

# The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 13, 1904.

Number 332.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

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

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

The democratic generalities of Judge Parker's speech are all that could be desired. So also is much that he says when he particularizes. Altogether the speech fairly encourages the hope that in his letter of acceptance, wherein he promises to consider the platform more minutely, Judge Parker may justify the confidence of those who vouch for his fundamental democracy.

It might seem that he was somewhat swift, after enumerating the platform promises for the correction of abuses, to explain that such action is intended to be "conservative." An assurance that we are to be conservative in opposing "the granting of special privileges by which the few may profit at the expense of the many," certainly produces a queer effect. It is a little like being conservative in opposing robbery. To be tactful is wise in opposing anything; but there are some things regarding which "conservative" opposition is indistinguishable from collusion. It may be, however, that Judge Parker was influenced to make this awkward assurance by force of a certain judicial habit, and not by any deliberate purpose of running with the exploited hares while hunting with the privileged hounds.

A more ominous thing about Judge Parker's speech is what appears to be an effort to inject "weasel words" into the platform plank on the Philippine question. That plank is an explicit declaration that—

we ought to do for the Filipinos 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.

There are no "weasel words" in that plank, and Judge Parker is not called upon to insert any. Yet he speaks of our duty to prepare the Filipino people for self government and to give them the assurances that it will come—

as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it.

"Reasonably prepared," are slippery political words. They belong in a slippery political vocabulary. The committee on resolutions at the convention rejected similar modifying words. Used as Judge Parker uses them they may serve to neutralize the promise. President Roosevelt is willing to promise the Filipinos self government "as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it;" for as we ourselves are to determine what these words mean, that promise binds us to no more, not even in honor as promisors, than to give the Filipinos self government when we are willing. But it would not be just to hold Judge Parker to responsibility for this tampering with the platform until his formal letter of acceptance shows whether he has meant to tamper with it or not.

The same thing may be said of that part of his speech which bears upon the tariff. The platform denounces "protection as a robbery of the many to enrich the few," and explicitly favors a revenue-only tariff. Judge Parker, speaking not merely for himself but for the party, states "our position" on the tariff, and he states it to be in favor not of tariff for revenue only, but "of a reasonable reduction of the tariff." Now a "reasonable reduction of the tariff"

means a tariff for revenue only, in the estimation of those who believe that protection is robbery; but to a protectionist, it means anything or nothing according to circumstances. What does it mean to Judge Parker? This is a question which it is to be hoped his letter of acceptance will satisfactorily answer.

It is true that in his speech Judge Parker describes the platform as "admirable," and as clearly stating democratic principles, and as pointing out the course to be pursued. Had he stopped there he might be regarded as cordially accepting the platform as it stands. But those general words of approval are modified to the extent that he modifies any part of the platform. If he intends these modifications, democratic Democrats in the party organization will find it increasingly difficult to hold their following for him. This is to be regretted if Judge Parker really is as democratic as the general tone and spirit of his speech implies. But as his letter is still to come, the ambiguities of his present position may yet be fully removed.

The most incisive comment on Bishop Potter's dedication of a drinking tavern, as in some way tending to conserve "the American home," comes from the pen of Edith Sessions Tupper, who suggests that if the Bishop would look a little deeper into the question, he would soon be so busy at quickening the consciences of his own aristocratic associates, that he wouldn't have time to dedicate taverns. "Who is responsible," asks this sprightly writer, "for these vile, filthy east side American homes, from whose crowded rooms, surcharged with reeking humanity, husbands and fathers must fly to the relaxation of tavern or saloon? Who but the very

class of which Bishop Potter is a distinguished member and ornament? The tenements of New York are owned by wealthy members of fashionable churches; the diamonds, laces, automobiles, yachts, blooded horses, etc., come, many of them, from the rentals of these humble 'American homes.' A list of the east side tenement owners of New York city would read very much like a list of New York's influential church-people. It seems to me that Bishop Potter might find a mission among his class that would accord better with the purple of his office than does helping to open taverns for the relaxation of dwellers in 'American homes.'" But really the well-meaning Bishop could do little good if he turned his attention to this wickedness in his own class. Suppose he aroused them to their guilt, and they stopped taking tenement house blood money. No matter what device they resorted to, they could merely turn the wretched mechanism over to others no less grasping. Individual reform cannot remedy this social evil. The evil is systematic, and only radical change of opinion regarding the system can avail. But that is a theory, and Bishop Potter says "you cannot save this Republic by theories." He will have none of your theories.—not while taverns are practical.

The sober statement of the origin and spirit of the Colorado disorder, which we are able to make this week over the signature of so judicial an observer as James H. Teller, a lawyer of Pueblo and brother of Senator Teller, can hardly fail to impress any fair-minded reader with the conviction that the responsibility for the trouble is not on the labor organizations.

It is indisputable now that the action of the State authorities, civil and military, was high handed to the point of revolution, and no one attempts to dispute it. Every newspaper correspondent sends back the same story in that respect. Nor does anyone defend it.

The thing is indefensible on any law-and-order theory. But attempts to excuse it are made on the ground that a reign of terror had been established by the labor organizations, and that this anarchistic lawlessness had to be met with government lawlessness.

The latest instance of this indirect defense of the lawlessness of the authorities is made by Walter Wellman, in his lurid letters from Colorado to the Chicago Record-Herald. He refers to the exasperation of the law-abiding people of the disturbed districts over several atrocious crimes of union men, and the intensification of this feeling by their acquittal in trials before juries packed with union officials. This is a typical excuse for what is one of the most menacing instances of lawless government in our history. Yet Mr. Teller's plain statement of the facts shows even that poor excuse to be without truth.

Not only is there no evidence that the crimes in question were committed by the unions, but one of them has been proved to have been committed by a detective of the employers' organization; not only have all the accused union men who have been tried been acquitted, but their acquittal was justified by the complete breakdown of the prosecution. As Mr. Teller says, all this talk about labor union terrorism as an excuse for military despotism, is pure assumption.

Apart from his narrative of facts, Mr. Teller offers a significant explanation of the vindictiveness of the mine owners. It is a new version of the old story of the beggar on horseback. They are plutocrats, not aristocrats. The plutocrat is harsh; the aristocrat has learned "noblesse oblige." One strenuously gratifies the brutal instincts of the slave driver; the other condescendingly practices the humanitarian precepts of the slave owner. The plutocrat founds aristocracies; the aristocrat is a stonion of plutocracies. They are alike except in genealogy

and manners. Each lives in the sweat of other men's faces—the one by traditional title, the other by personal conquest; and each believes in it—the one phrasing his faith in billingsgate, the other in litanies. It is harder in some respects, to be sure, to be the victim of a plutocrat's unpretentious greed than of an aristocrat's paternal protection; yet both come high, in labor, and even at greater cost wouldn't a real man prefer the Colorado miners' condition of enforced exile, to the "good" slave's condition of brute comfort?

Another point in Mr. Teller's letter is strikingly true and significant. It is his economic point, that the market price of the precious metals is so constant that alterations in the wages for their production affect the employer's own pockets and not the pockets of those to whom he sells. If wages rise his profits fall. This is because the employers are also owners of the mines, either as actual landlords or as tenants with a fixed term. They receive not only the profits of operation, but also the profits of ownership. The profits of operation would not fall with a rise of wages, but would tend also to rise. Legitimate profits of operation are governed by the prevailing rate of wages, being high when that is high and low when that is low. It would be absurd to suppose that legitimate profits of operation could be persistently low when the rate of wages was persistently high. Equally so is it to suppose that such profits can be persistently high when the rate of wages is persistently low. Profits of operation are really nothing but wages for a certain kind of productive skill, and we never make the mistake of supposing that high wages for unskilled labor are consistent with low wages for desirable skilled labor. In the case of the miners we are confused by the fact that the profits of mine-operation and the profits of mine-ownership go into the same treasury without distinction.

In most vocations, when wages

rise, either the consuming interest or the land-owning interest must suffer. Which it may be, depends upon which offers the least resistance. If higher prices would not seriously diminish production, production would go on as usual, though prices rose. In that case the consumer pays the higher wages. But if higher prices would check production to a degree sufficient to throw considerable land out of use, that land would compete for a job, and landlords would have to carry the rise in wages. It is precisely so with precious metal production, as with everything. In that vocation, however, the natural opportunities are more completely monopolized than in other vocations, and prices are as high already as demand warrants. To increase the price would correspondingly narrow the market. Consequently any rise in wages must come out of the mine-owning, as distinguished from the mine-operating, interests. But as the owning and the operating interests have a common treasury, higher wages seem to be at the expense of employers. That it is really at the expense of mine-owners would be obvious, if all royalties and other fixed payments for mining privileges were abrogated, and the owners' profits were kept in a separate till from the operators' profits.

The bitterness of the employers in the stockyards strike seems hardly less than that of the mine owners of Colorado. And it is the same plutocratic bitterness, characterized by the same beggar-on-horseback assumption of superiority, the same contempt for law and order, the same coldly calculating inhumanity, the same destructive spirit. Here are hardworking and by no means thrifless men and women, whose regular pay has been so small that within a week after their strike begins they are on the verge of starvation. Here are free-born American citizens forced by economic conditions to sell the products of their labor to the meat trust on terms that would have shamed any humane slave master

in the South before the war, and set in motion against him the protective machinery of the slave code. Here are men and women whom this trust employs upon more profitable terms than if it were to buy them outright as chattel slaves at a hundred dollars a head and care for them as masters in the South were compelled to care for their Negro slaves. Yet it drives them into a desperate strike in order to force still lower wages upon them; and at the first signs of disorder in this great writhing mass of humanity struggling for a chance to live, it yells lustily for the police. Law is what it wants when workingmen strike. Law! Law! Law! Don't you hear? Law! But law is not what it wants. It wants power, irresponsible power. This trust is a law-breaker by profession. It is a trust in flagrant violation of law. It is a thief caught in the act of stealing great volumes of water from the public mains. It is a tax dodger. It is a reckless violator of the sanitary code. By all means let the law be enforced. But let it be enforced impartially against it as well as in its favor. Of that "safe and sane" administration of the law which singles out one class for punishment and another for privilege, and for which the trusts have so great a liking, we have had enough.

It should be observed that the outcry against labor violence is not always well founded. The Governor of Nebraska has satisfied himself of this by personal investigation. There had been numerous reports of violence in connection with the meat trust strike, and troops were in demand from the offices of the trust. It was then that the Governor investigated. "Disguised as a common laborer," said the dispatches of the 1st from South Omaha, "Governor Mickey, of Nebraska, mingled this morning with the striking packing-house employes, listened to their talk, watched strike breakers run into different plants, and otherwise investigated for himself as to whether State troops were

necessary for the maintenance of order. Mr. Mickey had been in South Omaha only a few moments when it was reported that a carload of 'breakers' was coming. Scores of strikers made a rush, and with them went the Governor, but the crowd was orderly, and silently watched the strike breakers leave their car, and enter the Armour plant. There were forty of the non-union workmen. 'In the light of the reports of violence and disorder which have been spread I was agreeably surprised to see the strikers acting so well,' said Governor Mickey later." And so might other officials at other times and in other places be able to say if they were more solicitous for the good of society and less eager for the good opinion of men of money.

