

# The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1904.

Number 348.

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 leading commonwealth of New England, home of Harvard, with more college men to the square mile than any State of the Union, has elected to its highest office an ex-shoemaker and a present maker of shoes.

When a thousand men in Massachusetts who might have adorned the gubernatorial chair were fitting themselves in school for a college training that was to follow, this man was pegging shoes. If he had gone to college, he would not have posted the State with pictures of himself as a boy pegging shoes, for he would have acquired better taste than to parade his past career in such fashion; but — he probably would never have been governor of his State.

How came it about that this Democrat was elected against such heavy odds? Of course he is a man of energy and good business ability. His success as a maker and seller of shoes shows this. But there are thousands of energetic, wise business men in Boston and other cities of Massachusetts. What elected this man? There seem to be two reasons that stand out above other minor reasons.

For one thing this employer of labor has always been open, fair, and square in dealing with employees, retaining, moreover, from his humble beginning a sympathetic attitude towards workingmen. This attitude was shown when he was in the legislature, where he always stood on the side of bills

that were in the interest of the laboring masses.

But chiefly, it seems clear that Douglas's election was due to his brave, frank, business-like presentation of the tariff issue as it is best seen in his own State. During the whole campaign, throughout the country, at a time when the tariff should have been the leading issue, the best speech on the subject, because it was the most honest speech on the subject, was made by Douglas. It was clear, and it was forcible, coming from the heart as well as the head of the man. He believed in what he said. He had something to say, which he knew by experience.

When Douglas told the people the folly of the tariff laws as they applied to problems which they could understand, he told it with an earnestness that carried conviction. He showed furthermore that it was a principle rather than a personal advancement that he was earnest about, a fact which had been already proved by his offer to run second on the ticket rather than first. This combination of a brave, earnest man, with a clear-cut issue bravely met, won the day.

From all accounts it seems likely that the new governor of Massachusetts will make an honest and creditable executive; but we fear Harvard is glad that her ancient custom of conferring LL.D. on each succeeding chief magistrate of the Commonwealth has already been abandoned.

Certain "safe and sane" Democrats of the Atlantic seaboard are reported to be again secretly combining to fasten the Democratic organization in the clutches of plutocracy. Let these men make no mistake about the kind of

reception their agents and wire-pullers will get if again they come into a Democratic national convention as they came into that at St. Louis five months ago. The sweeping vote for Roosevelt means something, and it doesn't mean that Roosevelt is especially popular. It means that the Democratic voters of the country did at the polls what their true representatives could not do in the convention. The plutocratic Democrats were doomed from the start, in spite of their control of the convention; and election day sealed their doom. They bought a party convention, but the party itself did not go with the bargain. The "safe and sane" plutocrats cannot again control a Democratic convention. Their day has gone by. The Democratic party has shaken itself.

Apropos of the meeting of the Federation of Labor in San Francisco the Star of that city, a paper whose praise is a guarantee, pays a high compliment to Samuel Gompers as a leader. "But above all," says the Star, "and standing out in bold relief, is this one great and grand fact: He is incorruptible. He cannot be bribed nor cajoled. The lust of office (which has so frequently been tendered him) is dead within him. Other men, prominent in the labor movement, have surrendered their leadership when opportunity for office came their way, but not so Sam Gompers." It seems strange, but it is true, that the highest thing that can be said for a public man to-day is that he cannot be bribed.

Most persons who are intelligently and disinterestedly concerned about the education of the deaf, will approve the action of the Chicago school board in favor of establishing the oral system in the Normal School. Their action

was opposed by advocates of the combined system of oral speech and manual signs. The idea of "combination" is plausible, but it does not bear examination. Deaf people who speak only by manual signs are pretty certain to have their thinking modified by those signs. The influence against abstract thought becomes exceedingly strong. And this influence is intensified by the fact that they are forced to associate mentally only with persons who understand the sign language. There is therefore a trend toward the creation of a deaf and dumb people with a deaf and dumb civilization, if the sign language alone be taught. When it is taught in connection with oral speech, it becomes an additional and useless study; and what is worse, the fact that the sign language is much more easily acquired by the deaf than oral speech, invites the deaf to fall into a habit of preferring the former and losing ground in practicing the latter. Thus the combination system tends to become nearly if not quite as objectionable as the sign system alone. The best system, for many obvious reasons, is the system which best makes the deaf like unto other people, and that is the system of oral speech exclusively.

