

# The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 30, 1904.

Number 317.

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.

If it serves any purpose in politics to put the enemy into a hole. Bourke Cockran has achieved a signal triumph; for he has certainly put the Republican party into a hole very snugly. He has convicted them of shrinking with fear from an investigation into the corrupt methods by which Hanna elected McKinley in 1896. Incidentally Mr. Cockran has landed President Cleveland's little side-party of 1896, the Palmer-Buckner diversion, into a somewhat similar hole with the Republicans. Their campaign appears to have been carried on at the expense of the Republican corruption fund. A nice lot of boodlemongers were those "honest money" moralists of both parties who "saved the country" from "Bryanism" in 1896!

The full and frank statement of his relations to the Bennett will case, which Mr. Bryan makes in the Commoner of April 22d, in reply to editorial strictures of the Chicago Record-Herald, is not only a complete refutation of the diatribes of his political enemies with reference to that case. It further furnishes testimony unconsciously to the generously candid spirit of the man. That such a spirit in a public character should lack appreciation among the worshipers of financial success, is not strange, —being so rare; but the spectacle of men who, thinking they admire that kind of spirit, find satisfaction in echoing the malicious sentiments regarding Bryan of the cynics to whom that spirit is profitless and therefore foolish, is worth remarking.

One of the conservative Democratic papers of the South—the El Paso Times—was guilty of the indiscretion in its issue of the 10th, prior to the Democratic convention of New York which instructed for Judge Parker, of venturing this prediction:

We have an idea that when the Democracy of his own State declares in favor of Parker for President, then Judge Parker will break his silence and let the country know where he stands on all public questions. We believe the Judge is waiting to hear the voice of his own State calling on him to speak. But if he persists in remaining silent then, there is not much chance of his nomination. The silence persists.

Judge Parker's silence seems to be the only indication of his political existence. It recalls a story of Emory A. Storrs, the one-time noted lawyer of Chicago. Mr. Storrs left a committee-room to look for a member supposed to be somewhere in the corridor of the building, a member distinguished for his habit of silence. Upon returning, Storrs reported: "It was so dark in the corridor that I couldn't find him; but I know he's there, because its so thundering still!"

Four men have been hanged in Chicago within a few days. One had killed a fellow being while brutally under the influence of liquor. The other three were young men, scarcely out of their teens, who are described as bandits because of the strenuous life they led. These boys were no worse than the average boy. Had they lived in favorable surroundings they would have found an outlet for their adventurous inclinations by hunting wild game, struggling with the elements in yachts, or by participating in some of the great sports, from college football to military activity, whereby well-to-do youth tame the spirit of boy-

hood as they grow into manhood. But these boys were not so favorably situated, and the spirit of adventure and mastery led them into illegal forms of robbing and unlicensed methods of murder. They were accordingly hanged.

By the goody-goody their fate is attributed to the influence of dime novels. But these boys were not readers of dime novels. Even if dime novels were destructive of the moral character of youth, they would not be as much so as the newspaper stories of the execution of these victims of our disordered social system. The newspapers of Chicago—not merely the yellow ones, but the truly good newspapers also—did more to stimulate murderous possibilities when they reported those hangings than could be done by all the dime novels ever printed. Think of the strenuous young men of narrow horizon who read those reports and admired the culprits. Think of the children who read them! Think of the revengeful who darken their own characters by gloating over the doom of those young men. Above all, think of the mothers about-to-be, whose reading of those stories, whose mere glance at the homicidal headlines, may have made prenatal impressions that will furnish material for future hangmen!

But for all this it is not so much the newspapers as the people that are to blame. The papers only report facts about executions, and this is part of their business. As facts, executions must be reported. It would be extremely dangerous to free society to prohibit it. But the people themselves cause the facts. They do so by retaining the murderous, the murder-inculcating, the murder-making institution of capital punishment. Nor have they any excuse for it except their own mur-

derous desire for vengeance. They only trifle with themselves when they defend capital punishment as a preventive of murder. It is as certain as any fact can be that capital punishment is not a preventive of crime. It is almost as certain as any fact can be that capital punishment promotes crime. Within three days after the hanging of those Chicago bandits there were numerous burglaries and a double murder in the very city of their execution. The best preventive of lawless murder is not lawful murder. It is the general inculcation of respect for human life. That is the only preventive. But this preventive is impossible so long as society itself deliberately destroys human life, and teachers and preachers and law-givers applaud the custom.

One street car franchise in Chicago which has just expired affords a specially advantageous opportunity for executing the mandate of the people as expressed in the recent referendum (p. 7) for municipal ownership. This is the franchise of the Chicago Passenger Railway company, extending from the new post office building to the western limits of the city.

The 99-year grant does not apply to this road at all. The company owns absolutely nothing, not even the shadow of a pretense to a claim, except the movable tangible property, which would be old junk if removed. There is, therefore, no excuse in this case for any renewal of franchise, for any dicker, for anything whatever but a proposition from the city to compensate the company reasonably as to amount and mode of payment for its organized junk. Should a fair offer be refused, the "hold-up" would be evident; and we take it that the people of Chicago would make short work of a manifest "hold-up" by its incorporated servants.

Happily, the excuse of dilatory litigation does not apply to this case. Happily, also, other fran-

chises of like kind end in a few months, so that a considerable municipal system would soon be possible with this nucleus. The only thing to fear is that men of power and influence in local politics own stock in the existing company, and are therefore likely to use their power and influence to secure an extension of the street franchise.

Gov. Garvin, of Rhode Island, has challenged the corrupt ring of his State to what from a distance looks very much like mortal combat. This ring rules the legislature, and by the refusal of that body to alter antique laws it disfranchises and defies the people. No one is allowed to vote for city councilmen, for instance, unless he pays taxes; and the ring keeps non-landowning Democrats off the personal property tax lists so as to prevent their voting. Cases are cited of such men being listed for hundreds of dollars as soon as they force themselves upon the voting list by buying real estate. Other evils are as bad or worse. To remedy them several bills have been introduced in the legislature, but the ring has these referred to committees and the committees never report. Popular petitions are smothered in the same way. Among the bills so smothered are three proposed constitutional amendments, one for an initiative, one giving registered voters the right to vote for city councilmen, and one conferring the veto power upon the governor. All these have been smothered in the judiciary committee, and the legislature has adjourned until after election, thereby evading the obligation of either defeating the amendments or submitting them to popular vote this Fall. Gov. Garvin has met this defiance of the ring by calling a special session for next September to enable the legislature to act before election instead of afterward upon the proposed amendments. This call for a special session is of exceptional importance and of much more than local interest. To any one at all familiar with the "rot-

ten borough" politics of Rhode Island, it means that the Governor has resorted to one of the few gubernatorial prerogatives in Rhode Island to compel the ring to come out into the light and let the people look at it.

Says the Brooklyn Eagle of Congressman Baker, "the railroad pass incident thoroughly disgusted members,"—meaning members of Congress. Very naturally. Public officials who accept railroad favors secretly, are apt to be disgusted with those that refuse them openly.

Senator Bacon is to be complimented upon having secured from the Senate (see Congressional Record of April 20, page 5,411), along with the appropriation for placing a statue of Frederick the Great, which he could not prevent, a supplementary one for the erection of a statue of Thomas Jefferson. While we are kowtowing to European royalty in bronze it is not a bad thing to have at hand a bronze reminder of American democracy.

The American movement for Philippine independence is gaining strength among churchmen and educators. At any rate it is gaining names. Whether this is a gain of strength or not will be better known when the Presidential campaign waxes warm. In the list are two Catholic prelates, 36 Catholic and Episcopal bishops, 59 college presidents, and at least 153 college professors, including 75 from Harvard, 41 from Columbia, 21 from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and 16 from Amherst. Their signatures are appended to a petition to the national conventions of the two principal political parties urging party declarations in favor of granting independence to the people of the Philippines.

Little Dolly had been sitting opposite a guest with a waxed mustache. After gazing at him for several moments, she exclaimed: "My kitty has smellers, too."—Sacred Heart Review.

## BRYAN'S CHICAGO SPEECH.

It is safe to say that no other man could have drawn so large and thoughtful an audience under similar circumstances as that which gathered at Chicago last Saturday to hear Bryan's speech on the present crisis in the Democratic party. A meeting as large might have been easily assembled by a President in office, a foreign potentate, or a capital execution; but it would have been a meeting of thoughtless curiosity-seekers. Bryan's audience was not attracted by curiosity nor was it composed of thoughtless people. It had come together for the purpose of listening to the advice of a man who has proved that he would rather be right as he sees the right than to be a mortgaged President.

The circumstances and the occasion were remarkable.

No one need be reminded that the "irrepressible conflict" of which Seward spoke, is entering upon a new phase. The fact is rapidly becoming obvious to everybody. In Seward's time it was concerned with the question of chattel slavery; in ours the issue is plutocracy.

This issue is tending more and more to divide the two great parties, and in the process it is driving a wedge through both. Neither party is free from the splitting tendency; but in the Democratic party it is already manifest, whereas in the Republican party it is as yet subconscious.

It came to the surface in the Democratic party when the national convention revolted against the partnership its own President, Grover Cleveland, had so evidently made with the leaders of plutocracy. Since that time there have been two groups of leadership in the Democratic party: the plutocratic Democrats, represented in their several sub-groups by Cleveland, Hill, Gorman and Belmont; and the democratic-Democrats, whose most conspicuous representative is Bryan.

We do not mean to say that all the Democratic adversaries of Bryan are really plutocrats, nor that all his followers are really democrats. In any great com-

ination of conflicting forces there are confusing eddies, and this political combination is no exception. Just as there are true democrats in the Republican party, who remain there because they do not correctly distinguish the main currents of national politics, so there are true democrats in the plutocratic faction of the Democratic party, who are in that faction because they do not distinguish the main currents of Democratic factionalism. Neither would we imply that even Bryan himself is in all things democratic, by the test of ideal standards; or that Cleveland, Hill, Gorman and Belmont are in all things plutocratic. What we do imply is that the main current of plutocracy in the Democratic party carries Cleveland and the others upon its surface, while the main current of democracy carries Bryan. Show us an intense admirer of Grover Cleveland, and the chances are ninety-nine in a hundred that you are showing us a believer in plutocracy; show us an intense admirer of William J. Bryan, and the chances are ninety-nine in a hundred that you are showing us a believer in democracy.

