

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 6, 1904.

Number 331.

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.

Any person who thoughtfully considers present political conditions in the United States must take into account two facts which are usually overlooked. They are carelessly ignored by the indifferent and intentionally slurred over by the designing.

The first of these is the fact that the crystals of public sentiment, the world over, are agitated by new industrial questions which are generating new political issues. The other is the fact that these new issues are forcing upon American voters new alignments in their party politics and affiliations.

That this disturbance of party crystallization is vastly more disorganizing in its effect upon the Democratic than upon the Republican party is obvious. The reason for it is evident: the Democratic party happens to be the party out of power. But visible disorganization is not the only process whereby parties lose their vitality. If the Republican party, securely entrenched in power, has escaped visible disorganization, it has not escaped the potent forces of silent and invisible disintegration.

Both parties are vitally affected by these volcanic disturbances of public opinion, and if the party in power continues to present an organized front in spite of disintegration within, it is because its power enables it to appeal with success for the support and influence of the necessitous, the greedy, the conventionally respectable and the strenuously ambi-

tious, as well as those who have grown old and blind in its service and think it still what it used to be. Parties long in power excite patriotic emotions and control glittering opportunities. This strengthens the party machine and its power holds radicalism within the party in check.

It is different with a party long out of power. The party machine grows so weak that radical sentiment within the party breaks bounds. That is the condition of the Democratic party. Its organization is rent and torn by internal conflicts. On one side are mere office-seekers and traditional partisans, who hope to restore their party to power, and who are supported by conservatives wishing to perpetuate the existing order, or disorder, as the case may be. On the other are progressives who aspire to make their party vitally representative of their own newer views. This is the reason the Democratic party cannot present a united front to the united front of the Republicans.

Having been long out of power, the Democratic party has become, in the nature of things political, the seat of war in the clash of opinions over new political issues. Into it have come Republicans whose democratic ideas no longer find a congenial home in the Republican party. Out of it have gone Democrats whose plutocratic ideas make a party of democratic expectations and possibilities repulsive to them. Yet there are many plutocrats still in the Democratic party, and some who had left it returned when their hopes of controlling its machinery revived. So the conflicting forces of plutocracy and democracy in the United States center in this party.

There is at present a lull, while

the party awaits its Presidential candidate's speech or letter of acceptance. Its platform is satisfactory to the democratic element. Should its candidate accept that platform without equivocation, this element would doubtless make shift to accept him also. What that element will do if he takes the advice of plutocratic leaders and builds a platform of his own, inconsistent with the one upon which he was nominated, remains to be seen.

Democrats of the democratic variety will welcome the action of the anti-imperialists of Boston in their indorsement, at a meeting on the 1st in Faneuil Hall addressed by Gov. Garvin of Rhode Island, Bourke Cockran of New York and George S. Boutwell, of Massachusetts, of the Philippine plank of the Democratic platform. There is nothing equivocal about this plank. Without qualifying words or conditions, it distinctly insists that—

we ought to do for the Philippines what we have done already for the Cubans, and it is our duty to make that promise now; and upon suitable guarantees of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there at the time of our withdrawal, set the Filipino people upon their feet, free and independent to work out their own destiny.

It is important to observe, however, that this is not the declaration which the plutocratic element of the party tried to secure. The draft made by Williams of Mississippi and approved by the Parker leaders, was as full of weasel words as a dead horse of maggots. It declared we ought to do this thing for the Filipinos "ultimately," as soon as it can be done "wisely and safely for the Filipinos themselves," and after securing for ourselves "naval stations" and "coaling stations," and having fixed up "trade relations."

Had this draft been adopted it would have been about as hard to distinguish a "regular" Democrat from a "regular" Republican on the Philippine question as on the money question.

And it would have been adopted had the plutocratic element prevailed in the committee on platform. It would have been made worse. For Williams had garnished his dish with some democratic rhetoric, innocuous to plutocrats yet agreeable to democrats, which the sub-committee on platform did away with. The sub-committee's plank is entitled, in passing, to the credit of having also done away with Williams's weasel word—"ultimately;" but it limited the good intentions of the party, both as to time and conditions, even more plutocratically than had Williams. The time for independence, according to the sub-committee, was to be, as Williams had it, when it could be granted "wisely and safely for the Filipinos"—the same time that President Roosevelt is willing to fix; the conditions precedent were to be American "naval stations," "coaling stations," "trade" privileges, and "guarantee of protection" not merely to foreigners, as Williams had it, but "to all national and international interests"—thereby making secure provision for the safety of land and franchise exploitation. If that is anti-imperialism, Hanna was as good an anti-imperialist as anybody.

But, thanks to Mr. Bryan's vigilance, industry and ability, that imperialistic plank was struck out, and in its place was inserted the honest and unequivocal anti-imperialist plank which now appears in the platform and which the anti-imperialists of Boston have indorsed. Anti-imperialists everywhere are looking forward with no little interest to the 10th of August, the time set for Judge Parker to remove the seal from his political convictions, for an expression of his opinion on the Philippine plank of his platform. Will

he endorse the Bryan version without equivocation, will he restore the weasel-wordy version of Williams or that of the sub-committee, or will he dodge the issue altogether? This may prove later in the campaign to be a question of some moment.

Bryan's call to the Democracy to move forward has had a startling effect on the New York Nation. Its eyes are bloodshot and its jaws a-foam.

Having been told that Mr. Bryan refuses to speak for the gubernatorial candidate of the fraudulent Democratic convention of Illinois, the Chicago Chronicle, a Republican organ of long standing which has but recently put on the Republican label, explains it on the ground that the treasury of the Illinois Democracy is empty and Bryan speaks "for revenue only." Bryan's character in this respect is too well established to need any defense. Whatever weaknesses he may be supposed to have, no sane person believes that one of them is sordidness. But while Bryan does not need a defense from such an accusation as the Chronicle's, the accusation itself is significant. Does it not fairly arouse suspicion as to the Chronicle's own understanding of the relations of public politics to private finance?

There would be more to hope for out of the strenuous times in which we live, if men were disposed to give judgment according to their conceptions of what is just and fair all around, and not with reference alone to personal interests or class sympathies. Take the assassination of Plehve, for illustration, and why do we denounce the assassin for his crime while applauding the officials who have tortured him? If it is just to torture a Russian subject who murders without the arbitrary authority of a czar, why is it unjust to assassinate a Russian official who murders with the arbitrary authority of a czar? If one is right, why is the other wrong? Let us try to be fair about

these things. Did the Russian subject arbitrarily kill the Russian official? Very well, then let us approve the subject's execution so that he can assassinate no one else. Did the Russian official arbitrarily kill Russian subjects? Shall we say, Yes, and yet excuse his crime while denouncing his murderer's? We cannot do this and be fair. Murder is murder. The sad truth is that we are all too much disposed to appeal to Right when we are of the weak who suffer from the strong, while deifying Might when we are of the strong who make the weak to suffer. Plehve arbitrarily hurls the destructive power of an empire at its helpless subjects, not because they are criminal but because they are weak, and we find him an excuse in the philosophy that explains that the only right is Might; subjects hurl a destructive bomb at him under circumstances in which for the moment they are stronger than he, and forthwith we search our moral codes for assurances that might is not Right. Is this attitude of mind conducive to law and order?

Bishop Potter, who is in high degree, perhaps in the highest, the clerical representative of aristocracy in the United States, declares that "we must make the home of the workingman cleaner and brighter, and we must see that he gets his recreation." Whereupon the kindly bishop assists at the dedication of a workmen's saloon. We do not join in the pious hue and cry against him. But how his solicitude does seem, to quote his own words back at him, yet not harshly, to be appropriate to "the most tragic and at the same time the most comic feature in modern history." What a touching instance this, to be added to the vast catalogue of instances in verification of Tolstoy's idea that "the rich are willing to do anything for the poor except to get off their backs." If the aristocracy of this country, upon which Bishop Potter has so much influence, were to realize that its duty to "make the home of the workingman cleaner and brighter" and to "see that he

gets his recreation," is infinitely less imperative than to get off his back, the workingman might be in better form himself to make his home cleaner and brighter and to get his own recreation. The sympathy of the beneficiaries of privilege for the sufferings of its victims is not unlike the sorrow of the—

considerate crocodile
Which lived on the banks of the river Nile.
He lifted his eyes with a look of woe
While his tears ran down to the stream below.
"I am mourning," said he, "the unhappy fate
Of the dear little fish which I just now ate."

Mr. Lyman J. Gage, secretary of the treasury in McKinley's cabinet, has made a discovery in economics. He has discovered that land, labor and capital have in themselves no wealth-producing power, but must be supplemented by "ability"! It would be interesting to know what Mr. Gage imagines "labor" to be, since he finds it necessary to introduce "ability" as a fourth factor in production. He is not a man given to piling up words needlessly. Yet the term "labor" comprises all that he intends to imply by "ability." It is probable that what he means by "ability," is not ability in itself, for all grades of labor—even the lowest grade of the unskilled—must possess the ability to accomplish what it labors to do; he probably means organizing and managing ability. But this form of ability falls into the general category of "labor." It is only when subdivisions are necessary or convenient that it is proper to distinguish "managing labor," "organizing labor," or skilled labor" of any kind from labor commonly called unskilled. As a productive force all labor is one force, whatever its variety of expression, from coal bearer to engineer and thence to captain of industry; just as, on the other hand, all land is, as a productive opportunity, one opportunity, whatever its variety, from hard scrabble farming land to city building land that sells at the rate of ten millions the acre. In the language of the man in the street Mr. Gage "has another guess coming." If he makes that guess out of the ability of his own head, and

the richness of his own experience as a man of affairs, instead of tangling his thought in the fancies of some economic word-builder who puts forth a different name as a different thing, Mr. Gage's last guess will doubtless be very much better than his first.

LAND VALUE IN FARMS.

A gratifying degree of interest has been manifested in the striking fact brought out by the recently published assessments in New York city under the new law which requires the placing in separate columns of the land valuation and the total valuation respectively of each parcel. The public journals have commented on the stupendous and almost inconceivable value attaching to land on Manhattan island, and rural land owners have been forcibly impressed that from the standpoint of land value their farms, with all their vast and conspicuous areas, really cut but a very insignificant figure.

One idea which has frequently found expression, particularly in oral discussions, is to the effect that these enormous taxable values in mere sites ought to be in a sense and to an extent public property. It is hardly to be doubted that as other cities come to adopt the separate assessment plan, as in the interest of equity and good policy they are bound to do, the minds of thoughtful men will turn more and more to the land values thus brought to light as a basis for special assessments in case of such public improvements as cannot be claimed to be of perceptible benefit, pecuniarily or otherwise, to the tenant farmer for instance, or the day laborer.