#### THE BLOT IN THE SOUTHOEON OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

At this time, when universities and colleges are settling down to another year's course, it may be well to consider for a moment the question of their attitude and influence in regard to problems of social welfare and progress, as involved in the spread of democratic ideals.

We may take it for granted that in special subjects such institutions are doing their work with zest and energy. Whether it be in Latin syntax, or in biology, or in medieval history, professors are guiding their classes according to the most approved modern methods. Laboratories and libraries are well equipped, and students are brought to first-hand sources of investigation and knowledge. In the conduct of the specific work

done there is no apparent cause for criticism.

In what, then, is there any cause for criticism? Is there any reason for feeling that the influences of higher education are out of line with the higher aspirations for a better civilization than now prevails? Is there such a feeling? Do the men who have ideals for true democracy and juster conditions—the prophets of today—do such men feel that the influences of great institutions of learning are on the whole making for the advancement of the social betterment of which they dream and for which they work?

There is undoubtedly in the colleges a prevailing sentiment in favor of what is called good government. Probably nine-tenths of the college men believe, for example, in civil service reform, and abhor boodle and bribery. They want to see clean administrations, and are generally found in opposition to political rings and bossism. In local elections they are not likely to be bound by party regularity, and are ready to support independent movements.

But the question we have asked goes deeper. It concerns not so much the administration of things as they are—important as this is, so far as it goes—but rather the rejection of things as they are. It concerns not the good administration of slavery, but the abolition of slavery. It is not a question of management but of ideals. Can the influences of the institutions of higher education be felt to be on the side of the ideals of genuine democracy—those ideals which received their classic expression in the Declaration of Independence? We fear not, and it seems worth while to ask why.

Some will at once say that the cause lies in the question of endowments; that colleges, needing money, are naturally, and perhaps unconsciously, warped in favor of the monopolistic classes that stand for things as they are. Undoubtedly this feeling has its influence, but it is by no means the most potent. The cause lies rather in the nature of the internal influences which the colleges, in obedience to the spirit of the age, are instilling into the minds of young men. It is of utmost im-

portance that some of these influences should be recognized and considered.

If one has listened to or read the addresses made to young men in college, and will think a moment of the dominant note of these addresses, he will find that it has been an appeal to personal ambition. College men have it preached to them on all occasions that they are to make the most of themselves. This would not be harmful if they were not at the same time made to understand that it means simply personal ambition for getting ahead of their fellows in the race of life. They are taught that they must be the elect leaders.

This is in conformity with the accepted spirit of modern scientific philosophy, which makes the survival of the fittest its golden rule and applies the test of biology to the higher life of humanity. It is the spirit that says, succeed, succeed. It minimizes faith in ideals and ignores the disposition, if need be, to suffer for any positive truth. It is the spirit that would smile at the injunction of an old-time prophet, who advised young men to find out some unpopular cause and espouse it. We can hardly imagine such an injunction uttered before a college audience. There the spirit is quite the opposite—not devotion to a cause, but devotion to a career.

Another development of college influence is the institution of a class feeling, which amounts almost to a caste feeling. To this there are of course notable exceptions; but the majority of college graduates are encouraged to foster it in various ways, and even to take pride in it. This is due somewhat to the excessive preaching of college spirit, which one now hears so much about in all the institutions of higher learning. In consequence of this, it is not so much enthusiasm for learning that pervades college precincts as enthusiasm for alma mater. First things are not put first. It is the mere membership in an institution, not the attainment of learning, of clear thinking, of fine ideals, which is the predominating atmosphere. And this spirit is sure to foster the narrowness of

class and caste, which is the negation of democracy.

Back of all the causes is the lack of idealism in college teaching and training. This lack has been unfortunately emphasized by the prevailing ultra-scientific spirit, which is so immersed in the minutiae of things that it has lost grasp of the whole of things. All is analysis and dissection. The fear of hasty generalization, the fear of formulating uncertain truth, has gone so far that it has led to the extreme of rejecting all generalization and to the attitude of universal skepticism. This excessive half-science has shoved the humanities out of college, or else reduced them to its own methods. Science, not humanity, holds the boards. The result is a most natural one. While colleges have made immense gains in scientific knowledge, they have not advanced the nurture of the higher possibilities on the humanitarian side of character. This has led to a coldness in regard to the spread and progress of democracy. In short, the scientific spirit, in its present advancement, will study the minutiae of social conditions, but it will neither reach generalization as to these conditions, nor will it produce enthusiasm or emotion.