The latest and most critical expression of this split in the Democratic party was made by the Democratic convention of New York, when it adopted a bunco platform (p. 39) and instructed for a candidate who, though he conceals his opinions from the public, manages in some occult way to win the confidence of the plutocratic press, of the plutocratic financiers, and of such interesting varieties of plutocratic statesmen as Belmont, Gorman, Hill and Cleveland. This challenge to the democratic-Democracy of the country was met by Mr. Bryan in his speech of the 23d at Chicago.

There was no blare of trumpets nor beating of drums. No clubs nor local leaders were invited to invite Mr. Bryan to address them. No dead walls were covered with posters, no advertisements filled the papers. Mr. Bryan merely let it be known, four days in advance, that on the date specified and at the place named he would speak to those who cared to hear him. So insistent was he upon avoiding all complications of a merely personal sort that he rented the hall

himself and dispensed with committees, chairman, vice chairmen, and all the customary paraphernalia of public meetings. In effect he simply said to the public, and in the simplest way: "I have something to say about the present crisis in the Democratic party, especially with reference to the New York platform, and if you care to hear me I have provided a hall for your accommodation."

Only that, and nothing more. Yet the large auditorium was too small by more than half for the people who came. As they poured in, the local authorities discovered that only 2,000 could be admitted, as per city ordinance; but nearly 3,000 had gained admission before this official discovery was made. And in the street in front of the building there was another audience larger still, which vainly sought admission. The hour of the meeting was 8 o'clock, but few of the thousands who arrived after 7:30 were allowed by the police to enter the hall, and hundreds of these waited in a drenching rain for a possible chance to get in.

Mr. Bryan's speech was as remarkable as the circumstances under which he delivered it.

It was a plain warning that a capture of the Democratic organization for plutocracy by stealth will not be tolerated by democratic-Democrats; and this sentiment evidently expressed the views of the audience.

So eminently does this speech appear to us to be the master speech of an epoch that we reproduce in full in our Miscellaneous department the abstract prepared by Mr. Bryan himself. He read this abstract to the audience, but occasionally elaborated its points with extemporaneous remarks. Among these was his eloquent elaboration of the point on imperialism and colonialism, which he made so emphatic as to leave no room for the slightest assumption that he regards that issue as having been settled or as one to be compromised. He is a pronounced anti-imperialist, and "he works at it," which cannot be said of the Eastern gentlemen who are trying to get the Democratic party into office through the favor of Wall street syndicates.

Two other points in Bryan's extemporaneous remarks are espe-

cially worthy of note. We quote from the Record-Herald's report:

"We had an administration nominally Democratic, but really a J. P. Morgan administration," Mr. Bryan exclaimed, "and God forbid that we should have another that would be an August Belmont administration." After finishing his prepared speech, Mr. Bryan raised his voice above the thunder then bellowing overhead to give a parting shot to the Eastern reorganizers. "I have said I was anxious for success," he said. "Let me outline a plan. Let me show how the Democratic ticket may be made invincible. The trouble is the people doubt that the Democrats would do any better than the Republicans if placed in power. Why? Because of such a platform as that adopted in New York. Because such men as David B. Hill, August Belmont and Grover Cleveland are believed to be behind the Democratic candidate. Why do they doubt our party? Because when there is an investigating committee in city or State or nation it catches Democrats as well as Republicans. Let the party rise up and whip out those not true to the interests of the public. Let us drive them into the Republican party. Let's have a platform that is honest and a ticket that is in conformity with that platform."

Some effort was made at the Bryan meeting to give an appearance of its being a Hearst meeting. But this resulted in utter failure. A few cheers for Hearst two or three times were so feeble as to dispirit the Hearst clique that started them. Those were enough, however, to afford excuse for an elaborately false description of the meeting in the Hearst papers as a Hearst meeting, and to account for a page headline in Hearst's Examiner, which was insulting to Bryan as well as misrepresentative of the audience: "Bryan's gathering causes ovation for Hearst; listens to Ex—but cheers next candidate." It is a pity that Hearst's papers cannot get far enough away from the proprietor's personality to make their news reports veracious and to elevate their political policy to the level of political principle. All the cheering at Bryan's meeting, and there was much of it and very enthusiastic, was for Bryan's declarations of principle. It was no man's meeting; but it was a democratic meeting. And the speech throughout was for no man, but was a straightforward appeal to conscience.

We predict with confidence that

this speech marks the beginning of a new and more progressive campaign in the irrepressible conflict between equality and privilege, liberty and power, right and wrong. For the Democratic party to win in the sense of getting at the offices concerns no one but office seekers; for it to win in the sense of advancing the march of democracy, whether in office or out of office, concerns us all. That was the spirit of Mr. Bryan's speech, and that is the spirit which the St. Louis convention will find itself forced to take most seriously into account. The convention may defy that spirit with both platform and candidate, but if it does it will thereby write the epitaph of its party. Like the "doughfaces" of our politics of half a century ago, the "doughfaces" of this generation are also coming to judgment.

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

##### WASHINGTON.

Washington, D. C., April 23.—How completely Congress is governed and run by a few men was again plainly shown this week when they passed a Chinese exclusion act as a rider to an appropriation bill. It is doubtful whether Republicans had any idea that the leaders proposed to touch the question at this session. It was sprung upon the House without any notice, and the House kept in session for three hours beyond the usual hour of adjournment, so as to force it through that evening. Having received no intimation that the matter was even being considered, nearly half of the entire membership knew nothing of it until they read of its passage in the Washington papers the next morning.

The closing days of this Congress, as of all others, witness many attempts to rush through without notice, without warning, and without consideration, innumerable "log rolling" schemes. One would need to be argus-eyed, to be as sharp as a score of Philadelphia lawyers, and to be a regular magazine of information on multifarious subjects to be able to do one's duty under such circumstances. Under the rules any member who can obtain the previous consent of the Speaker can call up his particular pet project, asking unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. These bills are picked from a calendar containing several hundred projects, and they embrace every conceivable subject, running from a bill of ten lines to one of ten or more pages, as widely different as the construction of a bridge over

some unheard of stream to the building of a courthouse in some obscure town, or the granting of some special rights of entry on some public land, Indian or otherwise; or they may relate to a subject of such international importance as a government, or lack of it, for the new Panama canal zone. Probably the worst feature and the greatest danger to good government in this connection is the fact that so many members have one or more bills either already upon the calendar or which they are desirous of having considered at a later date, and fearing objection may be made to unanimous consent to consider these projects—no matter how innocent or meritorious—they sit by and offer no opposition to legislation which they know or believe to cover a steal or a raid upon the public treasury, fearing that their opposition to evil legislation may result in their failing to obtain unanimous consent for their meritorious measures. They are thus made assenting parties to vicious legislation. I admit that it is not an easy matter under present conditions and with the economic policies now obtaining to lay down a rule governing such a projected legislation which may not frequently work great hardship. But it would seem that it is not too much to require that the local authorities, preferably even the local community, must express an affirmative desire for local legislation before it can even be considered by the House. This would unquestionably cut off many log-rolling schemes which now are rushed through, not only because of the reasons just stated, but because of the total ignorance of their merits by practically the entire membership of the House. If such a rule were adopted, communities could compel railroad companies to pay for the privilege of bridging navigable streams, while bills to secure possession, without pay, of valuable water falls and large tracts of land would fail of passage unless they contained provisions protecting the public interests.

The attempt of the chairman and other Republican members of the House judiciary committee to make an exhibition of Mr. Hearst signally failed. Weeks ago Mr. Hearst introduced a resolution directing the attorney general to report what steps, if any, he had taken in the action he (Hearst) had instituted against the anthracite coal trust. This resolution has slumbered in the judiciary committee and probably never would have been discussed at all but for the belief privately expressed by some of the leading members of that committee that they could "make a monkey" of Hearst by inviting him to explain the purpose of the resolution. For nearly an hour he was subjected to a rapid cross-fire of questions, some of the most tantalizing nature, and all evidently designed for the purpose of embarrassing him to the fullest extent.

Every impartial observer must agree that Mr. Hearst acquitted himself admirably. Never attempting flights of oratory, he was most composed, had himself thoroughly in hand and showed an entire familiarity with the subject he was discussing. He gave what should have been conclusive reasons why the resolution ought to be adopted. But conforming to the almost uniform rule which the Republican party in this Congress has followed all through the session, of suppressing every investigation, shunting every disagreeable subject, the committee merely referred the matter to a sub-committee of three, who, of course, will do nothing—probably will not even report, as Congress is expected to adjourn on April 28.

In the guise of a "commission" bill the ship subsidy hunters made considerable progress to-day towards the United States treasury. It is true the bill merely provides for a commission to investigate the merchant marine, but that is but one of the steps necessary in the opinion of Republican leaders before the treasury can be reached. It is not merely an indirect method of attack, but it possesses, from the standpoint of the holders of the Republican campaign collection basket, the great advantage of putting a Presidential election in between the treasury and the final realization of the ship subsidy beggars' goal. The proposition that now confronts these patriotic gentlemen is: "Are you willing to put up a little 'insurance,' or will you run the risk of losing all the money already invested!" For this to be appreciated by the uninitiated it is necessary to say that it was generally understood by those believed to be well informed that in the Congressional campaign of 1898 the Republicans found themselves "shy" on campaign contributions. At one stage of the campaign the managers seriously believed that the Democrats would carry the Fifty-sixth Congress. Facing the possibility of such a dire calamity, the great corrupter of national politics was appealed to. As the "business" interests had been touched quite heavily two years before, they did not quickly nor generously respond. Recourse was then had to certain big shipping interests, who had already received considerable largesse, but who hungered for more. As the story goes, these gentlemen came down to the tune of \$400,000, in return for which they were assured of a ship subsidy bill, were even told that they might write their own bill. Although Hanna made strenuous efforts to carry out the contract, some stupid Republicans, unmindful of the "honor" of the party, refused to be cajoled or bullied into voting for the Hanna-Payne subsidy bill. The proposition therefore now before the contributors to the 1898 corruption fund is: "Shall we put up a little more now and help the Republicans to carry the presidential election, or shall we con-

sider the \$400,000 as a dead loss?" There is no doubt of what their answer will be. Being very largely the same men who have been the beneficiaries of other "protection" legislation, they will come to time, and, if their money can save it, the "honor" of the country will again be saved and the raid upon the treasury to the tune of some \$9,000,000 a year will surely follow. For even should the Republicans lose both the Presidency and the House of Representatives, there will be, under our foolish system of government, a short session of Congress within which to enact a ship subsidy steal.