It has generally been assumed that land-owning farmers, of whom the writer is one, would stand firmly in the way of singling out land value as a subject for special taxation. This assumption clearly involves the further assumption that land value taxation would injure the farmer, and must stand or fall with it. No considerable class of men, we may claim without undue arrogance, have a better capacity or better opportunities for finding out facts that concern their pecuniary interests than we have. We are

coming to be pretty well organized in most of the States, and we have free mail delivery to a considerable extent. A number of facts may be cited to show that up-to-date views even on taxation have been making considerable progress among us. The doctrine that "all property should bear its just burden of taxation,"—that is, should go on the tax list,—though not yet obsolete, is by no means so conspicuous as it formerly was in our Grange resolutions and official utterances. The "listing system," once so popular where it had not been tried, is now seldom asked for, and few among us are so unwary as to speak publicly in its praise. We feel a growing suspicion that our mortgage tax, while a monumental failure as a revenue raiser, is too much of a success as a raiser of interest rates on farm mortgages. And we yield to none in the loudness and vigor of our objections when our assessments are increased by reason of new or newly painted houses and barns.

Finally and seriously, we feel that rural production and consumption figure largely among the causes which give rise to the enormous taxable site values of populous centers; and while we fully appreciate the fact that much is being done for our pacification in the way of school and highway appropriations, public instruction in agricultural science and the like, we believe that we have, notwithstanding, a right to desire and to seek by all proper means a still more just distribution of the burdens and benefits of public expenditure between city and country. And as we come to more fully realize the impracticability of reaching by taxation the vast personal possessions, tangible and intangible, held in cities, our attention is hopefully attracted to comparative real estate values and assessments. The notorious undervaluation of unimproved lands in cities and suburbs, and even in our neighboring villages, is a matter of discussion among us, and the subject of proportionate land values in urban and rural communities possesses a growing interest.

In view of the above and other considerations the United States Department of Agriculture began

several years ago an investigation for the purpose of ascertaining the facts regarding farm values and assessments, including the proportion of land value to the total value, in the farms of certain sections of the State of New York. The results of this inquiry, as far as available at the time, were published by the Department in an official document entitled "Local Taxation as Affecting Farms." It had a considerable circulation and was widely known and quoted as "Circular No. 5."

This little pamphlet will repay careful study on the part of any farmer, good roads advocate, or other person deploring the drift of young people from country to city, and feeling the need of some practical means of increasing the advantages and attractions of rural life without adding to the heavy burden of local taxation on farms. Space will not allow of extended quotation, but it may be stated that 1,114 farms are covered by the report (Table 2, page 13), having a total real estate value of \$7,257,802, and an unimproved land value of \$2,842,192, or 39.2 per cent. of the total value. This 39.2 per cent. of land value is compared (page 9) with the only corresponding urban statistics then available, namely, those of Boston, whose assessments showed a proportion of land value to total value of 58.1 per cent. Accepting these as fair averages for country and city, the conclusion stated (page 11) was that a farming community having an equal total real estate value with a city community under the same fiscal authority would pay 19.4 per cent. less than one-half the common tax levy if land value, instead of total value, were the basis of assessment, the city, of course, paying correspondingly more than one-half.

The Greater New York assessment tables show a land value for the entire area equal to 77 per cent. of total real estate value (see The Public, vol. vi, p. 690). Detroit, which has also honored her civic judgment by adopting the separate assessment plan, reports 59 per cent. of land value to total value. It may, therefore, be assumed that the 58.1 per cent. of city land value employed in Circular No. 5 is not too high, and it is

the purpose of this article to show, among other things, that the 39.2 per cent. of farm land value is by no means too low as regards the great majority of farms in the sections examined.

The writer is in possession of duplicates of all the work done by one of the Department agents employed in collecting the data for "Circular No. 5," a large part of which was omitted through clerical carelessness from the report as originally published. An examination of these duplicates, whose figures cover a considerable area of good back-country farming land in the counties of Cattaraugus and Chautauqua, State of New York, as well as some very choice locations in the Lake Erie grape belt, has suggested some further interesting tabulations.

The 892 farms are first classified according to value, the basis of classification being the value per acre, as noted in the proper column of the official blank, of the cultivated portion of each farm, exclusive of buildings. This value in class I is \$50 and upwards; in class II, \$35 to \$50; and in class III, \$35 and less.

Table 1 shows the number of farms in each class by townships, and it is to be noted that the aim of the examiner was to take sample valuations from the best, the poorest, and the average, farming sections respectively of each township.

| | Class 1. | Class 2. | Class 3. |
|----------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Chautauqua County. | | | |
| Hanover | 19 | 2 | 6 |
| Sheridan | 20 | 1 | 5 |
| Dunkirk | 13 | — | — |
| Pomfret | 20 | 3 | 1 |
| Portland | 14 | 1 | 5 |
| Westfield | 18 | — | 5 |
| Ripley | 10 | 2 | 5 |
| Mina | — | — | 19 |
| French Creek | — | — | 18 |
| Clymer | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| Sherman | 3 | 1 | 17 |
| Chautauqua | 7 | 5 | 12 |
| Stockton | — | — | 25 |
| Charlotte | — | 1 | 27 |
| Arkwright | — | 1 | 22 |
| Villanova | — | — | 29 |
| Cherry Creek | — | — | 21 |
| Total | 125 | 19 | 228 |
| Cattaraugus County. | | | |
| Perryburg | 9 | 3 | 10 |
| Dayton | — | 3 | 16 |
| Otto | — | 3 | 13 |
| Leon | — | 2 | 16 |
| Persia | — | — | 14 |
| New Albion | — | 5 | 14 |
| Coldspring | — | 2 | 18 |
| South Valley | — | — | 15 |
| Red House | — | — | 18 |
| Carrollton | — | — | 15 |
| Ellicottville | 1 | 1 | 13 |
| Mansfield | — | 2 | 16 |
| East Otto | 2 | 2 | 13 |
| Ashford | — | 7 | 14 |
| Yorkshire | — | 7 | 13 |
| Franklinville | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Lyndon | — | 1 | 21 |
| Ischna | — | 2 | 33 |
| Humphrey | — | — | 30 |

| | Class 1. | Class 2. | Class 3. |
|--------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Allegany | 5 | 10 | 8 |
| Ocean | 8 | 9 | 1 |
| Portville | 2 | 3 | 24 |
| Hinsdale | — | 6 | 22 |
| Machias | — | 2 | 13 |
| Farmersville | 1 | 1 | 14 |
| Freedom | — | 16 | 6 |
| Total | 34 | 90 | 306 |
| Grand total | 159 | 109 | 624 |

It will be noted that the farms whose cultivated land without buildings is worth \$50 and upwards per acre constitute a trifle more than one-fifth of the total number of farms. More than one-half of the townships show no farms of this class, though this does not in every case indicate that none exist in the township, but only that the examiner, taking at random half-a-dozen farms in the best section, nearest the principal village as a rule, failed to hit upon land so highly valued. Classes I and II together make up less than one-third the whole, and it may be stated, as a matter of knowledge on the part of the writer, that good arable land in western New York, in localities not traversed by railroads and distant three miles and upwards from stations, is very rarely valued at more than \$25 an acre without buildings, while hillside pastures sell at from \$5 to \$10. It may, therefore, be safely asserted that class III, for all the purposes of the following table, typifies a grade of farms considerably above rather than below the general average of the prosperous rural townships of that section of the country.

Before presenting table 2 it may not be amiss to state that land value, as explained in "Circular No. 5," does not in all cases mean the value of the bare land in its actual state, but in its unimproved state, without advantages of any kind due to the application of recent labor. As a forcible illustration, suppose a farm lately cleared in the midst of a marsh or the wilderness of an abandoned timber tract. In such a case the land value would be no greater than the value of an equal area of the surrounding waste to which no labor had been applied. It might be \$5 an acre, while the actual farm was worth \$25 an acre or more; and it may well be supposed that land value instead of total value as a basis of tax assessments could have no terrors for the industrious and enterprising

owner of such a farm. But ordinarily, as in long settled and well improved localities, the difference between land value and the value of bare land is much less, though seldom if ever quite imperceptible.

Table 2 shows the proportion in the three classes respectively of land value and of actual assessments to total real estate value.

| | Class 1. | Class 2. | Class 3. |
|--|----------|----------|----------|
| Chautauqua County. | | | |
| Number of farms.... | 125 | 19 | 228 |
| Per cent. land value of total value..... | 55.1 | 40.6 | 34.0 |
| Per cent. assessment of total value..... | 36.0 | 44.8 | 56.4 |
| Cattaraugus County. | | | |
| Number of farms.... | 34 | 90 | 396 |
| Per cent. land value of total value..... | 55.4 | 43.0 | 37.5 |
| Per cent. assessment of total value..... | 47.9 | 57.9 | 60.4 |
| Chaut. and Catt. Counties. | | | |
| Number of farms.... | 159 | 109 | 624 |
| Per cent. land value of total value..... | 55.1 | 42.7 | 36.2 |
| Per cent. land value of total value..... | 38.0 | 56.0 | 58.9 |

It is often stated, as a general rule, that, taking any section of inhabited country as a whole, the land values are reflected in the improvements, the two divisions being substantially equal. But such data as are thus far available to throw light on the subject go to prove that as civilization and social development proceed land values tend to increase faster than improvement values, and from being considerably less to become correspondingly greater. Whether this follows from the natural order of social growth or is the result of institutional and artificial causes may be an academic question, but the fact itself undeniably demands practical consideration.

The further interesting fact indicated in table 2, that, other things being equal, the most intelligent and conscientious assessors tend in their estimates to come nearer the actual value of small and low-priced than of large and high-priced properties, seems to be due to a mysterious, but everywhere obvious principle of our logical processes. The irresistible conclusion is that, in view of this principle, and pending its scientific explanation, our tax laws and systems ought to be wisely and carefully readjusted, to counteract, as far as possible, rather than to foster and encourage, the injustice, not to say cruelty, involved in its operation.

Returning to the general showing of the table, we see that as

the proportion of land value falls from class to class, the proportion of actual assessment rises, as if the rise, equally with the fall, occurred in accordance with an irresistible law. The same tendencies are very noticeable in "Circular No. 5," although shown in separate tables and without the emphasis given by the classification of farms according to value. Take, for instance, Red House and South Valley, near the Cattaraugus Indian reservation, on the one hand, and on the other Portland and Pomfret, in the beautiful and fertile Chautauquan grape section. (Tables 4 and 6).

| | Red House.. | South Valley..... | Portland..... | Pomfret..... |
|--|-------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Per cent. land value of total value..... | 24.7 | 23.2 | 43.2 | 50.0 |
| Per cent. assessment of total value..... | 41.6 | 36.0 | 33.2 | 36.2 |

Such facts as these are worthy the serious attention of Patrons of Husbandry, as well as of all in whatever walk of life who are interested in just taxation. They should go far to dispel what may remain of prejudice against special land value taxation and against local option with a view to such taxation, showing, as they plainly do, that rural land owners have nothing to fear, but much to hope for, from a recognition of the justice and availability of this source of additional public revenue.

