

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 20, 1904.

Number 833.

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 Chicago traction question (p. 236) again arises, and in a manner ill calculated to inspire confidence in the good faith toward the public of the local public officials and the local monopoly interests between whom the matter has been a subject of dicker for the past two years.

The immediate cause of the present controversy is the recommendation to the city council by the transportation committee, of a compromise ordinance for the extension of certain street car franchises. It is the "tentative ordinance" proposed by the subcommittee nearly a year ago (vol. vi, p. 675), though with some important changes. The ordinance as reported is not a good one, but it is better than it was as it came from the hands of the subcommittee. It does bring the time for possible public ownership down from the positive 20 and probable 40 years of the original to 13; and unless there are as yet undiscovered "jokers" in it, it does place the city, as the original did not, securely in position to control the traction situation at the end of the term. Bad though it still is on its own merits, it may possibly be as good a compromise with the traction pirates as could be hoped for.

What is exasperating about it is not so much the character of the ordinance, which may be defended as a compromise, but the contemptuous attitude of its promoters toward last Spring's referendum, at which by an overwhelming majority the people demanded immediate municipal ownership and

no more franchises. Mayor Harrison is the principal known offender. He has issued a proclamation in which, after expressing his belief that the proposed ordinance "is the best practical solution of the traction question in the present circumstances," he notifies the people that "if a referendum is desired upon the proposition" those who oppose the ordinance should "immediately undertake the work of securing the signatures necessary to have the question placed on the ballot at the November election." The time for doing this expires September 9—only 26 days after his proclamation; but he promises that if by October 3d (nearly a month after the petition would become waste paper under the referendum law), it should have been signed by "a sufficient number to indicate a general desire on the part of the people" (whatever number that may mean) he will recommend that the city council defer action on the proposed ordinance; and "if the remainder of the necessary signatures" (about 100,000) are obtained by October 20, and the petition cannot then be submitted at the November election (as it certainly cannot) he will recommend deferring the ordinance until after the next Spring election. "Unless a petition with the necessary number of signatures is filed by October 20 next," he concludes, "it will be assumed that the ordinance meets with public approval and will be called up for passage in the city council." That is simply fooling, and not great fooling either.

Mayor Harrison is entirely silent about the fact that at the municipal election last Spring the people of Chicago voted 120,744 to 50,893 (a majority of 69,851) in favor of immediate municipal ownership, and 120,187 to 48,056 (a majority of 72,131) against granting

traction franchises. And well he may be silent. That vote was an overwhelming popular expression against the very kind of ordinance which he now proposes to regard as meeting "with public approval" unless the people petition to vote against it again. How many times must the people of Chicago go to the labor and expense of securing 100,000 signatures in order to express their opinion against the traction pirates—how many times must they do this before the business and social and professional and journalistic and official friends of these pirates will acknowledge that the people mean what their votes proclaim?

Notwithstanding that the people of Chicago have within six months declared themselves emphatically against this kind of ordinance, Mayor Harrison asks them to do so now with immediate reference to this particular ordinance, and under legally impossible circumstances. If it is not fooling, what is it? No petition of 100,000 could be got by September 9, and after that the petition would be legally worthless and the difficulty of getting signatures consequently multiplied. But if the 100,000 were got under these difficulties, what then? Why, Mr. Harrison would recommend the council to postpone action on the ordinance! If the council didn't postpone, the work of getting petitions would have proved a farce though completely successful. If the council did postpone, the petition-getters would have secured the inestimable privilege of doing their work all over again for the Spring election. For if they failed in that, they could be sure that Mayor Harrison or his successor would then be ready to assume from this neglect a "silent referendum," as he jocosely calls it, and "that the ordinance meets with public approval."

And this ordinance regarding which Mr. Harrison makes such an amazing assumption as that a people who have but recently rejected the whole class of which it is a specimen, must be taken to approve it unless they immediately rise up 100,000 strong and reject the particular specimen, under extreme difficulties and with no assurance of anything more than the mayor's "recommendation" to the council—what stage of definiteness has this ordinance reached? It has only passed the committee stage. When it gets into the council, it may be amended. Suppose this should happen, what would Mayor Harrison assume? Would he assume that the "silent referendum" covered the subsequent amendment? or would he suggest another laborious crusade for 100,000 signatures? Or, suppose that all Mr. Harrison's conditions were complied with, and that thereupon the council should amend the ordinance. Would Mr. Harrison then regard the objections of the petitioners as removed, and the amended ordinance as meeting their approval, if they neglected to roll up another 100,000 signatures to another petition for another referendum? There is no end to the possibilities of this kind of fooling, if you once begin it, as Mayor Harrison has done.

Assuming that the proposed traction ordinance is in reality a desirable compromise, the honorable course for Mayor Harrison and the city council to pursue is very simple. There is no necessity for disposing of the matter before next Spring. This is evident from Mr. Harrison's willingness to recommend its postponement until then if his petition requirements are complied with. The question of expedition being thus out of the way, the fundamental question of adopting a compromise contrary to the express mandate of the people at last Spring's election may be considered without the embarrassment of urgency. On this question the primary consideration is the fact that the people have voted overwhelm-

ingly in favor of immediate municipal ownership and against any more franchises. This condemns the ordinance. But on the other hand is the fact that legal obstructions temporarily interfere with that popular mandate. This may justify a compromise. But can a compromise be made with the monopolists, and would the people approve it? If a reasonable one could be made provided it were executed at once, a question of hurry would arise. The city officials would then be confronted with the duty of acting immediately, on their own responsibility, one way or the other, according to their best judgment, and with ordinary man's courage. But, as we have already seen, there is no hurry. Mr. Harrison virtually testifies that the proposed compromise can be deferred until after the Spring election. This gives the city officials ample time and opportunity to go to the people for instructions on the question of compromise. Let the proposed ordinance pass its first and second reading, so that it shall be in the form in which the council is ready to enact it and the monopolists to accept it. Then let the council postpone final action until after the Spring election, meanwhile providing for a petition under the referendum law whereby the people can vote upon the ordinance at the municipal election. Thereby the mayor and council can be properly and fully advised as to whether or not the people of Chicago regard this ordinance as a necessary and desirable compromise of their demands. This is the only decent course, if the mayor and aldermen intend to pay any attention to referendum voting at all. It is the only honest course, from the standpoint of popular referendum. It is the only course whereby those who make themselves responsible to the people for the proposed ordinance can avert a growing suspicion that they are less loyal to the rights of the public than they are solicitous for the privileges and profits of traction monopolists. It is the only course consistent with Mayor Harrison's specific pledges to the people in his campaign for

reelection a year and a half ago, in which he made this promise: "Any franchise ordinance the council may pass must be submitted to the people for their approval or rejection before I will sign it."

In an editorial on this subject in the Chicago Examiner of the 17th, wherein the reasons officially urged in behalf of the proposed ordinance are reviewed seriatim and with apparent justice denounced as unsound, the Examiner makes the startling statement that—

There are two men in Chicago of great influence in local politics, able heretofore to make and unmake mayors and aldermen. These two men are heavy stockholders in the Chicago City Railway company, and their fat dividends on watered stock are threatened by municipal ownership. Hence municipal ownership is to be killed to oblige these two men. And if the principle that the will of the people is supreme is killed also, no matter. These are the plain facts in the case, and there is no place where they are better known to be facts than in the city hall.

The Examiner either knows that statement to be true or it does not. If it does not know it to be true, it is as guilty of falsification as if it knew it to be false. If it does know it to be true it has no right to conceal the names of the two corrupt men to whom it alludes. The street railway company in which these men are alleged to be large stockholders is the beneficiary of the proposed ordinance, and if there is any evidence as direct as this of "grafting" in connection with that ordinance, the newspaper that possesses it should make it public circumstantially. There is good reason to suspect that some powerful influences are secretly at work with the authorities in the interest of the Chicago City Railway Company in connection with these traction negotiations. That suspicion can be turned into conviction if the Examiner will follow its ambiguous assertion with a specific personal accusation. And nothing else could serve so well at this time to defeat the conspiracy if there is one. If there is none, it is worse than folly to confuse the situation by vague or unfounded insinuations.

If our good friends the Christian Scientists have a reasonable share of "the saving sense of humor," they must appreciate an accidental juxtaposition on the editorial page of a recent issue of the Christian Science Sentinel. That interesting publication carries at the head of its editorial columns this standing notice:

Mrs. Eddy Takes no Patients.—The author of the Christian Science textbook takes no patients, does not consult on disease, nor read letters referring to these subjects.

Immediately under this notice appears in the issue of the 13th an editorial which begins as follows:

Jesus' success in healing the sick and his exhortation to his followers to do the works that he did, point to the true test of Christianity, and it is only as Christian Scientists are able to measure up to his standard that they know that they are his present-day followers.

Another horrible burning of Negroes at the stake in Georgia, under circumstances indicating collusion on the part of the military who were ostensibly guarding the prisoners, testifies to the lawless savagery of the whites. The crime of the Negroes was brutal to the extreme, but they were common criminals and the long arm of the law reached out for them and was about to exact the legal penalty for their crime. The mob, on the other hand, was composed of "best citizens," who have become as lawless as common criminals, but against whom the arm of the law is paralyzed; and it was worse than brutal, for it was not only indifferent to human suffering but was malignant in producing it. There was no excuse in this case on the plea of the law's delay. The criminals had been convicted and were to be hanged September 9 for a crime committed July 28. Neither was there the flabby excuse that the crime was "nameless." It was a ruthless homicide for robbery. No excuse for this mob is possible. It was actuated simply by insane race hatred and hunger for the enjoyment of human agony. To call it savage is to slander the instincts of the savage.

