chapter is so clear that it needs no diagram, but as the Irishman said, if any want this diagram, then of course this is the diagram that they want.

It is impossible in a brief review to notice the many interesting side questions discussed in these chapters, but there are several which I should like to mention. Nowhere else have I seen the much used terms "optimism" and "pessimism" so satisfactorily dealt with. And the discussion is well worth while, for it has become the fashion, the moment a criticism is made, to cry "pessimism" and consider that that settles everything. Mr. Post does well to show so conclusively that much so-called optimism is spurious, and that one who finds fault with an existing condition or policy may be the best of optimists. In the same connection he shows that some apparent negations may be in reality affirmative, while some affirmations are negative. Falsehoods may be affirmed as well as truths.

Another important point that he makes deserves special attention at the present moment, because it concerns our whole system of education. "Economic scientists," says Mr. Post, "are so deeply absorbed in the contemplation of multitudinous and multifarious minor data that they often give but scant attention to familiar and simple major data. They cannot see the forest for the trees, nor the city for the houses." Many college men and students of educational problems are beginning to see that this criticism applies to other departments of study as well as to economics. The trouble arises from an abuse of a good thing. The scientific spirit of patient work in details is good; but it must not master the man instead of being mastered by the man. In almost every department of collegiate work to-day the man is the slave and not the master of this system. Hence the barrenness, the total absence of greatness, in any of the economic publications that come out of our universities. The scientific spirit has, falsely and sadly, come to mean a perpetual doom to detail, a deadening of the power of generalization, and a blindness to the relations of great facts and dominating principles.

A chapter that comes very near the heart of the book is the one entitled "Service for Service." In this and the preceding chapter, "Justice or Sacrifice," Mr. Post points out that justice is moral equilibrium, implying both giving and getting. "The business," he says, "that does not give an equivalent in service for the service it gets, is a plundering business; the business that does not get an equivalent in service for the service it gives, is a plundered business." Service for service is the true statement of the ethics of business and indeed of the normal relations among men; sacrifice implies superiority and inferiority, and is exceptional and special.

In the rendering of service for service, Mr. Post says, "the fact that the

service in one direction was rendered long before the service in the other, makes no difference," and he illustrates by the supposition of a note given to a farmer for produce, which is from time to time renewed and is finally paid to the grandson of the original payee. In thinking of this illustration with reference to the discussion of income from an investment in land, some readers will, we suspect, find occasion to deny any important distinction between the note handed down and a piece of land handed down. True, Mr. Post reiterates "that obligations to serve are essentially of two kinds—those which certify to exchange of service, and those which certify to a legal power of extorting service;" but it would perhaps have added to the effectiveness of his argument at this point if he had continued his illustration.

In conclusion we may venture to say that to those who believe that genuine democracy is genuine ethics, as well as to those who are searching earnestly to see whither the next step in economic history is to lead, this book is the most important that has appeared in recent years. Those who agree with the author will find previous arguments variously illustrated and enforced; those who disagree will find much to answer.

The publishers have done their share to make the book attractive. The type and paper are exceptionally satisfactory. Only one lapse in proof-reading has been observed, the omission of half a set of quotation marks on p. 63.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—Aladdin & Co. A Romance of Yankee Magic. By Herbert Quick, author of "In the Fairyland of America." New York: Henry Holt & Company. Price \$1.50. To be reviewed.

—The Mother Artist. By Jane Dearborn Mills (Mrs. James E. Mills). Introduction by Hannah Kent Schoff, President National Congress of Mothers. Boston: The Palmer company, 50 Bromfield street. Price \$1 net; postage 6 cents. To be reviewed.

—Social Progress. A Year Book and Encyclopedia of Economic, Industrial, Social and Religious Statistics, 1904. (Price, \$1 net.) Josiah Strong, Editor. New York: The Baker and Taylor Co., 33-37 East 17th street, Union Square North. To be reviewed.

PAMPHLETS.

In "A Sufficient Faith," the Rev. L. M. Powers, of Buffalo, makes a brief statement of modern Universalism. Not only does this pamphlet luckily present the dominant thought of the Universalists at the present time, but it embodies an interesting study of some of the profoundest problems of human life. Mr. Powers thinks with comprehensive mental grasp, and expresses his thought in charming literary form. Another pamphlet of his, "How to Be Happy," is a fine example of both qualities.

It is a sufficient recommendation of any pamphlet that it is from the pen of Edwin D. Mead, of Boston; and as Mr. Mead is above all things else an intelligent advocate of peace, the leaflet containing his address before the Mohawk Arbitration Conference of 1902 is no exception. His words about patriotism are especially pertinent

and suggestive. When he says that "the general public has got no further yet in this whole question of patriotism than that the gun is the natural symbol of it," he lays bare the most deplorable thing in modern national life.

PERIODICALS.

Two very attractive papers of the serious sort will be found in the Pacific Monthly (Portland, Ore.) for April. One is by William Bittle Wells. In strong phrase it utters the needed word that history, so far from being the chronicle of an ethics factory, is "simply the record of men's progress toward the complete recognition of an absolute and inherent right, first by the individual and then an acknowledgment of this right by the body politic." The other article to which we refer is by that splendid specimen of a democratic Democrat, C. E. S. Wood, who devotes it to telling the Democratic party what political parties are for and what it ought to be.