The use that is made on occasion of the name of reputable organizations when special interests so require, is shown in the telegram sent to the New York delegation in Congress yesterday immediately preceding the vote on the ship subsidy bill. The telegram, which was in duplicate, was as follows:

New York, April 23, 1904.—Trust you will support Gardner commission bill investigate merchant marine.—New York Board of Trade and Transportation.

In order that they might not be in doubt as to the reasons which controlled at least one member, I at once sent this reply:

I shall oppose ship subsidy bill as I shall oppose all special privilege legislation.  
ROBERT BAKER.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, April 28.

What appears to be regarded by the press of the country generally (judging by their comments and extended reports) as the most important political event of the week, was Wm. J. Bryan's speech of the 23d at Chicago, on "The New York Platform." This estimate is doubtless correct, for it is well-nigh impossible to regard that event as anything less important than the opening battle of the contest within the Democratic party which will probably be fought out to the death in the convention at St. Louis. Mr. Bryan's audience filled a large auditorium. Another crowd as large as the audience clamored for admission, but were excluded by the police under the safety ordinances of the city. The authorized abstract of the speech Mr. Bryan delivered on this occasion is printed in full on another page of this issue.

The Democrats have met in State convention since our last report (p. 39) in only two States,

Massachusetts and New Hampshire. The Massachusetts convention assembled on the 21st. George Fred Williams contested for an endorsement of William R. Hearst, but was defeated by P. A. Collins, who leads a delegation instructed for Richard F. Olney, of Massachusetts. The instructions assume to control the district delegates as well as those at large; but the Hearst leaders denied the authority of the State conventions to do this and appealed to the district conventions. These met on the 26th, and 22 of the 28 delegates then elected are claimed for Olney. Mr. Williams was himself defeated in the 12th district. Charges of corruption are made by the Hearst followers and Mr. Williams announces that the fight has just begun. The New Hampshire convention met on the 27th. It adopted no instructions, but left the question of candidate to "the wisdom of the delegates."

Republican conventions were held for Rhode Island and Indiana on the 26th. The Rhode Island convention instructed for Roosevelt on the 26th, as did the Indiana convention at an adjourned session on the 27th. The Louisiana convention met on the 27th and endorsed Roosevelt.

A sensation has been created in Congress by attacks upon Congressman Cockran, New York Democrat, by Congressman Dalzell, Pennsylvania Republican, and Mr. Cockran's replies. Dalzell charged Cockran on the 23d with having been influenced with money to make speeches in 1896, and Cockran retorted that he had for twenty years been a contributor to and not a recipient of campaign funds, and that he had not only received no pay for speaking for McKinley in 1896, but had paid his own expenses. This contradiction was explained by Walter Wellman in his Record-Herald [Chicago Republican paper] letter from Washington of the 24th, in which he writes:

Bourke Cockran's indignant denial that he was paid for the speeches which he made against free silver in 1896 is understood to refer to any payment alleged to have been made by the Republican national committee. Mr. Cockran is wholly in the right. The Republican national committee did not

pay him a cent, and had no dealing with him in that campaign of any sort. Probably Mr. Cockran would not deny that he was paid \$15,000 for fifteen speeches by the Palmer-Buckner campaign committee. A detail of this transaction, of no little interest now, is that the money which was paid to Mr. Cockran for his services in that campaign was given the Palmer-Buckner committee by the Republican national committee, and was given for the express purpose of sending Mr. Cockran out on a speaking tour in favor of sound money. But Mr. Cockran did not know that the money came from Mr. Hanna, and probably does not know it to this day.

But Mr. Cockran did deny getting any pay, and produced the following letter from Mayor John Byrne, the Chairman of the "Democratic Sound Money League" of 1896, to prove it:

Governor Flower and I hit on Mr. Cockran as the only man who could effectively reply to Mr. Bryan. Mr. Cockran spoke the first time in Madison Square Garden. Afterward he made a tour of nineteen states, speaking in all the big cities. He never cost the league a single dollar. Railroad fares, hotel expenses and everything else he paid out of his own pocket.

Early in the present week the controversy between Cockran and Dalzell was renewed on the floor of the House, and with added bitterness. It was brought to a climax on the 26th, when Dalzell charged Cockran circumstantially with taking money to speak for candidates not of his own party, and Cockran, replying that Dalzell had by implication confessed to corruption within his own party, raised a question of personal privilege. He said:

Before I sit down I shall ask this House to agree with me on this, that if what the gentleman has said is true I am unworthy of its membership; if what he said be false, he is unworthy of membership. This will take a wider range than our personal virtues. I shall ask for a committee to investigate this charge, and shall ask for power to send for persons and papers.

He thereupon offered this resolution:

Whereas, The Hon. John Dalzell, a member of this House and of the Committee on Ways and Means, charged on the floor that William Bourke Cockran, a Representative from New York and a member of the same committee, has been paid money by a political

party to support the candidate for the Presidency nominated in opposition to the party with which the said William Bourke Cockran had theretofore been affiliated; and, whereas, the charge, though attacked specifically on the floor by the said William Bourke Cockran, has not been withdrawn by the said John Dalzell; and, whereas, said charge, if true, establishes such conduct as should unfit any man for membership in this House, and, if false, should be so declared and its author censured severely; therefore, be it resolved, that a select committee of five members be appointed by the chair to inquire into the truth of said charge and to report the testimony with their conclusions thereon to this House at its session beginning the first Monday of December next; be it further resolved, that said committee be, and it is hereby given, full power to compel the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such papers as the members thereof may deem necessary to the full and proper discharge of the duty hereby imposed on them.

In commenting upon his resolution Mr. Cockran said:

If this resolution be adopted we shall learn to what extent there is basis for the charge often heard that the election of 1896 was compassed by corruption; we shall see what the facts are, and whether or not these Republicans who now deride and sneer will then have the temerity to rejoice at their own infamy.

Mr. Grosvenor raised the point of order that the incident alluded to took place before the election of Mr. Cockran to the House, to which Mr. Cockran retorted that Brigham Roberts's polygamy antedated his election, but he was expelled nevertheless. The Speaker refused to rule on the resolution as raising a question of personal privilege until the 27th. On that day the Speaker ruled that the resolution was not privileged. Mr. Williams appealed from this decision and Mr. Payne moved to lay the appeal on the table. By a party vote, 169 Republicans to 125 Democrats, the motion to table was carried and the ruling of the Speaker sustained.

Politics in Rhode Island are attracting general attention in consequence of the challenge made by Gov. Garvin on the 21st to the legislature to meet important matters pending before it openly and fairly. The legislature had adjourned with a mass of important

unfinished business pending before it, and had fixed the time of adjournment for a day following the Fall elections. Believing that this was done for partisan or worse than partisan purposes, Gov. Garvin has called a special session for the 13th of September. His proclamation, dated the 21st, relates to matters of general concern and interest and is as follows:

Whereas, the present General Assembly, following the example set by the House of Representatives for the two preceding years, has deliberately refused to consider some of the most important measures brought before it, including the following amendments to the constitution, which are demanded by a large majority of the people, and which, if not acted upon before the November election, will be postponed for another year: (1) the Constitutional Initiative, which provides that 5,000 electors may propose specific amendments to the State constitution; (2) equal suffrage, which confers upon registry voters in cities the right to vote in the election of city councils; (3) the veto power, which enables the governor of the State to check hasty and vicious legislation; and whereas, a post election session for any purpose, as experience in this State has shown, is detrimental to public interests and welfare, for the reason that it permits a General Assembly, which has ceased to be responsible for its acts, to enact laws directly contrary to the wishes of the people; and whereas, the commission to revise the judiciary system of the State, if it reports to this General Assembly, should make that report prior and not subsequent to election; Therefore, an extraordinary occasion having arisen, under the authority vested in the governor by section 7 of article vii of the Constitution of the State, I do hereby convene the General Assembly at the State House in the city of Providence, at eleven o'clock in the forenoon of Tuesday, the thirteenth day of September, A. D. 1904.

In press interviews explanatory of his action Gov. Garvin says:

I believe that the people of the State of Rhode Island wish the business of the General Assembly transacted fairly, squarely and expeditiously and not unnecessarily delayed or distorted. I do not think that the average taxpayer believes in having important bills hung up perpetually in committees, for such action is against all principles of government and leads to results that are deplorable. I am determined to force, if possible, the report of some of these things that have been sidetracked and for that reason

have called this special session of the legislature. And I have called it at this time to give the committee a reasonable chance to prepare their reports.

The conflict in Colorado between the judicial and the military authorities (p. 40) came before the Supreme Court of the State at Denver on the 26th, upon a writ of habeas corpus under which the president of the miners' union, held in military custody, was produced before the court. The military authorities raised the point that the judiciary have no jurisdiction, and this point is to be passed upon by the court on the 5th of May. Application for release on bail meanwhile was denied. Regarding that question the court said:

If the liberty of the petitioner alone were involved we should probably resolve the doubt in his favor, admit him to bail and determine the question of jurisdiction afterward. But the head of the executive department of the State has stated in the return of the writ that in his solemn judgment peace and tranquility cannot be speedily restored in the county of San Miguel, unless the petitioner remains in the custody of the military authorities. Therefore, the matter involved affects not only the liberty of the petitioner, but the peace of the people of San Miguel County and incidentally the tranquility of the people of the entire State.

The Supreme Court on the same day granted to the military officers a stay of execution on the judgment of the district court fining them for contempt (p. 25) upon their refusal to produce their prisoners before him on writ of habeas corpus. The portentous circumstances out of which this Colorado controversy arises are impartially told in McClure's Magazine for May, by Ray Stannard Baker, who has specially investigated them as the representative of that magazine.

Regarding the Asiatic war between Russia and Japan (p. 39) there are abundant rumors, but the only news of importance appearing to be probable is a report from Liaoyang, confirmed by a dispatch from St. Petersburg, that in the night of the 25th-26th, the Japanese effected a crossing of the Yalu river at an indefinite point south of Wiju. Subsequent re-

ports are to the effect that at least two crossings have been made, one to the north of Wiju.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—President Loubet, of France, visited Rome on the 24th.

—Ammirus Darrow, father of Clarence S. Darrow, died at Chicago on the 24th at the age of 86. He had been active as an abolitionist in the '50's and as a greenbacker in the '70's.