It is agreeable to observe in

some of the daily papers a disposition to return, at least in theory, to axiomatic morality. Among the instances we note the following: "No cause is so good as to justify assassination." But this may not be as axiomatic as it sounds. What does "assassination" mean? If it excludes excusable or justifiable homicide, then the "axiom" is meaningless, as may be seen at once by throwing it into that phrasing, thus: "No cause is so good as to justify man-killing without excuse or justification." Of course not. But if "assassination" means the intentional killing of a human being, whether with or without excuse or justification, then the axiom condemns several things that are not yet disreputable, whether they are wrong or not. What about "assassination" in self-defense? What about "assassination" for crime, commonly called capital punishment? What about war? Is it axiomatic that the "assassination" of a tyrant out of war is not justified, and yet that the "assassination" of thousands of persons in war is justified? If so, perhaps some one can explain at what point between retail assassination, which is wrong, and wholesale assassination, which is right, the principle of justice begins to distinguish.

MORE ABOUT THE PROTECTIVE SPIRIT AND ITS OPPOSITE.

We owe to Henry Thomas Buckle the term "Protective Spirit" and the conception of its application in affairs political and social. This—although it may appear to be a mere incident in his argument—will in time be recognized as perhaps the most original and valuable contribution which his book has brought to modern thought. And yet reviewers and commentators have hardly mentioned it. It is a dangerous subject, and to many a most disagreeable one. It goes to the root of modern contentions. It forces into consciousness an irrepressible conflict.

The Protective Spirit makes much of inequality. Its underlying

ing conception is that the many are dependent upon the few. In the ordination of things it thinks it right that the many should be drawers of water and hewers of stone. It persuades itself that the best welfare of the masses lies in the guidance and protection of the more favored classes.

If the Protective Spirit were to formulate its honest creed, its first article of belief would be: "I believe in special privilege." It demands special privilege in order to maintain ascendancy. It believes in landlordism and in all commercial processes whereby wealth can be concentrated. It believes in monopoly and big dividends. It winks at lobbies, silent favors, railroad passes and subtle bribes, whereby legislators and public officers are kept in line with the established order, and are nourished with the hope of keeping themselves in the favor of favored classes.

The established order, even in this so-called democratic country, is fully imbued with the Protective Spirit. A century ago one might talk of the independence of a free American citizen. True, we had slaves, but the average white man was in truth far more independent than the average white man to-day. There was less monopoly; there was more opportunity for self-employment. The decrease of independence marks the growth in America of the Protective Spirit, which has all along been dominant in Europe.

Mr. Ghent's clever book, "Our Benevolent Feudalism," is the witness of this fact. No one can read this book, taking with him the thought of the Protective Spirit, without seeing how true it is in its main argument, and how truly it shows the growth of the ideas that have upheld the ancient regimes of the old world.

Ghent did well to use the word "benevolent"; for benevolence is a necessary adjunct to the maintenance of the Protective Spirit. This benevolence is for us—as indeed it was for vassals and underlings of medieval kings and lords, and as it is for vassals and underlings of kings and lords to-day—the very flower of the Protective Spirit. It is perfume to our nostrils. We worship in its incense. We educate our youths to breathe its sweet odors.

But benevolence requires the stuff to be benevolent with, and great benevolence requires much stuff, and much stuff comes in but one way, namely, by diverting wealth. The Protective Spirit makes people blind to the ways of diverting wealth.

A high tariff lets the manufacturer fill his pockets with double prices. It is all right—infant industries and labor, especially labor, must be protected. A street-car monopoly lets investors draw dividends on watered stock. It is all right—we must protect capital and not drive it away. Land monopoly lets the owner take the value which the public gives to his land. It is all right—vested rights must be protected.

Such are the kinds of protection that in modern times Buckle's Protective Spirit needs to thrive on. Given these forms of protection, then those who are so favored will throw their benevolent arms—or alms—around the great body of the people, and will manage for them their politics, education and religion. Many a one who talks eloquently of the improvement of the masses thinks that this is the only way to promote the welfare and development of "such people." This is the Protective Spirit.

The real mistake of the good men who believe in the Protective Spirit lies in supposing that development can come from without.

The opposite of the Protective Spirit is the Democratic Spirit. The Democratic Spirit makes much of equality. Its underlying conception is individual independence. Its ideal is a fair field for self-development. It abhors special privilege and favoritism of every kind. It believes in equality in all affairs, political and social, under laws that recognize no distinction, save the great distinction between what is common and what is individual.

The Democratic Spirit believes in the equal rights of every individual in that which no individual has produced. It believes in the exclusive right of every individual in that which he himself has produced. It believes that the right of the individual to his own can only be attained by the recognition of the common right of all in what should truly belong to all. It

believes that the root of social distress lies in fostering the favors and special privileges whereby some can hold or take more than their share of the common right.

The Democratic Spirit believes in neither giving nor receiving protection. It abhors the protected ways of diverting wealth.

A high tariff lets the manufacturer fill his pockets with double prices. The Democratic Spirit says this is wrong—let the buyer be free to buy where he chooses, and let government cease to tax one for the benefit of another. A street-car monopoly lets investors draw dividends on watered stock, while the people pay more fare than is necessary, and get little from the company in taxes. The Democratic Spirit says this is wrong—the street belongs to all the people, and those who have special use of it should pay properly for the privilege. Land monopoly lets the owner take the value which the public gives to his land. The Democratic Spirit says this is wrong—what is produced by all should belong to all, and whoever holds land should pay properly for the privilege.

The Democratic Spirit has no part in the protection of favors and vested wrongs. It believes that the absence of these forms of protection will remove all color of need for the guidance and benevolence of the Protective Spirit. It believes that in a fair field, the people in self-dependence will have a chance to develop into manhood and true ideals of living, as can never be possible so long as the Protective Spirit holds sway.

The Democratic Spirit has never been organized, but it is spreading and rising into consciousness here and there. It is indeed the new conscience—the conscience that concedes the rights and possibilities of all men, despising none, and ready to believe that failures and shortcomings and degradations are perhaps mainly due to the denial of rights and the greed of privilege. The new conscience says, in the words of the noble mayor of Toledo, who has just passed from us, "We are all people—just people, you know."

By and by the scattered forces of this new conscience will unite to overthrow the Protective Spirit and to establish the Democratic Spirit, and this triumph

will be the next great consummation in the march of human progress.

J. H. DILLARD.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

NEW ZEALAND.

Auckland, July 15.—In the year 1896 the parliament of New Zealand passed a law entitled "The Rating on Unimproved Values"—in other words, the local option taxation law. Several amendments have since been made, which leave the position as follows:

In any city, borough or county 15, 20, or 25 per cent. of the local taxpayers, according to the number in the district, can present a petition to the chairman or mayor of the local governing body, asking that a poll be taken for the adoption of the provisions of this act. If a majority of the local taxpayers who vote on the question decide in favor of adopting the act, then all the local taxes are thereafter levied on the unimproved value of the land, and buildings and other improvements go untaxed?

Since the passing of this law, about 65 places have voted on the question; and 54 have agreed, mostly by large majorities, to adopt the act, while 11 have rejected it.

Palmerston North was the first locality in the colony to adopt the act, which they did almost immediately after its passage. Others followed soon after, and every year since that time additional localities have adopted this method of raising local revenue.

The act provides that after three years the local tax payers can revert, by vote, to the old system; but up to the present time only three localities have taken a vote on the question of reverting, and all have refused to revert, two out of the three by larger majorities than those by which the act was adopted in the first place. In the third, where the mayor was fighting hard for a reversal, the majority of votes in favor of continuing the new system was only nine less than for its adoption three years before. This locality is the borough of Devonport, near the city of Auckland. The voting here was 415 for the maintenance of the new system, as against 176 for a return to the old. The number of votes may appear small, but one explanation of that is that only owners of property are allowed to vote.

Two of the leading cities in the colony, namely Wellington, the capital city, and Christchurch, have adopted the act within the past three years. The opinion of the people of Wellington may be gathered from the following extract from the annual report by the town clerk for 1903:

"The result of the first year's trial of this system of rating must be considered a gratifying one, and leaves no room for regret at its adoption. That

which was claimed by its exponents has been amply fulfilled. It encourages improvement, stimulates the use of land, secures the unearned increment to those who have added the value, mulcts all lands in their fair share of taxation, and paralyzes the old system under which rental values on lands could, by simple manipulation, reduce local taxation to a farce. It is to be hoped that in the near future legislation will enable the unimproved system to be adopted for all those purposes for which it is now necessary to also undertake an assessment on the annual value basis. It is only stating a fact to admit that much, if not most, of the activity of the building operations of the city and surrounding during the past year is due to the influence of this healthy measure; and with the necessary restrictions to prevent overcrowding of buildings, no untoward result need be apprehended."

The effect of adopting this system of raising revenue has in every way been beneficial, while in some places the effect has been almost phenomenal. Take the case of Hamilton, a town in the center of an agricultural district in the north island of New Zealand. For three years prior to the adoption of the act, the population and land values were almost stationary. In the three years from the time of its adoption the value of land and buildings in the town increased from \$686,445 to \$1,423,760, while no such phenomenal increase was registered in towns similarly situated in other parts of the colony.

Of course it must be borne in mind that a special development necessarily applies to an isolated place adopting this method of taxation which would not apply if the whole country simultaneously adopted the reform. Take, for illustration, what happened in the city of Wellington. The demand for labor in the building trade was so great that employers had difficulty in getting men, and at some meetings of the master builders' association feelings ran high, one employer accusing another of having stolen away his men. The rate of wages in some cases went as high as four and six cents per hour above the wages fixed by the Arbitration Court, which fixes the wages in every branch of organized labor.

The working out of the tax everywhere means the relief of taxation on the homes of the workers, and the increase of the tax on vacant land and land made valuable by the people in the centers of population. In some cases as many as four out of every five of the local tax payers pay less than under the old system, these payments being mainly on the homes of the workers on the outskirts of the town.

Opponents of the system at first tried to make the workers believe that taxing on the unimproved value of the land, exempting all improvements from

taxation, would amount to letting the owners of large buildings in the centers of the city escape their fair share of taxation; but actual experience has shown that where the buildings are largest the tax falls heaviest, because of the enormous values of the land on which such buildings stand.