An illustration of the depth to which this notion that law is the luxury of the rich has sunk its roots, may be found in the Iron Age, a plutocratic trade paper. In its issue of the 4th this entertainingly ingenuous paper objects to labor organizations' heckling legislative candidates with reference to the kind of laws the candidates will vote for if elected. The American Federation of Labor having announced its purpose to question these candidates on government by injunction, the eight hour bill, and direct legislation, the Iron Age says:

It is simply another attempt to accomplish by force or duress that which the community has steadfastly refused to grant. The principle which actuates such a plan of procedure is precisely the same as the conception of sympathetic strikes to influence an impatient public against a hard headed employer or any of the other means employed to stir up wholesale trouble whenever a strike occurs that seems likely to fail. Candidates for office are to be threatened with defeat unless they yield to the dictates of those who assume to know the proper number of hours which should constitute a day's work, and who would also break down judicial obstacles to lawlessness in times of strikes.

There is something pathetic about the political ignorance (if it is not sordid dishonesty) of a paper which abhors the pledging of candidates by their constituents, as

a "threat" to defeat them for office. A ten-year-old child might understand that unless those who make the "threat" are sufficiently numerous, it must be ineffective; and even a subsidized trade paper ought to know that if they are sufficiently numerous to make their "threat" good at the polls, they are exercising the right for the exercise of which the polls exist. The function of legislatures is to enact the laws that the people want; a function of the voter is to keep out of office legislators who are opposed to enacting the laws he wants. One might think the Iron Age was satirizing its own constituency, for of all brain-hardened creatures on this footstool, the worst is the average "business" man who has had his arrogant dignity ruffled and his arrogant temper ruptured by the arrogance of a union committee. But the Iron Age can hardly be suspected of satire. It is too serenely and smugly serious for that. What it says is really a fair expression of the spirit which prevails among the class upon which it depends for advertising.

#### ECONOMIC CAUSES OF GAMBLING.

Although gambling assumes many forms and is rather difficult to define exactly, its chief varieties and characteristics are fairly well in our minds. Whatever else gambling may include, it always involves the getting of something of value without earning it. This increases the property of one person and decreases the property of another, as a result of what we call chance or of future developments which are not thoroughly known to all parties when the gambling transaction begins.

What is it that leads people to gamble?

While there may be some persons who do it simply for sport or from other motives besides the winning of the prizes, I am convinced that the hope of winning something of value is the chief inducement to the great majority of persons who engage in gambling. To eradicate gambling, therefore, we must destroy or neutralize this

principal motive—the desire to get value without creating it by labor or giving something in a fair exchange.

We cannot suppress it effectually by laws repressing this or that form of gambling, although these may be very desirable and may be of great assistance. The gambling spirit to a great extent defies the laws and invents new forms when old ones are denied to it. We must strike at the root and destroy or neutralize the principal motive, the desire and willingness to get value without a fair exchange.

To illustrate: This same desire, in the form of stealing, has been largely destroyed or neutralized. It has been destroyed in the truly honest man, who has no desire to appropriate his neighbor's property and would scorn to do it even in the absence of restrictions. This desire has been neutralized in most other men not strictly honest, by attaching to the conduct known as stealing, as a consequence thereof, a term in jail or prison or the contempt or disapprobation of society. To put it bluntly, the motive to gamble, like the motive to steal,—and it is the same motive,—must be either destroyed by making men strictly honest and honorable, or it must be neutralized by attaching to the conduct known as gambling, as a consequence thereof, the reprobation and contempt of society and possibly penalties known to the law.

Nothing is truer than the saying that primarily there are but three ways of getting property, namely, earning, begging and stealing; we are all of us, morally speaking, either laboring men, beggar men or thieves. In which class does the gambler belong? He certainly does not labor or beg. It is because society has not yet awakened to the fact that gambling is thieving and is dishonorable that it is still in many quarters fashionable and even considered respectable.

You may reply that it is the nature of men to get what will satisfy their wants with the least effort possible. Generally speaking that may be true. But many men have ceased to be willing to get value with little effort.

when the method is generally recognized as dishonorable or is dishonorable in essence. Ordinary begging and the vulgar forms of stealing have ceased to be respectable or popular; and, with right education and right thinking, the more polite form of thieving, known as gambling, may also be put under the ban.

Your ordinary boy or girl, with the education now commonly received, would scorn to beg or pick pockets. Our education must produce in the boys and girls an equal scorn to take another person's property on a bet or a wager and actually convert it to his or her own use. The taking of money or property as a result of gambling, is essentially a mean, low and vulgar thing to do. There is no element of dignity or manliness in it. Boys and girls should be taught this truth both practically and theoretically, just as they are given all other moral and ethical teachings. In the case of a youth who has a fair sense of the propriety and fitness of things, the money obtained by him upon his first wager should burn his fingers and make him so uncomfortable that he cannot rest until he has restored it to its rightful owner. He should find it beneath his dignity to take another's property and actually use it to satisfy his own needs and desires, just as much as he would if a stranger should approach him and offer to make him the object of charity.

Do not teach your child that it is wrong to gamble because it is a losing game. It may be inexpedient for that reason. But teach him that it is a disgrace for him to take and appropriate the value produced through no effort of his own. When individuals and society can be led to look upon gambling in its true light, as an undignified, mean and vulgar practice, the chief motive for gambling will be destroyed or neutralized.

We have now considered the nature of gambling and the general characteristics of the remedy. Are there any features in our economic and industrial system which hinder the application of this remedy and are therefore to be considered as causes of the prevalence of gambling? In my judgment there are such economic causes which contribute more than

all others to the respectability which gambling enjoys.

The surest cure is to drive out evil with good. Teach your boy the correct ethics of wealth and he will have little desire to make money by gambling. Teach him that not a dollar rightfully belongs to him which has not been acquired by honest labor or some form of social service.

The dignity of labor needs teaching in a practical as well as in a theoretical way. For that purpose we need the great assistance of manual training in the public schools from top to bottom. When boys and girls are convinced by their education and vital experience that they must be either workers, beggars or thieves, and that gambling can be properly classified only as thieving, we shall be on the way toward the eradication of gambling.

The chief obstacle which stands in the way of this result, is the fact that, while society pretends to believe in the dignity of labor, it does not believe in it really or practically. Of course in the term labor I include intellectual as well as manual labor. Theoretically labor is dignified, but practically it is dignified only for certain classes upon whose labor other classes find it convenient to live.

The economic causes which tend to lessen the respect for honest labor, tend also inevitably to increase the respect for gambling. With reference to society's attitude toward labor, let me quote from a recent issue of *The Public* (vol. vi, p. 673).

The report of the trustees of the Tuskegee normal and industrial institute, of which Booker T. Washington is the head and personification, declares that the chief need of the Negroes of the South is "for teachers or leaders who will not only teach in the ordinary manner, but who will emphasize the dignity of labor," etc. But nothing is said of the need of emphasizing the fundamental rights of laborers, namely their right to natural opportunities and their right to the full value of their productions. Dignity of labor and exploitation of laborers are incompatible things. So long as our institutions allow laborers to be exploited, just so long shall we have to plead for a recognition of the dignity of labor, and plead in vain. The very classes that are most insistent verbally upon the dignity of labor, are least insistent practically upon getting their share of this dignity. Give them the products of labor and they care not who

has its dignity. So long as this is so, the Negroes of the South cannot be truly impressed with the dignity of labor. While they observe that it is not the man who labors, but the one who lives in luxury upon the labor of others, who is respected and honored—and the greater his unearned income the greater the respect and honor—how can they really believe that there is dignity in labor? With their native courtesy they may reply: "Das so. I reckon das so," but in their hearts they must feel like exclaiming: "G'way, chile, g'way." Most of the talk about "the dignity of labor" is mere mockery. It is like that other phrase, now so common in plutocratic circles, about "liberty to work." In truth, labor is dignified in the nature of things; but it is not dignified in the estimation of society. That society does dignify it, is the untruth to which our plutocracy tries to give currency as truth. They want a contented mental class upon whose labor they may luxuriously live, and this is one of the little confidence games they play upon the unsophisticated.

Let us consider the nature and operation of some of the causes which have robbed labor of its dignity in public estimation:

The earth, with all its resources and opportunities, is the gift of God or of Nature to mankind, from which, by labor, man may satisfy his wants either by producing what he needs or by exchanging his product for the product of some other man's labor. Labor, then, is the only basis or justification for individual ownership of property. If this be true, there can be nothing more dignified than labor. But our economic system has refused to recognize this truth, and, in direct violation of it, has given to individuals property in the source of wealth, in the earth itself, and has thus enabled them to wax rich without labor, but merely by granting to their fellows the privilege of laboring upon the earth. How can labor practically preserve its dignity under these circumstances? A man by luck or chance acquires land where a populous city is destined soon to be built. He and his descendants for many generations become independently rich and need never bother themselves about the dignity of labor except to preach it to those who are laboring upon their lands so that they will labor on contentedly. The holders of land, as such, perform absolutely no service to society or their fellow individuals,

and their income, being unearned, is a standing contradiction of the dignity and worth of labor.

To take another instance, suppose that in the early history of a city or State, a company acquires from a careless, improvident or perhaps venal city council or State legislature, a franchise of long or unlimited duration to carry passengers or freight on a route destined to become the teeming thoroughfare used by millions of people. The holders of this franchise need not use or operate it by their own labor. They have only to hold on to their title deeds and let others do the labor of transportation, paying well for the privilege. The owners of the franchise and their descendants will be dignified without labor, and will need to toil only in the way of caring for and investing the unearned income which accrues from the labor of others.

Or, suppose that certain men succeed, by chance or skill, in getting possession of the petroleum fields from which the people must get the material for lighting their homes and factories; or have succeeded in acquiring the coal fields from which the people must draw their means of heat, light and power; or have secured the copper ranges, from which must be derived the metal which will conduct the electrical current in this age of electricity. These fortunate individuals, as the world esteems them, need not worry about the dignity of labor. The inhabitants of the country, being engaged in acquiring that dignity during so much of the time that they have little chance for thinking or reflection, will gladly pay these owners of the earth a round sum for the privilege of getting these materials which are necessities of human existence under present conditions.

These individuals, whose wealth has come from the labor of others, or of society in general, are, by common consent, the princes of the earth, more honorable than any one who labors with hand or brain, more honorable even than the really great ones of the earth, the great inventors, the great scientists, and the great teachers of their times.