—The National Municipal league held its 10th annual meeting at Chicago on the 27th. Lawson Purdy, of New York, discussed the subject of "Municipal Taxation" at the evening session of that day.

—At a meeting of the stockholders of the New Panama Canal Co., held in Paris, France, on the 23d, a resolution ratifying the sale of the Panama canal (p. 9) to the United States for \$40,000,000 was adopted with only five dissenting votes.

—Ex-President Cleveland has been appointed to the Princeton university lectureship endowed by the late Henry Stafford Little. His first lecture, to be delivered on the 2d, is to have for its subject "Circumstances of the Chicago Riots of 1894."

—The railroad strike in Hungary (p. 41) is reported to have been suppressed. On the 25th a public gathering in sympathy with the defeated strikers was ordered by the police to disperse, and upon refusal the police poured a volley into the crowd, killing 24 and wounding many more.

—The city council of Chicago at its meeting on the 25th, hurriedly called in the afternoon, instead of the evening as usual, passed an order regarding the traction question (p. 7), calling upon the mayor to confer with "the officers of all traction companies whose franchises expire July 30 last," regarding the granting of new franchises.

—At Odd Fellows hall, Philadelphia, on the 24th, Emma Goldman delivered her address on "The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation," which the police had forbidden on the 10th, suppressing the meeting (p. 35), and no police were visible. The hall was crowded and the meeting absolutely orderly.

—The British House of Commons, on the 22d, by a vote of 238 to 199, passed the second reading of the trades union bill. It legalizes peaceful picketing, amends the law of conspiracy in connection with trade disputes, and protects trades union funds against legal process for damage caused by the action of members of such unions. The bill is an outcome of the judgment of the court in the Taff Vale railway case (vol. v., pp. 515, 729), in which the Railway Men's union was ordered to pay heavy damages for picketing and interfering with non-

unionists. Premier Balfour opposed the bill.

—The central committee of the Socialist party of Chicago has voted to expel from the party the Socialist alderman, William Johnson, elected a year ago (vol. vi., p. 6). His offenses are alleged to be refusing to introduce Socialist party legislation in the city council, introducing "graft" measures for personal gain, accepting annual railroad passes, repudiating Socialist party principles, and introducing a measure in the city council to permit aldermen free street car transportation. Before the expulsion takes effect it must be affirmed by referendum.

#### PRESS OPINIONS.

##### BRYAN'S CHICAGO SPEECH.

Chicago Chronicle (pluto-Dem.), April 25.—The speech delivered by Mr. Bryan in Chicago on Saturday evening is deserving of notice only because if fell from a man who has been the candidate of a great party for the Presidency. Maltitious, dull and vain, its publication is all that is necessary to its refutation.

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.), Apr. 24.—The only question that Mr. Bryan leaves open is as to what candidate he will support. He mentioned none that he could approve. He was emphatic and definite as to the candidates he would oppose. The logic of his speech points to one candidate only—and that is William J. Bryan, the twice defeated, the hopeless.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), April 27.—When, after the downfall of Napoleon, the Bourbons were restored to the throne of France, they started in again to misgovern in exactly the same way that their ancestors had done. The lessons of the French revolution were lost upon them, and it was said of them "that they had learned nothing and forgotten nothing." This saying may be applied to William Jennings Bryan. He seems to insist that the Democratic party shall seek the Presidency on issues which the people have twice disapproved. This may be sincerity, but it is not politics.

New Haven Union (dem. Dem.), April 25.—He shows what Hill's object in this campaign is, what use he is making of Judge Parker and what selfish motives are behind the Parker boom. It is all Hill or Belmont. There's no Parker. This is becoming generally recognized throughout the country and the Parker movement on that account is practically at a standstill to-day. Democrats do not want Hill as dictator. They don't want any man who has been pushed to the front by Hill. Read that speech in which the selfish purposes of the gentlemen behind the Parker movement are mercilessly laid bare. It was a great effort and is fearless, clear and comprehensive as it is great.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Ind.), Apr. 25.—Why did Mr. Bryan consider it worth his while to hire a hall in which to repeat this already twice told tale? It has been supposed that he had a medium of his own through which to enlighten the public as to his personal opinions. Can he induce people to lend him their ears only by traveling to Chicago and speaking his piece in a hall hired at his own expense? Is the Commoner losing circulation or influence? To those familiar only with the surface indications of current politics the necessity of such a declaration as that in Chicago is not apparent. Mr. Bryan evidently sees the shadow of a coming event.

Buffalo Enquirer (Dem.), April 26.—But Mr. Bryan directs a vituperative assault against Judge Parker, a man whose character and record are worthy of all admiration, and in whom the State takes an honest pride. He speaks scornfully of the New York platform, which the Democracy approves as an accurate and sound summary of standard principles. Furthermore, the Nebraska statesman impeaches the good faith of the Democratic

party in the most important State of the Union. By such a course Mr. Bryan commits a grave offense against that spirit of unity which every good Democrat should do his utmost to maintain and encourage.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Apr. 25.—Mr. Bryan is on the side of elementary political morality and decency when he says: "No one can defend the Democratic party without defending its principles, and its principles ought to be so clearly set forth as to be easily understood." But Mr. Bryan does not confine himself to criticism. He assumes throughout that the rank and file of the party are at heart still with him and the radical element, and that the reaffirmation of the Kansas City platform would be received with joy and enthusiasm. Here his wish is father to his thought. The great majority of the Democratic party want an honest, straightforward platform, but they do not want Bryanism. There is a world of difference between these things. There are tens of thousands of honest and thoughtful Democrats who have no sympathy with Mr. Bryan's denunciation of "organized wealth" and corporate industry, or with his talk about the "great conflict between plutocracy and democracy."

#### THE PRESIDENCY.

Arena (Ind.), April.—The Democrats who believe in bargaining with Wall street and predatory wealth, while following the Republican policy of perfunctorily denouncing oppressive monopolies and corporate aggressions, are determined that no person shall be nominated who will be unwaveringly loyal to the interests of the people in the battle against the trusts and corporate domination in government. They will strenuously oppose the nomination of any man whom the great campaign contributors among the privileged classes—the trusts and other predatory bands—shall oppose; for their eyes have long rested eagerly upon the enormous corruption funds that have been so lavishly used by these interests in subverting the republic and securing the domination of the Republican party. On the other hand there is the progressive Democracy, representing the ideals of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln; representing unwavering loyalty to the interests of all the people and implacable hostility to class government and special privilege; the element that will stand loyally by the interests of the people against the aggressions of predatory wealth and for the maintenance of the fundamental principles of the Declaration of Independence.

#### 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, Apr. 18-23, 1904.

#### Senate.

The Senate resumed consideration of the sundry civil bill on the 18th (p. 5215), suspending for a consideration of the House bill for the sale of the Roseland Indian lands (p. 5217) which with its amendments it passed (p. 5221), and resumed consideration of the sundry civil bill on the 19th (p. 5311) and 20th (p. 5400) when the bill with amendments was passed (p. 5412). The pension appropriation bill was taken up on the 21st (p. 5473) and passed (p. 5485). The deficiency appropriation bill was under consideration on the 22d (p. 5540) and 23d (p. 5653).

#### House.

On the 18th the House passed the taxation bill for the District of Columbia (p. 5433), rejecting an amendment by Representative Baker exempting building and loan associations (pp. 5243, 5244); after which consideration of the general deficiency appropriation bill was resumed (p. 5247) and the bill was passed (p. 5272). The question of Statehood for Oklahoma and the Indian Territory as one State and Arizona and New Mexico as another was debated on the 19th under a rule for four hours' debate (p. 3324), and the bill was passed (p. 5354). The only business of general interest on the 20th was the passage after 40 minutes' debate of a

bill allotting in severalty to the Indians of New York State their land now held tribally (pp. 5425, 5433), a bill which was strongly opposed by Congressman Sulzer as a Standard Oil trust measure. On the 21st (p. 5489) a rule was adopted for the discussion of a bill providing for a commission to recommend ship subsidy legislation; after which the Senate bill for the government of the canal zone at Panama was taken up (p. 5501) and a substitute passed (p. 5504). The ship subsidy commission bill was under discussion on the 22d (p. 5579) and again on the 23d (p. 5689), when it was passed (p. 5703).

Record Notes.—Speech of Representative Livernash on President Roosevelt and the working classes (p. 5178). Senator Morgan's resolution and speech on controversy between Great Britain and Kongo (p. 5291). Speech of Representative Baker on unjust taxation and tariffs, with especial reference to taxation in the District of Columbia (p. 5321).

## MISCELLANY

### LONG WARRING FOR GREAT WINNING.

For The Public.

I doubt it not—the Truth will come,  
The clouds that cover now the sun  
Will vanish, Love will find her home,  
And Wrong be righted, Justice done.

Yet ere we reach the destined goal  
Our feet will tire, our hearts will doubt,  
And many a false and faithless soul  
Will yield ere we are mustered out.

Our foes are strong, their forts are high,  
And where the myriad legions stand  
Our ranks are thinned, and now the sky  
Is bending black above the land.

What wonder that the standard bends  
In hands that held its staff so long?  
What wonder that faint-hearted friends  
Grow weary of the war with Wrong?

Yet, courage, we who build for God  
Earth's Palace of the Coming State—  
Who hope so much may bear the rod,  
In darkness hold His hand, and wait.  
JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

### THE PENALTY OF THE SYSTEM-ATIC LIFE.

The effect on nerves of the systematic life, more especially in its minor, even trivial, details, was strikingly pictured in a paper by Dr. O. T. Osborne of the Yale medical school faculty, read at the last meeting in Washington of the American Therapeutic society. Stated technically, the penalty is "nervous disturbances of the heart and debility of the heart muscle, hastening a degeneration of the circulatory system that comes normally only late in life." The unremitting persistency of effort to be "on time" throughout the working, if not the waking hours, rising, breakfasting, reading the newspaper, reaching the office, keeping a series of engagements, each within an allotted minimum, or doing the daily stint of routine work, all "according to schedule," means an unceasing strain on the human machine. The effect, accustomed to it as we are, is not recognized until brought home by

some unexpected outbreak of irritation, often entirely disproportionate to the cause.—Scribner's Magazine.

### UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL.

Printed from the Original MS.

Dear John: Spring has cum. The farmer begins to burn trash in the back yard, and calls on his literary department for a sign, which he stakes out on the lawn, forinst the trolley road:

FRESHEGS.