They should, furthermore, rally the mass of farmers to follow the good example of New York city and demand assessments at full value and separate valuation of land and improvements.

In connection with these reforms the Purdy plan of apportionment deserves a word of earnest commendation as a desirable and probably a necessary preliminary measure. This plan, named for the indefatigable secretary of the New York Tax Reform Association, is embodied in a bill presented to the legislature of that State by Senator Elsberg. It provides that the apportionment of State tax among the several counties shall be according to local revenue (aside from that applied to public schools), instead of according to local assessment valuations; thus entirely disconnecting

the methods of assessment in the different counties from their quota of the general tax levy, and obviating the necessity of expensive State supervision of local assessments. One county might tax all property at 40 per cent., another real-estate alone at 70 per cent., and a third land alone at full value; and all might make any change desired in their basis or their rule as to percentage without affecting their apportionment, which would be according to the amount of revenue they raised for local purposes, other than schools, without reference to their manner of raising it. The same system could be applied equally well to the county tax levied on the different townships, and, besides the saving in log-rolling and wire-pulling by members of the board of supervisors, would furnish added incentive to vigilance on the part of local tax-payers by making the county tax to an extent the penalty for extravagance and mismanagement of the public funds, and not, as now, a fine upon honesty and conscientiousness in the public service of assessment. With the Purdy plan of apportionment in operation, full value assessments, as well as other tax reforms, would be greatly facilitated and any injustice between localities during the progress of the change obviated.

The entire range of topics relating to taxation, assessment and apportionment, in all their bearings, but especially with reference to comparative real estate assessments and land values in city and country, are here earnestly commended, by one of their own class, to the attention of land-owning farmers whose interest and influence in these subjects are so great. The principles of taxation and the effects of its various forms, while not difficult of comprehension when carefully and candidly considered, are still not obvious to the casual thought, but quite otherwise. That to tax evidences of debt is to tax debtors and not creditors, that a tax on vacant lots makes them cheaper, while a tax on merchants' goods makes them dearer, are truths plain enough when once pointed out. But how many of us would ever have discovered them independently? Of all the great public

questions that appeal to us at this time, none calls more urgently for examination and discussion than how to employ most equitably and to the greatest general benefit the mighty and far-reaching power of taxation.

E. P. ROUNSVELL.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

BUFFALO.

Buffalo, N. Y., July 31.—On the 25th the mayor signed the local public opinion ordinance which had been passed on the 11th and 12th by the two houses of the Buffalo common council. This ordinance is patterned after the Illinois public opinion act. It provides that when five per cent. of the voters petition for the submission to the people at a general election of any question of public policy, or when the common council by a majority resolution orders it, the question shall be submitted. Not more than three questions may be submitted by petition, however, in any one year.

The ordinance is a result of the activity of the Referendum League of Erie county, of which Lewis Stockton, upon whom has devolved most of the work, is president. Last fall, when Mr. Stockton was elected president of the League, he made an aggressive campaign by the distribution of literature and the questioning of candidates for office. All the local candidates for the assembly (the lower branch of the State legislature) save one, professed to favor the two bills the League had prepared—one a public opinion law for Buffalo, and the other a compulsory referendum law on Buffalo franchises. All the candidates for councilman (one of the two houses composing the common council of Buffalo), and nearly all the candidates for alderman (the other house of the common council) also gave favorable replies to the League's questions. The public opinion bill was indorsed unanimously by the then existing common council, and the referendum bill was indorsed by the chamber of commerce on a referendum vote. The president of the street railway company, who is an influential member of the chamber of commerce, worked very hard to defeat this latter indorsement, but failed. Both bills were indorsed by the labor organizations.

But neither bill passed the legislature. The explanation was that George A. Davis, one of the two senators from Erie county and a member of the committee on cities, to which the bills were referred, refused to allow them to be reported back to the senate.

As soon as the legislature adjourned Mr. Stockton presented to the common council the public opinion bill, in the form of an ordinance, and asked them to pass it, under their general authority, contained in the city charter, to pass ordinances for the good government of the city, and under a section of the general election law which requires the election officials to put upon the ballots any question submitted to the voters of the State or any subdivision of the State. A hearing was had by the committee on ordinances and a large number attended. About 15 men spoke in favor of the ordinance, some of the speakers being the most prominent business and professional men in the city. There was no opposition and the matter was referred to the corporation counsel for his opinion on the legality of the proposed ordinance. He advised that the common council had the power to enact the ordinance. He did not think, however, that the election officials, who are mostly county officers, could be required to place the questions on the ballot. Yet he recommended that the ordinance be passed so that the question might be tested in the courts. It was accordingly passed, and has been signed by the mayor as stated above.

The League therefore proposed a resolution for the common council to adopt, providing as a question for submission to the voters, that the schoolhouses be opened for citizens to hold meetings in to discuss public questions. The aldermen refused on the 25th to adopt this resolution without a reference to committee. That means that probably it will not be passed in time for the next election, for it must be passed by the common council two months before the election, and the common council has now adjourned until September. If the League wish to have the public opinion ordinance passed upon by the courts this year, they must procure a petition of about 3,500 names for the submission of a question under the ordinance, and file the petition before September 8. This would not be difficult under ordinary circumstances, but as August is the vacation season, when most of the League's workers are away, it may be neglected. But local interest in the referendum idea has wonderfully increased.

ALBERT H. JACKSON.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, August 4.

What is believed to be in all probability the decisive battle of the Russian-Japanese war (p. 265)

has been in progress in the region of Haicheng and Liaoyang since the 23d. It has been a double movement of the Japanese, with Haicheng for one objective and Liaoyang for the other, yet with a common purpose. The Haicheng or left wing of the movement is led by Gen. Oku, and the Liaoyang or right wing by Gen. Kuroki.

Advancing westward from Kiaotung (p. 265) by two roads, Gen. Kuroki has driven the Russians out of Yangtyuling on the southern road line and out of Yashulintzu on the northern road, points about 26 miles apart and 30 miles east of Liaoyang. These points were secured by the Japanese on the 2d, when the Russians withdrew westward to Anping.

Meanwhile Gen. Oku advanced upon Haicheng. Fighting began on the 23d at Tatchekiao, a point on the railroad to the south of Haicheng. Tatchekiao was soon evacuated by the Russians, and on the 29th Gen. Oku had swung his force eastward and attacked Simucheng, which he captured on the 31st. Haicheng itself fell on the 3d, and the Russians withdrew back of the defenses of Liaoyang, which they still hold.

These defenses are Anshan-shan, on the railroad and south of Liaoyang; Liandiansian, to the east of the railroad and southeast of Liaoyang; and Anping, to the east of Liaoyang. The Russian line stretches in front of Liaoyang in a semicircle, touching those three points; while the Japanese enveloping movement, now completely unified, with Liaoyang for the objective, is pressing on.

By some correspondents it is believed that the Russians are retiring farther north to Harbin, the junction where the Russian railroad diverges southward to Port Arthur and eastward to Vladivostok. Their losses in guns are reported to be heavy, from which it is inferred that their retreat is not pursuant to any prearranged plan of campaign.

While Gens. Oku and Kuroki have been driving the Russians under Kouropatkin northward, Field Marshal Oyama has continued his advance upon Port Arthur

(pp. 185, 204, 217, 236). It was reported on the 29th that Port Arthur itself had fallen. This report has proved to be untrue; but the Japanese are said to have captured Shantaiku, one of the important natural defenses of Port Arthur, about ten miles from the fortress, after three days of desperate fighting.

After capturing several neutral vessels for carrying contraband goods, and sinking some, the Vladivostock squadron (pp. 185, 265) returned to Vladivostock on the 2d. The commander, Rear Admiral Jessen, reported the squadron in perfect condition. It had sunk a small Japanese vessel; searched the British steamer Camarra; captured but released a Japanese passenger steamer, most of whose passengers were women; sunk four Japanese schooners; searched and released the steamer Schinau from Australia for Yokohama; sunk the German vessel Thea with a cargo of fish from America to Yokohama, as a prize impossible to bring into a Russian port without endangering the squadron; sunk the British steamer Knight Commander for the same reasons; and captured the German steamer Arabia, as a prize caught carrying goods to the enemy. The Arabia was brought into Vladivostock by the squadron. She was immediately put on trial before the Russian prize court at Vladivostock, but no decision has yet been reported. The question at issue is whether her cargo of flour and railway material, consigned to Japanese ports by American consignors who had chartered the vessel from her German owners, are contraband of war. The flour is charged with being contraband under the Russian rules of war as "foodstuffs sent at the enemy's cost or order," and the railway material as having been shipped with a distinctly hostile purpose—the construction of government railways in Korea for military purposes.

In consequence of Russia's interference with neutral vessels on the high seas the Pacific Mail Steamship Company has directed its general freight agent to accept no cargo consigned to Japan, Korea, Siberia or Manchuria, including the port of Newchwang.

Diplomatic relations between France and the Roman Catholic church have been severed, at least temporarily. Following the events of two months ago (p. 135), the church authorities addressed letters to the bishops of Laval and Dijon, France, based upon accusations as to the former that he had married, and as to the latter that he had become a Free Mason. The letters summoned them to Rome, to appear before the Holy Office on the 22d of July. Both bishops referred their summonses to the French government, which forbade their departure and demanded of the Vatican that it withdraw the letters. This demand was made on the ground that in sending the letters without previous consultation with the French government, the Vatican was guilty of a breach of the concordat which has existed between France and the Vatican since the time of Napoleon I. The Vatican was advised by the French ministry, along with their demand, that in default of compliance diplomatic relations would be severed. On the 29th an unfavorable reply from the Vatican, dated the 28th, was received; and this was answered on the 30th. The French answer is cabled as follows:

After having on several occasions pointed out the serious blows struck at the Government rights under the concordat by the Vatican's dealing directly with the French bishops without consultation with the Power with which the concordat was signed, and seeing that the Pontifical secretary of state in his reply of July 25 affirmed those proceedings, the Republican government has decided to conclude official relations, which at the Holy See's desire had become objectless.

The French embassy to the Vatican was thereupon recalled and the Papal nuncio in Paris dismissed. The matter now awaits the action of the French parliament, which controls all treaties, and is expected to abrogate the concordat.

In American politics the principal news item of the week is the informal acceptance by Thomas E. Watson, of Georgia, of his nomination for President by the People's party (p. 215).