Somebody now and then writes a leading editorial in the New York Independent stating most clearly the imperative moral need of to-day. "The imperative moral need of to-day," he says, "is for an enlightened social conscience that shall see the essential wickedness of trying to suppress individualism within the sphere of private conduct, while permitting it to seize upon and to control those natural resources and those economic opportunities that rightfully belong not to individuals, but to society." Let us hope that the multitude of Independent readers have read this editorial, and that they paused to reread and inwardly digest this closing sentence.

J. H. D.

Always instructive and almost always interesting, the International Journal of Ethics is both to an unusual degree in its April issue. Felix Adler writes of the problem of teleology, J. G. James of the ethics of passive resistance, and C. S. Myers in defense of vivisection. But the most notable article of all is that on the development of a people, by W. E. Burghardt Du Bois. It is especially notable because it deals with the burning question of white race and black, broadly and masterfully, and is from the pen of a Negro. This product of a Negro's brain fairly compels a comparison of the mental qualities of the educated Negro with such educated white men as the author of "Leopard's Spots," for example—a comparison which in its results is far from flattering to those white men.

Alice Stone Blackwell writes a clever letter to the Springfield Republican anent the idea that the ballot should not be extended to women until a majority of women want it. "When a merchant in Saco," she writes, "first employed a saleswoman the men boycotted his store, and the women remonstrated with him on the sin of placing a young woman in a position of such 'publicity.' When Lucy Stone sought to secure for married women the right to their own property, women asked with scorn: 'Do you think I would give myself where I would not give my property?' When Elizabeth Blackwell began to study medicine, the women at her boarding house refused to sneak to her, and women passing her on the street held their skirts aside. When

AMERICAN PAUPERISM and the Abolition of Poverty, by Isador Ladoff, is a study of the last United States census from the view-point of the laborer. It is a cloth-bound volume of 240 pages, full of facts never before brought to light. Price by mail, fifty cents; still lower to those taking advantage of our co-operative plan, explained in a booklet which may be had for the asking. CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, 56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

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

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 infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department 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.

EWING & RING,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
HOUSTON, TEXAS.
Presley E. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

CONTRACTORS.

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

DAVE'S PASSIONATE APPEAL.

Mary Lyon made her plea for higher education, her efforts were received with ridicule by the majority, not only of men, but of women, too." J. H. D.

Sir Edwin Arnold, who died in London on the 24th of March, was born in England June 10, 1832. He was married three times, his third wife being a Japanese. For twenty years he was chief editor of the London Telegraph, and so may be claimed as a newspaper man of letters. He had a high sense of the importance of modern newspapers, and regretted anything that detracted from their dignity. "Arnold was very critical," says the Springfield Republican, "of the American newspapers, regarding them as lacking in dignity, reverence, and even good manners, especially in the vulgarity of the display heads." His

first acquaintance with India came through his appointment to the principalship of a college in that country, a position which he held from 1856 to 1861. To India he owes what will probably always be considered his greatest work, the Light of Asia, one of the most readable, to say the least, of all modern poems. J. H. D.

Special Offer

Send us a \$1.00 bill and receive Ernest Crosby's two books "Plain Talk in Psalm and Parable" and "Tolstoy and His Message," together with a yearly subscription to the Whim.

The Whim, edited by Ernest Crosby and Benedict Prieth, is an artistic, 40-page, monthly magazine, which is likely to interest thoughtful people. Each number contains a goodly amount of serious stuff together with enough nonsense to keep the balance fairly true.

If you do not care to risk a dollar on this proposition, send 10 cents for a three months' trial subscription, or 5 cents for a copy of the April number.
THE WHIM,
P. O. Box 288, Newark, N. J.

Mr. John Z. White Writes for "Why."

Mr. White will have an interesting letter in April "Why" and each month thereafter, until further notice, describing his lecture tours and the work of the Henry George Lecture Association. You should not miss any of these issues. Send twenty-five cents in stamps or coin to FRANK VIERTH, Editor "Why," Cedar Rapids, Iowa. This pays for yearly subscription.

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.

Volume VI of The Public

Complete Volumes, including index, sent post paid at Regular Subscription price, \$2.00.

BOUND VOLUMES, PRICE, \$3.00, by Express, prepaid, \$3.50, will be ready for delivery about May 15.

Address,
PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

The Works of Clarence S. Darrow

A Persian Pearl, \$1.50 net; postpaid. Their high literary merit and charming style render them worth reading, even by those who disagree fundamentally with Mr. Darrow's philosophy.—Chicago Record-Herald.

Resist Not Evil, 75 cts; postage, 7 cts. It is an intelligent presentation from a theoretical point of view of the cause of crime and the evil and unsatisfactory results of punishment.—Indianapolis Journal.

IN PRESS

Letters From Abroad, \$1.00 postpaid. The series will make a valuable text book on labor questions and industrial economy.—Independent.

Tolstoy and Other Essays, \$1 postpaid.

CONTENTS:

Tolstoy, Conduct and Profession,
Literary Style, Observance of Law.

For sale by booksellers everywhere and by

The Hammersmark Publishing Co.
151 and 153 Wabash Ave., Chicago.

JOHN Z. WHITE'S MOVEMENTS.

Mr. John Z. White will complete his New York-New Jersey-Connecticut lecture tour June 15th. On June 23rd he begins his engagement among the western Chautauquas, speaking at Lake Madison, S. D., Big Stone, S. D., Devil's Lake, S. D., and other points. He will be in the west till August 1st. On August 10th he begins an engagement among the eastern Chautauquas, speaking first at Cumberland, Maryland, and later in Ohio. For open dates and particulars, address F. H. MONROE, Pres., Empire Hotel, Broadway and 63rd Streets, New York City, N. Y.