Dignity of labor forsooth!

Can you expect the average boy, under these conditions, to

think that it is wrong to get something for nothing? Can you expect him to believe in industry as the best means of success? Could you expect him to refrain, upon principle, from any gambling practices or enterprises from which he might hope to get something for nothing?

It will only be when we exterminate from society the parasite who lives upon it merely by allowing others the privilege of laboring, and when we make labor the real basis for the ownership of property, that we will make labor truly and actually dignified in the minds of the people, will make the getting of wealth without labor dishonorable, and will destroy or neutralize the motive which is the root of the gambling spirit. We must remove the economic causes which have counteracted and contradicted all the teachings of home, church and school about the dignity of labor, which have led the youth of the country to conclude that wealth and success are the things to be aimed at, without much regard to the means employed, and that honest labor, either manual or intellectual, is the least likely means of acquiring wealth.

JESSE F. ORTON.

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

##### COLORADO.

Pueblo, Colo., Aug. 6.—While the newspapers of the East have generally been quite fair in their comments upon the troubles in Colorado, they have accepted and given currency to statements, emanating from the mine owners, which do the State grave injustice.

It has been stated repeatedly that the calling out of the militia was necessary because of a reign of terror in the mining camps to which troops were sent. The Western Federation of Miners is charged with planning and encouraging murder, train-wrecking and all forms of violence, and it is represented that in several counties its orders were so well obeyed that life and property were no longer safe. To these charges the Governor has given official approval in his proclamations declaring three counties in a state of "insurrection," as well as in his several interviews and published defenses. To be sure, insurrection is something more than the lawless and criminal conduct charged against the communities in question—being equivalent to rebellion—but alleged lawlessness and not revolution is the condition asserted as an excuse for the Governor's course.

In justice to the State, it should be known that in truth no such lawlessness existed in any of the counties which were placed under military control. The "insurrection" was in every case a fiction deemed necessary as a basis for the order for troops.

But two definite charges of violence in the Cripple Creek district have been made; one of an attack upon Justice Hawkins, of Altman, which is alleged to have been to punish him for a decision unfavorable to a union miner. The other case is that of one Stewart, who is alleged to have been beaten by union miners. Stewart's wife admits that she administered the beating in a family broil, and Stewart confessed as much to a police magistrate, who is authority for this statement.

After the arrival of the troops, an explosion in the Vindicator mine resulted in the death of the superintendent and a shift boss. This was at once charged to the unions. But no evidence was produced, and the coroner's jury reported that it was unable to determine the cause or to fix the blame. As the mine was under military guard, positive evidence of outside interference is necessary to show that the explosion was more than an accident.

It is declared, too, that the unions attempted to wreck a train loaded with soldiers and non-union men. But on the trial of the alleged wreckers, it clearly appeared that the loosening of the rail was the work of detectives of the Mine Owners' Association, who employed a worthless character to testify to facts incriminating the president of one of the unions. Not only was the accused acquitted, but the cases against his alleged accomplices were all dismissed, while the principal witness for the prosecution, this tool of the detectives, was held for perjury committed at the trial.

In Telluride, from the calling of the strike—and for some time previous—to the arrival of troops, the camp enjoyed a period of quiet never before known.

But more than a year before the troops were placed in control, Manager Collins, of one of the principal mines, was killed by a shot fired through a window of his residence. This act was credited to the unions, though there was at that time no labor trouble in that district. Some of Collins's friends attribute his death to parties who feared that he was about to expose their dealings in stolen ore; and others think it was an act of revenge on the part of a discharged employe. That the unions were in any way connected with the assassination is pure assumption.

Much is made also of the fact that in the Fall of 1901 a non-union miner disappeared and in the Spring of 1902 a second one disappeared, and it is charged that they were murdered by the miners. Whether the men were killed, and if

killed, by whom the deed was done, are matters upon which there is no evidence. Whatever the facts may be, as the latest of these disappearances occurred in March, 1902, it can hardly be regarded as evidence of an insurrection in December, 1903.

In the coal-mining district of which Trinidad is the center, there was no pretense of disturbances, except the killing of three Italians by deputy sheriffs, and sundry assaults upon members of the executive committee of the United Mine Workers. This is on the authority of the postmaster at Trinidad. Yet, when the troops were sent there in March last, they began a series of deportations of union officers, the only purpose of which was the breaking up of the unions.

In fact, the evidence is overwhelming that this was the sole purpose of calling out the troops in every instance. That purpose has been repeatedly expressed not only by the members of the Mine Owners' Association, but by Sherman Bell and the other officers of the National Guard.

It is a suggestive fact that the mine owners with all the powers of military government in their hands for nine months, have not convicted a single member of the miners' union of an offense against either life or property. And this is not due to any miscarriage of justice. On the trial of the few cases prosecuted to trial, in which it had been proclaimed that the evidence of guilt was abundant and damning, the prosecution utterly broke down, in some cases producing no evidence at all.

The decision of the Supreme Court by which Governor Peabody seeks to justify his course, is only to the effect that in the suppression of an insurrection the Executive may arrest and detain insurgents for a time without being answerable to the courts. While this decision has been severely criticised, and the fact that it cites no precedents has been noted, it does not afford any support to the deportation of citizens, nor to their arrest and detention without at least a charge of wrong-doing.

The Governor and his friends have asserted, and made much of the assertion, that the strike was the arbitrary act of the executive committee of the Western Federation of Miners. A like charge has been made as to the strike of the United Mine Workers. In neither case is there any foundation for such a statement.

In Cripple Creek, by a vote of the unions the question was referred to the district committee. That committee recommended the executive committee to order the strike.

In Telluride, the strike originated in a demand by the mill men for an eight-hour day, and was ordered by a vote of the men.

In the Coal fields, the miners insisted

that the executive committee order a strike, the conditions being, as they claimed, intolerable.

The peculiar bitterness shown by the mine owners toward the miners' union is due, probably, to two causes:

First, an arbitrary, dictatorial spirit, not uncommon in men who have come suddenly into possession of wealth, and, with no previous training in the employment of labor, are placed in the position of employers of labor. These are the conditions surrounding the mine owners, as a rule. They have passed quickly from poverty to affluence, and now regard the world as theirs. They have given no study to the rights of man, and have but one idea on that subject, to-wit: that those rights inhere solely in the owners of property.

Second, in ordinary industrial communities employers understand that a uniform wage scale tends to uniformity in prices; that if all in the same line of production pay the same wages, any advance in wages will be compensated by an advance in the selling price of the product. In the mining of precious metals, however, the case is entirely different. There is always a market for the product, and at a fixed price, which bears no immediate relation to the cost of production. The lower the cost of production, the greater the profit; hence labor's demands are directly upon the pocket of the mine owners.

It is asserted, and apparently not without reason, that the strike was encouraged, if not actually brought about, by the mine owners, with a view to a disruption of the unions. With a vain, weak man in the executive chair, whether pledged to them in consideration of liberal campaign contributions or not, they might well deem themselves in a position to accomplish the long cherished purpose of driving out organized labor. Events have proved that the Governor is willing to go to any lengths in support of the mine owners' criminal acts and purposes, and they have shown themselves utterly lacking in regard for law, and without the slightest feelings of humanity. It is they and not the miners who have brought disgrace upon the State.

JAMES H. TELLER.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, August 11.

Judge Parker's long silence on all public questions except the money question, makes his speech of the 10th, accepting the Democratic nomination for President (p. 247), the most important political event since the St. Louis con-

vention. The meeting was at his home. Champ Clark, of Missouri, chairman of the convention, made the address and delivered the letter conveying formal notice to Judge Parker of his nomination. In beginning his response—

the candidate expressed himself as especially gratified with the confidence shown by the convention in reiterating its determination to make him its standard bearer after his telegram declaring that he regarded the gold standard as firmly and irrevocably established. He then approved the platform in general terms, and after enumerating several of its promises of reform he observed that its spirit nevertheless "assures conservative instead of rash action." The labor question he discussed with evident reference to the difficulties in Colorado, the lawlessness of both sides being condemned. "The essence of good government lies," said the speaker in this connection, "in strict observance of constitutional limitations, enforcement of law and order, and rugged opposition to all encroachment upon the sovereignty of the people." On the tariff question he remarked that as the Republicans will control the Senate for four years no modification of duties will be possible without Republican consent; but he declared "our position" to favor "a reasonable reduction of the tariff," and his belief that "a wise and beneficent revision of the tariff can be accomplished as soon as both houses of Congress and an Executive in favor of it are elected, without "creating a sense of uncertainty and instability, simply by providing that "such a reasonable period shall intervene between the date of the enactment of the statute making a revision and the date of its enforcement as shall be deemed sufficient for the industry or business affected by such revision to adjust itself to the changes and new conditions imposed." He charged encouragement of trusts to the tariff, and declared that the prevalence of monopolies is due to failure of administrative officials to call upon the courts to enforce the existing laws. A discussion of the Philippine question, favoring independence, closes with the recommendation that we prepare the Filipinos "as rapidly as possible for self government," and give to them "the assurance that it will come as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it." Militarism came in for a share of Judge Parker's attention. He denounced conquest; described our people as loving peace not only for ourselves but for all the nations of the earth; and declared that "the most efficient work we can do in uplifting the people of other countries is by the presentation of a happy, prosperous, self-governing nation as an ideal to be emulated, a model to be followed." In closing he pledged himself to retire to private life after his first term, saying: "I shall not be a can-

didate for, nor shall I accept a renomination."

Judge Parker did not attempt to cover all the questions suggested in the platform. He reserved its full consideration, he said, for his letter of acceptance.

In connection with the faction contest in the Republican party in Wisconsin (p. 182), the Supreme Court of the State issued a process on the 9th restraining the secretary of state from certifying the names of the nominees of the La Follette faction as Republican candidates, and authorizing proceedings to compel him to so certify the names of the Spooner faction. The hearing is set for September 6th.

At the Democratic convention of West Virginia on the 4th, John Cornwell was nominated for governor. The Democratic and the Populist conventions of Nebraska met on the 10th at Lincoln, but the Populists refused to unite with the Democrats upon an electoral ticket. They did agree upon a fusion State ticket.

The strike against the beef trust packing houses of the country (p. 262) is still in force, though nothing notable in connection with it has occurred apart from two or three disturbances which were soon quieted by the police.

A lockout in the building trades within a radius of 25 miles from the New York city hall, began on the 8th. The reason given for it by the Building Trades Employers' Association is that some of the trades unions have begun sympathetic strikes inconsistent with an unexpired arbitration agreement for continuous work.

Foreign news relates almost exclusively to the Russian-Japanese war, and this is meager. Since the capture of Hajeibeng by the Japanese on the 3d (p. 278) it has turned again to mere rumor, gossip and speculation, interspersed with reports of unimportant events. Among the latter is a naval action outside of Port Arthur. Russian vessels came out on the 10th and were driven back.