A call for the organization of a new political party to be named

the "Jefferson Democracy," has been issued by several representative trades' union men of Chicago. It is addressed "to the voters of the United States of America without reference to creed, color or nationality." The call is signed by John Fitzpatrick, chairman, 56 Fifth avenue; Arthur McCracken, secretary, 335 La Salle avenue; and John M. Vail, treasurer, 92 Hill street. Among the other signers are: O. E. Woodbury, Carpenters' Union; L. W. Washington, Colored Waiters' Union; E. N. Nockels, secretary Chicago Federation of Labor, and T. P. Quinn, Solicitors and Canvassers' Union. The call provides for holding a national delegate convention at Chicago on Monday, August 29. Only wage-workers, farmers and members of economic reform associations more than one year old are eligible to membership. The national convention of another side party, the Continental (p. 265), is called to meet at Chicago on the 31st.

Nominations for State officers were made in four States on the 3d by the Democrats. They respectively nominated for governor of Michigan, Woodbridge N. Ferris; for governor of Indiana, John W. Kern; for governor of Washington, George Turner; and for governor of Kansas, David M. Dale.

NEWS NOTES.

—William Pickens, a young Negro who graduated with high honors at Yale in June, has been elected to membership in the Phi Beta Kappa society.

—Robert E. Pattison, twice governor of Pennsylvania and a man of national fame as a Democratic leader, died at Philadelphia on the 2d, at the age of 53.

—Charles W. Fairbanks, of Indiana, was formally notified on the 3d of his nomination by the Republican party (p. 204) for Vice President of the United States.

—Mary Sherman Miles, wife of Gen. Nelson A. Miles, died suddenly on the 2d at West Point. Mrs. Miles was a niece of Gen. Sherman, and at the time of her death was 62 years of age.

—John Rogers, designer and sculptor of the Rogers group of small statuary, which were very popular in the '60's and early '70's, died, after a long illness from creeping paralysis, at his summer home in New Canaan, Conn., on the 27th.

—Lieut. Gen. Keller, of the Russian army, was killed on the 29th, at the age

of 54. While standing near a Russian battery at the beginning of the battle 30 miles east of Liaoyang, he was struck by a piece of bursting shell and died in 20 minutes.

—The annual meeting of the English League for the Taxation of Land Values met in London on the 20th. The sale of the English six-penny copy of Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade," was reported to have nearly exhausted editions aggregating 24,000 copies.

Galignani's Weekly Messenger, an English newspaper published in Paris, France, and one of the oldest papers printed in English on the continent, suspended publication on the 1st, after an existence of ninety years. It was first issued in Paris at the restoration in 1814. Among its editors in the early days were Byron and Thackeray. Its founder, William Galignani, died in 1882, at the age of 84.

—By a decision of the British House of Lords on the 1st, the remnant of the Free Church of Scotland acquires all the property which that organization held at the time of its amalgamation four years ago with the United Presbyterians. A small minority of the ministers of the Free Church, refusing to submit to the majority, perpetuated the old organization and sued for its property. In the Scottish courts they were defeated, but in the House of Lords they have won by a majority of two. By this decision some 4,000 or 5,000 people and 24 ministers, for the most part in remote regions of the Highlands, not only gain absolute control of the Free church organization, but acquire its hundreds of churches and millions of money, while hundreds of thousands of people and several hundred ministers are dispossessed of churches and church property.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Aug. 1.—There is really no doubt of Judge Parker's election, if the Democrats of this country, who believe in Democratic principles instead of trust domination and the reign of an aristocracy, will stand shoulder to shoulder for the Democratic ticket.

Chicago Chronicle (Rep.), July 28.—Mr. Roosevelt will have the support of conservative, sober-minded Democrats in 1904, as Mr. McKinley had, in 1896 and 1900, and in greatly increased numbers. Men who disapprove of some Republican doctrines and measures and who favor some rational measures of reform will no longer seek to gain their laudable ends through a party which is utterly destitute of coherency and is thoroughly and dangerously bad in its personal ingredients and in its prevailing tendencies.

Cleveland Recorder (Dem.), Aug. 1.—I am informed by a gentleman who spent two hours in Mr. Bryan's company the other day, and with whom the whole situation was thoroughly canvassed, that Bryan is very desirous of having the ticket succeed this year. The gentleman who gives me this important information is one of the strongest of democratic Democrats in the West, and he is a man of national reputation. He says that as Bryan sees it the cause of true democracy will be furthered

better by the election of Parker than in any other possible way. I know that this man is truthful and that he knows what he is talking about. I know that William Jennings Bryan is not a liar and that when he declares that he wants the ticket to succeed he does not say so with any selfish purpose in view. This is also exactly the feeling and belief of Tom L. Johnson. He is not only for Parker but he is actively for the ticket and the platform. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Bryan are urging their friends to vote the ticket this Fall and thus push along the cause which they have most at heart.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), July 29 (weekly ed.).—The resemblance to the situation in 1852 is striking to a degree. True, sharp differences appear between the Republicans and the reorganized Democracy on nearly all questions touched upon in their platforms, and this was the case in 1852, as between the Whigs and Democrats. But now, as then, no consideration has been able to trample all questions under foot for the time being, as it were, and to compel the paramount attention of both the great parties—and that is the maintenance of the status quo in regard to business and immediate commercial interests. Both parties then were brought to hush up regarding slavery, and both parties are now to hush up regarding all disturbing agitators respecting the finances and socialistic issues. . . . Thus it is that a presidential contest of exceptional quiet has been brought into prospect. How it is to end, whether in a manner resembling the outcome of that of 1852 remains to be seen. But that it introduces the conditions of a temporary truce simply, in the collision of varied popular interests, to be followed by greater intensity or conflict than ever, as in 1852, there can hardly be any question.

The Commoner (Dem.), July 29.—The New York Herald seems to be trying to counteract the influence exerted by the Chicago Chronicle. The Chronicle is helping Parker by its support of Roosevelt, and the Herald is helping Roosevelt by its support of Parker. In coming out for the Democratic ticket the Herald says: "What the Democrats needed was a master. They have found one in Judge Parker and he may yet lead them out of the wilderness." Certainly no editor who desired to help Judge Parker would advance such an argument in his behalf. Men may honestly differ as to the wisdom or even courage of Judge Parker in sending the telegram he did after keeping silent until the nomination was made, but one who asserts that the Democratic party needs a "master" must be either ignorant of human nature or indifferent to the candidate. The man chosen to present Judge Parker's name to the convention explained the Judge's silence on public questions by saying that he was not the master of the party, but its servant. Judge Parker informed the convention (quite inopportunistly) of his views on one question which the convention had decided to ignore, but will he disregard the platform on the questions upon which the convention has spoken and upon which he has been silent? If the Herald wants to help the ticket it ought to point out, as the Commoner has done, the questions upon which Judge Parker is right and the Republican party wrong.

BRYAN.

Dubuque Telegraph Herald (Dem.), July 28.—The opposition press is prophesying that Mr. Bryan's next step will be into oblivion. Having previously suffered death at the hands of these same newspapers, it is difficult to understand how as a corpse he can make any more steps.

Nashville Daily News (Dem.), July 27.—Why should not Judge Parker and Mr. Bryan speak from the same platform? There is but one objection, and that is likely to be made by Judge Parker, who doubtless realizes that as a speaker he would make a poor showing beside the Nebraska leader.

Goodhue County (Minn.) News, July 20.—Naturally it has attracted attention. This man Bryan, whom they were going to eliminate, is somehow the most conspicuous man in public life. We hear about Judge Parker's morning on his head by a bucking broncho, we give headlines to Parker's campaign plans and the President's platitudes of acceptance, but when

Bryan speaks his mind there starts a debate approaching a riot at once. Roosevelt flourishes his big stick and praises domestic virtues, and sleepy editorials of laden gold follow. Parker will presently expose his opinions which will be greeted by decorous or vigorous applause. But when Bryan opens his mouth they call out the fire department.

THE SOLID SOUTH.

Chicago Chronicle (Rep.), July 30.—Why is the South solid? Not because the people of the "solid South" party are agreed upon any principle or policy of a broad, national character, such as a tariff policy, a monetary policy or a colonial policy. The Democratic party in the Southern States is not united upon any such thing. Men who call themselves Democrats in the South do not know what Democracy meant when the Democratic party was democratic. The older ones have forgotten and the younger ones never knew. The South is solid on only one thing, and that is the Negro with two d's and two g's. Democracy is identified in the minds of Southern white men with the "lost cause" and the hope of regaining it. The "lost cause" is essentially the cause of slavery. Its adherents do not now say slavery, but they say what comes to the same thing. They say that the three anti-slavery amendments must be repealed. They say in substance that this must be done in order that the "trigger"—and every one is a "nigger" who has a drop of African blood in his veins—may be robbed not only of all political rights but of all opportunity to rise above the status of a menial. In other words, they say in substance, by word and deed, that all Negroes must be held in an inferior and servile condition wholly irrespective of their individual merits and that to this end they must be denied equal rights before the law.

MISSOURI POLITICS.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), July 29.—The Republican State convention of Missouri deliberately sinned against the light when it made a party nomination for the governorship and refused to indorse Joseph W. Folk. It showed its indifference to a great moral issue and its ignorance of practical politics. What the convention should have done was to indorse Folk not as a Democrat but as an anti-boodler, and to nominate men for the other State offices. These men, or some of them, could be elected for the Democratic machine dictated the nomination of at least two candidates—Allen and Cook—on the Folk ticket. If these two are elected, as they probably will be now, they will do all in their power to thwart Mr. Folk's anti-corruption policy. The men who ran the Republican convention reasoned that Folk had made so many enemies by exposing political criminals and by overthrowing the Democratic State machine that he would not get his full party strength at the coming election. It was anticipated that the boodlers whose business he had ruined and the machine men whose power he had destroyed would surely bolt Folk. The Republican politicians of Missouri exhibited a good deal of smartness but not much sense. The boodlers will undoubtedly bolt Folk and vote for the Republican candidate, but for every boodler whose vote he loses Folk will gain ten ballots from honest men who had heretofore voted the straight Republican ticket, but who will, in the coming election, vote for Roosevelt and Folk. Folk will probably be elected by one of the greatest majorities ever cast for any candidate in Missouri. Which is as it should be.