A few examples of specific cases in the cities of Christchurch and Wellington will illustrate the position pretty clearly. Following shows the changes in Christchurch from the old system in 1902 to the new in 1903:

Capital Value.	Land Value.	Tax 1902.	Tax 1903.	Remarks.
\$125,250	\$80,250	\$1,090	\$1,090	Bk. bidg.
.....	1,670	1,650	Store & offices.
.....	450	555	Newsp. offices.
11,000	21,000	380	430	Store.
.....	25	17	Cottage.
2,200	475	30	16	Cottage.
2,275	450	30	16	Cottage.
.....	12	10	Cottage.
.....	15	5	Cottage.

The following table for Wellington, though different in form from that for Christchurch, also compares the old system with the new:

Annual Value.	Land Value.	Tax on Annual Value.	Tax on Land Value.	Remarks.
\$10,000	\$12,310	\$1,185	\$1,420	Bank.
3,250	8,275	385	1,115	Bank.
2,500	30,000	295	380	Bank.
2,250	40,000	265	505	Bank.
1,750	38,125	205	480	Insurance Co.
3,500	52,500	415	665	Hotel.
1,850	35,570	215	450	Hotel.
2,750	40,700	325	515	Hotel.
3,000	57,800	375	725	Hotel.
250	13,550	30	170	Vacant.
250	8,300	30	105	Vacant.
175	600	20	5	Cottage.
140	430	15	5	Cottage.
150	950	15	10	Cottage.
140	335	15	5	Cottage.
125	600	15	5	Cottage.
140	575	15	5	Cottage.

In addition to the beneficial effect of this system of local taxation, there is in New Zealand a national tax of two cents to the \$5 on the unimproved value of all lands, with exemptions up to \$2,500, and a graduated tax on large estates reaching to six cents in the \$5 on estates over \$1,050,000 value, making the total tax on large estates eight cents to the \$5.

GEORGE W. FOWLDS.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, August 18.

In their prosecution of the Russian-Japanese war (p. 295), the Japanese have suspended aggressive operations against Liaotung and Mukden in the north, and made a determined attack upon Port Arthur in the south. The first evidence of Russian desperation at the vigor of this attack was the attempt on the 10th of their Port Arthur squadron to escape. It was sighted by the Japanese squadron and pursued. A sea fight lasting all the afternoon followed, in the

course of which the Russian formation was disorganized and the ships scattered. Most of them returned to Port Arthur. Others, in a disabled condition, took refuge in neutral ports. Rear Admiral Withoft, commander of the Russian squadron, was killed in the battle.

A combined land and naval attack upon Port Arthur was begun by the Japanese on the 15th. There are no details, but on the 17th it was reported from Tokio that Japan had on the 16th demanded the surrender of the fortress, offering to release all non-combatants. A reply was hourly expected, but there is no trustworthy report that any has yet been received. Japanese rumors of the 17th were to the effect that the Russians had refused the demand.

Meanwhile a naval battle with the Vladivostok squadron occurred off the Tsu islands, near that harbor. The Russian armored cruisers, the Rurik, the Gromoboi and the Rossia emerged from Vladivostok on the 14th and were attacked by the Japanese. The Rurik was sunk, and at latest reports the Japanese were pursuing the other two. In this battle the Japanese were commanded by Admiral Kamimura, whose squadron had been considerably depleted by the demand for ships to reinforce Admiral Togo in his operations before Port Arthur.

Out of some of the incidents of Togo's naval battle on the 10th, in which he scattered the Port Arthur squadron of the Russians, new international complications are threatened. One of the fleeing Russian ships, the torpedo-boat destroyer Ryeshitelni, took refuge in the neutral port of Chefoo, China, where it was captured by the Japanese. The Russian version of this incident is to the following effect:

When the commander of the Russian ship arrived at Chefoo he disarmed his ship, lowered his flag, and otherwise complied with all formalities. On the 12th a Japanese officer and party came on board as if for a conference, but immediately began to hoist their flag, whereupon the Russian commander threw the Japanese officer overboard ordered his party to be thrown into the sea, and having no arms with which to resist, ordered preparations to

blow up the ship. Explosions did occur in the fore part of the vessel, but she did not sink, and the Japanese took her out of the port.

The Japanese version is to this effect:

Upon discovering that the Russian vessel had taken refuge in the port of Chefoo, the Japanese vessels waited outside with a view to attacking her when she should leave. But she did not leave, and fearing that she might escape in the night and attack merchant vessels as the Vladivostok squadron had done, the Japanese entered the harbor the better to watch her movements. When they did this they found her undismayed. Thereupon they sent an officer with a party to notify the Russian ship that they expected her to leave by dawn or surrender. The Russian refused to comply with either demand, and while the conference was in progress he was overheard to give instructions to blow up the ship. He also threw the Japanese officer overboard, and the Russian sailors showed signs of resistance. About this time the forward magazine exploded, killing some of the Japanese party, and thereupon the Japanese captured the vessel and towed her out of port.

Russia has made a protest to the neutral powers against this act, which she describes in her circular note as "a flagrant violation of international law and neutrality."

From Berlin come reports of further fighting in the German war upon the Hereros (vol. vi, p. 209), of German Southwest Africa. The battle occurred on the 12th, and the Germans are reported to have lost in killed 5 officers (including Count von Arnim) and 19 men, besides 6 officers and 52 men wounded. There is a strong flavor in the report of something like a massacre of the natives. It reads:

The natives, who numbered about 6,000 fighting men, under old Chief Samuel Maherero, to whom the younger leaders had turned after their reverses, were concentrated in the Waterberg mountains. With their women, children and flocks they occupied a plain of meadowland roughly estimated at 250,000 acres, on which they had 50,000 head of cattle and 50,000 sheep, goats, etc. The approaches to the plain were difficult passes, so that the Germans had hard work forcing them. The number of the Germans is not known accurately, but as nine companies and four and a half batteries, with some irregular troops were engaged, the total probably was about 2,000 men. Deserters from the Hereros reported that the arrival of German reinforcements at Swakopmund caused great depression in the native camp.

Chief Samuel spent much time in having the Bible read to him. It seems improbable that many of the natives escaped, the German forces holding the mountain passes.

NEWS NOTES.

[The note last week in this department (p. 296) regarding the "American Association of Africans," should have read: "American Association of Opticians."]

—The British parliament was pro-rogued by the King on the 15th.

—The biennial conclave of the Knights of Pythias opened at Louisville on the 15th.

—The encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic opened at Boston on the 15th.

—Waldeck-Rousseau, former premier of France, died on the 10th at his country residence near Paris.

—A boy child was born to the Emperor of Russia on the 12th. He is heir apparent to the Russian throne.

—The Republicans of Idaho on the 11th nominated Frank R. Gooding for Governor. The Democrats on the 16th nominated Henry Heitfield.

—Frank Buchanan, of Chicago, was on the 11th elected president of the Structural Building Trades Alliance at its session at Indianapolis.

—Henry G. Davis was formally notified on the 17th of his nomination by the Democrats for Vice President (p. 264), the notification taking place at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., and being made by John Sharp Williams.

—The Supreme Court of Connecticut decided on the 12th that the bequest of Philo S. Bennett to William J. Bryan, described in a letter referred to in the will (pp. 41, 49), is not part of the will under the laws of Connecticut and is therefore not a valid bequest.

—Thomas E. Watson, of Georgia, and Thomas H. Tibbles, of Nebraska, candidates of the People's party for President and Vice President, are to be formally notified of their nomination at a public meeting at Cooper Union, New York city, on the 18th. The speakers announced are Samuel W. Williams, ex-Senator Allen, Mr. Watson and Mr. Tibbles. An electoral ticket of the party is to be put in the field in New York.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States (p. 248) for the month ending July 31, 1904, as given by the statistical sheet of the Department of Commerce and Labor for July, were as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold and S for silver):

M	\$4,883,431	\$71,123,520	\$13,759,911 exp.
G	1,083,219	8,925,418	7,842,169 imp.
S	4,534,514	1,381,017	3,153,497 exp.
	\$99,501,194	\$81,429,955	\$9,071,239 exp.

—Two Negroes convicted at Statesboro, Ga., and sentenced to be hanged for the brutal murder of a white family

consisting of a man, his wife and three children, were seized by a mob on the 16th and consumed in a bonfire of pine knots and kerosene. It appears that the troops who were guarding the prisoners from the mob were armed with empty guns.

PRESS OPINIONS.

PARKER'S SPEECH.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Aug. 11.—On the whole, the speech of acceptance is exceedingly conservative. Its tone will perhaps be described by his especial admirers as judicial. It certainly is in contrast with the tone of Mr. Bryan's acceptance speeches in 1896 and 1900. And the progressive Democrats who have been proud to follow the leadership of Mr. Bryan will miss the ring of that brave man's voice in these rather colorless expressions.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Goldwin Smith, in Toronto Weekly Sun (Lib.), Aug. 10.—That people in England are gradually coming to their senses is shown by the continual success of the opposition in the by-elections, as well as by the reduction of the army. For the time at least the danger of protection is past. But the government elected on the issue of the war, and under the influence of the war fever, retains a large part of its huge majority, and, though its credentials are withdrawn, continues to legislate in the teeth of national opinion, making arbitrary use of the cloture. This is a warning of the mischief which unscrupulous politicians appealing to the war passion, may do.

COLORADO.

The Iowa Socialist (Soc.), Aug. 13.—In your excitement over the news about Kuroki and Kuropatkin don't forget the bull-pensky in Colorado.

BRYAN IN THE SENATE.

Chicago Evening News (ind.), Aug. 11.—No one can deny that the Senate would be a more interesting place with William J. Bryan in it.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Aug. 10.—Perhaps Mr. Bryan's ambition to carry Nebraska and go to the Senate is for the purpose of being in position to give the reorganizers in his party all the trouble possible. (Easton Free Press).—Mr. Bryan doesn't need to get into the Senate in order to give the reorganizers trouble. He will give them plenty of it between now and 1908, whether in the Senate or out of it. But is it not conceivable that Mr. Bryan's ambition to enter the Senate may spring from a desire to advance the cause for which he stands?

Prof. George E. Beers, formerly secretary of the Yale law school, tells how a colleague in the department of philosophy was interrupted in his study of the workings of a child's mind. Prof. Beers was passing the philosopher's-house one day, when the latter's small son came running out of the garden where he had been walking with his father, crying bitterly.