The Russian prize court at Vladivostok decided on the 4th, in the

case of the Arabia (p. 279), to confiscate as contraband of war that part of her American cargo which was consigned to Japanese ports, consisting of 59,000 pounds of flour and the railroad equipment. This constituted less than half the bulk and weight of the cargo, the remainder consisting of 142,500 pounds of flour consigned to Hong-kong. The steamer was released.

The court next took up the case of the British steamer Knight Commander (p. 279), which it adjudged, on the 6th to have been with its cargo a lawful prize. The evidence having shown that the cargo, consisting principally of railway material, was consigned through a Japanese port to Chemulpo, the court inferred that it was designed for use on the military railway under construction from Seoul to the Yalu.

Apropos of these inquiries a diplomatic circular from the American State department to the American ambassadors in Europe, setting forth the position of the United States concerning contraband, has just been made public. It was issued June 10, 1904, and is in form an argumentative protest against the attitude of Russia toward certain classes of merchandise carried in neutral ships in time of war. The classes named are coal, naphtha, alcohol and other fuel. Regarding these the department argues that they should be considered with "provisions and foodstuffs of ordinarily innocent use, but which may become absolutely contraband of war when actually and especially designed for the military or naval forces of the enemy."

At last the British invaders of Thibet (p. 217) have reached Lhasa, the capital. Early in the month they crossed the Brahmaputra river, after which they met no armed opposition, and on the 4th they entered the forbidden city. But the Dalai Lama had fled to a Buddhist monastery in the Himalaya mountains, eighteen miles away, where he has secluded himself. The condition in the city since the invaders arrived is vividly described by a cable dispatch to the Chicago Record-Herald of the 8th as follows:

From the moment the British marched

into Lhasa and set foot in streets that for twelve centuries have been hallowed to Buddha, the priests and monks have been in a state of frenzied agitation. The temples are crowded continuously and the city echoes with prayers and supplications. The inhabitants seem subdued and abject, but in view of the fierce fighting that made every mile from the frontier to the forbidden city a battle field, the British leader is taking no chances. He has intrenched his men strongly where they can defend themselves against attack, and is now waiting for the signing of a new commercial treaty—the aim of the expedition. His commission from Lord Curzon contains an order that will keep the troops in the holy city until all differences are settled. It reads: "Remain at Lhasa until you secure a treaty opening Tibetan markets to British merchants."

NEWS NOTES.

—In a railway disaster near Pueblo, Colo., on the 7th, 106 people were killed.

—James T. Lewis, the famous war governor of Wisconsin, died on the 4th. He was 83 years old.

—On the 5th Judge Parker, the Democratic candidate for President, resigned his office as Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

—George G. Vest, United States Senator for Missouri from 1879 to 1903, and a member of the Confederate Congress during the Civil War, died at Sweet Springs, Mo., on the 9th at the age of 74.

—Gen. Grant has been transferred to command at New York, and Gen. Funston takes his place at Chicago, the change to be made October 1st. Orders of the war department to this effect were reported on the 6th.

—The convention of the International Typographical Union began its sessions at St. Louis on the 8th. On the 10th a motion that no member should enlist in the militia under penalty of expulsion was voted down.

—At the convention of the American Association of Africans, in session at Milwaukee on the 4th, it was decided to adopt the word "optometry" for the science which treats of the physiology of the function of vision, and "optometrists" for one skilled in that science.

—The monthly statement of the United States treasury department (see p. 248) for July shows on hand July 31, 1904:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash.....	154,081,576.63
Total .....	\$304,081,576.63
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1904.....	319,027,242.39
Decrease .....	\$14,945,665.76

—The monthly treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal

government (see p. 248) for the month ending July 31, 1904, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff .....	\$19,482,749.88
Internal revenue.....	20,234,004.88
Miscellaneous .....	7,068,632.62
	<b>\$46,786,387.38</b>
Expenses:	
Civil and misc.....	\$16,564,168.38
War .....	18,484,284.60
Navy .....	12,163,653.73
Indians .....	957,259.98
Pensions .....	12,054,380.06
Interest .....	3,970,368.60
	<b>\$64,194,115.35</b>
Deficit .....	<b>\$17,407,727.97</b>

PRESS OPINIONS.

JUDGE PARKER'S SPEECH.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind. Rep.), Aug. 11.—There is in this production no suggestion of a genius rising to a great opportunity. There is in it nothing of the eloquence of Mr. Bryan, whose sentences would have set the blood of millions to tingling. There is no ringing keynote, no electrifying battle cry, nothing that inspires one with a sense of great accomplishment and of a lofty mission in the speaker's party, and with a spirit of fierce aggression toward the party of the second part—with which issue is joined on a platform that reads much like an agreement. But this is not to imply that the address is contemptible. If we were to sum it up in a word we should say that it was judicial, which is just what one would expect from the speaker's record. . . . What he says of the Philippines is a reaffirmation of the principle of government by the consent of the governed, but it does not work out very differently from the policy announced by the Republicans. . . . The speech closes with the assurance that the Judge will not be a candidate again if he is elected. Mr. Cleveland had some such thought once, and it will be regarded as a boon by the writers of pert paragraphs.

Chicago Examiner (Dem.), Aug. 11.—In the main the candidate follows the platform, which he formally indorses. But it is noticeable that, instead of seeking to outdo the party's declarations of principles in vehemence, he is considerably less emphatic. Take the tariff, for example. The platform speaks of the trust-breeding tariff as a "monstrous perversion of those equal opportunities which our political institutions were established to secure." It also says: "We denounce protection as a robbery of the many to enrich the few, and we favor a tariff limited to the needs of the government, economically administered." Judge Parker betrays none of the denunciatory fervor, but temperately points out that "the present tariff law is unjust in its operation, excessive in many of its rates, and so framed in particular instances as to exact inordinate profits from the people." . . . The platform is quite as warm on the subject of the trusts as on the tariff, but again Judge Parker refrains from reflecting its heat. There is just complaint of the growth of monopoly, he admits, but he is of the cheerful opinion that the trusts present no very formidable problem. . . . This speech plainly presents to the country the issue on which the Presidential campaign is to be fought: Rooseveltism versus Parkerism. Do the people want a government of impulse, experiment and adventure, or a government of law, unwarlike, prudent, conservative? Judge Parker has told the American people the principles and purposes for which he stands. It is for them to decide whether they prefer a peaceful conservatism to the perils of radical Rooseveltism.

Chicago Chronicle (Rep.), Aug. 11.—It is sufficiently evident that Judge Parker gained the Democratic nomination for the



Presidency by evasion if not by deception. In the populist free silver States of the South and West he was supported for the reason that in 1886 and 1890 he had voted for Bryan and cheap money and for the further reason that he had repeatedly boasted of the favor thus shown to the enemies of private and public faith. In New York and other eastern States it was assumed that he was sound in finance and, while no one was authorized to quote him, his intimates did not qualify their declarations that he was uncompromising in his adherence to the gold standard. Having secured the nomination at St. Louis in this fashion . . . he was forced by his New York backers to declare himself on the subject of the platform, and this he did in a fashion highly characteristic of the trimmer and the dodger. He expressed an opinion to the effect that the gold standard had been "irrevocably established." He had nothing to say about the principle involved. He was silent as to his own convictions on the subject. With these facts in mind we may read the speech of acceptance delivered by this gentleman yesterday without surprise and without particular interest. A man who gains a Presidential nomination as a blank may well assume that it is good policy for him to accept it as a blank. . . . The candidate of Tammany Hall, of David B. Hill, of William J. Bryan, of William R. Hearst, of Thimian, of Vardaman, of the big bonanza silver barons, of the populists and of the socialists speaks in platitudes to the American people because he dare not speak to them in plain and straightforward language. He wants to be elected and he wants the votes of every man, no matter how evil minded or how weak minded, who for any reason or for no reason ever voted a Democratic ticket. While this may surprise some people, it is no surprise to the Chronicle, which has made no mistake from the first in estimating this timid and tricky office seeker and self-seeker at his true worth.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Aug. 11.—It has been imagined that when the Democratic nominee broke his long silence he would express himself forcibly on the issues of the campaign. But he has not done so. His speech is cautious throughout—in places vague. It is hard to tell from some passages just what Judge Parker means. True, the candidate is clear on one matter. He believes in the gold standard. He also speaks emphatically in favor of the law, of proper administration, of Jeffersonian principles, of economy, of the rights of property, of "conservative instead of rash" action, of the methods of the founders of the Republic, and of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. But on modern questions Judge Parker is not so specific. On the matter of capital and labor, for instance, he is undoubtedly evasive.

On the tariff Judge Parker also leaves his hearers in the dark. In a word, the Judge passes out at kind word to those who believe in the tariff for revenue only, but assures the protected industries that they need have no fear of a tariff reduction in case he is elected. . . . Judge Parker says that the common law affords an adequate remedy for the evils in the trust system, and that no further trust legislation is needed. With all due respect to common law, it is an antiquated weapon to deal with modern trusts. . . . The trusts would rather take ten doses of common law than one dose of publicity.

Finally, the Philippines. It might reasonably have been expected that the candidate would be a little definite here. . . . After expatiating on the rights of man, the Judge said that we have a responsibility in the Philippines which we can best subserve not by giving the islanders their liberty, but by assuring them that self-government will come to them as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it. No time is specified. This is exactly the same attitude taken by the Republicans, and it is a wise attitude. But there is no difference between the Philippine policies of the two parties which can be detected by the naked eye. All that can be readily set forth of the speech is its general trend, which is extremely conservative, if not perhaps reactionary.

**THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN.**

The Worker (Soc.), Aug. 7.—"Cortelyou meets Perkins." So comes the news. Who is Cortelyou? Chairman of the Republican National Committee. Who is Perkins? Partner of J. Pierpont Morgan and chair-

man of the finance committee of the United States Steel Corporation. What do you suppose they met for? To discuss the weather?

The (Chicago) Voter (Ind.), August.—Of course there are many wealthy and influential Republicans who are not intending to support the Colonel because they fear that he is not sufficiently "safe and sane," but to the contra, there are numerous Democrats who say that the Democrats have not done their duty; that they have sacrificed principle to expediency and have built a platform in the closest possible imitation of the one occupied by the elephant, hoping thereby to elevate the donkey to the proud position of the national flower, or is the donkey a bird?

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), Aug. 9.—The New York Journal, which opposed Belmont's appointment as treasurer of the Democratic national committee, says that "the appointment of George Foster Peabody as treasurer will gratify every Democrat who wants his party to stand in this campaign for fundamental human rights and to hold life and liberty above property—who wants his party to represent the rights of the people as against the privileges of plutocracy. In everything but wealth Peabody is the antithesis of Belmont, and of all Belmont's narrow and selfish kind." This recommendation of Mr. Peabody, coming from Mr. Hearst, will satisfy western Democrats of Peabody's genuine democracy.