WHEN ASSASSINATION IS NOT ANARCHY.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), Aug. 2.—When the case of John Turner, the English anarchist who was deported from the United States because he "disbelieved" in existing systems of government . . . was under discussion, the metropolitan press with a few notable exceptions was violent in denouncing the Englishman because he refused to make categorical answer when asked if he held the killing of rulers to be justifiable. Turner replied that it was a question that he felt unable to answer. While he himself did not believe in assassination, yet he expressed the opinion that the character of the ruler and the motives of his assassin should be taken into account before passing judgment. . . . Singularly enough, the New York city newspapers that were the loudest in de-

nouncing Turner are found to entertain the same views held by the English anarchist. In its editorial on Von Plehve the Sun said: "Assassination is an execrable crime, but there are times and circumstances when even the act of an assassin may cause an anxious and humiliated people to fetch a sigh of relief." The Sun also printed with apparent approval an article from its London correspondent, in which it was argued: "The world's greatest oppressor and liberty's bitterest enemy died to-day and appropriately by an assassin's hand." The Tribune ventures to guess that "the cause of liberty may be promoted" by the blowing up of the actual ruler of Russia, and says: "With Plehve removed, it may be possible for the Czar to assert his more benevolent disposition." The Press sees in the murder "the hand of the Lord laid heavily on the Czar." The Times discusses the subject at length, calls the Finn who killed Bobrikoff "that unhappy patriot," declares that assassination is "the one effective method of political agitation or political criticism left open by the Russian government to the Russian people, the only way to bring political questions to the attention of the Czar," and commends the murder of Plehve as "an impressive lesson on the vanity of ambition." Similar views have been printed by many of the daily newspapers of the country that were clamorous for Turner's expulsion.

YELLOW JOURNALISM.

Friends' Intelligencer (rel.), July 30.—There are two ways in which yellow journalism may be done away with. One would be to get rid of the journals and their writers. The other would be for each of us to refuse to be a yellow reader. The first would be very effective, and would have the advantage of preventing even those who want to be entertained in this way from having access to papers that would pander to their depraved tastes. The only difficulty would be that this abolition could not be accomplished. Besides, yellowness has permeated the whole of journalism. The very best papers we have are more or less tainted. . . . We cannot afford to follow the crowd and be mere wordlings in our newspaper reading. Even worse than a yellow newspaper is a yellow reader, and we need not wait till the millennium and the abolition of the one in order to cease being the other.

AMENITIES OF JOURNALISM.

Life (ind.), July 28.—It is delightful to witness the high spirits of the Evening Post over Judge Parker's nomination and his gold-plank telegram. It has found a praiseworthy Democratic man and caught him doing a praiseworthy thing. It is human to err, and the next thing the Judge does may not strike the Post so favorably. So while the chance is still unimpaired, it has put in motion all its rusted apparatus of approbation. The result has been magnificent. It is as though the Saturnian day's had returned.

PROSPERITY.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), July 27.—The strike of the butchers will not leave an empty void in the "full dinner pail." The cold potato has been playing a lone hand since the rear guard of prosperity was shackled by cunning and greed.

AN UNBARNED DECREMENT.

Columbus (O.) Press-Post (Dem.), July 28.—If vehicles are to be taxed to pay for wearing out good streets, who is going to pay for the vehicles that are worn out by bad streets?

"Ask him what he thinks of the Americans," said the reporter to the interpreter who was helping him interview the distinguished Japanese. The interpreter asked the question and the distinguished visitor made a reply. "He says," the interpreter translated, "that the Americans are the greatest people he has seen in his travels. Indeed, he declares, they may well be called 'the Japanese of the west.'"—Baltimore World.

MISCELLANY

THE SOCIAL REFORMER TO HIS FELLOWS.

For The Public.
Build fair Utopias—dream your cities fair,
But here Utopia is—not hence, nor there;
Not in the years to come, but now, in fact,
Lo, the Millennium—if men will but act.
Not in laborious building of the laws,
Not in those cumbrous schemes that arts devise,
Not out of Chaos wrought of Labor's wars
Will the fair Palace of the Dreamer rise.
But they who build the city—they will bring
Justice to sit enthroned, the Kingdom's king.
They will know nothing of an Iron state,
In that fair land where only man is great;
Where each strong arm and each unloosened will
Doth what it pleaseth, save to others' ill.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

From an address delivered in Cincinnati July 10, 1904, in the Vine street Congregational church, by the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow.

A Chicago preacher declared the other day: "There never was a more interesting falsehood than 'all men are born free and equal.' Freedom is something to be won. Men are not born free."

These words are taken from the public press. He may have qualified them. But as they stand, they seem to assume that either the authors or the readers of this Declaration are fools.

The men who put their names to that Declaration well knew that they might be signing their death warrant. They understood quite as well as this preacher that freedom had to be won. What made them great was the conviction that under God they were entitled to their freedom, and that the men who tried to rob them of it were offenders against Heaven's laws.

A century and a half removed from the bullets of the Red Coats, does the preacher stand in his pulpit in security, and tell our youth that the men who bequeathed them their liberties palmed off upon the world interesting falsehoods which should be outgrown?

There were greater need that preachers should earnestly commend to our young men the eternal principles of this Declaration. What does it teach? Freedom is a natural law, and the moral obligation rests upon human government to respect that law. It means that man's soul needs freedom as much as his body needs food. It

means that liberty is a necessary condition of man's moral welfare. Every page of history bears witness to this fact. The centuries are eloquent with warnings to those who ignore it.

If we know anything about God we know that He intended man to live in a state of freedom. If any obligation rests upon man it is the obligation to respect his brother's freedom. Shame upon the men who, while walking in safety above the graves of the martyrs of '76, seek to instill into the minds of their fellows the maxims of the old-world tyrants until they no longer understand the glory of that great Declaration which made the heart of man leap with hope when it was born, and which has sent a light down the centuries to guide nations now unborn.

This Declaration that all men are born free, states as sober a truth as ever found its way into words. It does not declare the obvious absurdity that men are not born with different and unequal endowments. It was not referring to natural endowments, it was discussing political principles. It was disputing the right of any man to lord it over his fellows by means of unequal laws. When the children of Queens are born with the stamp of royalty upon them; when the mice monopolist can show us his title deeds duly signed by almighty God; when the unrequited toilers are born without stomachs and the luxuriant and the idle are born without hands, then we may know that Jefferson was wrong in asserting that men are born with an equal right to political justice.

The child of an Astor comes into the world as naked as the waif of Five Points. Land monopoly makes the difference. Nature does not starve one and gorge another. Human law does that. To the stars above men are brothers, heirs of a common bounty, children of the same impartial father.

That government which exaggerates the differences in Nature, making the strong stronger and the weak weaker, violates primary justice. This is the teaching of our immortal charter. It is the Golden Rule translated into politics. Let us teach our children to love it that in all coming days it may be, as Lincoln said, "a rebuke and a stumbling block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression."

You who shall liberate the land will do more for your country than we have done in the liberation of its trade.—Richard Cobden.

COAL "BAER" ON TO PROMETHEUS.

C. B.—Why are you chained to this rock?

P.—Because I brought fire to mankind.

C. B.—And what price did you get for it?

P.—Nothing. I gave it free.

C. B.—Well, then it serves you right. What business had you to give away fuel for nothing?—Lustige Blaetter (Germany).

FLESH-POT AND IDEAL.

For The Public.

Extract from a sermon preached by Rev. Quincy Ewing, in the Church of the Advent (Episcopal), Birmingham, Ala., July 31, from the text, Exodus 14:11: "Because there were no graves in Egypt, East thou taken us away to die in the wilderness?"

The majority of the followers and shouters-up of any great leader are likely to have their eyes only half open to his truest greatness, and to be painfully indifferent to the value of his supreme ideal, except as it appeals to their immediate self-interest on the plane of their commonplace desires. And, when loyal to his ideal and purpose, he leads to where the sunshines of gladness is displaced by the shadow of gloom—imminent defeat apparently sure, ultimate triumph apparently impossible; then, either they lay upon him the burden of responsibility for their undoing, and turn upon him with their taunts, or else they continue to flaunt his banners in the breeze while utterly repudiating the principles and the purposes those banners were first unfurled to proclaim.

Give any great leader 50 followers to cheer him on with their applause when his course seems to lie straight and smooth toward the promised land—the land of better bread and butter, or more of it—and he will be lucky if he retains as many as five to do him heart-reverence when he leads to the shore of the threatened deep waters of uncertainty, or enters the dim wilderness of waiting and struggle and lean living that intervenes between every large ideal purpose and its fulfillment—the flesh-pots of servitude left behind, the bread of the free spirit yet unbaled!

The truly heroic leader loves his ideal more than himself, and uses himself serving his fellow-men. They love themselves more than his ideal, and aim to serve themselves using him; and he becomes to most of them a very foolish, and useless, in-the-way-sort-of-creature, when, by using him, they cannot serve themselves in the present moment. This is the many-

times repeated tragedy of human history—great men followed by thousands who are not followers of their greatness; great men purposing great things in the realm of the Ideal that ought to be the realm of the Real—eternal truth their pillar of cloud by day, their pillar of fire by night—repudiated by the majority of their professed disciples, when the majority think they discover that the Seer's eternal truth is a barrier before their temporal welfare; the Seer's ideal course leading straight away from the flesh-pots, and not visibly and certainly toward any Canaan of milk and honey!

Nevertheless, the work of the truly heroic leader of men is never a tragedy nor a failure on the stage of what abides, however this time or that may declare it such. A regenerating idea nobly entertained and loyally served by a human soul is a beneficent power in the human world forever. A humanly-helpful purpose bravely battled for to-day, or 10,000 years ago, goes forward to the day and place of its fulfillment, though it need to journey, stumbling, over the piled cry bones of uncourted generations of men. Moses dies before he leads into the Land of Promise; but the forward-command of his potent spirit was spoken and could not be silenced, and the Promised Land was his vindication and triumph.

So in the case of every great leader, followed and then distrusted by his fellow-men. Distrust may be succeeded by what seems absolute rejection on the part of the generation he appeals to, face to face. But absolute rejection of a regenerative idea there never has been and never will be. It is a force that bends men and bows them, and urges them onward and upward, even while they think they are praying on their knees to be delivered from it, or standing on their feet to hurl it from them. Crucify it on a bleak hill-top, and of its cross it will make a throne, and from that throne rule its empire! Great, indeed, assuredly, is the power of the flesh-pot in determining what men shall love and what they shall hate; what they shall strive for and what they shall strive against; great is its power, and loud its shouts and gorgeous its triumphs in human history. But its shouts, however loud, are swallowed soon in silence; and its triumphs, however gorgeous, have all paraded garlands that withered while they were worn!

Greater than the power of flesh-pot and full stomach is the forward-word of the honest human soul in the service of eternal truth—uttered though it be, in what seem but a wilderness for graves, and a sea impassable ahead!

Sooner or later it will be obeyed. Sooner or later it will pass the impassable. The waters of all seas of space and time will divide for it; and on some further, fairer shore, at last, humanity will sing in mighty voice its hallelujah-ode of eternal thanksgiving!

UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL.

Printed from the original MS.

Dear John: That was a good man you sent me, that Samuel M. Jones, who became Mayor of Toledo. I was mighty sorry to lose him. He is dead. I grew some big men myself, but Jones was the only one of the kind I had—a Welshman, I think he was. It's a kind of a grim joke on me; but I have forty millions of people here, some of them preachers, and all of 'em superior, and blamed if Jones didn't come over and make a national reputation among 'em by observin' the Golden Rule. No novelty about the rule. It had been advertised in the religious papers. Lots of fellows were telling you how to do it every Sunday; but Jones some way showed 'em how. He started with the right feeling.

"We are just people," says Jones. He didn't say "just thieves," or "saloon keepers," or "millionaires," or "members of the 400," but he hit them all, angels and devils.

"We are just people," says Jones, and the saloons closed up when he died, and all went to the funeral. There is that about folks, I notice. They appreciate a good man. They may be fools other ways, they may be thieves or highway-men or any kind of pirate you please. They may even be rich and respectable, but they catch on to his value all right; and those ashamed to follow him livin', will ease their consciences by following him dead. It's the Divine spark within 'em that recognizes its kin, and warms up to it.

Jones was no great man as kings go; a simple, plain man, but strong. John, strong. A strong man is one who takes God's side when it is unpopular, and sticks to it; God does the rest. He lends strength to his elbow, music to his voice, and tips his pen with fire. How? I dunno, and I don't much keer. I've seen it done. Sometimes the people back him up and boost him. Sometimes one way, sometimes another. But I'm sorry about Jones, sorry to lose him, if I have lost him. One thing is sure, wherever his sweet spirit is, that country is richer.

UNCLE SAM.

By the way, since Parker was nominated the Democracy is no longer the great unwashed.—Goodhue (Minn.) Co. News.

DEMOCRACY MUST MOVE FORWARD.

Wm. J. Bryan's leading editorial in The Commoner of July 22.

My selection as standard-bearer of the Democratic party in 1896 and again in 1900 made me the nominal leader of that party, and as such I did not feel at liberty to engraft new doctrines upon the party creed. I contented myself with the defense of those principles and policies which were embodied in the platform. Now, that the leadership devolves upon another and I bear only the responsibility that each citizen must bear, namely, responsibility for opinions, my utterances and my conduct, I am free to undertake a work which until now I have avoided, namely, the work of organizing the radical and progressive element in the Democratic party.

The money question is for the present in abeyance. The increased production of gold has lessened the strain upon the dollar and while bimetalism is as sound in theory as it ever was, the necessity for it is not so apparent. I believe that the time will come when the people will again turn to bimetalism and reject the gold standard, but this period will not come while times are good and while the advocates of the gold standard can point to a reasonably sufficient supply of money. Of course, it is absurd for those who said that we had money enough in 1896 to point with pride to a large increase since 1896, but inconsistent as it is they do so and as the present enlarged volume of money brings, in part at least, the advantages hoped for from bimetalism, it is useless to press the subject of bimetalism for the present. While the advocates of the gold standard intend a crusade against the silver now in circulation, they do not openly proclaim it, and we must wait until they attempt to carry out their purpose before the people can be awakened to a realization of that purpose. The advocates of the gold standard intend to withdraw the greenbacks from circulation and to substitute bank notes, but as they do not proclaim their purpose we must await an object lesson before the people will understand it. The advocates of the gold standard intend to substitute an asset currency for the present national bank currency, but they do not proclaim their purpose and until they attempt it the people cannot be made to understand it. The advocates of the gold standard intend to establish a branch bank system such as Jackson overthrew, but as they do not an-

nounce their purpose the people do not see it and will not see it until some open and overt attempt is made.

Time will open the eyes of the people and events will reveal the purposes of the financial group that has its home in Wall street and makes forays against the country as often and as rapidly as care for their own safety will permit.

But while the people cannot be brought at this time to consider the various phases of the money question, they can be brought to consider certain other questions with which the Democratic party must deal. I have heretofore refused to take a position upon the question of the government ownership of railroads, first, because I had not until recently studied the subject, and, second, because the question had not been reached. Recent events have convinced me that the time is now ripe for the presentation of this question. Consolidation after consolidation has taken place until a few men now control the railroad traffic of the country and defy both the legislative and the executive power of the nation. I invite the Democrats, therefore, to consider a plan for the government ownership and operation of the railroads.

The plan usually suggested is for the purchase of these roads by the federal government. This plan, it seems to me, is more objectionable than a plan which involves the ownership and operation of these roads by the several States. To put the railroads in the hands of the federal government would mean an enormous centralization of power. It would give to the federal government a largely increased influence over the citizen and the citizen's affairs, and such centralization is not at all necessary. The several States can own and operate the railroads within their borders just as effectively as it can be done by the federal government and if it is done by the States the objection based upon the fear of centralization is entirely answered. A board composed of representatives from the various States could deal with interstate traffic just as freight and passenger boards now deal with the joint traffic of the various lines. If the federal government had the railroads to build there would be a constant warring between different sections to secure a fair share of the new building and development, but where this is left to the State the people in each State can decide what railroads they desire to build or to buy. The maintenance of the track,

the care of the stations, the handling of incoming and outgoing freight and passengers—all these things require the employment of men, and if the employment is left to State authorities instead of to national authorities, most of the objections that have been raised to government ownership will be answered.

The arguments in favor of the assumption of the ownership and operation of railroads by the government are numerous:

First—Extortionate rates would be prevented. So far it has been impossible to secure any real regulation of railroad rates. The railroads regulate the government instead of the government the railroads. When the government owns the railroads and operates them, there can be no question about the fixing of reasonable tolls.

Second—Discrimination would be prevented. At present the railroad authorities can kill one town and build up another, destroy one locality and enrich another. And these discriminations are not always made out of consideration for the interests of the railroad, but are sometimes made because of the investments of officials in the town or locality to be favored. Great injustice has been done by these discriminations, and no way has been found to prevent them.

But there is another kind of discrimination which is operating against the nation's welfare and progress, namely, the discrimination in favor of the large city as against the small one. To the railroads more than any other influence is due the fact that the population is being driven from the country to the city. With fair and impartial rates the small town might again hope to be the home of the small factory, and those people who are being crowded into the cities where they live without the economic, sanitary, intellectual and moral advantages which they deserve, would be scattered more evenly throughout the country to their own great benefit and to the nation's good.

Third—The politics of the nation is being debauched by money. This money is drawn from the great corporations that desire special privileges or immunity from punishment, and is used to corrupt not only voters, but legislatures. How can this corruption be stopped so long as enormous wealth can be made by watered stock and by the exploitation of the public? The railroad is to a certain extent a monopoly. As soon as a line is built between two points the field is occupied and it is impossible to have competi-

tion. If a second road is built for the purpose of securing competition, the traffic between the two terminals must support two roads instead of one, and it is impossible for two roads to carry the passengers and the freight at as low a cost as the one road could. This being true, the result usually is that the competing lines are soon consolidated and the attempt at competition given up. Legislation has been attempted against consolidation, but so far such legislation has been very ineffectual. The benefits to be derived by the railroads from the destruction of competition are so enormous that they have thus far been able to protect themselves by the giving up of a small part of the benefit to those who are in a position to interfere with them, but whose views can be modified by an argument addressed to the pocketbook.

Fourth—Another objection to the private ownership of railroads has been forced upon me with increasing emphasis during the last few years, namely the corrupting influence of these great railway corporations over the young professional men of the country. The railroads have lawyers in every county and general attorneys at every State capital. These men stand high in their profession and are usually men of character. Their connection with the railroad has in many instances made them not merely the attorneys for the road in legal matters, but lobbyists for the road in political matters. These men have controlled conventions, dictated nominations, written platforms and so shaped appointments that the masses have been ignored and their interests disregarded. The United States senate today contains so many men who are obliged to the railroads that it has been impossible to secure an amendment of the interstate commerce law, although for years the interstate commerce commission, composed of both Republicans and Democrats, has been pleading for an amendment.

It is not necessary to believe that United States senators actually draw salaries from these railroads at the same time that they draw salaries from the government, although it is known that salaries have been offered to senators by railroads having business before that body, and it is known today that there are men there who did receive salaries from railroads just before their election and it is not known that those salaries have been relinquished.

If the railroads were owned by the

several States instead of by private corporations, the railroad officials would be selected by the people and responsible to the people, whereas now these attorneys are selected by the railroads, paid by the railroads and subservient to the railroads.

Fifth—Another objection to the private ownership of railroads—and it is an objection that all recognize—is the use of the pass in politics. In some of the States the constitution forbids the use of a pass by public officials, but even in such States officials sometimes use passes and when an official in such a State accepts a pass, having violated the law, he puts himself where the railroad can blackmail him and force him to vote for measures desired by the railroads.

So powerful is the influence of the pass that it was impossible to secure at the last session of congress consideration of a resolution introduced by Congressman Baker of New York asking whether the giving of a pass was a violation of the interstate commerce law. The Pennsylvania railroad and the Baltimore & Ohio road secured large appropriations from the last congress for the enlargement of the depot facilities at Washington, and it is a notorious fact that representatives of the roads were present in the lobbies of the capitol building giving passes to the members of congress who voted with them and refusing passes to the members who voted against their demands. Any one who has had any experience in politics cannot be blind to the fact that the use of the pass often controls conventions, determines the selection of legislators, governors and often judges. When the recipient acts upon questions that involve the interests of the people, either his mind must be influenced by favors received or he must constantly brace himself against that influence. These are some, not all, of the reasons that may be given in favor of the government ownership and operation of the railroads. By leaving the matter to the State each State can act for itself and be governed by the sentiment of the people, moving as slowly or as rapidly as that sentiment demands. But I feel assured that the time has come when the Democratic party as a party should turn its face toward the solution of this great question, and by the advocacy of the government ownership of the railroads bring to the people relief from the economic evils that have followed private ownership, and relief from the political corruption which seems indissolubly connected with the private ownership of railroads.

Whether the various roads shall be secured by purchase or condemnation is a matter that each State can decide for itself. It may be wiser to begin by building new lines where they are now needed and thus determine the value of the old ones by the operation of the new ones. But the means to be employed for the securing of the lines and the rules to be adopted for the operation of them, will be found easy after the public has determined that the people, acting through their government, should take upon themselves the work of controlling this great branch of the business of the people.