"Well, little man!" said Prof. Beers, "is it as bad as all that? What's wrong?"

The boy, pointing to his father, exclaimed between sobs: "That fool over there is trying to make me think."—N. Y. Times.

MISCELLANY

"THE SACRED RIGHT TO LABOR."

For The Public.

The Parry-led Philistines, after profits and per cents,

Disposed to stay in power and knowing whence it springs,

Have gone to preaching ethics, with an interest intense

In "the right of men to toll!"—for them, the toll that tribute brings.

And how they love the workers,
The "free" non-union workers,
The brave strike-breaking workers,
The "heroes" known as scabs!

And how they hate the unions,
The leaders of the unions,
The solid front of unions—
The class who won't be scabs!

"The sacred right to labor"—how zealously they urge it!—

"The right to sell one's 'capital' as pleases one"—the boss;

But, O, the blow to freedom when men with manhood merge it

And follow trusted leaders into idleness and loss!

'Tis then they love the workers,
The "free" non-union workers,
The brave strike-breaking workers,
The "heroes" known as scabs!
And how they hate the unions,
The leaders of the unions,
The solid front of unions—
The class who won't be scabs!

Somehow this narrow Parry-sort of Pharisaic preaching

Sounds true and fair and Gospel-like when suitably applied;

The right of men to labor is good universal teaching,

And that what is right is duty can by no one be denied.

Then why lock out the workers,
The brotherhood of workers,
The faithful, able workers
Who claim the right to toll?
And why insist that shirkers,
The income-drawing shirkers,
The lily-handed shirkers,
Should be exempt from toll?

The vital point at issue is, how wealth shall be divided—

Shall those whose sweat creates it say, and none be born to rule?

Or shall wage and life conditions by employers be decided,

And the toiler be a purchased thing, a profit-earning tool?

The right of all to labor,
The need of all to labor.

The blessedness of labor—

Free labor—let us teach,

And justice to our neighbor,

Our robbed and wounded neighbor,

Our long neglected neighbor,
Let's add to what we preach.

GEORGE HOWARD GIBSON.

PENN AND THE INDIANS.

William Penn, when he came to America, gave a most interesting account of the Indians whom he met.

"They are generally tall, straight, well built and of singular proportion," he said.

"They tread strong and clever,

and mostly walk with a lofty chin. Of complexion black, but by design, as the gypsies in England. They grease themselves with bear's fat clarified, and using no defense against sun and weather, their skins must needs be swarthy. Their eye is little and black. The thick lip and flat nose, so frequent with the East Indians and blacks, are not common to them; for I have seen as comely European-like faces among them of both sexes as on your side of the sea. And truly an Italian complexion hath not much more of the white, and the noses of several of them have not as much of the Roman.

"Their language is lofty," declared Penn, "yet narrow; but, like the Hebrew in signification, full. Like shorthand in writing, one word serveth in the place of three, and the rest are supplied in the understanding of the hearer; imperfect in their tenses, wanting in their moods, participles, adverbs, conjunctions, interjections. I have made it my business to understand it, that I might not want an interpreter on any occasion; and I must say that I know not a language spoken in Europe that hath more of sweetness or greatness, in accent and emphasis, than theirs.

"In liberality they excel," Penn said. "Nothing is too good for their friend. Give them a fine gun; coat or other thing, it may pass twenty hands before it sticks. Light of heart, strong affections, but soon spent. The most merry creatures that live. They feast and dance perpetually. They never have much nor want much. Wealth circulateth like the blood. All parts partake, and though none shall want what another hath, yet exact observers of property."—Chicago Daily News.

"FLESH OF OUR FLESH AND BONE OF OUR BONE."

An extract from an article in The Open Court for August, by the editor, Dr. Paul Carus.

Though we may be the strongest race and be in possession of the most accurate methods of science and also be blessed with the most liberal institutions, religious as well as political, we ought to recognize that other and weaker nations are flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone. They are our brothers and their social, political and religious life has developed according to the same laws and is bringing forth similar blossoms and similar fruits, and in spite of our boasted superiority we may still learn from them in many details, and if we want to teach them, we must not be too proud first to know them and appreciate the good qualities they have.

JOHN BURNS ON OUR METHODS WITH STRIKERS.

From an interview in Washington, as reported in the New York World of January 1, 1895.

Your government makes a great mistake when it thinks to decrease strikes by shooting down strikers or imprisoning their leaders. Such an incident as the imprisonment of Debs would be impossible in England, conservative as she is. Until the courts treat strike leaders with the same leniency they do trusts and syndicates, you cannot expect laboring men to respect the government.

INHERENT RIGHT.

What changes men? What settles great questions? Is it argument, war, or advice? In the last analysis it is none of these. The hopelessness, the futility of argument and advice is always apparent to experience, and war itself has never settled anything.

The burning questions of right or misconceptions of right which impel men to risk their lives in order that their views may prevail are never settled by force of arms. We yield to might, but convictions are not changed by might. Bullets are harmless when principles are at stake. No one is so foolish as to suppose that if a war for a great principle could end in ignominious failure, the principle would be affected by the result. The terms of capitulation at Appomattox did not settle the belief in men's minds. No body of men, whatever they may write on paper, or whatever force they may use to accomplish their ends, can affect or destroy a settled conviction. Though we may be compelled to abide by its results, mere force is a most efficacious agent, and argument and advice are only less so.

In all changes that take place in men and in society, there is a primary, individual force which must be taken into consideration, and which has little or no connection with argument, advice or the results of war. Since the foundation of the world there has been an Inherent Right that cannot be charged. The application of common sense to this fact creates the great individual force in the world that makes for progress in men and nations.

This is equally as true of the things which concern the individual alone as it is of those things which have to do with society as a whole and the progress of mankind. The common-sense application of right is more important to a young man than all the advice the world can give him. Nor will argument with the indolent be effective. A

man must have within himself a sense of Inherent Right, or success will be an impossibility, for this sense of Inherent Right carries with it the appreciation of industry, application, energy, and an un-sullied, determined, never-wavering aim.

From the more comprehensive point of view, common sense tells us that there is an Inherent Right in the people to govern themselves as they see fit; that there is an Inherent Right for each man to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. Yet over these two principles seas of blood have been spilled by men of all nations and all ages.

In the infancy of the world men were not able to appreciate the rudimentary principles of Right; but as the individual progressed toward an understanding of it, he slowly carried the world with him. History becomes, therefore, simply the record of men's progress toward the complete recognition of an absolute and Inherent Right, first by the individual, and then an acknowledgment of this Right by the body politic.—William Bittle Wells, in *The Pacific Monthly*.

HOW TO OBTAIN FULL INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM.

An abstract of the address made by Mr. John Z. White, of Chicago, at a dinner given by the Single Taxers of Cleveland, O., at the Euclid hotel, on Thursday evening, August 4, 1904.

Individual freedom is the aim of those who support the doctrines advocated by Henry George. Taxation is the practical means whereby they hope to realize his ideals. In both inspiration and method they claim to be conservative—that is, to be in accord with the tendencies which have prevailed in the civilization of which they are a part.

The glory of modern civilization—the feature by which it is distinguished from all others—is the fuller recognition of individual freedom that now obtains. And this is but another way of asserting the more extended destruction of privilege. Privilege is the curse of society. How to adjust ourselves to the physical facts of the world, and at the same time avoid privilege, is the problem.

In the three relations in which men live—the religious or spiritual, the political or governmental, the material or physical—individual freedom is, in the United States, nearly complete. The small interference with individual freedom that still obtains is, however, vital. The resulting condition is like that following an attempt to swim a torrent—failure, no matter how small the margin, is fatal.

In the religious or spiritual field, thanks to the struggles of our forefathers, every man may now worship God in accord with the dictates of his own conscience, or avoid worship, as he wills. In religion we have secured individual freedom. In the political or governmental field every man may vote equally with every other man. In political affairs we have secured equal individual freedom.

In the physical or material field, however, we have but partly secured individual freedom. Man must eat to live. To secure food he must (directly or indirectly) cultivate the earth. Two things are here involved—the cultivator and the thing cultivated; that is, labor and land. The first of these has been freed. No longer is man a serf or a slave in his body. But all the labor in the world cannot of itself produce one ounce of food. Therefore, individual freedom in religion, individual freedom in government, individual freedom of the person, are of but little worth to him from whose grasp the land is held. The modern rule of equal individual right obtains in religion, in government, and as to the person; but the ancient rule of aristocratic privilege still dominates our regulations as to land, without the use of which individual rights enumerated as secured are as joys that vanish with possession.

Henry George proposed nothing more nor less than to continue in the pathway that hitherto has led to the realization of the distinctive characteristic of the modern world—individual freedom. We believe that we are properly called conservatives. Equal religious rights, equal social rights, equal rights to labor, must be supplemented by equal rights to land.

But while the American people love freedom, they are also intensely practical, and very properly insist on knowing just how this result may be achieved. And just here is the greatness of Henry George revealed. Poet and seer though he was, he yet gave to practical detail that careful attention without which no great work was ever accomplished. The practical proposal is simplicity itself: Land and labor are the primary factors of all production. Land is owned by a comparatively few. The product is therefore divided between those who labor and those who own land. The portion going to labor is earned. The portion going to landlords is the value of privilege. Privilege is unjust legal advantage. George proposed to turn privileged values into the public possession by abolishing all taxes on labor or its products, and concentrating all taxes for public revenue upon the value of land.

As a mere matter of getting public revenue this system has every argument in its favor. But the thought that gives it vitality and power is that through it we will obtain, in the economic, as in the religious and political field, complete individual freedom.

DIRECT LEGISLATION IN OREGON.

For The Public.

Oregon has achieved the distinction, through its two statutes enacted last June by direct legislation, of being the first State in the Union to become, and exercise the prerogatives of, a pure democracy and thereby secure true political freedom.

The laws referred to were, one for direct primaries and one for liquor local option; and both were, as allowed by the initiative and referendum amendment of their State constitution, enacted by the people without the intervention of the Legislature.