I've bin a-clearin' up, myself, and dug out the old poetry machine, but it was rusted bad. Howsomever, with a little oil it squeaked out a couple of lines to the tune of "My Old Love Is Lost:"

Oh, we'll all economize  
And contribute to the trust,  
'For Republicans are reigning,  
And—Be Jabbers, we must.

I'm afraid mine is a political machine. Don't get one, John, unless with a stop attachment. You wouldn't want ita-runnin' all the time.

Been havin' lots of fun in politics. The Democrats had a convention in New York State last week to make a nomination for President, and blamed if they didn't nominate a paper rosette. Fact! The New York Democrat is a monstrous polite man,—and he don't put salt in his victuals, fer fear it won't taste good to Republicans. Well, these pale Democrats (you can't tell 'em from Republicans across the street), they went down to Albany, and they was doves—not a fighting cock among 'em. Tammany had spurs, but they knocked 'em off before convention time. But even doves will fight. This Doves' Convention, at Albany, after the nomination, split into two hostile camps over the question of how long the applause lasted when Parker was nominated. One side held to 15 seconds; the other vows by all that's holy that the applause was pretty strenuous for full 30 seconds, with a final flirt like a firecracker that thought it was a-goin' again, but didn't. It was the palest thing in politics—the Doves' Convention at Albany.

After all, John, it don't make much difference which gets it, Parker or Roosevelt; it's all one family. The Parker men are real kind to Roosevelt, and the Parker electors are selected from among the Republicans, as evidence of good faith.

UNCLE SAM.

P. S.—Since writin' the above, Billy Bryan went up to Chicago, hired a hall, and called Parker an "artful



dodger," and talked the platform full of holes, and the political weather looks a little gusty. About a thousand of us couldn't get in to hear Bryan's speech, and stood out in the rain and wanted to know a few things—why Bryan didn't hire a big hall, and why he didn't come outside where the fun was, etc. One shover at the door was mad clear through. "Why," he says, "I'm a Texas man, and I can't get in! Let me get near enough to the door to hear what they are yellin' about inside! You won't, hey? Well, I was up to Lafayette, Ind., on a little business, and I says to myself: 'I'll just run up on the cars and hear Billy Bryan.' I could have been here six hours ahead, but they told me that Bryan, up here, was a back number. Read it comin' up. The paper said there'd be plenty of seats. Listen to 'em yell! That's what a man gets for believin' the newspapers. Oh, yes, he's a back number; but I've come all the way up from Lafayette, Ind., and I can't get a good sight of the door!"

U. S.

#### WHAT THOMAS JEFFERSON STOOD FOR.

Letter of Hon. John Sharp Williams, Congressman from Mississippi, to the Iroquois Club of Chicago, read at the Club's banquet in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Jefferson, at the Auditorium, Apr. 13, 1904.

To the Iroquois Club,  
Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen:—I regret very much not to be able to be with you on the occasion of the celebration of Mr. Jefferson's birthday. I am in spirit and politically with you, notwithstanding my bodily absence. There is in the history of all the world no birthday, except one, so well worth being celebrated by the masses of mankind. Mr. Jefferson was very nearly the only man of equal or of approximate celebrity in his time who sincerely believed in the capacity of the people for self-government. It is to him more than to any other man that we owe the first ten amendments to the Federal Constitution. Without them there would have been no fundamental guarantees of freedom of speech, freedom of assemblage, freedom of religion, freedom from unreasonable search, in short, no Bill of Rights for the American people. Moreover, there would have been no distinct declaration of the great Democratic principle that the powers not delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the States, or the people therein.

In this day it is especially well to

remember what Mr. Jefferson stood for. I would suggest that you have some one read to the Iroquois Club Mr. Jefferson's first inaugural address. It is the political "Sermon on the Mount" of all Democrats, and would not make a bad platform for the Democrats, even in this year of our Lord's grace, 1904. Are Democrats anti-consolidationists? Mr. Jefferson taught them the doctrine. Do Democrats believe that a national debt is not a national blessing, but a national curse? Mr. Jefferson taught them that. Do Democrats believe that there should be left to the individual every liberty possible, consistent with the welfare of other individuals, that there should be left to the town or the county the largest possible measure of home-rule, that there should be lodged in the State, every judicial and legislative power that is not strictly national and necessary to the public defense and to national independence? They got that lesson from Mr. Jefferson. Mr. Jefferson taught and taught wisely, that, as a rule, "the people least governed are best governed" and that the less Federal interference with local self-government in the family, in the town, in the county and in the State the better for all concerned.

Do Democrats believe that, within the scope of the exercise of Federal power, there should be, as nearly as possible, equal opportunities and equal burdens? Mr. Jefferson taught them that. Do Democrats believe that the taxing power ought to be used for the purpose of raising a revenue to carry on a government constitutionally, economically and effectively administered? That was one of Mr. Jefferson's lessons, too. Do Democrats believe that, "the object of all government is the happiness and prosperity" of the masses, "the greatest good of the greatest number"? He is the author of the phrase.

Do they believe that our foreign policy ought to be based upon the idea of friendship for all and entangling alliances with none? He was the Secretary of State under whose guidance Washington practiced the policy. Do Democrats believe in a proper and right expansion over unpeopled areas, or homogeneous and assimilable people—an expansion carrying with it equal laws and our common constitutional guarantees? Mr. Jefferson set the example and blazed the way. Are Democrats anti-colonialists? Stronger denunciations of colonialism and of the arbitrary, unlimited government lodged within the discretion of the governors, that necessarily goes with it—

were never penned than the utterances of Mr. Jefferson upon that subject. Do Democrats believe that no community has the right to govern another community across the seas, in accordance with the uninformed dictates of its own sweet will? Mr. Jefferson was the pen of the Revolution who wrote that doctrine large. Do Democrats believe in amicable and reciprocal trade relations with the other nations of the world? Mr. Jefferson negotiated the first reciprocity treaties. Do Democrats believe in the Monroe Doctrine, its proper assertion and its proper limitations? Mr. Jefferson expressed the idea before Monroe, after a consultation with him, had included it in a state paper. Do Democrats believe militarism to be a curse, and that the farmer or mechanic ought not to be compelled to bear upon his stooped shoulders a helmeted soldier; that the military power ought always to be subordinate, not in words nor in law alone, but in spirit as well, to the civil authority? Mr. Jefferson was their forerunner there, too. Do Democrats think that, in our relations with foreign countries, we ought to be a true world power by setting a glorious example of liberty, home development, industry, prosperity and sweet-winged peace? It was Mr. Jefferson who said: "I frankly admit that my passion is peace." Do Democrats believe, however, in proper resentment of international wrong and in brave confrontation of positions of peril? It was Mr. Jefferson who put down the Algerine pirates when England, "the mistress of the sea," was paying them a tribute. It was Mr. Jefferson who gave notice to the great Corsican himself, when the world was trembling at his nod, that "the one power in all the world which could not be our friend and necessarily must be an enemy" was a strong European government in control of the Mississippi Valley and its outlets!

There were no trusts in Mr. Jefferson's day, but we may well understand what his doctrine would have been concerning them if we will but re-read what he said about the menace to the people's liberties and happiness which the undue amassment of great wealth in the hands of a few people would occasion. He not only foresaw it, but did what he could to prevent it, giving up his place in the Continental Congress in order to go home to Virginia and pull up, by the roots, primogeniture and entail—the two sources whence the evil seemed chiefly to grow in his day. He went further—and further than we are prepared to go, even now, at this day—when he said, that

the time would come when the "statutory privilege of bequest and devise" would have to be limited in the interest of the well-being of society "in whose interest" it had been granted, and that the amount which could be left by bequest or devise to any one person or for any one purpose should be demarked.

Intelligence, subtle and far-seeing; character broad and all loving; a moral courage superb; consideration for the foibles and prejudices of others; exquisite courtesies; indifference to personal enrichment; all these marked him a gentleman, and, as such, an embodiment of the highest ideals of the English-speaking race.

I am, with every expression of regard,  
Very truly yours,  
(Signed) JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS.  
Mar. 4, 1904.

#### FASHIONABLE ANARCHY.

Some ten days hence  
all the assessors  
in eighty-three counties  
assembling by counties  
will agree among themselves  
to nullify the law,  
to repudiate their oaths,  
to ignore the constitution—  
all the people consenting.

According to their custom  
they will adopt their own standards,  
one class of property 50 per cent,  
another 25 per cent,  
another 20 per cent,  
another 60 per cent,  
another 80 per cent,  
another full 100—  
all in despite of the law.

Other classes they will rate  
at \$40 apiece,  
others at \$1.50 a hundred,  
others at \$5 apiece,  
others at \$5 to \$75,  
without regard to value,  
others they leave entirely  
to the whim of the assessor.

Then they'll go home  
and ignore their agreements  
even as the agreements  
set aside the law,  
all the people consenting.

Here is a shame  
and a veritable scandal,  
the most fundamental  
law of our government  
swept into the dust bin  
by the very officers  
sworn to enforce it—  
all the people consenting.

It strikes at the bottom  
foundations of the government,  
it saps and enfeebles  
the bulwarks of state,  
it undermines decent  
respect for the law,  
it is virtual anarchy  
with its red shirt concealed  
by a mild gray disguise.

It is the same brand of disorder  
that is seen in our great cities

where it spreads into corruption,  
into purchase of special favors  
by otherwise honest citizens,  
where politics is tainted  
by upright business interests,  
where the civic life is rotten  
and honeycombed with grafts  
because law is despised.

This disregard of law  
is the republic's only peril.  
There is one place to cure it  
which is right here at home.  
Goodhue Co. (Minn.) News of Apr. 16.

#### MR. BRYAN ON THE NEW YORK PLATFORM.

Abstract of the speech delivered by William J. Bryan at the Second Regiment armory in Chicago, Saturday evening, April 23, 1904.