**BRyan's FUTURE WORK.**

(Frankfort, Ind.) American Standard (Dem.), Aug. 4.—To the real democrat, no one thing in current politics is a hundredth part as hopeful as Mr. Bryan's announced determination to "begin the work of organizing the radical and progressive element in the Democratic party" immediately after the election.

**FIGURES DON'T LIE, BUT—**

The Commoner (Dem.), Aug. 8.—The indications are that Mr. Carroll D. Wright, chief statistician of the government in general and of the Republican party in particular, will be the busiest man in the country for the next three months. As chief juggler of figures Mr. Wright will be called upon by the G. O. P. management to show that labor is better rewarded and has more left after paying living expenses than ever before in its history. If anybody can juggle the figures so as to make a showing, Mr. Wright is the man. Not long ago he proceeded to show that the average cost of living was lower now than it was ten years ago, and did it by showing that while such things as bacon and flour had increased something like 40 per cent., nutmegs and spices had decreased something like 60 per cent., showing a clear decrease of 20 per cent. in the cost of living. And in his estimates of the cost of living Mr. Wright forgot to include the important item of rent, which takes fully 19 per cent. of the average workingman's income. Mr. Wright will have to work at a desperate rate if he would do what his employers expect him to do for the G. O. P. campaign.

**JAPANESE FREEDOM.**

San Francisco Star (Dem.), Aug. 6.—If the Japanese can accomplish such marvels when left to form their own institutions, who is to say that the Philippines need the guidance of American carpet-laggers?

**THE BISHOP'S BAR.**

(Frankfort, Ind.) American Standard (Dem.), Aug. 4.—Now let the New Yorker say to his friend: "Let's go over to the Bishop's joint and have a high-ball." "Amen." "Going home by the sub?" "Yes." "Good; we'll take a nip at the Bishop's as we meander."

**LAND ARBITRATION.**

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), Aug. 6.—Why should the government give away the land? Why should it favor the generations which happen to live to-day at the expense of the generations which will live to-morrow? . . . Private ownership of land will inevitably produce private monopoly, just as private ownership of the coal and other mineral deposits has produced private monopoly. England's experience with Ireland proves the truth of the former statement, yet England devised a poor remedy in seeking to settle the in-

dustrial unrest and provide employment and opportunity for the Irish people.

**"PROTECTION TO AMERICAN LABOR."**

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), Aug. 8.—A feature of the strike in the meat packing industry has been the importation of train loads of immigrants fresh from Castle Garden to take the places of the strikers. The foreigners are used as "strike breakers." This incident, however, serves to emphasize the fallacy of the contention that the protective tariff is designed to "protect American labor." The tariff is upon goods, not upon labor. When the goods, which are the product of labor, are finished they are the property of the capitalist, not of the man that makes them. The man that produces the goods does not share in the profits. His wages are determined by conditions in the labor market. . . . In the meat packing industry, the strike has not served to bring in competition with American packers the product of Canadian packers. The tariff excludes foreign meats. The packer is protected. The striking laborer, however, has no protection. His place is filled with foreign labor. But when the striker buys meat he has to pay the protection.

**A COMPARISON.**

Aberdeen (Wash.) Herald (Dem.), Aug. 4.—The Czar assures the Finns that their "historic destiny is indissolubly bound up with those of Russia." That sounds like Judge Taft talking about the Filipinos at an Administration banquet.

**THE RUSSIAN BEAR.**

Kansas City (Mo.) World (Ind.), Aug. 5.—Then there is also the bear that runs like a man.

**MISCELLANY**

**DESTINY.**

For The Public.

The captain who has sent the teeming ship  
Against the jutting rocks because he  
couldn't see—  
Extenuation soothes his evil trip.

But who for this will call the captain wise,  
And praise, aloud the dire calamity,  
While each mute charge beneath the  
ocean lies?

I hear men prate where ruin rears its  
head,  
That wrongs and crimes are works of  
destiny;

I hear them say it of the quick and dead,  
But shall the author of this foul decree  
Claim a reward for *deus neid* knavery,  
Or ignorance, if that the case may be?

If destiny hath wrought the good or ill,  
That wrecked the ships upon a peaceful  
sea,

Why let your praise a weary welkin fill,  
And laud the captain for the "Higher  
Will"?

Fair Destiny stands guiltless of the spell,  
That guides our state by Scylla's howling  
sea;

If we are headed for the depths of hell,  
Give Cant the palm; the praise, Hypocrisy!

WILLIAM HOFFMAN.

**THE REFORMER.**

The People murmured and grew restive under the conditions imposed upon them by arrogant and merciless masters.

"There is something wrong," declared The People.

"That is true," said The Reformer.

Thereupon The Reformer pointed out the wrongs and suggested the remedy, which lay close at hand and was marked "The Ballot."

"What you say is true," responded The People, "but if we use the remedy, you will receive too much credit for having prescribed it."

So saying, The People continued to suffer, rather than be cured.

Moral: Those who quietly suffer wrong deserve it.—Will M. Maupin, in The Commoner.

#### THE NEED OF MANUAL LABOR.

Leo Tolstoy in a letter, quoted in the Artsman for May.

A few days ago I received a visit from an intelligent and deeply religious American, Mr. Bryan, who asked me why I regarded manual labor as obligatory and indispensable. I answered him in almost the same words which I have used in writing to you: First, it is an evidence of sincerity in the recognition of equality among men; in the next place, it brings us into relations with the majority of workers, whereas we are separated from them by a solid wall when we merely profit by their needs; finally, such work brings us the greatest happiness—peace of mind—which a sincere man can never have unless he performs slavish labor.

[Tolstoy's meaning, doubtless, is not "slavish," but "manual."—Ed. Public.]

#### MORAL COWARDICE AND PHYSICAL COURAGE.

Strange that heroism to the point of death and cowardice to the point of the ridiculous could exist in the make-up of one man. The captain of the doomed steamer Norge, standing on the bridge of the sinking hull and striving to direct the feverish crew and the frenzied passengers in their desperate efforts to escape, is a figure to thrill the hero worshiper. Nerved by generations of tradition, his duty standing out as clearly as Rockall on a sunny day, he looked death in the face unflinchingly and stayed by the ship until washed off by the swirling waters.

On the initial day of that fated voyage he presented another picture. He fronted duty, recognized it, and failed to meet it squarely. See him in the owner's office. His vessel is licensed to carry 488 passengers; his sailing list bears 800 names. He can refuse to take the vessel out, thus exposing an attempted violation of the laws for safety, and bringing down on the

owners the condemnation of an imperiled public. He will lose his job by so doing. He falters, takes the ship out loaded beyond her capacity, and forfeits 200 lives that should not have been risked.

How abject a man in the fear of losing his job! How brave in the face of losing his life!—The Berwick (N. S.) Register.

#### "JUST FOR A HANDFUL OF SILVER HE LEFT US."

Ernest H. Crosby, in The Whim for June, 1904.

There is a little book of poems to be found in our libraries, written, most of them, thirty or forty years ago by a young Western man who showed in his works the marks of true poetical genius, even if his radicalism went almost to the point of anarchy. One of his finest poems is inscribed to Liberty. He compares the passions of the people to the sea, "now calm and beautiful, now giving away to elemental fury," but always majestic, and continues in the following strain:

So all in vain will timorous ones essay  
To set the metes and bounds of Liberty,  
For Freedom is its own eternal law;  
It makes its own conditions, and in storm  
Or calm alike fulfills the unerring Will.  
Let us not then despise it when it lies  
Still as a sleeping lion, while a swarm  
Of gnat-like evils hover round its head;  
Nor doubt it when in mad, disjointed times  
It shakes the torch of terror, and its cry  
Shrills o'er the quaking earth, and in the  
flame

Of riot and war we see its awful form  
Rise by the scaffold when the crimson ax  
Rings down the grooves the knell of shud-  
dering kings.

Forever in thine eyes, O Liberty,  
Shines that high light whereby the world  
is saved;  
And though thou slay us, we will trust in  
thee.

This is certainly a fine passage, but it is also pretty extreme. It is no wonder that the last three lines have for years been printed as the permanent headlines of the principal anarchistic journal of America, to-wit, Benjamin Tucker's "Liberty." If the author were a foreigner who had passed less than three years in this country, I would hesitate to divulge his name for our energetic Secretary of Commerce and Labor might feel obliged to deport him for an anarchist. But luckily, he is native-born, and no less a personage than Mr. John Hay, Secretary of State. It would indeed be embarrassing to the cabinet if one secretary were in conscience bound to capture and cage another, as Mr. Turner has been caged. But I must confess that Mr. Hay's anarchy goes too far for me

and I must protest that crimson axes and shuddering kirgs do not appeal to me, even in poetry. It is perhaps because Mr. Hay went so far in his youth that the reaction in the other direction has been so violent, and we find him engaged no longer in composing stirring verse on behalf of freedom, but on the contrary endeavoring, and not without success, to play the part of his kings before they were called upon to shudder, steeping his soul in the soul-destroying business of modern diplomacy, and calmly overthrowing in the Philippines that very Liberty of which he was once apparently enamoured. Alas, he is another victim to the miasmatic atmosphere of Washington, of the Court of St. James, of official life. Some men live too long. Lowell was one of them, and unless John Hay repents in dust and ashes we shall have to add him to the list.

#### THE SILENT, UPTURNED FACE.

For The Public.

Ring out the thousand wars of old,  
Ring in the thousand years of peace. . . .  
Ring out the darkness of the land,  
Ring in the Christ that is to be.

—Tennyson.

Ex. Gov. Black, in the speech in which he placed Theodore Roosevelt in nomination for the presidency, said:

Men may prophesy and women may pray, but peace will come to abide forever on this earth only when the dreams of childhood are the accepted charts to guide the destinies of men.

How closely this accords with the words of Him who said:

Verily I say unto you, Except ye . . . become as little children ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.

In scores of pulpits to-day, ministers of the gospel are explaining to their congregations that the disciples of Christ erred in supposing that His kingdom was to be established by force of arms. They are telling the people that the multitudes hoped that His triumphal entry into Jerusalem was the first act in a coercive despotism. That the people of that day could not understand the Master's purpose of conquering the world by means of love alone. The ministers are telling their congregations to-day that Jesus' example was in perfect accord with His precepts; for He was led as a lamb to the slaughter—He was dumb before His accusers—He made no resistance when they pressed the thorns into His brow—He was silent when they spat in His face—He bore His own cross—He, who might in a breath have called legions of angels to His defense, rather than set an example of coercion to the world, suffered Himself to be nailed to

the cross; and, in that supreme moment, while all the hosts of heaven listened, and men, exhausted by the frenzy of their hatred, rested for a space, hark!—

Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.