The initiative petitions containing 8,500 signatures, which was about 1,500 more than the law required, were filed with the Oregon Secretary of State on the 5th of February, 1904. The election, which occurred on the 6th of last June, gave results as follows: For direct primaries, 56,205; against the same, 16,354; and for local option, 43,316; and against the same, 40,198. On the 24th of June the two laws, by proclamation of Gov. George E. Chamberlain, were declared to be "in full force and effect," both of them having received "an affirmative majority of the total number of votes cast on said measures."

The States of Utah and South Dakota have direct legislation amendments in their State constitutions, but Utah has as yet no enabling act to carry it into effect; and South Dakota, while it has an enabling act, has not as yet enacted any statute by initiative petition or demanded a referendum under the new amendment. The voters of South Dakota have thus far contented themselves with allowing their amendment to remain a dead letter except in its operation, which is an exceedingly important function, as a potential check on legislative misconduct. They as yet prefer to allow their amendment to stand (as *The Oregonian*, of Portland, last year declared their amendment stood in their State at that time) "as a safeguard in the people's hands against pernicious acts of an unworthy and a conniving governor."

In Oregon the direct legislation amendment to the constitution was adopted in June, 1902. "The first noticeable effect," says Hon. W. S. U'Ren, of Oregon City, in a late article in *The Arena* magazine, of Boston, "was a

large decrease in the number of paid lobbyists at the next session of the Legislative Assembly in January, 1903." Subsequently one of the circuit courts of Oregon declared the amendment unconstitutional, one of the grounds for the adverse decision being that it was in conflict with Section 4, Article 4, of the Constitution of the United States, guaranteeing to every State a republican form of government.

In December, 1903, the Supreme Court of Oregon reversed the decision of the lower tribunal and confirmed the validity of the amendment. Mr. U'Ren, regarding this action, says:

No more important or far-reaching decision has ever been rendered by any court in our country, nor any that more ably represents and sustains the American ideals of government. The court said in part: "Now, the initiative and referendum amendment does not abolish or destroy the republican form of government. The representative character of the government still remains. The people have simply reserved to themselves a larger share of legislative power, but they have not overthrown the republican form of government, or substituted another in its place."

Mr. U'Ren, in speaking of the bill for direct primaries, said it "is proposed by initiative petition because it is a more direct and certain method of obtaining the law than to wait for the Legislative Assembly, in which the party bosses have heretofore defeated all attempts to secure such a law." He continues:

So far as I can learn, the initiative and referendum is more popular with all classes in Oregon than it was two years ago. Capitalists and business men regard it as ample insurance against any revolutionary laws, socialistic or otherwise, which might be enacted by any political party that may obtain power, as well as affording a complete protection against any hasty, ill-advised or corrupt action of the legislative assembly. On the other hand, it is now demonstrated that the initiative gives the people power to propose and adopt or reject any reform laws that party bosses do not want or that politicians would fear to make in the legislative assembly, as well as furnishing a safe and practical method for reformers and agitators to get a decision directly from the people on their demands in the concrete form of a proposed law. The initiative and referendum is in the Oregon constitution to stay.

JAMES P. CADMAN.

Chicago.

Long-tailed Dog—Don't you get tired of everlastingly wagging that little stump of yours?

Stump-tailed Dog—No; it feels just as if the tail was all there, and I get just as much fun out of the exercise as you do, with a good deal less work—Chicago Tribune.

WHY JUDGE SEABURY WILL NOT VOTE FOR JUDGE PARKER.

Without fully indorsing the conclusions of the writer of the following letter, we reproduce it in full as an important and significant incident of the presidential campaign. The writer is Samuel Seabury, one of the judges of the City Court of New York city, and a Democrat of force, standing and deserved influence.

I shall not vote for Parker and Davis. The action of the convention in approving the crime committed in Illinois, the facts being clearly presented and being undisputed, showed that the convention preferred the rule of the political corruptionist rather than recognize that political conventions should be honestly conducted and that the majority should rule.

Judge Parker's persistent silence before he was nominated and his tricky telegram as soon as he had safely secured the nomination showed him to be an apt pupil of the political methods of David B. Hill. The deception to which Judge Parker and his friends resorted to secure the nomination and the repudiation of the compromises entered into in relation to the platform will, I believe, before the campaign is over, be made perfectly apparent. When the facts are appreciated they can excite no other feeling than disgust and contempt.

The convention was controlled by a union of monopoly and pro-slavery elements. It was impossible that any really democratic action could have proceeded from such a combination. Both the Republican and Democratic parties as at present constituted are controlled by plutocratic influences. The great corporations which depend for success upon special privileges, the existence of which impoverishes the masses, will in this campaign contribute impartially to both of the great political parties. No matter which party loses, monopoly is confident that it will win.

In the contest between Roosevelt and Parker no political issues are involved. It is a mere personal contest for place and power. This is the lowest plane upon which a political campaign can be fought.

The fact that Grover Cleveland and others who deserted the party when it became Democratic in 1896 are now in control of the party is a sure guarantee that the party will be administered for the benefit of a corrupt plutocracy, as it was during Cleveland's last administration.

The indictment which Mr. Bryan brings against the element which now

controls the Democratic party is in all respects true, and the fact that it is true shows that the party is unworthy of support. It seems to me unreasonable to assert that the Democratic party stands at present for policies which are destructive of free government, and at the same time to support that party upon the theory that the best way to reform a party is to intrust the plutocratic element in the party with the control of the government.

The best way to reform the party is to see to it, when it sells out to the plutocracy, as it has in this campaign, that it should go down to the defeat which it deserves. The Republican party stands for the same plutocratic influences which are behind Judge Parker, and for imperialism and militarism. There is no reason to believe that Judge Parker is any more opposed to imperialism and militarism than is President Roosevelt, but even if he is opposed to imperialism, and should be elected, no change in the present imperialistic policy could be secured without a similar change in the Senate, which cannot be secured in this election.

From my standpoint a choice of two evils is presented, and I shall choose neither. If Parker is defeated the Democratic party will be forced to adopt progressive and liberal democratic principles, or go out of existence and give place to some party which will give expression to these principles.

The principles are more important than the party. Mr. Watson, nominated by the People's party, is a worthy representative of the principles which I conceive to be truly democratic, and the adoption of which I believe to be essential to the preservation of democratic institutions in this country.

He is the only representative of these democratic principles in this campaign. I shall, therefore, cast my vote for him. I am informed that a full Watson electoral ticket will be nominated, and I believe it will receive a large vote.

FIGURES CAN'T LIE.

There lies before us—the word lies is used advisedly—The Tariff Handbook, compiled by the American Protective Tariff League, the association of grafters who have taught the Republican party to stand pat; a document largely devoted to showing the terrible effects of Democratic free trade.

In Eighteen Ninety-Three, says this voracious handbook, a terrible blight struck the country, to-wit, the election of Cleveland. And statistics follow to prove it.

The wheat crop of '91 was six hundred million bushels; the wheat crop of '92, five hundred and some odd millions. The farmers in '93 put in the same quota of seed on nearly as many acres, but they didn't know in their blindness that the tariff of '94 was going to ruin their crop; they stupidly failed to realize that this tariff, which was not passed, would shrivel and wither the kernels; the result was they reaped, because of this far reaching tariff, less than four hundred millions. The Handbook has figures to prove it.

Of cotton in '92 the crop was nine million bales. The trusting planters made ready for a like crop in '93. But the tariff of '94 got in ahead of the pickers for they raised but six million bales in the season of '93, because of this terrible tariff that sent out its baleful influence a year ahead of its passage.

More wonderful still, we find the effect on railroads preceding the cause by two years. For in 1891 some two thousand miles of railroads went into hands of receivers, which was about the normal amount. But it jumped to 10,000 miles in the year 1892— We quote the same Handbook's figures— because of the terrible tariff that was to be passed in two years. Even so far in advance the interest ate up the earnings. The next year, the year of the panic, almost thirty thousand miles went by default because of impending changes in tariffs, notwithstanding their earnings were only beginning to feel the effect of the shrinkage of crops. They foresaw the tariff amendments and slumped like a lot of lame ducks.

Look at the other picture. The effect of McKinley's election was not felt till '97. Then nature smiled again— wheat half a billion bushels on acres the same as before; and the year after that six hundred and some odd million bushels, on account of McKinley's election. Cotton production rose first to eight million bales and then to eleven million. Oh, it was wonderful what an affect on crops McKinley's election had.

One thing they don't explain— the panic of '73 came in Republican times, no Democrat anywhere round— unless perhaps it was caused by Tilden's election in Eighteen Seventy-Six. —Goodhue Co. News, of Red Wing, Minn.

THE HEART OF THE LABOR QUESTION.

This picturesquely rugged and very able exposition of the labor question is the work of Warren A. Reed, a typical son of New England, who has for years earned his living sometimes as a day laborer on Western railroads but mostly as a Western farm hand, and who has evidently found that hard laboring is not necessarily incompatible with clear thinking. Mr. Reed delivered his address before the Peoria (Ill.) Sunday Lyceum, which meets in the Council Chamber of the City Hall every Sunday afternoon at half past two. We reproduce it from the Peoria Star of March 3, 1904.

Any man who will look around him will notice this fact, that as a rule the people who do the hardest and the most disagreeable and the most necessary work in the world are the people who get the least to eat and the least to wear and live in the poorest houses. Now, when we take the fact into account that labor produces all wealth, it must be evident to anyone who has a decent heart and even a thimbleful of brains that there must be something radically wrong with an industrial system that would produce such a state of things. A great many people seem to think that when a final solution of this problem is found we shall have a sort of patchwork affair. They say that it will be found that no one faction or school of thought has got all of the truth.

Now, I take an entirely different view of this problem. I became convinced a good many years ago that everything in this universe was governed by fixed and unchanging law. I am, of course, referring to the laws of nature and not to the statute laws enacted by man. And, of course, I then became satisfied that political economy was no exception to the rule. It seems to me it ought to be evident to any man who possesses a logical mind that when we have discovered the true philosophy that it must be one where the different parts of it would fit together and mutually bound each other; that there would be nothing lacking or nothing left over, for truth cannot be discordant. The truth is, this problem is similar to a problem in mathematics. We can prove addition by subtraction and multiplication by division.