As it is somewhat unusual for a political speech to be made as this one is to-night, let me preface my remarks with an explanation. I have hired this hall, and I introduce myself, because I do not care to speak under the auspices of any club or organization which is committed to any particular aspirant for office. My concern is not about the name or the personality of the nominee, but about the principles for which the Democratic party is to stand. While many of the papers seem to assume that the contest for the Democratic nomination is necessarily between Judge Parker and Mr. Hearst, and that every Democrat must either be for one or the other, such a position is illogical and without foundation. Those who are classed as reorganizers—and by that I mean those who would carry the party back to the position that it occupied under Mr. Cleveland's administration—are not entirely agreed among themselves as to the proper candidate upon whom to concentrate their votes, and so those who are in sympathy with the spirit of our recent platforms may differ as to the relative availability of those who represent the progressive element of the party. My own position is one of neutrality. I regard as available all candidates who are in favor of making the Democratic party an honest, earnest and courageous exponent of the rights and interests of the masses; and I regard as unavailable all who are in sympathy with, or obligated to, the great corporations that to-day dominate the policy of the Republican party, and seek, through the reorganizers, to dominate the policy of the Democratic party. I have no favorites among those on our side, and no special antagonism to those who represent the reorganizers. I believe that the line should be drawn between principles, not between men;

and that men should only be considered as they may be able to advance or retard the progress of Democracy.

I have come to Chicago because from this point I can reach a large number of voters in the Mississippi valley; and I have expressed a desire to have the ministers attend, because they can and should exert an influence in behalf of honesty and fairness in politics. When some two years ago I became satisfied that ex-Senator David B. Hill was planning to be a candidate, I pointed out the objections to his candidacy. When the Cleveland boom was launched, I pointed out the objections to his candidacy; and now that Mr. Parker seems to be the leading candidate (though not the only candidate) among the reorganizers, I desire to present some reasons why he cannot be considered as an available candidate for a Democratic nomination; and I find these reasons not in his personality, but in his position upon public questions. For a year he has been urged to speak out and declare himself upon the important issues of the coming campaign, but he has remained silent. If this silence meant that nobody knew his views, those who have been loyal to the party in recent years would stand upon an equal footing with those who deserted; but it is evident now that while to the public generally his views are unknown, they are well known to those who are urging his nomination. Whatever doubt may have existed on this subject heretofore, has been dispelled by the platform adopted by the New York State convention; and, taking this platform as a text, I am sanguine enough to believe that I can prove to every unbiased mind that Judge Parker is not a fit man to be nominated, either by the Democratic party, or by any other party that stands for honesty or fair dealing in politics. I cannot hope to convince those who favor deception and fraud in politics, but I am satisfied that we now have evidence sufficient to convict Judge Parker of absolute unfitness for the nomination. If he did not know of the platform in advance, if he did not himself dictate it, or agree to it, he has allowed it to go out as his utterance, for the convention was dominated by his friends, and adopted a resolution presenting him as the candidate of the party of the State. This platform, then, can fairly be regarded as his declaration upon public questions, and what does the platform say? The first plank reads:

This is a government of laws, not of men; one law for presidents, cabinets and people; no usurpation; no executive en-

encroachment upon the legislative or judicial department.

This is a general plank that says nothing definitely. It is probably intended as a condemnation of the president's pension order, but the idea is so vaguely expressed that those who support the platform can deny that any criticism was intended, if they find that such criticism is unpopular.

The second plank reads:

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.

This is probably intended as a rebuke to the President for his action in the Panama matter; but this, too, is so indefinite that the supporters of the platform can repudiate any such intention if it ever becomes convenient to do so.

The third plank reads:

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.

This, possibly, is intended as a criticism of the rashness of the President and of his emotional temperament; and yet it is so impersonal that those who support the platform can very plausibly insist that it has no particular reference to any person, but is intended as a very broad statement of a very general principle.

The fourth plank reads:

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.

This plank might find a welcome place in any platform. It would be difficult to conceive of a party that would object to "just regulations by the state in the interest of the people," nor is there any party that is likely to defend taxation for any other than a public purpose. Even the Republican party has never declared itself in favor of "government partnership with protected monopolies." The plank, therefore, has no meaning at all as it stands, unless there is a secret suggestion that the regulation of corporations must be left entirely to the States. This is the position that is taken by the trust magnates. Whenever congress attempts to interfere with a trust the friends of the trust at once insist that the state must do the regulating—that is the position taken by

the dissenting members of the Supreme Court in the merger case, and if this plank means anything, it is an indorsement of the minority members of the court, rather than an indorsement of the decision of the majority. The fact that the platform is silent about the merger decision lends color to this construction.

The fifth plank reads:

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

This is the anti-trust plank of the platform! At least it is the only plank in which the trust is mentioned by name. The plank contains 14 words, and it will be noted that the opposition is not to all monopolies, or even to all trusts, but simply to those that "oppress the people and stifle healthy industrial competition." That is the position taken by Judge Brewer in his separate opinion. He contends that the Sherman law was not intended to prevent all restraint of trade, but only "unreasonable restraint," and so Mr. Hill and the other New York friends of Judge Parker so have worded their trust plank as to make their meaning uncertain. They have so worded the plank as to present the trust view of the question, rather than the view entertained by the people at large. In order to excite the opposition of the friends of Judge Parker the trust must be shown to be "oppressive." It must be shown that it is not only stifling industrial competition, but that it is stifling a "healthy industrial competition." The trust magnates claim that the object of the trust is to stifle unhealthy industrial competition and to promote a "healthy industrial competition." The qualifying words used in this very brief and ambiguous plank destroy whatever vitality it might have had without them. The Kansas City platform declared a private monopoly to be indefensible and intolerable. It not only arraigned private monopoly, as an unmitigated evil, but it pointed out specific remedies for the destruction of this evil. Compare the Kansas City platform with the cowardly and straddling anti-trust—or rather trust—plank of the New York platform, and you will understand why Mr. Hill and Judge Parker are so afraid of the Kansas City platform.

The sixth plank reads:

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

There is another plank that is as meaningless as those that have preceded it. Who advocates extravagance? Even when the Republican party is

guilty of the largest appropriations, it insists that it is not extravagant, but that it is simply legislating for a large country.

The seventh plank reads:

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

This plank is also evasive. The tariff revision must be "reasonable." What party ever advocated what it believed to be unreasonable on any subject? The duties upon raw material must not be "needless" duties. What party ever admitted that it put needless duties on anything? This plank justifies the criticism of one of the leading Republican papers of the West which says that the platform "does not even dare to recommend the abandonment of the Republican doctrine of protection of home industries, which had been fondly supposed by the old-fashioned Jeffersonian fellows to be about the only thing the party dared to cheep about at St. Louis."

The eighth plank is as follows:

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

Now here is a plank that is a model of obscurity and brevity. Only ten words in the plank. To what issue is it to be applied? How is it to be construed?

The ninth plank reads:

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

As President Roosevelt prides himself upon his enthusiastic advocacy of honesty in the public service, and as his friends boast of his vigilance in the prevention of fraud and his firmness in the punishment of guilt, that plank might be regarded as an indorsement of him but for the fact that it is contained in a platform that suggests a candidate to oppose him.

The tenth plank reads:

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.

Senator Allison has a reputation of being able to walk on eggs without breaking them, and this plank, if it appeared anywhere else than in a Democratic platform, might be attributed to him, for it is about as nice a piece of balancing as has appeared in many a day. The party stands "impartially" between labor and capital. If any discrimination is made, it must not be an "unequal" discrimination. That is, if the party discriminates in favor of one side, it must offset it by an equal discrimination in

favor of the other side. There must be no abuse of the powers of the law, either for favoritism or oppression. Why this prodigality in the use of type? If the convention had said that it was in favor of doing right as between capital and labor, the plank would have been just as clear and just as useful as a guide to the party. In fact the whole platform is so noncommittal, so absolutely colorless, and so capable of being construed in any way, that "we will do right" would have answered as well for the whole platform. A Republican could run on that platform, and after the election construe it as an indorsement of every policy for which the Republican party stands, or at least he could find nothing in that platform that would rebuke him for doing anything that a Republican might want to do.

What are the issues before the country? The trust question is certainly an issue, and yet there is nothing in that platform that gives any encouragement to the opponents of the trusts. There is not a word or syllable that binds a person elected on such a platform to do anything that the trusts are unwilling to have done. The Kansas City platform stated the party's position on the trust question, but the New York platform not only fails to indorse the last national platform, but also fails to propose any definite or positive plan of relief.

Imperialism is an issue. Our government is now administering a colonial policy according to the political principles employed by George III, a century and a quarter ago, and yet there is not in this platform a single word relating to the question of imperialism, not a plank that defines the party's position on that subject, not a protest against the surrender of the doctrines of self-government. The Kansas City platform stated the party's opposition to a colonial policy, but the New York platform not only fails to indorse the Kansas City platform, but fails to take any position at all on this important question.

The labor question is an issue. The laboring men have been before the committees of congress endeavoring to secure three important measures. One is the arbitration of differences between corporations engaged in interstate commerce and their employes. Both the Chicago and Kansas City platforms declared in favor of arbitration, but the New York platform not only fails to refer to the arbitration plank of these platforms, but it fails to write a new plank covering this subject.

The laboring men are also trying to secure an eight-hour day, but the New York platform is silent on this subject.

The laboring men are also trying to secure the abolition of government by injunction. Both the Chicago and Kansas City platforms contained planks on this subject, but the New York platform dodges this as it does all other vital questions. As the capitalists now have what they want and are in the position of defendants in a suit, while the laboring men are in the attitude of plaintiffs seeking relief, the failure of the New York platform to advocate what the laboring men desire is really a declaration against them.

On the tariff question no issue is joined. It was reasonable to suppose that on this question, at least, something would be said, but Mr. Hill and Judge Parker seem to be as much afraid of the tariff question as of other issues.

The money question is ignored entirely. No reference is made to bimetallicism at any ratio—not even to international bimetallicism to which Mr. Hill seemed to be so attached in the Chicago convention. No reference is made to the measure now before congress to melt up nearly six hundred million legal tender silver dollars into subsidiary coin that is only a limited legal tender. Nothing is said about the asset currency which is a part of the scheme of the financiers. Nothing is said about the Aldrich bill which proposes to subsidize the banks into opposition to tax reduction by loaning them the surplus money in the treasury. There is no condemnation of the corruption that such a system would lead to. The platform does not antagonize the proposition now before Congress to give the national banks unlimited control over the volume of paper money. In other words there is not a line in the platform that is written in behalf of the people; not a line that will excite criticism in Wall street.

The platform ignores the income tax; it fails to indorse the election of Senators by direct vote; and it also omits the plank of the Kansas City platform denouncing corporate domination in politics.

The New York platform is a dishonest platform, fit only for a dishonest party. No one but an artful dodger would stand upon it. The submission of such a platform to the voters of a state is an insult to their intelligence, for it is intended to deceive them, and a deliberate attempt to deceive—especially so clumsy an attempt as this platform is—is a reflection upon the brains of those to whom it is submitted.