Black was right. Men may prophesy and women may pray, but peace will come to abide here on earth only when the dreams of childhood are the accepted charts to guide the destinies of men. Not till men become as little children will peace come to abide here on earth.

But Black spoke, not as an exponent of this doctrine of the Christ, but as a scoffer of it. Hear him:

The fate of nations is still decided by their wars. You may talk of orderly tribunals and learned referees; you may sing in your schools the gentle praises of the quiet life; you may strike from your books the last note of every martial anthem, and yet, out in the smoke and thunder will always be the tramp of horses and the silent, rigid, up-turned face. . . . If the pressure is great, the material to resist it must be granite and iron.

No doubt, so long as the scoffers of peace, who sound the praises of war, are dominant, the silent, rigid, up-turned face will mark where passed the man of granite and iron; for war is the instrument by which the men of granite and iron decide the fate of nations.

But, you may talk of world powers, and the glories of battle; you may voice from the forum the wanton eulogies of strife; you may blot from your books the last note of every paean of peace and love, and yet, forever upon Calvary will appear the silent, up-turned face of One who died under the iron heel of the men of granite; died, without so much as lifting His almighty arm in His own defense; and in so dying, branded eternal infamy upon the hellish front of war. And over the crests of the centuries, wafted on airs of heaven, we hear the matchless words:

Except ye become as little children ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. . . . Peace on earth, good will to men.

And when (God hasten the day!) the will of the common people—the multiplying hosts of Christian democracy—shall have wrenched the helm of human destiny from the crimson hands of self-seeking demagogues, then war shall end, and peace shall usher in the blessed reign of human fellowship and love, beautiful as the dreams of childhood.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

The slave that is content is twice a slave, for not his body alone is in bondage, but his soul also.—C. V. Burke.

THE GREED OF A FEW A PERIL TO THE LIBERTIES OF THE MANY.

From the editorial columns of the Detroit Times of May 5, 1904.

We see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves us and causes us to tremble for the safety of our country.

As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned, and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money-power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all the wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the republic is destroyed.

We feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of our country than ever before, even in the midst of war. God grant that our forebodings may be groundless.

Monarchy itself is sometimes hinted at as a refuge from the power of the people. In our present position, we could scarcely be justified were we to omit to raise a warning against the approach of returning despotism.

It is not needed or fitting here that a general argument should be made in favor of popular institutions; but there is one point with its connections, not so hackneyed as most others, to which we ask brief attention.

It is assumed that labor is available only in connection with capital; that nobody labors unless somebody else owning capital, somehow, by the use of it, induces him to labor.

Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor and could not have existed if labor had not first existed.

Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration.

We bid the laboring people to beware of surrendering the power which they possess, and which, if surrendered, will surely be used to shut the door of advancement for such as they, and fix new disabilities and burdens upon them until all of liberty shall be lost.

In the early days of our race, the Almighty said to the first of mankind, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," and since then, if we except the light and air of heaven, no good has been or can be enjoyed by us, without first having cost labor.

And inasmuch as most good things have been produced by labor, it follows that all such things belong of right to those whose labor has produced them.

But it has so happened, in all the ages of the world that some have la-

bored and others have, without labor, enjoyed a large portion of the fruits. This is wrong and should not continue.

To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any government.

It seems strange that any man should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing bread from the sweat of other men's faces.

This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it.

P. S. There is no doubt that this editorial is pretty fierce. Doubtless there are those among the solid, conservative "sane" element who will declare that it is actually "socialistic," since labor is declared to be the "superior of capital," and entitled to all of its product. The suggestion that the Republic is in danger of destruction if the concentration of wealth be permitted to go on a little longer, will also doubtless be regarded as the product of an overwrought imagination. In fact, this editorial contains so much "dangerous" doctrine and so many extravagant statements that we should not now print it were it not for the fact that it was written by Abraham Lincoln 40 years ago, forming part of his Message to Congress in 1864. In reprinting it we have changed the Lincoln "I's" and "my's" to "we's" and "our's," but otherwise it is word for word as Lincoln wrote it.

We trust this explanation will be considered sufficient justification for printing so incendiary an article.

POLITICAL ECONOMY.

By Louis F. Post. Written for and published in the first number of the magazine "Successward," of San Antonio, Tex., and reproduced here by permission of the editor-in-chief, E. G. Le Sturgeon.

"Economy" is a term which refers to the management of resources. It names the process of adapting appropriate means to desired ends.

We know something, for instance, of the "economy" of birds, of the "economy" of squirrels, of the "economy" of beavers. They adapt the means or resources at their command to the ends they desire—the satisfaction of their respective wants.

So with man. He adapts the means or resources at his command to the ends that he desires—the satisfaction of his wants.

In the case of a Robinson Crusoe, this process of adapting means to ends is wholly individual. It is in no sense

political, for the term "political" implies human intercourse.

But when we transfer our thoughts from a lonely Robinson Crusoe to mankind in general, the fact of human intercourse is disclosed and trading phenomena begin to appear. Trade is one of the phases of human economy in the social sphere. It is a natural method of co-operation, whereby men mutually adapt their available resources or means to the end of satisfying their respective individual wants.

The best name for this co-operative economy would be "social economy." But governmental organization has become so intimately identified with social concerns as to affect our economic thought with political impressions and to color our language with political terms. We are consequently accustomed, when we mean social economy, to say "political economy." Strictly, political economy is merely government economy—the economy of public finance. But as most commonly understood, the term is synonymous with the social economy of mankind. It refers to the co-operative processes whereby the means available to man are by man adapted to the end of satisfying human wants.

Although political economy is a subject of wide and varied application, often subtle in detail and sometimes mysterious, its fundamental principles and great governing facts are extremely simple and easy of apprehension. All its facts, little and great, fall into two categories: (1) man, and (2) man's natural environment; and its processes are but the varying relations of these two things with reference to the adaptation of the latter to the wants of the former. Nothing whatever exists in this world of man and matter, from a clod of earth to a "captain of industry" and the most stupendous and intricate machine he controls, which is not one of those two things or a product drawn by the one from the other. It is man himself; or else it is some part of man's natural environment; or else it is some artificial adaptation of his natural environment by man for the satisfaction of human wants.

In the terms of political economy those three classes of objects—the active producers, the passive resources, and the desired products—have distinctive names. Man's natural environment is called "land;" his economic energies are called "labor;" and the products resulting from the economic application of his energies to his environment are called "wealth." Thus we have the fundamental formula of po-

litical economy, that "Labor from Land produces Wealth."

With a clear understanding of that formula, the subject of political economy is as an open book. All the subdivisions, such as capital, interest, wages, rent, profits, insurance, skilled and unskilled labor, wages of superintendence, exploiter and exploited, competition, etc., are then readily classified according to their true relationships; and all economic problems, such as taxation, public ownership, trusts, tariffs, trade unions, strikes, boycotts, and the like, are thereupon illuminated with a brilliant and steady light.

Equipped with a clear understanding of that primary formula any intelligent person may study political economy in all its ramifications, with pleasure to himself and profit to his community. Instead of a dismal study it will then be to him the most interesting of all possible studies—the study of the phenomena of men at work making a living for mankind.

#### THE RUSSIAN RETORTS.

Said the Russian: "No one ever saw me in a town with such a name as Be-o-wa-wee, Billierica, or Chacaboula, Kokebona, or Wallula, which are in that wild America. And look! Here's Ocheyedan, Chincoteague and Schaghticoke.

"Isn't it a mighty lucky thing for us we have no names like Agamenticus, Or Guadelupe-Cala, Or Choccolocco-Aia, Cheektowago, Auchincloss, or Alexauken, Cuddebackville, Mehoopany, or Weehawken?

"If we held Anasagunticook in Me., With the Japs at Metabetchouan in Que., I rather think 'twould threaten us With geographical tetanus! Or if we were down in Waxahachie-Tex., And they fell back to Ixcaquixtla-Mex.!

"Wouldn't the correspondents jeer us with a will

If we had a town called Aptakistic-III? A Kishacoquillas-Pa., Or a Kinchefoonee-Ga., A Quinnipack, or plain Shetucket-Ct., A Michlgamme, Mich., or Queechie-Vt.?

"D'ye think I'd live in Wapapello-Mo.? Wapwollopen-Pa., or Wapakoneta-O.? Or Nitta Yuma-Miss., Or Kronenwethers-Wis., Toughkenamon, Onondaga, Squannacook, or Cuyahoga?

"Daguscachonda-Pa. and Quambah-Minn. Rather make a simple-languaged Russian grin.

Yet no doubt they think us dippy At Bogue-Chitto-Mississippi, And conceive our brains as buggy In Alabama down at Chunnenugee!" —Edmund Vance Cooke, in Columbus (O.) Press.

#### SOME NON-PARTISAN POLITICS.

Editorial in August 1st issue of Farm, Stock and Home, of Minneapolis.

The soul of the American citizen must be out of tune or his partisanship fit stuff to armor ships with if he does not have a higher regard for W. J. Bryan now than he had before the late Democratic national convention. This is not said because Mr. Bryan is a Democrat, but because he is an American citizen of whom every other citizen ought to be proud. When in the beginning of his last speech at the convention he modestly, reverently, and with slight paraphrase, quoted Paul's words: "You may dispute whether I have fought a good fight; you may dispute whether I have finished my course, but you cannot deny that I have kept the faith," it is no wonder that 10,000 men rose to their feet and gave the speaker an indorsement that, all things considered, is perhaps without parallel in the history of politics or oratory. And the indorsement came because the words were as true as when Paul spoke them.

And it is well to be proud of an encouragement in well doing a fellow citizen—who is a politician—who will "keep the faith" that is in him, when faithlessness is all round him, and where policy is pushing principle from the platform, and where "what is right" is made subordinate to "how can we win?"

While Mr. Bryan's efforts were defeated by the convention delegates he was triumphantly indorsed by the voteless mass that, constituted an immense majority of convention attendants; and it is now admitted by everybody acquainted with the facts that he came out of the convention with more strength as a leader than he went in with, all of which is more creditable, however, to public sentiment than to Mr. Bryan; it honors itself in being just to that gentleman. Upon this point the following editorial expression of the Chicago Record-Herald, a strong political opponent, is submitted as a sample of many similar expressions that might be quoted:

In the contrast both of cause and of persons the Nebraskan shows to such great advantage that he should receive a tribute of respect even from those who have differed from him most widely in the past upon political principles.

We believe, moreover, that his cleanliness of character, his fine moral qualities, his purity of purpose, his political zeal and his unrivaled gifts as an orator absolutely preclude the idea that he has ceased to be a force in our public life. Whether one approves all his tenets or not, one should recognize the power that is in him, and it may affect millions in the future as it has in the past.