I put in two months' time studying George's book, "Progress and Poverty," and the point I was most particular about was to discover whether there was any part that failed to correlate with the other parts. And I claim for the single tax philosophy that we have the whole truth and that it will not be necessary to borrow anything from any other school of thought in order to

make a complete thing of it. Of course, in an article of this length it is impossible to cover the whole ground.

I will now state some of the economic laws that our philosophy is based on:

The law in regard to labor is that men "Seek to gratify their desires with the least exertion." If you find a man who is an exception to this rule, you want to look for him in some insane asylum and you want to look in the ward that is reserved for incurables.

The law in regard to wages is what a man can make off land that is below the no-rent line, on the theory that no man will consent to work for any other man for less than he could make by working for himself.

The law in regard to the value of land is "The superiority of any piece of land over land that can be had for nothing."

The law in regard to commodities is the well understood law of supply and demand, although I once heard of a populist who said that when his party got into power they would repeal that law.

Now these laws are all-compelling, and it would not strengthen them one bit if Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Bryan would consent to sign their names to them, neither would it weaken them a particle if the devil himself would attach his name to them. Now, what we want to do is to make our statute laws in conformity with them.

There are three factors to the production of wealth. They are land, labor and capital; land and labor being the primary ones; capital being the offspring of the other two. Now, of these three factors that I have mentioned, the laborer provides the labor, the capitalist furnishes the capital and God or Nature contributes the land. Now what the single taxer would like to know is, where does the land owner come in? The truth is, he is an entirely useless animal. Sometimes we are asked what we intend to do with him after we have deprived him of his power to live off of the labor of other people. This is a matter that we have not fully decided upon as yet, but we would, however, throw out merely a suggestion that he might try going to work.

In regard to the distribution of wealth, the portion that goes to land is called rent. The part that goes to capital is interest. The amount that goes to labor is wages. This being a vital point, I will state them again briefly: the three factors are land, labor and capital. The products are rent, interest and wages. As I have said before,

this is really a problem in mathematics and will have to be settled on that basis and not on a sentimental one.

We will not talk about dollars at present, but we will consider it as an example in proportion. I suppose all of you understand about the rules of proportion taught in the arithmetic. I never had the benefit of anything but a common school education, but I was very much interested when I was a boy in the rule of proportion, and it has been a great advantage to me since I became a man and have taken an interest in economics. After we get this all figured out, I find that the share that goes to the active factor—namely, the laborer—in the production of wealth is something magnificent. That is one of the reasons why a man like myself who performs common labor for a living can generally be found every morning riding to work in an automobile. But I will come back again to the main question.

I suppose every man understands arithmetic (even the most stupid) well enough to know that 100 per cent. is all there is of anything. If Tom, Dick and Harry are in partnership and Tom's share keeps getting larger and larger, it is evident to anyone that the shares of one or both of the others must grow less and less. Now, if any one will look around him in this country of ours, either in the city or the rural districts, he will notice that the landlord's share keeps rising all the time. This is caused by the increase in population and improvements and, in short, everything that goes to make up civilization; and as the landlord is of no use to anyone, but is simply a parasite, I believe it would be best to make some different arrangements than the system we are living under at present. I know what I am talking about, for I have worked a portion of my time in those parts. At least two-thirds of the farmers in the best portion of this State are renters, and not land owners. The men who own that land are living in the towns and enjoying all the advantages of civilization, but a more useless lot of people never cumbered the earth. And if we consider it in the city it is still worse, because in the rural districts no ordinary man is likely to make enough off of the increase of land values to make him a millionaire, while any amount of men in the cities have succeeded in doing it. And in the mining districts, it is as bad or worse; in fact, we are making this fight against landlordism of every descrip-

tion. I did think when the Anthracite Coal Miners' strike was on perhaps it would knock a little sense into the heads of the people. I noticed that a great many of the newspapers at the time made considerable sport of Mr. Baer because he claimed to be in partnership with the Almighty, but I always thought it was a harmless delusion on his part. What I considered the serious thing about it was that the laws of our country had decided that those mines should be private property, but I will say that there is no more reason for denying the right of private property in coal fields than there is any other kind of land.

Now, this shows where the fruit of the laboring man's toil is going to. Under our present economic system we are compelled to support a lot of good for nothing drones and the fact is we are powerless to help ourselves as individuals; but we could easily do it at the ballot box collectively, if laboring men, speaking of them as a whole, had sufficient intelligence to do it; but when I look around me and consider what a wonderfully intelligent man the average laboring man is, I ask myself the question, "Have I got to wait until I can get a majority of these lunkheads before I can get what I desire?"

But let us take a view from the moral side of the question in regard to private property in land. If what we contend for is wrong from a moral standpoint, we ought not to succeed, no matter how desirable it might be, for some reasons. According to the single tax philosophy, in order for anything to be rightfully private property the title must emanate from the original producer. Of course this would include all the products of labor, but would not include land of any description.

I have felt much encouraged since the socialist movement started up, not that I take any stock in their doctrines, for their ideas and ours never could be blended, but because it gives the single taxer the advantage of position as between them and the people who would uphold the present system. There is something amusing to me about the situation, for if any man tries to put up a fight against socialism, he is compelled to take the same position that the single taxer does. One reason why socialism has made such progress as it has is because the present system is such a wretchedly immoral one that no matter how preposterous the claims of the socialist might be they could not possibly be

any worse than the present system as far as injustice is concerned. The fact is, it seems to me, that the man who would stand up before an audience and defend our present system of private property in land would sell his mother's grave-stone or pasture her grave if there was any profit in it. I believe he would have to possess the heart of a snake and the conscience of a hyena.

In regard to the power that the ownership of land gives a man, let us suppose a small number of men were on an island from which there was no escape, and suppose one of their number owned the land of that island. Now, we claim that he would have as much power over the rest of them as he would have if they were his chattel slaves, for he would have the power to demand of them in rent for the use of the land all but enough for a bare subsistence, and if they were his slaves he would be compelled to allow them that much for his own advantage. In this case the men's necessities would take the place of the slave drivers' whip.

Some people seem to think that the private ownership of land must be right because it is quite an old institution. Chattel slavery, polygamy and several other abominable institutions have been pretty old, but they never were right. The truth is the private ownership of land is nothing more or less than a system of legalized robbery, causing one man to get without producing and another man to produce without getting. There are some things that belong to you, some things that belong to me and some things belong to all of us. The value of land is one of those things that belong to all of us. Why? Because in the first place it was a free gift from God or Nature presumably to all of us and not to a few. For the next reason, because the value that attaches to land is a creation of the community as a whole and not of the individual who has possession of the land. On the other hand the products of labor are rightfully private property because they are not the gift of nature but are the fruits of man's labor. Of course when we say that labor produces wealth, we mean that man by his labor transforms matter that has been in existence for all eternity, for all we know to the contrary, into various shapes by moulding, combining, dividing, and so on. As far as actually creating a particle of matter, we are well aware of the fact that if he labored for all

eternity he could not create the tiniest mote that floats.

In regard to the trusts, the way to make them harmless is to take the special privileges that they enjoy from them. Those special privileges consist of the private ownership of land and a protective tariff. To take away the tariff and leave the land system as it is would do but very little good, for some of them are not buttressed by a protective tariff at all. No matter how great a combination of capital we might have it could do no harm if the land monopoly element was absent. We contend their feet must rest, "Antaeus like," on the ground for them to be able to do any harm; for instance, suppose a number of capitalists owned all the steel mills in the country and then suppose your humble servant owned all the coal and iron mines available. Who do you suppose would be the master of the situation? The truth is that factories can be multiplied indefinitely, but it would be a pretty big contract for a man to undertake to multiply coal and iron mines, would it not? The truth is, there is no comparison between property in land and property in the products of labor, and when these people write their essays on the struggle between capital and labor and either ignore the land altogether or else classify it with capital, treating both factors as capital, it is of no more benefit than a refrigerator would be at the North Pole. If we attempt to solve any problem, we must take all factors into consideration and we must keep them in their proper order.

In regard to our practical proposition, we propose to leave the land in the hands of its present owners, but they will be required to pay the yearly rental value of the land over to the government. I have had some men intimate to me that they would not care to own quite all of God's creation under such a system.

In regard to the opinions of laboring men generally on these questions, I often think on Labor Day, when I see the hosts of labor marching, if you could only use your brains as well as you can your legs how easy this problem would be of solution. I often wish I could have been present when the first man sold another man a piece of land. Certainly the one who sold the land must have seen something green in the other man's eye, or he would not have made such a proposition to him. I should have thought he would then have offered to sell him the right to breathe the air and enjoy the

sunlight. It certainly would have been no greater outrage on natural rights. The vision of some people is obscured in regard to the truth on account of the division of labor, and so many occupations in a highly developed state seem to have no direct connection with the land, but first principles have never been changed or abrogated.

The same thing is true of the industrial structure that is true of a very tall building, that no matter how high the super-structure may be reared, the foundation must rest on the ground; for it is as true to-day, as it was in primitive times, that in the last analysis all wealth is produced by the application of human labor to natural resources. We harbor no delusions; again and again will the truth be overborne, but, although the friends of privilege may turn back the hands on the dial, they cannot stay the sun in its course, and, in spite of all discouragements, we keep bravely hoping for the dawning of the day when the right of all God's children to the use of the earth will be no longer the mere dream of the enthusiast, but the realized and accomplished fact.

SOCIAL PROGRESS.

Speech of Louis F. Post in a symposium on "Social Progress" at the commencement exercises at Ruskin College, Glen Ellyn, Ill., Monday, June 27, 1904.

Men who are in the whirlpool of social disturbance at any time in the world's history, cannot know whether the world is at that time progressing or not. Living generations never know whether their social disturbances are carrying them forward or turning them backward. All they are positively aware of is the disturbance. They cannot be sure of its tendency; they can only infer.