This platform proves that the opposition to the Kansas City platform is

not opposition to silver, but opposition to every needed reform and opposition to all that the masses desire.

I had expected that a platform prepared by Mr. Hill for Judge Parker would be evasive and lacking in frankness, but I did not conceive that any body of men calling themselves Democrats would present such a platform as a recommendation of a candidate. If we are to take the New York platform as an indication of what the next Democratic platform is to be, in case the reorganizers control the convention, then who will be able to deny the secret purpose of the reorganizers to turn the party over to predatory wealth? It is to this danger that I desire to call your attention to-night. With such a platform and a candidate who would be willing to run upon it, the party could secure as large a campaign fund as the Republican party has ever secured, but in securing it it would, like the Republican party, secretly pledge the administration to a construction of the platform satisfactory to the corporations and the combinations. If you would know why the corporations contribute to campaign funds, read the testimony given by Mr. H. O. Havemeyer before the Senate committee in the spring of 1894. The answers made by Mr. Havemeyer to Senator Allen's questions are conclusive as to the purpose of the campaign contributions made by the great corporations:

Senator Allen—Therefore, you feel at liberty to contribute to both parties?

Mr. Havemeyer—It depends. In the State of New York, where the Democratic majority is between 40,000 and 50,000, we throw it their way. In the State of Massachusetts, where the Republican party is doubtful, they probably have the call.

Senator Allen—In the State of Massachusetts do you contribute anything?

Mr. Havemeyer—Very likely.

Senator Allen—What is your best recollection as to contributions made by your company in the State of Massachusetts?

Mr. Havemeyer—I could not name the amount.

Senator Allen—However, in the State of New York you contribute to the Democratic party, and in the commonwealth of Massachusetts you contribute to the Republican party?

Mr. Havemeyer—It is my impression that wherever there is a dominant party, wherever the majority is very large, that is the party that gets the contribution, because that is the party which controls the local matters.

Senator Allen—Then, the sugar trust is a Democrat in a Democratic State, and a Republican in a Republican State?

Mr. Havemeyer—As far as local matters are concerned, I think that is about it.

Senator Allen—In the State of your nativity, or the nativity of your corporation, New Jersey, where do your contributions go?

Mr. Havemeyer—I will have to look that up.

Senator Allen—I understand New Jersey is invariably a Democratic State. It would naturally go to the Democratic party?

Mr. Havemeyer—Under the theory I have suggested, if they were there it would naturally go to them.

Here we have the head of the sugar trust admitting that his corporation contributes to campaign funds, and that its contribution is determined, not by political convictions, but by its desire to stand in with the winning party. Senator Allen tried to ascertain the amounts contributed to the various campaign funds, but Mr. Havemeyer refused to answer.

The two Republican members of the committee, Senator Davis and Senator Lodge, joined Senator Allen in calling the matter to the attention of the attorney general for the District of Columbia. Senator Allen individually reported a resolution in favor of calling the witness before the Senate for contempt, but Senator Gray and Senator Lindsey, both Gold Democrats, presented a minority report in which they opposed taking any action in regard to the witness.

If you desire further testimony in regard to the purpose of corporations in contributing, you will find it in a letter sent by Mr. A. B. Hepburn, of the National City bank, of New York, to Lyman J. Gage, Secretary of the Treasury. The letter bears date of June 5, 1897, and is published in House document 264 of the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress. In closing the letter, after asking for deposits, Mr. Hepburn says:

Of course the bank is very strong, and if you will take the pains to look at our list of directors you will see that we also have great political claims in view of what was done in the campaign last year.

Here is the president of the most influential bank in the country calling attention to political service rendered by the directors of the bank, as a reason why the bank should be remembered in the distribution of government money. Now, with the testimony of the head of one of the great trusts, and the testimony of an official of one of the great banks, can any one doubt that contributions are made by the corporations for the purpose of controlling the policy of the party after the election? Can any one doubt that with such a platform as was adopted in New York, and with a candidate whose conscience would permit him to run upon such a platform—does any one doubt that with such a platform and candidate the party

would be mortgaged beforehand to the corporations that are now using the government as a private asset, and plundering the people at will?

But there is another reason why the Democratic party cannot afford to go before the country with an ambiguous platform and an uncertain candidate. No matter how people may differ as to the relative importance of issues, all must recognize that the trust question to-day presents an important phase of the great conflict between plutocracy and democracy. We have recently had a Supreme Court decision on the merger case. This decision was rendered by a bare majority of one, and that one (Judge Brewer) in a separate opinion has stated his position in such a way as to leave no doubt that in the first case involving a trust he may join the minority and defeat the Sherman law. Judge Brewer construes the anti-trust law to apply only to reasonable restraint of trade. He would have the Court decide whether the restraint is reasonable or unreasonable. His decision, taken in connection with the dissenting opinions of Justices Fuller, Peckham, White and Holmes, shows that the appointment of a new judge might throw the decision to the one side or to the other. The judges of the Supreme Court are appointed by the President, and the President to be elected this fall will doubtless have the appointment of one or two, and possibly three, Supreme Court judges. If his sympathies are with the corporations he will doubtless appoint judges satisfactory to the corporations—especially if obligated to the corporations by large campaign contributions—and these judges can make it impossible to secure any remedial legislation for years to come. If, four years hence, the people should secure a President, a Senate, and a House opposed to private monopolies, they may find themselves unable to get any remedial legislation past the Supreme Court for several years.

The opinion filed by Judge White and concurred in by the others, denies the power of Congress over monopolies organized in a State. These dissenting judges insist that Congress has no power to regulate or restrain the creation of a monopoly within a State. It will be remembered that the decision in the Knight case, known as the sugar trust case, turned upon that very question. It was admitted in that case that the sugar trust controlled the production of sugar; but the Court held that the Sherman law

did not prevent the buying up of the individual refineries, even though the product of the refineries might ultimately enter into interstate commerce.

The division of the Supreme Court in the merger case shows the cleavage on the trust question. The dissenting judges would deny the power of Congress to prevent a private monopoly; and when the power of Congress to destroy monopolies is denied, the people are left helpless, because some of the States, such as Delaware and New Jersey, find it profitable to permit the creation of these monopolies, and so long as they are created and can evade federal laws, no separate State can fully protect itself against them.

The dissenting judges in the merger case refused to draw a distinction between an individual and a corporation. Justice White says:

The principle that the ownership of property is embraced within the power of congress to regulate commerce, whenever that body deems that a particular character of ownership, if allowed to continue, may restrain commerce between the states or create a monopoly thereof, is in my opinion in conflict with the most elementary conceptions of rights of property.

And Justices Fuller, Peckham and Holmes concur.

"Rights of property," are, according to the dissenting judges, supreme, and when Congress tries to prevent a monopoly, it is interfering with "the most elementary conception of the rights of property." The issue presented to-day in the trust question, and in all the other questions with which we have to deal, is the question between human rights and so-called "property rights"—or, more properly speaking, between ordinary people and the great corporations. Those who believe that property rights are supreme, take the side of the trusts. If we have a President who is in sympathy with this theory, it means that the Dollar will be given consideration before the Man; it means that organized wealth can continue to trample upon the rights of the people; it means that the instrumentalities of government can be used for the protection of every scheme of exploitation that the capitalists can conceive.

I, for one, am not willing that the Democratic party shall become the tool of the corporations; I am not willing that it shall be the champion of organized wealth. And it is because I believe that the party has a higher mission than to be the exponent of plutocracy, that I am protesting against the schemes of those who would put it into competition with the Republic-

an party for the support of Wall street financiers. It is for this reason that I protest against mortgaging the party to the capitalists to secure an enormous corruption fund.

If any who are present to-night, or who read what I say, think that I am trying to interfere with Democratic success, let me answer that no Democrat is more anxious for the party to succeed than I am. No one has suffered more from dissensions and divisions in the party, and no one, I believe, is more eager for the country to enjoy the great benefits which a triumph of real Democracy would bring. But I do not desire that the party shall win offices only. If that is the only purpose of the party, let its principles be abandoned, and let its platform simply declare the party hungry for the patronage. The lesson of 1894 shows the folly of hoping to win by a surrender to the corporations, but even if success could be bought in such a way, it would not be worth the price.

No one can defend the Democratic party without defending its principles, and its principles ought to be so clearly set forth as to be easily understood. We ought to appeal to the conscience of the public, and arraign Republican policies as hostile both to the principles of free government and to the principles of morality. We have an opportunity to make the Democratic party a power in this country—not only a power, but a power for good. Let us array the party against every abuse of government and against every policy that is hurtful to the people. Let us drive out of the party every Democrat who betrays his trust, every official who would administer the office for his private advantage. Let us make Democracy stand not only for good government—for honest government—but for a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." And the first step in this direction is the adoption of a platform that recognizes the right of the people to decide public questions, as well as their capacity for understanding public questions. To present a platform which is evasive and ambiguous, shows that those who write the platform either distrust the people who are to act upon it, or have purposes that they desire to conceal.

The New York platform is ambiguous, uncertain, evasive and dishonest. It would disgrace the Democrats of the nation to adopt such a platform, and it ought to defeat as an aspirant for a Democratic nomination any man who

would be willing to have it go forth as a declaration of his views on public questions. In Illinois, in Wisconsin, in Michigan, in Minnesota, in Indiana, in Ohio, and in every other State that has not acted, it behooves the Democrats to avenge themselves and organize, to the end that they may prevent the consummation of the schemes of the reorganizers. Their scheme begins with the deception of the rank and file of the party. It is to be followed up by the debauching of the public with a campaign fund secured from the corporations, and it is to be consummated by the betrayal of the party organization and of the country into the hands of those who are to-day menacing the liberties of the country by their exploitation of the producers of wealth.

#### "WHEN WAS A DUMB MAN SENT TO THE WHITE HOUSE?"

At the April dinner of the Gridiron club at the Arlington hotel in Washington, April 22, four members sang to the tune of "The Little Black Bull" a song, the title of which was given as "Peeping Through the Knot Hole in Papa's Wooden Leg, or Why Was the Ocean Bull so Near to the Shore?" We reprint from the report in the Chicago Tribune.

David B. Hill came down the mountain,  
Hoosan Johnny, Hoosan Johnny.  
David B. Hill came down the mountain,  
Long time ago.