While the Democratic party in the nation is advocating the government ownership of railroads, the Democratic party in the cities should upon the same theory espouse the cause of municipal ownership of municipal franchises. Private contracts for water, lighting and street car facilities have been the fruitful source of municipal corruption, and there is no solution of these municipal problems that does not involve municipal ownership. The progress made in this direction in European cities shows what can be done, and it is only a question of time when in each city in the United States the people acting through their municipal government will do for themselves, without the intervention of corporations, that which is now done at greater expense by private corporations. The municipal operation of the street car lines will result in such a reduction in fares that people can live farther from the center of the city and thus secure healthier locations. There are many questions of sociology that affect the municipal population and the Democratic party must meet all of these with an eye single to the public welfare.

We have also reached a time when the post office department should embrace a telegraph system as well as a mail system. While the telegraph lines do not reach as many people as the railroads do, and while the abuses to private ownership have not been so open and notorious, yet there is no reason why this nation should not do what other nations are doing in this respect. In the small towns the postmaster could act as telegraph operator and thus a great economy could be effected. In the larger cities the telegraph system could be under the control of the postmaster and such employes added to the postal service as might be necessary. It is safe to say that the cost of messages could be reduced one-half, and yet have the system self-supporting.

There is no good reason that can be urged against the government ownership and operation of the telegraph system in connection with the postal department. The matter has already been investigated by Congress and favorable action taken, but the influence of the telegraph companies exerted through their corporate interests and through the franking privilege has been sufficient thus far to prevent any action being taken. The democratic party ought to take up this reform and make it a part of its creed.

Private monopoly must be destroyed. The Democratic platform adopted at Kansas City declared private monopoly to be indefensible and intolerable. This declaration was reproduced in the St. Louis platform adopted a few days ago. To what extent this will be overcome by the influences that surround Judge Parker no one can yet declare, but it is evident that the conservative Democrats, as they call themselves, will never give the country any relief from the trusts. The government ownership of railroads will exert a tremendous influence toward the destruction of private monopolies, for most of the great trusts have been built up by railway discriminations and rebates, but the democratic party cannot content itself with any partial remedy for the trusts. It must declare war upon every private monopoly and it must prosecute that war relentlessly until the principle of private monopoly has been eradicated and industrial independence again secured.

The door of opportunity must not be closed against the young men of this country. The right of the citizen to build up an independent business and to enjoy the fruits of his toil must be guaranteed to him. It is the basis of our industrial development and it is the guaranty of our political liberty. The State should be encouraged to employ every power that it has to prevent the incorporation of a private monopoly, and the power of Congress over interstate commerce should be invoked to resist any and every effort to use a State charter for the exploitation of the whole country. A line must be drawn between the inalienable rights of the natural man and the law-conferred rights of a corporation. A corporation has no inalienable rights; it has no rights except those given it by law, and the people cannot be presumed to desire the creation of a man-made giant, having both the power and the disposition to trample upon the rights of the God-made man. The

private monopoly must be destroyed, root and branch.

The democratic party has in two campaigns stood for an income tax. The plank was omitted this year because the men in control of the party thought it would jeopardize success in the eastern States. This objection may have weight when the appeal is made to a particular section and to the wealthy men of that section, but it cannot have weight when the party goes forth, as it must ultimately, to appeal to the masses. It is unnecessary to say that a progressive Democratic party must favor a tariff for revenue only. It cannot favor the taxation of the many for the benefit of the few.

An income tax is just and without it it will be difficult to secure any effectual tariff reform. When the people understand the income tax the popular demand for it will be so great that no party will dare to ignore it merely to court favor with the comparatively few who are now avoiding their share of the expenses of the government and throwing too large a portion of the public burden upon the poor.

Even as now organized the Democratic party stands for the election of senators by the people and it ought to stand for direct legislation as far as the principle can be conveniently applied. Everything that brings the government nearer to the people is good. There is more virtue in the people than ever finds expression through their representatives.

Our party should also consider whether our federal judges should not be elected by the people to serve for a limited period. The life position in the civil service is not in harmony with our theory of government and the appointment of judges for life is not justified by experience. The president must rely upon his advisers when he appoints United States judges and the people at large can make the selection better than any president can. Elections for a stated period would bring the judiciary into closer touch with the people whose servants the judges are.

I suggest, not for the purpose of insisting upon it, but merely to bring the matter to public attention, that it may be found desirable to change the method of selecting postmasters. At present they are appointed by the president upon the recommendation of congressmen. The post office department is now a great political machine presided over by a man skilled in

political maneuvers, and the wishes of the people in the various communities are entirely ignored. Why should a federal administration ignore the wishes of the people whom the postmaster is expected to serve? If a system can be devised whereby the federal government will still retain the power of appointment and the power of removal and yet be restricted in appointment to persons named by the local community, a step in advance will have been taken. The right of local self-government can thus be vindicated and the use of the post office department for the benefit of the congressmen or for the benefit of the administration prevented. Such a change would also make it impossible for a federal administration to force colored postmasters upon white communities for political purposes. Is there any good reason why the president in making appointments should not consult the convenience and the will of the people who patronize the post office?

The differences between labor and capital are becoming more and more acute. And why? Because capital has not only been permitted to monopolize the resources of the government and feed fat upon the toil of the people, but it has been given a free hand in dealing with labor. It has been permitted to use labor for its own enrichment and then to dictate terms to the wage-earner. The Democratic party must be the champion of the man who toils—not his defender when he does wrong, not his apologist when he is led into error, but his exponent in the effort to secure the protection of his rights and the conservation of his interests. The Democratic party is not the enemy of wealth; on the contrary, it is the best friend of honestly acquired wealth, for by preventing the acquirement of wealth by illegal and unjust methods it would give to the possessor of wealth the honor and the distinction to which his thrift, energy, industry and economy ought to entitle him.

The Democratic party, if it is to be a power for good in this country, must be the defender of human rights. It must devote itself to the protection of human rights. It must declare, establish and defend the true relation between man and property, a relation recognized by both Jefferson and Lincoln—a relation which puts man first and his possessions afterward, a relation which makes man the master of that which he has created, a relation which puts the spiritual and moral life of the nation above its material wealth

and resources. This is the great struggle of to-day and it is a struggle in which the Democratic party must take an important part.

The contest above outlined must be made whether the party wins in November or not. A single election is but an incident in the life of a party. For more than a century the Democratic party has stood forth as the representative of certain great ideas. Jefferson founded it, Jackson defended it, and even Cleveland could not destroy it. If Mr. Parker is elected his administration will rid us of imperialism and of the threat of a race issue and give us greater freedom in the taking up of economic questions. Nothing that he can do or say as president will thwart the purpose of the democratic masses to rid the party of plutocratic influences or tendencies. The Republican party is growing more and more plutocratic and it can furnish a home for all who believe in the rule of wealth. The Democratic party cannot be a plutocratic party; it cannot belle its history; it cannot disappoint the hopes of its members. The fight must go on and must go on until victory is secured. Can we win? Who can doubt it? To those who think that a temporary victory of the conservative element ends progress in the Democratic party let this reply be made:

O ye of little faith! Go forth into the fields and see how the myriad grains, bursting forth from their prison in the earth, push upward toward the light. Watch them as under the influence of sunshine and shower they grow to maturity and furnish food for the race. Go into the orchard and see the seed or the grafted twig grow into a great tree whose leaves furnish shade and whose fruit gives nourishment to man. Measure if you can the mighty forces behind the grain and the tree, and know ye that the forces behind the truth are as irresistible and as constantly at work. God would have been unkind, indeed, had He made such ample provision for the needs of man's body and less adequate provision for the triumph of those moral forces which mean more to the race than food or clothing or shelter. He is a political atheist who doubts the triumph of the right. He lacks faith in the purposes and the plans of God who for a moment falters in the great struggle between truth and error—between man and mammon.

Evelyn—Yes, my great grandmother eloped with my great grandfather.

Cholly—Just fancy! Old people like that!—Smart Set.

"IT'S MAH HOME."

A dispatch from New York to the Chicago Record-Herald of July 24.

"Bill" Everson, a middle-aged colored man, snaps his fingers at John D. Rockefeller and his millions. "Bill" owns a three-acre farm on the slope of Buttermilk hill, in Westchester county. John D. Rockefeller owns 6,000 acres, including Buttermilk hill, his property extending from the village of Hawthorne on the Harlem railroad to Pocantico Hills, on the Putnam railroad.

Dozens of farms in Mount Pleasant township have been purchased by the Standard Oil magnate in the last few months, and Buttermilk hill, several miles long and a mile wide, now is included in the Rockefeller property—that is, all of Buttermilk hill except the three-acre farm owned by "Bill" Everson and a cabin and a half an acre occupied by Marie Everson, his maiden sister.

Farm after farm in Hawthorne, East View and other towns along the slope of the hill has passed into Rockefeller's possession, and to-day he is the largest land owner in Westchester county. Some of the farms purchased by Rockefeller were bought at their real value, some cost him a fancy price, but neither fair price nor fancy can move "Bill" and Marie.

"I don't want Mistah Rockefeller's money," said Everson to-day. "I ratheh have mah fahm. Why should I sell out mah little home? Here I have mah wife, mah three children, mah ole hoss, mah garden sass, mah hayfield and mah 'tate patch, and I owns all ob 'em. If I sell mah fahm to Mistah Rockefeller, where do you s'pose I'm goin' to live? Nobody much wants colored folks 'round as neighbors, and I'm not goin' to spend mah time lookin' for another fahm. He offered me \$1,200 for mah fahm, but I don't want his \$1,200; mah fahm's worth more to me than all the money Mistah Rockefeller's got in his iron chest. It's mah home, mah wife's home and mah children's home, and I'm goin' to stay right there."

Everson's farm is a neat little patch of ground on the state road between Hawthorne and Briarcliff Manor. Mr. Rockefeller owns the land on three sides of it. As "Bill" says, he has a garden and hay and potatoes, and, moreover, he has a water melon patch that would make most colored folk sit up all night and wink and blink at the prospects of melon days still to come.

Down the State road, half a mile from Bill's house, lives his sister, who has a cabin home on the side of Buttermilk hill. She is an invalid and says she doesn't want the \$890 Mr. Rockefeller

offered her for the little hillside home. She is old and feeble, and she wants to end her days in this little mountain bower, with her chickens, her honey-suckle vines and the cool spring that trickles out of the hillside.

She cares not whether Mr. Rockefeller owns the land east, west, north and south of her; she wants to live in peace. She is nearly blind, lives alone and has few callers. Her brother comes every few days and chops wood for her, and once each week the village dominie of Hawthorne calls on Marie, says a prayer with her and carries away her blessing.

So these poor colored people. Bill in his \$1,200 home and old Marie in her \$800 cabin, dwell in content, while upon the mountain side they hear the powder blasts of Rockefeller's workmen, who are constructing a marvelous driveway circling round and round Buttermilk hill.

A PUZZLER.

For The Public.