It was ardently hoped and confidently

prophesied that the late convention would end the political career of Mr. Bryan. If that hope and prophecy had been realized it would have been a greater disaster to the nation than to Mr. Bryan; for when the public opinion and the politics of any nation can no longer tolerate men of his character and ability those forces are neither pure enough nor potent enough to safeguard the nation's interests or life.

We believe that the closing sentence of the foregoing quotation will prove to be prophetic. It does not seem possible that the American people will very much longer endure the systems and practices that are so alarmingly effective in centralizing wealth in a few hands. It takes the mass of the people a long time to see or comprehend the silent, insidious centralization of a nation's wealth in the hands of a plutocratic class. In fact, history does not record that it ever was seen until it was first felt, and then something happened at once. It has taken longer to feel it in this country than it would have taken in any other, because of its amazing natural resources. But it will be felt here sometime, and possibly soon, and when the feeling comes such men as Mr. Bryan and his kind will be needed, will be "called," and will be trusted because they have "kept the faith."

This article, be it remembered, is not written by a partisan, but by one who tries his best to be a patriot; it is not written of Mr. Bryan as a Democrat but as a man; the writer does not refer to dangerous systems and tendencies as an alarmist but as a student who thinks he sees clearly the things of which he writes, and his strongest desire is that his countrymen will earnestly strive to see whether he does see clearly or not. And finally, this is written because admiration for courage, ability, integrity, and loyalty to conviction, though the heavens fall, makes silence impossible.

**AN OPEN LETTER TO THE HON.  
JOSEPH H. CHOATE, AMBASSADOR  
OF THE UNITED STATES TO  
THE COURT OF ST. JAMES.**

A letter to Reynolds's Newspaper (London) for June 26, 1904.

Sir,—The rules of good sense, good manners, and good taste alike prescribe that a foreign resident in a country shall refrain from public expressions of his personal views on the domestic affairs of that country. The obligation incumbent on those who have no representative character, is of immeasurably greater force in the case of one entrusted by his fellow

citizens with the duty of representing them in a foreign country.

You have trampled under foot the rules of good sense, good manners, and good taste, and, still worse, you have allowed yourself to throw to the winds all the restraints imposed upon you by the high office you hold. On a recent occasion you prostrated yourself before Lord Roberts. You told your hearers that his fame had filled three continents. "Let us," you said, speaking in the name of the United States, "let us have a little share of the glory. I do most cordially invite him, both in my official and in my personal capacity, to cross the ocean. I can assure him that he will have a reception such as no other Englishman has had in the United States, or in any other country."

Sir, I will not stay to ask whether you were authorized thus to speak in the name of the country of which you are the accredited representative. That is a matter which rests between you and those whom you represent. I am concerned only with the fact that these words were spoken in England by a foreign ambassador.

You cannot but be aware that the mere mention of Lord Roberts' name brings a blush to the cheek of thousands of the best men and the best women of this country. What is this fame which has filled three continents—this glory, of which you desire a share? It is the fame of the devastator, the glory of the man who deliberately set himself to destroy all the works of peace in a vast territory. Not as a painful necessity of warfare, but of fixed purpose, Lord Roberts destroyed thousands of farmsteads, burnt school-houses, cut down fruit trees, trampled crops into the earth, broke down irrigation dams, destroyed sheep, cattle, the very implements of husbandry. Two of your fellow countrymen, Messrs. Putnam and Van Der Weyde, have energetically protested against the imputation that a precedent for this destruction could be found in the deeds wrought in your Civil War.

But this is not all. Unable to conquer the men who, like your brave forefathers in the War of Independence, were fighting for their freedom, Lord Roberts made war on their women and children. Six years ago—only six years from now—President McKinley addressed to Congress a celebrated message. He denounced the methods adopted by General Weyler in his war on the Cubans. "Reconcentration, adopted avowedly as a war

measure to cut off the resources of the insurgents, worked its predestined result. It was extermination. The only peace it could beget was that of the wilderness and the grave." With what sincerity, or want of sincerity, you can judge better than I, he declared that the adoption of these methods left to the United States no choice but to intervene in the sacred names of Humanity and Civilization. "The war in Cuba," he declared, "must stop." Lord Roberts bettered the instruction of General Weyler; the graves of more than 15,000 children testify to his success.

I will not dwell on Lord Roberts' earlier career. I have not to tell here of his deeds in Afghanistan, where he carried fire and slaughter into unresisting villages. It is not those exploits that have caused you to prostrate yourself and your country before him. He killed two Republics, ruined a vast land, and instituted his foul "camps," in which these thousands of children were done to death. It is those deeds which have carried his fame through three continents; it is for those deeds that you invite him to cross the Atlantic to receive the homage of America.

Sir, with grief I say it, you need not to have left your country to find fitting subjects of your eulogies. You have at home soldiers whose fame has filled the world—the practicers of the "water-cure," the General who gave orders to "shoot everything over ten;" in a word, the butchers of the Filipinos. Go back to your country, and there worship at the shrine of Militarism—a Militarism which has revived the methods and the infamies of the sixteenth century. In your own country preach the gospel of fire, sword, slaughter, famine, desolation, the murder of innocents. The area of the United States is wide enough; be content with it. There you will be within your rights. Here we do not need your aid.

**AN ENGLISHMAN.**

**GOLDEN RULE JONES'S OWN DAY.**

Not since Lincoln was buried has any American community paid greater tribute to its dead than Toledo lavished upon the loving life and public service of its Golden-Rule Mayor. Nothing had ever been too much for him to undertake for his city. Its citizens withheld nothing from him that their hearts could yield. None was higher in his esteem or in command of his life than his fellow townsmen. No one had ever been so much to all of them.

That "dear love of comrades," which the mayor went about to exemplify and enjoin in the words of "Old Walt," whom he loved to quote, was never more real or more fully and freely lived out and loved in. The day of his funeral was "Samuel Jones's own day," as his nearest of kin said, while adding only the one wish "that his old Welsh mother might have seen it."

His spirit had been abroad before, strangely permeating and uniting his fellow men, but never as upon that day. Never had so many different minds and kinds of folk been so at one with him and with each other as around the still heart of this big brother to every one of them. It was the people's own day, too. The whole people made it their own. The city government did what befitted it and the occasion, without detracting by any display from the simplicity and solemnity of the supremely impressive facts. But men, women and children did the homage to the memory of their own man and mayor. Business men closed every branch of business, some of them printing black-bordered notices in the newspapers telling why they did so. Stores, factories, little shops, humble homes and finest residences alike were draped in mourning. Phrases from the mayor's talks, snatches of the songs he wrote and sung, couplets from the favorite poets he was wont to quote and pictures of his familiar face were seen everywhere.

Some of these were taken from the walls of the mayor's office in the city hall, which are lined with photographs and lettering presenting men and mottoes heralding the new time and its better day, of which they had caught the vision. From Robert Louis Stevenson are the words to which its occupant keyed his life:

To be honest, to be kind, to earn a little and spend a little less, to make upon the whole a family happier for his presence, to renounce when that shall be necessary and not to be embittered, to keep a few friends, but these without capitulation, above all on the one condition to keep friends with himself—here is a task for all that a man has of fortitude and delicacy.

From Leo Tolstoy this far cry, so near to Samuel Jones's heart:

Men think there are circumstances when one may deal with human beings without love, and there are no such circumstances. One may deal with things without love, one may cut down trees, make bricks, hammer iron without love, but you cannot deal with men without love.

Within the Memorial hall, which had so often reechoed his ringing voice,

the people took their last look at the face they loved. They had outlined in flowers the aisle through which they were to pass by their dead. And were flowers ever more the symbol of hearts grown together? For they were sent there by all the city departments, by "Syrian-American citizens," Polish, German, Hungarians and other nationalities; by the University club and the Bartenders' union; by the United Catholic Societies and the Spiritualist association; by the horseshoers, cloakmakers and many other labor unions; by the Western Oil Men's association, accompanied by 62 names of his business associates and competitors; by his own employes, who gave a great floral golden rule with the words: "We knew him."

Between 5:30 a. m. and 9 p. m. for two days, 50 people a minute passed up that aisle, until fully 55,000 men, women and children of every description silently, reverently and affectionately parted from their friend.

Then his fellow-workmen took up his body to carry it home. Such a procession as followed it has seldom been led by the living or the dead. There were not only the labor unions, but the mothers, wives and children of the men; policemen, firemen, mail carriers and officials of the Toledo, Cleveland and other city governments; 600 newsboys and their band, playing "Nearer, My God, to Thee;" musical, benevolent and fraternal societies, and unorganized groups of citizens, women and children followed in their train. No military company nor any implement of war or strife was seen. To the music of the Golden Rule shop band they marched in strange silence through silent throngs.

On the spacious lawns of the home and adjoining residences fully 15,000 people gathered for the out-of-door funeral service. The casket lay upon the threshold of the home, upon whose lintel were the words, "A Wide House to Shelter a Friend," and over whose open hearth, "The Truth Against the World." Surrounding it upon the porch were speakers and singers, city officials and friends from abroad, while close about the balustrade the shopmates of the resting workman grouped themselves with their women and children.

From his own marked-up Bible the panegyric to love was read. From his wayworn and underscored copy of Whitman favorite lines were recited. Words of just, discriminating, appreciative friendship were spoken by a clergyman, a lawyer and a shopmate. Accompanied by the little piano, which had done hard duty in four political cam-

paigns, songs were sung in his native Welsh, in words of his own heart and voice, and by the fellow workmen in his own shop whom he had trained to sing "Freedom's Day."

At the end of the long march to the distant cemetery thousands more were in waiting by the open grave. When friends were leaving it and it was being filled, a German singing society spontaneously broke out in a farewell song, and a broken voice in the tongue of the fatherland was heard saying good-by.—Graham Taylor, in the Chicago Daily News.

### THE BISHOP'S BAR.

For The Public.

Press dispatches state that Bishop Henry C. Potter, in connection with earnest colleagues, has provided at New York city a resort (without lodging-rooms, but called the "Subway Tavern") at which, in a back room, intoxicating liquors of carefully selected purity are philanthropically served to men, while women and others may partake of lighter refreshments in front. The dispatches state that the establishment was dedicated with services closed by the Doxology.

To sacred impulses our whiskies stir!  
No wili unclean may take from them a spur.

The alcohol is of superior brand—  
No curse attends its ministrations bland.  
To maddening thoughts and deeds no guilty leaven,  
Its fumes shall nurse to God, and sweetly whisper "Heaven!"

Let sweetheart, wife and children—all there are—

Assemble gladly near the holy bar,  
To hear with gusto through the curtains thin

The gurgling brandy and the sough of gin;

And there—to garnish out the gracious trade—

Invoke the gentler joys of pop and lemonade!

With thoughts of those outside, in generous soul,

Let lover, husband, father, wretch his bowl!