He picked out a man whose name is Parker,  
Hoosan Johnny, Hoosan Johnny.  
He picked out a man whose name is Parker,  
Long time ago.

He says: "Don't talk, and we'll beat T. Roosevelt."

Hoosan Johnny, Hoosan Johnny.  
He says: "Don't talk, and we'll beat T. Roosevelt."  
Long time ago.

And he didn't say a word all spring or summer,  
Hoosan Johnny, Hoosan Johnny.  
And he didn't say a word all spring or summer,  
Long time ago.

But when was a dumb man sent to the white house?  
Hoosan Johnny, Hoosan Johnny.  
But when was a dumb man sent to the white house?  
Long time ago.

#### CHORUS.

Long time ago, long time ago,  
But when was a dumb man sent to the white house?  
Long time ago.

Just as in a neglected house there may be conditions that attract vermin and breed a pestilence, so in the mind, long closed to light, there may be a stock of old ideas in different stages of decay in which are nurtured the germs of disease and death. To go down into the cellar of the mind and up into the garret, to drag out the moldy and infected thoughts

and scour the hidden corners and flood the darkness with the sunshine—what if we were to do this every spring?—Herbert S. Bigelow.

Miss Susan B. Anthony at 84, as chipper as a blackbird and merry as a cricket, says: "I may not be here when the campaign opens but if anywhere, I shall be somewhere." This is lucid, diplomatic, a little mysterious and delightfully non-committal. She would make an excellent secretary of state if anything should happen to John Hay.—Lawrence (Mass.) Sentinel.

The man with narrow mind and low ambitions who is irritated at the mere mention of the wrongs of others and whose absorbing interest is in personal gain and pleasure—he is a vulture spirit, bent on carrion, and has not the moral perception to realize his own ugliness.—Herbert S. Bigelow.

## BOOKS

### A CHALLENGE TO SOCIALISM.

The anti-socialism crusade of the Roman Catholic church in the United States, seems upon the surface to be an ecclesiastical attack upon an economic and political movement. There are many things about the crusade and in the spirit and method of its active participants to account for this; but it must eventually be conceded that there is much in socialism that would justify such a crusade from purely religious motives and upon strictly religious grounds. For socialism, in so far as it is represented by what are called "scientific" socialists—and they are now dominant in the movement, not only in Europe but here—stands not alone for economic and political change, but also for the destruction of existing religious institutions and beliefs and the denial of absolute moral ideals and standards.

This is the keynote of the book before us: "Socialism; the Nation of Fatherless Children," (Boston: The Union News League), by David Goldstein. Mr. Goldstein's work is edited by Martha Moore Avery. His subtitle is an allusion to the subject matter of his chapter on "Homeless Children," which explains that under socialism children would be reared no longer in family homes, but in collective nurseries.

It appears that Mr. Goldstein was for eight years an active and studious propagandist of socialism. Being a theist, though not a church-goer or advocate of any religious creed, he was always repelled by the assertions of the German socialists, who "controlled the organization, that 'you cannot be a socialist without being an atheist,' " but for a long time he took this for their

personal opinion, not for "the bed rock of socialist philosophy," and assumed that as the movement advanced it would "come under American management and so outgrow its foreign atheistic accompaniment." In this expectation he was disappointed. "It was the accumulation of fact on fact," he writes, "which at last has left me with the conviction that the atheistic forces, which under the socialist propaganda are taking political form, will compel a closer association of those organizations which stand for the propagation and enforcement of a religious law." He accordingly declares that "the time-worn battle between right and wrong is on," and gives it as his personal conviction that "upon the religious aspects of this great issue the fight now centers around the Catholic church."

Having come to this conclusion Mr. Goldstein, by letter of May 23, 1903, formally resigned his membership in the State committee of the Socialist party of Massachusetts, having already resigned as member of the Highland District Socialist Party club, of the Boston Socialist party and city committee, and of the general committee of the Massachusetts Socialist clubs. In resigning he announced his intention of publishing a book that would "prove to the candid mind (if facts count for anything) that a vote cast for socialism is a vote cast for the destruction of those institutions which promote and sustain civilization; namely, the church, the state and the monogamic family." The book named above appears in fulfillment of that announcement.

Mr. Goldstein is apparently animated by ecclesiastical motives. It may be that he is carrying on an anti-socialist agitation under ecclesiastical management. He is certainly embittered and possibly prejudiced by the resentments of the old comrades he has abandoned. Under the influence of these and kindred feelings he has weakened his book by not a little demagoguery. The space devoted to appeals to indiscriminating supporters of existing institutions might have been better used for judicial discrimination between good and bad institutions and for rational defense of the good. The subtitle, for instance,—"the Nation of Fatherless Children"—in which the author implies that under socialism the commonwealth would supersede the family, is manifestly an attempt to excite prejudice; and so is the chapter on "Homeless Children," to which it alludes. Yet it would have been as easy to refute the socialistic literature on this point as to quote it without other protest than an unreasoning appeal to conventional ideas.

But every man must be allowed to make his own book in his own way; and if Mr. Goldstein, whose principal object was to demonstrate that socialism runs counter to cherished institu-

tions, chooses to start with the assumption that these institutions ought to be cherished, that is his affair. It is a perfectly legitimate mode of addressing audiences who are already convinced, whether rationally or not, of the soundness of the assumption; and Mr. Goldstein is not open to criticism for adopting it as his hypothesis. And that he accomplishes his main purpose, that of demonstrating the essential hostility of the present socialist movement not only to church, state and monogamous marriages, but also to the idea of a spiritual religion and moral principles, is hardly to be questioned.

Although the author enters so slightly into argument in refutation of the socialist doctrines and their corollaries which he discloses, he nevertheless exhibits now and then an ability in that direction of which one might have wished to find more instances. One of these instances is his short and incisive reply to the materialistic doctrine of scientific socialism. Quoting the epigrammatic statement of a socialist author in support of this doctrine, "the inventions and not the intentions of men have been the cause of progress," Mr. Goldstein retorts: "This sounds well! The music of its rhythm is mistaken for logic. The simple fact is that the inventions of men have always been preceded by the intentions of men." The materialistic postulate and the idealistic reply could find no better epigrammatic statement.

It is to be observed that Mr. Goldstein distinguishes socialism from public ownership of public utilities. His distinction is sound in economic principle and he credits it—though without citation, unfortunately—to the judiciary of Massachusetts, summarizing a judicial opinion as follows: "Public utilities are those things which require a governmental function, such as the distribution of water, gas, electricity—commodities which necessitate a single enterprise with supplies emanating from a single source—those things which require the use of the public highways, etc."

There are implications throughout the book of a grasp of fundamental economic principle. But the reader whom these implications may favorably affect will be disappointed upon finding that Mr. Goldstein's philosophy rounds up in trades unionism plus individual charity.

PAMPHLETS.

Hugo Bilgram, 1235 Spring Garden street, Philadelphia, publishes a proposed "substitute for elastic currency" and a "simple remedy for financial stringency." His plan is borrowed from the clearing house idea. It could be put into operation by voluntary associations of any number of people having mutual business relations. Their object would be the settling of their mutual accounts, and this they would do precisely as clearing houses now settle the mutual accounts of bankers, except that the checks or due bills going through this clearing house "would rest upon original values instead of representatives of value, like cash

and its substitutes." The checks or due bills of each member of the association would be secured by preliminary deposits of adequate collateral, and provision for paying the clearing house balances would be made by requiring small periodical cash payments by the members of the association.

Some very effective tax reform work has been done by the Massachusetts Single Tax League under the presidency of Mr. C. E. Fillebrown, of Boston. A distinctive feature of this work is the annual series of banquets which the league has for some years been accustomed to give to representative classes. One of these, the banquet of April 13, 1903, was given to some of the landlords of Boston, and the address of President Fillebrown on that occasion, together with newspaper comments, has been put into a pamphlet which must profoundly interest every student of taxation. Mr. Fillebrown's speech is a rich mine of valuable and but little known fiscal facts. He has, for instance, collected the particulars of 120 real estate sales in Boston, which show an average of 80 per cent. as the ratio of tax valuation to true selling value. From the same data Mr. Fillebrown ascertains that the actual capitalized land value, net of those parcels of real estate aggregates \$5,623,470—about 77 per cent. of the value of land and improvements together. This is about the same proportion, as recently disclosed by the taxing authorities of New York, that prevails in New York city. Another of Mr. Fillebrown's exhibits is a table comparing the assessed valuations of 751 pieces of real estate with their actual rentals. The tabulation particularizes for the whole 751 cases and presents the results in nine columns, aggregating as follows: (1) assessed valuation of the real estate, \$35,808,800; (2) assessed valuation of the land, \$25,067,800; (3) assessed valuation of the buildings, \$10,741,000; (4) net rental, less taxes, \$2,277,222; (5) ten per cent. allowance on building for interest, insurance, repairs and depreciation, \$1,071,800; (6) net income from land, \$1,205,422; (7) per cent. of net income on assessed valuation of land, 4.8 per cent.; (8) paid by the user for net ground rent, plus tax, \$1,577,425; (9) gross value of land, being the user's rent, capitalized at five per cent., \$31,548,500. Mr. Fillebrown tabulates other facts which cannot but command serious attention. In these he shows that the actual and potential gross ground rent of Boston in 1902 was \$42,000,000, whereas the total of taxes paid was only \$18,000,000. On the question of the appreciation of real estate, Mr. Fillebrown makes a significant showing in a table of Boston's growth for 15 years, which we condense, as follows:

Valuation of buildings, 1888.....	\$24,000,000
Depreciation, plus taxes.....	88,750,000
Value of same buildings, 1902.....	146,000,000
Valuation of land, 1888.....	\$328,000,000
Appreciation, minus taxes.....	245,000,000
Value of same land, 1902.....	\$573,000,000

Thus Boston buildings have depreciated in value over a third in 15 years, while Boston land has almost doubled its value in the same time. Well may Mr. Fillebrown say: "Those persons who agree with John Stuart Mill that it would be sound public policy and no injustice to land owners to take for public purposes the future increase in ground rent will be interested to note what an opportunity is shown by the above figures to have been lost 15 years ago for putting such a plan in operation in Boston."

PERIODICALS.

—Henry George, Jr.'s fourth article for Pearson's, on modern methods of "finance," appears in the May number. It tells the story of the wreck of the ship-building trust, and incidentally shows some

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.