Four years ago, and, truly, eight years, too, My neighbor Jones declared with virtuous scorn

That though a Democrat all through and through,

As was his father before he was born, McKinley should receive his best support;

'Twas hard to vote Republican, but yet

'Twas harder still Bryan should be allowed

Our solid business interests to upset.

My neighbor Smith, also a Democrat. (Although he spells it with a little c.)

Says this year Roosevelt is the proper man

For him to vote for, far as he can see.

'Tis well agreed the choice is merely one Of persons; and Smith says that while he feels

No hankering for fish diet, when it comes To choosing eels or oysters, he takes eels.

This tickles Hawkins just about to death; The G. O. P. is Johnny on the spot.

But I'm surprised to see how Jones goes on.

Call's Smith a turn-coat, traitor, and what not.

Now why 'tis worse this year than 'twas before

To vote Republican, I can't quite see; There must be the same famous difference

There was 'twixt tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee.

JAY HAWKINS.

After denouncing the men who nominated it as train robbers, Mr. Bryan cannot support the Illinois state ticket. The Nebraska statesman always did allow the small virtue of consistency to hamper his movements.—Chicago Daily News.

A TWISTER.

Said the Democratic Gold Plank,
In the watches of the night:
"I'm the hole inside the doughnut
If you think it out aright.

"For you surely can't deny it
When you get right down to biz,
It's the presence of my absence,
Makes the platform what it is."
—McLanburgh, in New York Sun.

"If Washington was alive to-day do you think he would be elected president?"

"I do not."

"Not enough of a politician, eh?"

"That isn't the reason."

"What then?"

"He'd be too old."—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Out of the Democratic conventions in St. Louis came nominations for president and vice president without anyone threatening to bolt, beyond the candidate for president.—Sioux Falls Journal.

Ask your lawyer friend who don't believe in unions if he isn't a member of the Bar Association. Then hear him stammer.—Poinf (Tex.) Password.

BOOKS

G. W. E. RUSSELL'S MATTHEW ARNOLD—A STUDY OF CRITICISM AND CULTURE.

Matthew Arnold expressed the wish that no biography of himself should be written, and so the writers have had to get around this desire as best they might. Two volumes of his letters have been published, and several volumes of criticism. Mr. Russell's book (Matthew Arnold, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, \$1) is a series of essays, bearing the titles Method, Education, Society, Conduct, Theology, the whole making a pretty complete account of Matthew Arnold's work and influence. The appearance of the book is attractive, the type is excellent, and there are 17 very satisfactory illustrations. These illustrations are partly of places intimately connected with Arnold's life, and yet there is not a word in the text to show the connection. In fact there is next to nothing of external biography in the book.

This fact detracts much from the interest of the volume, and probably accounts for the feeling of partial disappointment with which it has been received. For Mr. Russell has often shown himself to be a most entertaining author, and readers had a right to expect from him on such a subject a more lively book than the present treatment can be claimed to be.

It may be that some of the disappoint-

ment is due to the fact that so much was expected of Mr. Russell, and his critics must after all confess that his dealing with the main lines of Matthew Arnold's thought and work shows an intimacy of acquaintance and appreciation which few could have equaled. The book is therefore well worth owning and reading.

Matthew Arnold was born in 1822, was educated at Rugby and Oxford, spent most of his active life as Inspector of schools, and died in 1888. It was natural that the sons of his father, England's most celebrated schoolmaster, should be connected with education. Matthew, the eldest, and Edward, the third son, were inspectors; Thomas, the second son, father of Mrs. Humphry Ward, was professor in University college, Dublin; the fourth son, William, was director of public instruction in one of the provinces of India.

Matthew Arnold did great work in four lines—in education, in poetry, in theology, and in criticism. Some regard him as one of the greatest poets of the Victorian age, and predict for his poetical works increasing appreciation and fame. Some think that his theological books, "Literature and Dogma," "God and the Bible," "St. Paul and Protestantism," by popularizing liberal views, represent his largest services to his age. But Mr. Russell seems to me right in putting him greatest as critic—critic of literature, critic of morals, critic of life. If one wishes to read a genuine specimen of literary criticism, let him read Matthew Arnold's introduction to his selections from Wordsworth. With the possible exception of Froude's essay on the Book of Job, there is no greater piece of literary criticism in the language. As to his larger criticism upon conduct and life, we find this in all his works. It is the man himself.

The word that comes first to mind when one thinks of Matthew Arnold is "culture," and in trying, therefore, to understand the man, it is of first importance that we remember what he says about the function of culture. "Culture," he says, "seeks to do away with classes and sects; to make the best that has been thought and known in the world current everywhere; to make all men live in an atmosphere of sweetness and light. . . . This is the social idea; and the men of culture are the true apostles of equality." To spread culture, this was Arnold's ideal work. He was so impatient with those who lacked this thing, that he seemed sometimes to approach dangerously near to a sort of foppish superciliousness. But there is a wide difference between a man who, knowing his superiority in taste, manner, and liberal outlook on life, wishes to break down the barrier of separation by the spread of these qualities, and a man on the other hand who magnifies the possession of such qualities as a perpetuation of separation. The former is at

heart a democrat, the latter an aristocrat.

"If experience," says Matthew Arnold, "has established any one thing in this world, it has established this: That it is well for any great class or description of men in society to be able to say for itself what it wants, and not to have other classes, the so-called educated and intelligent classes, acting for it as its proctors, and supposed to understand its wants and to provide for them. They do not really understand its wants, they do not really provide for them. A class of men may often itself not either fully understand its own wants, or adequately express them; but it has a rarer interest and a more sure diligence in the matter than any of its proctors, and, therefore, a better chance of success." There is nothing of the protective spirit of aristocracy about this. No, Matthew Arnold, with all his worship of culture, had no desire to limit it, but, rather, that it should permeate the whole nation.

"He reminded us," says Mr. Russell, "that the true greatness of a nation was to be found in its culture, its ideals, its sentiment for beauty, its performances in the intellectual and moral spheres—not in its supply of coal, its volume of trade, its accumulated capital, or its multiplication of railways." Again: "He taught us to seek in every department of life for what was 'lovely and of good report,' tasteful, becoming and befitting. . . . Alike his teaching and his example made us desire (however imperfectly we attained our object) to perceive in all the contingencies and circumstances of life exactly the line of conduct which would best consist with delicacy, and so to make virtue victorious by practicing it attractively."

Above all his other performances this desire for the spread of the spirit of doing things decently, the spirit of admiring genuineness, simplicity, and beauty—this propaganda of culture—was Matthew Arnold's most distinctive work. Mr. Russell has brought out the point with due emphasis, and this alone would be enough to justify his book.

There is so much that one can say about Arnold—for he provokes discussion—so much about the quality of his poetry, so much about the broadness of his educational views, so much about his interpretations of the Bible and of the contrasts between Hebraic and Hellenic influence on the world, that even a brief review hardly knows where to stop. Mr. Russell's treatment of these subjects will be found to be stimulating and helpful; but of course Matthew Arnold is his own best interpreter. In poetry let one read *Sohrab and Rustum*, *Rugby Chapel*, *Self-Dependence*, and the *Sonnets*, *Quiet Work*, the *World's Triumphs*, *East and West London*. In prose Arnold thought his "Discourses in America" his best work; to many it must always seem that the highest expres-

The Public

is a weekly review which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of radical democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

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

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

ATTORNEYS.

HENRY B. TAWRESEY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,
213 South Sixth Street,
PHILADELPHIA.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER
COUNSELOR AT LAW,

BENNETT BLDG.
39 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 404 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1014.
NEW YORK.

CONTRACTORS.

GEORGE H. ATKINSON,
CONTRACTOR.

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

PLUTO. AND HIS FAITHFUL SERVITOR.

Grover—Good! he smiles; he is pleased with my account; he will see that I acted throughout as his particular friend. If I can please *him*, I care nothing for the riff-raff!

sion of his philosophy of life is to be found in "Literature and Dogma." But after reading this, one should, without fail, read Principal Shairp's "Culture and Religion," one of the most beautiful and instructive little books ever written.

It is hardly possible to close any account of Matthew Arnold, however brief, without saying a word about style. "Whatever," says Mr. Russell, "may be thought of the substance of his writings, it surely must be admitted that he was a great master of style. And his style was altogether his own." What is its chief characteristic? Certainly I think we may say, straightness, simplicity, entire absence of pomposity. He had, as Mr. Russell says, "a lively horror of affectation and unreality." He had no tolerance for what he called "desperate efforts to render a platitude enduring by making it pompous." To be one's best self, not to try to be somebody else's self—in style as well

as in life, that seems to be the secret of all masters. "People," Arnold once said, "think I can teach them style. What stuff it all is! Have something to say, and say it as clearly as you can. That is the only secret of style."

J. H. DILLARD.

PAMPHLETS.

Americans wishing to follow the drift of British politics will be interested in one of the pamphlets of the National Liberal club (political and economic circle), to be had of P. S. King & Son, 2 and 4 Great Smith street, Westminster, S. W., London. It is by J. H. Levy and is entitled "The Fiscal Question in Great Britain." Two other pamphlets, to be had of "Land Values," 13 Dundas street, Glasgow, Scotland, relate to the same general subject. One is a speech by the Liberal leader, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, in favor of the taxation of land values. The other is a paper by Charles Trevelyan, M. P., on land reform versus protection.

Campaign Subscriptions

THE PUBLIC will be sent during the campaign to persons not now on its subscription list, for

THIRTY CENTS

This will include the issue of November 19, 1904. Address: BOX 687, CHICAGO.

Volume VI of The Public

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

BOUND VOLUMES, PRICE, \$3.00, by Express, prepaid, \$3.50, are ready for delivery. Address,

PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

PUBLICATIONS OF L. S. DICKEY & CO. 1601 Unity Building, - CHICAGO.

ETHICS OF DEMOCRACY.—

By Louis F. Post, 400 pages, silk cloth, deckle edges, gilt top. Price, \$2.00 net. By mail, \$2.12.

BISOCIALISM.—The Reign of the Man at the Margin. By Oliver R. Trowbridge. 400 pages, in cloth. Price, \$1.50 net. By mail \$1.60.

COMPLETE WORKS OF HENRY GEORGE, LIBRARY EDITION.—

Just issued in ten volumes, with Life of Henry George, by Henry George, Jr. Uncut edges, green buckram. Price, \$17.50 per set.

THE PROPHET OF SAN FRANCISCO.—A Monograph, by Louis F. Post, 80 pages. Per copy, 20c postpaid.

All of above sent to any address in the United States, for \$3.10 on monthly installments of \$3. Deliveries in Canada and Mexico will be made without additional charge other than for customs duties, and to other foreign countries without additional charge other than for customs duties and expressage.

L. S. DICKEY & CO.,
1601 Unity Bldg., Chicago.