And their inferences are not always rational. When social motion lifts one's own interests to the top, he naturally fancies that the disturbance implies social progress. But if the social motion jostles him "out of the swim," he as naturally fancies that it implies social decadence. It is the same with one's pet reforms. If our own theories of reform happen to be tossed up into popularity, we think the world is progressing because our cause seems to be winning. But if our theories happen to be submerged, our cause seems to be losing and we think there is no God in Israel.

Let us not be deceived by appearances. A sailing yacht is none the less truly moving forward though it turns from its course to beat against the

wind. Driftwood floating down the Mississippi is just as surely on its way to the great southern gulf when it follows the river's current around a bend and toward the north as when it turns another bend and floats toward the south. The piston rod of a locomotive drives the iron horse forward as truly by its backward as by its forward stroke. And so with social phenomena. We must never be swift to infer from any backward social motion that the social movement is backward. Rational inferences depend upon further circumstances, upon wider observation, upon clearer thought.

Considered simply in themselves, most of the social phenomena of our day discourage inferences of social progress. Do you doubt it? Bear with me then while I sketch in broad outline a picture of our social life. Don't be quick to exclaim "Pessimist!" if the picture irritates you. He is not the dangerous pessimist who reminds you of bad social conditions in order to urge you to change them. The dangerous pessimist is he who falsely tells you there are no such conditions or that they are passing away. And it will make little difference to you in the end, whether he tells you this because he is a lighthearted fool who doesn't know any better, or because he is a designing confidence man to whom those conditions are useful as a trap. I am no pessimist. What I am about to describe, disheartening as it may seem, makes my heart throb with optimistic pulsations; for I see in it something of that reactionary social motion from which I think experience justifies us in inferring a forward social movement.

I cannot better indicate social conditions than by recalling a curious novel which I read several years ago. I do not remember its name and I have forgotten its story. All I recall about it is its picture of reaction in this country from a condition of virtual equality of rights and opportunity to one in which a few were masters and the many had to serve or be shot.

This picture as I remember it portrayed a gradual spread of involuntary poverty, and a concurrent acquisition of power by a few designing men. These tendencies grew until the whole country had been divided into great dukedoms whose owners ruled the inhabitants with arbitrary will and a rod of iron.

Yet our political institutions had not been overthrown. There were still

presidents and congresses and governors and legislatures; and the people voted with the same nominal freedom as before. But voters dared not vote against the interests of the great land-owning dukes of Ohio and Illinois and New York. Through ownership of most of the land of the country, those monopolists owned everything upon it—including the citizens themselves and their citizenship. As to presidents and congresses and governors and legislatures, these obsequious functionaries were as obedient to the impudent commands of the unofficial dukes of our country as ever was French parliament when summoned by absolute king to bed of justice.

That novel seemed fanciful to me in my younger days. But it seems so no longer. And I do myself the justice of believing that it is not I that have changed, except that I know a little more, but that the conditions which that novelist saw then and logically worked out in his imagination have gone far toward working themselves out in actual experience.

Think of the degrading poverty of our great cities, and see how it is invading our smaller towns. Consider how the tramp has become a type within 30 years, and is more of a problem instead of less as time passes on. Remember that 40 years ago the beggars of New York city were foreign born, and that native poverty of the degrading sort was hardly known. Our criminal prisons then were filled for the most part with foreigners, and most of our degrading poverty and crime was accounted for by reference to the unthrift of our immigrants. All this is changed, and not for the better. If poverty and crime were really due to immigration and could be checked by restrictive laws, we should have more need now for immigration detectives between here and heaven than between here and Europe.

During the period of this change which that novel portrayed, there has been the correlative change. The darkening shadow of monopoly millionairism has brought on an eclipse, at least a partial eclipse, of our free institutions. With fearful poverty on the one hand and unbridled power on the other, there has come a regime of servility and despotism.

Reflection upon the political and economic changes in this country for the past two decades will convince any impartial intelligence that the novel I have referred to was far from fanciful. Even the dukedoms, though

not here in name, are now here in fact. Who governs Pennsylvania? Who governs California? Who governs West Virginia? Who governs Colorado? Who governs any of the States in which Providence has created great natural opportunities? Not the civil officials, not the voters, not even the politicians; but a few men who have secured control of the ownership of these natural opportunities and of the railway franchises that command their utilization. At first the monopolists were timid and sly. That was so when the novel I have recalled was written. They have now become bold and domineering. This signals the progress of their power.

Would you see a small working model of this regime in full operation? Turn your eyes, then, to Colorado. There you behold a country on the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains richly endowed by nature with mineral deposits. Nature neglected to affix to these deposits the business card of any man or combination, but what nature thus neglected the law has wrongfully supplied. I say wrongfully, because if it be true that the only excuse for civil law is to preserve equality of rights, then was civil law without excuse when it disinherited the people of Colorado. It was thereby wrested from its legitimate purpose to serve the interests of monopoly; and now nearly all these rich deposits, and the railway franchises that control their connection with the markets of the world, belong to a few corporations—over which a few men are dictators. Without their permission no one can extract ore from these natural deposits and swap it for bread. They thus command the natural sources of livelihood of Colorado miners. And through this ownership has come despotism. Law has been overthrown by its sworn administrators, and the owners of the mines of the State of Colorado are the State of Colorado.

The officials tell us that they have acted dictatorially only to put down lawlessness on the part of some members of a trade union. That is the Governor's apology when he comes upon a visit to our own Illinois, a State which has not yet fallen wholly into the power of supra-legal corporations. But it makes no difference what apology they have to offer for subverting law in the name of law; the vital question is whether or not they have done it.

That they have done it admits of no denial, and none is made. If you want a circumstantial account from the pen of an impartial investigator, go to McClure's Magazine for May, 1904,

and read Ray Stannard Baker's report. But let me tell you the story briefly.

When the mine owners became autocratic, the miners organized unions to meet organization with organization, power with power. A fight followed—carried on by the miners, at first at any rate, with the ballot. But it was an unequal fight. The mine owners were able to say among themselves: "Let us own the mines of Colorado and we care not who does the voting nor how he votes."

At first the miners secured an eight-hour law from the legislature. But the Supreme Court nullified it as unconstitutional. Then the miners appealed to the people for a constitutional amendment, and the people granted it by an overwhelming majority. But the new legislature, bribed by the mine owners, violated both their official oaths and their campaign pledges by neglecting to execute this mandate of the people; and the Governor refused to call them in special session to perform that official duty. The miners then went on strike.

There was violence on both sides, but there was no violence with which the local civil authorities could not and did not cope. It was no greater in lawlessness than the crimes that are common in any community, no worse in character than those which are familiar to frontier communities. But at the behest of the mine owners the Governor declared the strike regions in a state of insurrection and placed the military in absolute control.

The State was without funds for this purpose, but the mine owners' organization supplied the funds. The military, instead of attempting to suppress disorder impartially, took its orders from the mine owners' association. One of the captains, put in military charge of a whole strike district, was also the manager of one of the associated mines in that district.

Among other things, this mine-owners' militia captain arrested the president of the Western Federation of Miners. He preferred no charge against this labor union official, but held him in custody by sheer force of his military authority. When the courts ordered his release under that time-honored implement of liberty, the writ of habeas corpus, the military defied the courts. Then the matter was carried to the highest court of the State, on the bench of which there sat men whose affiliations raise against them at least a reasonable shadow of suspicion. Two of these judges overruled the third and refused to release the prisoner. It would

have been the same if he had been under sentence of death, for the judges said so. They decided in substance that the mere declaration by the governor that insurrection exists anywhere in the State, whether the declaration be true or false, makes him an absolute dictator in that locality—a dictator so absolute that he may destroy property without cause, deprive citizens of their liberty without charges, execute innocent prisoners without trial; and yet that the courts cannot interfere.

This is a dictatorial prerogative, which it is doubtful if the emperor of Germany would be allowed to exercise, and which the king of England certainly does not possess. It makes any mine-owners' governor of Colorado a czar. Even a popular election could not displace him. Only a popular revolution could avail.

Having received that astounding authority from two of the three Supreme Court judges, this mine-owners' governor of Colorado gave the troops carte blanche in the strike region, and right royally did they exercise their dictatorial power. Professing to preserve order, they merely obeyed the commands of the mine-owners' organization. In doing this they supported a mine-owners' mob in gutting the co-operative stores of the miners' union, and in destroying the printing plant of the union newspaper. They also supported the mine-owners' committee in forcing civil officials to resign. These officials had been duly elected by the ballots of the people and were charged with no offense known to the law, either of malfeasance, misfeasance or non-feasance, but they were forced by this mine-owners' committee to resign, on pain of instant death, and for no other purpose than to make vacancies into which the employes of the mine-owners' organization were thrust. Instead of preventing this most audacious disturbance of law and order, the military aided and abetted it and recognized the unlawful appointees as legitimate officials.

Though the military supported that manifest subversion of the law, making no arrests of its perpetrators, they arrested and deported miners by wholesale, and upon no other charge than that of being members of a union. More than this, they forced a peaceably conducted mine to shut down for no other alleged reason than that it employed union men. In this mine there had been no strike. Its business had been peaceably and lawfully conducted throughout the whole strike period.

But it was operating in competition with the mines of the mine-owners' organization. That organization wanted it closed and the obedient military officers in command therefore ordered it to close.

How do you like this Colorado model of monopoly despotism in active operation? You may be sure that the picture is not overdrawn. The regular newspaper reports bear it out in every particular, though editorial pages are silent; and nothing has been urged in refutation except the immaterial fact, immaterial even if it be a fact, that labor unionists were committing lawless acts. If they were, there were laws to reach them and these should have been enforced. Let it be even conceded that a military dictatorship was made necessary by lawlessness of unions in a controversy with their employers, and still it was incumbent upon the dictator to preserve order; to protect property, and to respect personal rights—in the interest of all. He stands condemned, even as a lawful dictator, of overriding the laws of property and liberty in the interest and at the command of the mine-owners' organization.

But can we concede the lawfulness of this Colorado dictatorship, can we concede even its necessity, when we find it acting under the control of the associated owners of the mineral deposits of Colorado,—can we concede this without trembling for the liberties not only of Colorado but of our common country? Colorado is but a pioneer State in monopolistic aggression. She has gone only a little farther in the direction in which all the other States and the Union itself are going. Though it happens that in no other State have the despotic purposes and methods of monopoly been so frankly unmasked and the extent of their power been so completely exposed, yet the advance of the monopolistic revolution is everywhere apparent. To point this out in detail would require too much time, but intelligent observers who look farther than their noses may easily see it.