"Betrothed! soon, at our longed-for fire-side,

What I enjoy shan't be to you denied.

Sweet wife! when from these walls we hearthward roam

I'll take a worthier drop for you to sip at home.

"My darling boy! Heaven knows my honest pride

That you, full soon, shall quaff here by my side!"

To words like these the kindly haunt inspires,

And in each heart shall kindle gracious fires.

They glow, they burn, they blaze; they flame a ray

Of that slow-dawning light of His approaching day!

"This place has now changed hands"—instructed see,

By blazons pledging worthier ministry.  
No brimstone odors here you plainly smell,

Pervasive of the reeking routes to hell.  
This afar smokes with fragrant sacrifice,  
Whose incense soars, and heming finds its  
kindred skies!

Nor hoof, nor horn, nor forked tall pre-  
sides  
The bottles o'er, and spill's their burning  
tides.

Garbed all as saints, the ministrants ap-  
pear—

Pour out each draught of fire with Chris-  
tian cheer,  
Or to each fable, mixed with loving care,  
Pop in a bible-text, perhaps a heartfelt  
prayer!

L'ENVOY.

Praise Him, our God, from whom all bless-  
ings flow,  
Yea, even rum shops in His Kingdom here  
below!  
Chicago, Aug. 8, 1904. C. M. S.

If we were just we would grant that  
the white peril to the yellow race is  
much greater than the "yellow peril"  
to the white race.—Dr. Paul Carus, in  
The Open Court.

Petey—So youse lost de game nine-  
teen to nuthin?

Captain Mulligan (cheerfully)—Yes,  
but we didn't need dat game anyway.

Petey—Say, youse ought ter be a  
Russian general!—Puck.

The word Voodoo and the notions as-  
sociated with the term, are not of Afri-  
can, but of European origin. As heret-  
ics, the Waldenses, or Vaudois, ob-  
tained evil repute as sorcerers; they  
were therefore credited with all the  
orgies ascribed to witches, and the  
name, losing specific application, passed  
over into a designation of any enchanter.  
The dialectic form Vaudou came with  
French emigrants to Hayti and Louisi-  
ana, and, extending itself to English-  
speaking districts, is used to denote a  
negro conjurer and an imaginary negro  
sect.—New York Nation.

Editor (addressing school)—Now,  
children, I suppose you all know that a  
newspaper is a public educator?

Head Scholar—Yes, sir. Teacher  
brings a copy of your paper to school  
with her every day, and makes the gram-  
mar class pick out all the grammatical  
errors, and she makes the infant class  
pick out all the errors of spelling and  
punctuation.—Woman's Journal.

Martha is a little New York girl  
who last week for the first time ex-  
perienced some of the benefits of the  
fresh air camp at Westfield. A kind  
of a quiet awe seemed to pervade her  
spirits as she joined the ranks of the  
children waiting at the railroad sta-

tion. All through a wide stretch of  
open fields she sat solemnly and silent-  
ly looking out of the window. Final-  
ly one of the women in charge of the  
expedition, touching her on the shoul-  
der, said: "Martha, wouldn't you like  
to look out of the window at the other  
side of the car?" Martha hesitated a  
moment and then, looking searchingly  
in the woman's face, said, cautiously:  
"Will it be country on the other side,  
too?"—Elizabeth (N. J.) Times.

"The chief of the secret service says  
that there is \$100,000 in good bills for  
every dollar that is bad."

"Yes; but we are much more likely  
to get the bad dollar than we are to get  
100,000 good ones."—Cleveland Plain  
Dealer.

BOOKS

THE YELLOW VAN ONCE MORE—  
AN EPIC OF THE LANDLORD.

Mr. Whiteing's Yellow Van, which  
is at the same time a book with the  
land question as its theme and a novel  
of first-rate artistic qualities, has al-  
ready been most happily reviewed in  
The Public (vol. vi., p. 606). My purpose  
is only to call further attention to sev-  
eral points which cannot be too often  
noted, and to do homage to the au-  
thor's fine literary touch, which en-  
ables him to present the earnestness of  
reform in the attractive garb of a real-  
ly artistic performance.

We all know that there are large  
landed estates in England. But how  
vividly Mr. Whiteing brings the fact  
home to his reader: "For 20 miles  
round at Anstead, as for 13 here at  
Allonby and for about the same at  
Lidstone, you might walk without set-  
ting foot on any man's land but the  
duke's."

Then he tells us incidentally how  
gently and peaceably many of the  
great estates have grown in the hands  
of their benevolent lord: "First, he  
puts up a notice-board warning man-  
kind at large against trespass and its  
consequences. Then, when the notice  
has matured into a kind of assumption  
of private ownership, he puts up a  
fence. The fence, in its turn, matures  
into a full recognition, as from time  
immemorial; and the strip is now  
part of the ducal domain."

Really, the neat manner in which  
England's dukes have dealt with Eng-  
land's land, before the face of all the  
people, goes a long way in support of  
the theory that the English are a peo-  
ple lacking in a sense of humor. Mr.  
Whiteing's book ought to help them  
open their eyes to the humor of the  
situation, and incidentally to remind  
us on this side that, though not quite  
so amusing, our own practices are not  
without comic features. Do not all

of our assessment books present fun-  
ny pages, not to speak of the farce of  
our method as a whole?

"Saxon chiefs or Norman lords,"  
says Mr. Whiteing, "in the fullness of  
their power were not in it with the  
landowner of to-day. He has got you,  
body and soul. The parson is actually  
his nominee, and often his poor rela-  
tion. . . . The tradespeople of the  
village rent under him, and even if  
they don't they can be ruined by his  
power. The laborers live in his cot-  
tages, and are absolutely at his mercy  
for the privilege of hiring a bit of al-  
lotment land—hiring, not owning;  
mark that well! He is usually the  
magistrate; and so he and his admin-  
ister the law that should stand be-  
tween you both."

Who can say that this picture of the  
landlord's power is overdrawn? Land,  
labor, church, court—are they not all  
at bottom his, whenever he chooses to  
exercise his sway?

This book shows the submergence of  
a farm laborer, under the stress of this  
sway, into the slums of London.  
"Who killed Cock Robin? Shall I  
tell you? The English land system.  
. . . . You can't keep all this wicked  
luxury of landlord, aye, and gentleman  
farmer, too, out of one pair of laborer's  
hands. . . . You can't live and  
thrive, increase and multiply, here  
without the good leave of your bet-  
ters; and they won't give you leave.  
They want the land for a pleasure-  
ground; they can get their incomes  
somewhere else."

So the Herions went to London.  
"They had saved a little while his  
work lasted, but her confinement and  
the loss of work together pulled them  
down. And they went from bad to  
worse. The rent was crushing. It  
keeps pace with the very need of shel-  
ter. The greater the crowd, the dear-  
er the homes." When the friend of  
the duchess of Allonby at last found  
them, "George had gone out again to  
look for work. Rose was lying ill  
on the bed in a dismal room, still and  
quiet, with a baby opening its eyes,  
for the first time, on a vista of East  
End back yards. A mouse, trustful in  
the stagnant place, foraged for its  
breakfast, and hardly stirred when I  
came in."

"Who sublets such holes?"

"Speculators."

"Who owned that one?"

"The duke of Allonby, I believe."

Thus had they, leaving the duke's  
country, come to the duke's city and  
a source of the duke's income.

Is the duke of Allonby an ogre? On  
the contrary he may be a most agree-  
able, charming, kind-hearted gentle-  
man. And his American duchess may  
even have a sort of enthusiasm for hu-  
manity. The author makes no impos-  
sible drawing. His people are natural  
enough.



TAXATION OF IMPORTS  
THE COCKNEY SPORTSMAN.

"Confound that dog! he's gone off on the wrong scent altogether!"

And the story, what little there is of it, takes us on smoothly. It catches the reader's interest and holds it. Some of the latter part of the book might have been spared for a closer following of the misfortunes of the Herions, but this would not have been very pleasant reading, and it must be remembered that Mr. Whiteing wants an audience for his preaching. The success of his books shows that he knows how to attract as well as how to preach. This is a great part of his power. Rarely, indeed, has a book appeared which combines so cleverly as this the craft of artistic excellence with the purpose of a splendid radicalism.

J. H. DILLARD.

#### PERIODICALS.

C. E. S. Wood does some plain and wholesome writing in the Pacific Monthly for August.

An Illustrated "Reading Journey Through Japan," by Anna C. Hartshorne, is the feature of The Chautauquan for August.

"Wages and the Cost of Living" is the subject of the July Bulletin of the Department of Commerce and Labor, which has just appeared, in the nick of time for the Presidential campaign.

Outing for August presents a variety of attractive matter. Admirers of Dan Beard, the Illustrator, will be interested in his instructions for amateur dam-building, bridge building, etc., etc.

The Arena for August, more than maintains the promise of its first number under the new regime. The only criticism to make of it is the bad printing of the portrait illustrations of Flower's "Golden Day in Boston's History," though this defect is well offset by the excellent frontispiece portrait of Prof. Frank Parsons. One of the valuable articles, though not one of the opinions of

which we should wholly approve, is Holder's account of the workings of the Chinese Six Nations in this country. An open letter to President Roosevelt by his personal admirer, Prof. Parsons, is a well-aimed hint to Roosevelt the taking of which might open a new and brilliant career to him; but Prof. Parsons probably mistakes his man. U'Ren's story of the initiative and referendum in Oregon is too brief for its subject, though good as far as it goes. Another article of special interest describes the political situation in the Australian parliament. These are only a few of the more serious articles, to which ought to be added a review of Poe's poetry by Edwin Markham.

## FREE AMERICA

By BOLTON HALL.

Bound in Paper; Price, 25 Cts.

Mr. Hall's new book "Free America" shows that kindly yet pointed wit and humor that makes him a welcome contributor to "Life," as well as the epigrammatic faculty that is shown in his economic fables.

But this book is no mere jeu d'esprit; it is a serious book, which bears evidence of an immense amount of work and of great research. Every point is re-inforced by statistics derived from the Census and other authorities, but so put as to be clear to the casual reader, and stated with an exact care that the Department of Labor would do well to imitate.

Mr. Hall has no theory to propound and no panacea to urge; the book is devoted to showing why all who work ought to be rich, why they are not rich, and how each one may become rich.

Though it is "an appeal to discontent" it is a refreshing change from former popular books on the social condition, such as "Coin's Financial School" and "Merrie England." Individualistic, yet with scorn for our social stupidities, it breathes the most ardent hope, and will be welcomed by conservative men who are sick of things as they are and would fain medicine the diseases of our civilization. Sent postpaid on receipt of price.

L. S. DICKEY & CO.

79 Dearborn Street, Chicago.

## 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.

#### CONTRACTORS.

GEORGE H. ATKINSON,

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

## 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.

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