Unless you belong to that class of deceived or deceitful optimists who though they have eyes see not and boast of it, you need no guide to show you the trend of things. You can see for yourselves that this "gem of the ocean," this "land of the free," this beloved country of ours, is fast becoming what the mining regions have already become—the absolute private property of a few persons. You can see for yourselves that its inhab-

itants, like those of Europe in feudal times, are fast dividing into two classes: a small but powerful landed class, and a large but weak and timid class of landless tenants and laborers. The principal difference is that our landed class own their land largely through corporations, and that our landless class have votes—which they don't know how to use. Were Colorado to adopt this warning motto to the other States, "As I am now you soon must be," there would be nothing misleading in the doleful sentiment.

And observe, I beg you, that this lawlessness in Colorado is no riotous struggle between parties or factions, in which one has enlisted the power of the State. It is no hot-blooded conflict between angry strikers and angry employers, in which the latter have gained an advantage through the militia. It has none of the characteristics of ephemeral popular passion. If it had, we might think of it as lovers think of their quarrels. But this overturning of law and order by the State officials themselves has been done at the command of the mining corporations. With premeditation and calculation, calmly, deliberately, coldly and relentlessly they have caused it, for the purpose, not of winning a strike merely, but of testing popular forbearance. Their unconcealed purpose is to overthrow the Republic and build a despotic government upon its ruins. Democratic government has failed in Colorado, so their agents openly say, and a stronger government must take its place. It is this revolutionary spirit of monopoly that makes the situation in Colorado so peculiarly alarming.

But make no pessimistic mistake. All this does not necessarily imply social decadence. The social motion is indeed backward, but the social movement of which it is part may nevertheless be forward. To me, at any rate, there is more to hope for in such great backward manifestations, discouraging and alarming though they be in themselves, than in all the little manifestations of progress which side-parties in politics and segregated reform associations are able to show. Notwithstanding that in themselves the great social phenomena of our time give little encouragement to infer social progress, those phenomena take on a different aspect when we consider them in the light of wider experience and closer observation.

The greatest of all allegories illustrates the truth that social progress may spring from victories against social progress. When the devil accomplished the expulsion of Adam, and Eve from Eden, it was a victory for him and a

seeming disaster to the human race. But without it there could have been no progress. Though man thereby lost the innocence of ignorance, he was set free to gain intelligent righteousness.

The Christian gospels give the same assurance. What could have seemed darker and more hopeless to the disciples of Jesus than treachery and crucifixion as the climax of his career? How that must have blasted their hopes and shocked their faith. Yet it was ancient paganism rather than the Nazarene that died on the cross at Calvary.

All history teaches the same lesson. Out of the most disheartening reactions against social progress have come its most notable advances. The accession of Charles II., for instance, was a return to absolutism, but it revived the spirit of British liberty and reacted in the establishment of the British constitution. Nor need we look abroad nor far back in history for instances of reactionary social motion promoting a forward social movement. When the British soldiery at Boston fired into a patriot mob, their fusillade killed more than the victims. It killed American love for the mother country, and thereby made Bunker Hill, Saratoga and Yorktown possible. Behold, too, the fugitive slave law of the '50's leading on to the emancipation proclamation and the thirteenth amendment of the '60's.

So out of the very magnitude and boldness of such episodes as the Colorado reaction there may flash a light that will lighten all the dense darkness of American thought. The contest in this country is not between lawless mobs and law-abiding citizens and officials; it is not between employers and hired men; it is not between organized and unorganized workers; it is not between labor and capital in any fundamental sense of those terms. The great contest in this country, the contest that is now on and of which the Colorado usurpation is a startling episode, is a struggle for mastery by legal privilege over equality of legal rights. Let this truth be once grasped by our people, and American monopoly is doomed. Let them once grasp this truth, and we shall no longer have a country fostering conditions that make for monopoly and serfdom. We shall then have a country of equal legal protection as to person and property, of equal legal rights as to natural opportunities, and of order under law and law according to order.

In my judgment the most encouraging sign of progress in that direction

is this reaction in Colorado. It is better adapted than any other fact of which I know, to enlighten the public mind as to the revolutionary purpose and defiant methods of monopoly. It is like a flash of light in the face of an imperilled sleeper,—an imperilled sleeper who needs not so much to be told what to do as to be awakened and told what to look at. In the very excesses of social reaction I see some of the strongest assurances of social progress.

A PROCLAMATION.

O, citizens of Lhassa, for about a thousand years

We have had to let you go it all alone,
With your bossy lot of prophets and your
lazy lot of seers

And your tubby little idols made of stone.
We were busy in the basement while you
idled on the roof,

But we've tidled up the intervening floors.
And you'll have to drop the notion you
can hold yourselves aloof,

For across the Himalayas something
roars: "Get busy!"

You will have to try the trolley, and the
auto on the way.

And we like the looks of Lhassa for some
links;

So you'd better get some golf clubs and be
learning how to play,

And be smoothing out your antiquated
kinks.

You must get the latest fashions, and be
civilized in dress,

We will show you how to form a trust
as well;

And you'd better read the papers on "The
Way to Win Success,"

For across the Himalayas comes the
yell: "Get busy!"

There's a clinking in the valley, there's a
clatter on the hill,

There's a racket on the mountain and
plateau—

It's your Modern Progress coming, and you
have to pay the bill,

And expense accounts for that are never
low.

You must drop your ancient customs,
though you say you like them best,

You must cut adrift from prayer wheels
and all—

You must quit this thing of living in a
constant state of rest,

For across the Himalayas comes the call:
"Get busy!"

O, citizens of Lhassa, a thousand years
or so

We have let your little llama live alone
With his curious delusion he was running
all the show,

With his tubby little idols made of stone.
But we've finally arranged it so that we
could take your case,

And we've downed your ancient wall and
heavy gate.

So you'll please to get in training—we are
here to set the pace,

And we want to civilize you while you
wait. Got busy!

—W. D. Nesbit, in Chicago Tribune, of
Aug. 19.

Some Scotchmen were dining, and
after the toasts each contributed some-

thing to the entertainment. Dr. McDonald was pressed to sing, but protested that he could not. "My voice is altogether unmusical," he explained. "I never sing." The company thought the doctor very modest, and insisted. "Very well," he said at last. Long before he had finished his audience was uneasy. There was a painful silence as the doctor sat down, broken at length by the voice of a braw Scot at the end of the table. "Mon," he exclaimed, "your singin's no up to much, but your veracity's just fine!"—Woman's Journal.

"Jessie, I have told you again and again not to speak when older persons are talking, but wait until they stop."

"I've tried that already, mamma. They never do stop."—Woman's Journal.

"The musical critic is kicking because he has two big concerts in addition to the grand opera."

"But I didn't expect him to do the opera—the fashion editor will cover that."—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

"A man expects to be illicted prisdint iv th' United States, Hinlissy, f'r th' fine qualities that th' r-rest iv us use only to keep out iv th' pinitinchry."—F. P. Dunne.

BOOKS

THE NEW EDITION OF BUCKLE'S GREAT WORK.

The mere fact that a new edition of Henry Thomas Buckle's "Introduction to the History of Civilization in England" has appeared is a welcome announcement, showing an abiding appreciation of a work that is destined to be, as Thucydides said of his own history, "a possession forever."

No matter whether Buckle's main contentions be accepted or not, there is more than enough of insight and genius in this learned and brilliant fragment to make it for all time a book that will live. When most of what passes for literature is gone, this book will continue to enlighten the minds of those who ponder the ways of men and value truth. If there were nothing else in it but the exposition of the "protective spirit," this alone would be enough to make it a great book.

To see clearly the conception of the "protective spirit" in contrast with the conception of the "democratic spirit" is to see the one supreme irrepressible conflict of the ages. More and more in our day the contrast is becoming emphasized. It is the great fight: on the one side, oppression, privilege and aristocracy, more



THE ISSUES FOR THE CAMPAIGN.

U. S.—Now, see here: I want these twin questions settled before another thing is attended to!

or less softened by a fitful benevolence, which superciliously seeks to "protect the masses;" and on the other side, freedom, equality and democracy, built upon the one idea of justice, which shall put all men upon an equality not only in politics but in the chances for livelihood and self-development. To see clearly the line of conflict is the beginning of action, and it is for this reason that Buckle's recognition of the "protective spirit" is so important a contribution to historical thought.

As to this new edition, issued in this country in one volume of 900 pages by E. P. Dutton & Co., New York, at \$3, it is necessary to say that the type, while clear, is too small. The volume cannot therefore be commended. It is folly for one to buy a poor edition of a book of permanent value. It is far more satisfactory to wait and save the necessary amount for a good edition, and in the long run it is more economical. Good editions of standard works always have a market, while poor editions become worthless.

J. H. DILLARD.

PERIODICALS.

Ernest Untermann's *Ethics of Historical Materialism*. In the *International Socialist Review* for August, is well worth reading for its compact and lucid exposition of the ethics of scientific socialism. The letters of a porkpacker's stenographer, in the same issue, are both readable and real.

Martha Baker Dunn's description in the August Atlantic of her experiences, psychological and otherwise, as a "reformeress," is as interesting a production as is often

found in any of the magazines; and it is sane and wholesome, as well as interesting. "Unpunished Commercial Crime" is another good paper in this Atlantic.

—The summer number of the *Single Tax Review* is the best issue of that publication which has yet appeared. It is coming rapidly to justify its mission as the organ of the movement whose name it has adopted. It collects with considerable fullness the news of the movement as an organ should, and is interesting as well, which organs sometimes fail to be.

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. Familiarly with *The Public* will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

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

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

ATTORNEYS.

HENRY B. TAWRESEY,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
213 South Sixth Street,
PHILADELPHIA.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.,
90 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call 404 Corlandt, Rooms Hill-Mia.
NEW YORK.

CONTRACTORS.

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