Let it be noted that the expression used above is "the scientific spirit in its present advancement." No one wishes to deny the great work of the scientific spirit both in its practical results and in its effort to correct loose vaporings. The point is that the scientific spirit as it is now interpreted has fostered a certain temper of mind. This temper of mind ignores the great truths and belittles the enthusiasms that make for the spread of justice and freedom.

So it is that the prevailing note of college teaching is diametrically opposed both to the enthusiasm and to the generalization of such a document as the Declaration of Independence. And hence it is that this great paper is almost universally discredited in college halls.

Such are some of the reasons, inherent in the inner influences of the present life of the higher in-

stitutions of learning, which hold them back from being in the advance line of the surely coming changes in economic and social conditions.

J. H. DILLARD.

### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

COLORADO.

Denver, Nov. 28.—It is difficult to describe the stress of political conditions in Colorado, and impossible to predict their outcome. All this cloud of trouble may blow over in a few weeks; but it is just as probable that the difficulties may culminate in some violent upheaval.

Attention is concentrated at present upon the Supreme Court of the State, which has undertaken to control the situation by means of injunction proceedings. This is the longest stride yet, in the direction of government by injunction. The local circumstances should be understood, therefore, wherever the dangers to popular government which that judicial innovation threatens are appreciated. My information regarding these circumstances is derived almost wholly from representative Republicans who are defenders of the course taken by the Colorado court, and principally, so far as the theory of the court proceedings is concerned, from Mr. John M. Waldron, one of the most astute and prominent lawyers of the State, under whose advice and active professional direction, as leading counsel for Gov. Peabody, the present injunction proceedings were begun and are being carried on.

It must be understood at the outset that the ballot in Denver has for years been monstrously corrupted. The corruption began with the Republicans, and was imitated and progressively improved upon by the Democrats. As to the beginning of this corruption by the Republican machine there is no dispute. The Republicans themselves freely admit it. Neither is there any dispute about its imitation by the Democratic machine. This is as freely admitted by the Democrats. If there is any dispute at all it is only as to whether or not the Democratic imitation has been worse in character than the Republican original. I am disposed to believe that it has been; not because the Democrats are worse than the Republicans, but because they were later in the line of this infamous progression.

At any rate there appears to be no room for doubt that it has long been customary in Denver to stuff registry lists, to connive at wholesale repeating, to substitute false for true ballots in the count, and in numerous other ways familiar to political heelers to falsify the legitimate vote. This custom has been advancing toward the perfection of shameless infamy. The frauds have

not only been perpetrated by election officials, but they have been connived at by county officials to such an extent that criminal prosecutions for election offenses have been practically impossible.

Notwithstanding the shamelessness and shocking notoriety of these frauds, they do not appear to have outraged public sentiment—not as frauds. Some men of both parties have, indeed, freely and honestly denounced them because they were crimes, and regardless of whom they might help or hurt. But these objectors appear to have been in a hopeless minority. Theirs were only feeble cries in the wilderness. On the whole, those who have liked the electoral results of the frauds have been inclined to condone the means for the sake of the end, while those who have not liked those results have condemned the frauds all too evidently from partisan and not from civic motives. All through and on both sides the question has been, for the most part, only a question of whose ox was gored. The city itself seems to have been, in the civic sense, utterly debauched.

That was the situation when Mr. Waldron and his associates, just prior to the recent election, began in the Supreme Court of the State the equity suit which is the basis of the present proceedings.

This suit was begun in the name of the people of the State on the relation of the attorney general and against the election officers of Denver. It is in theory a suit by the people of the State for the protection of their reserved sovereignty. According to the theory of those who brought it, which I shall explain farther on, the people's sovereignty was assailed by the assaults upon the integrity of the voting franchise on which the sovereignty of all the American commonwealths rests.

Immediately upon bringing the suit an application was made for an injunction order against the election officials, and in support of that application it was charged, upon the basis of past experience, that force and fraud would probably be used at the approaching election to prevent a free, fair and open election in certain election precincts.

An argument on this application, summarily ordered, was had before the court; and at its conclusion, a few days prior to the election, the court granted an injunction order against the election officials, forbidding a great variety of things already criminal by statute, and with voluminous particularity commanding a faithful performance by those officials of all their statutory duties.

Among other things, in order to secure respectful regard for this equity process, simply in the execution of its equity

powers and without any express statutory right, the court appointed two persons for each voting precinct as officers of the court, to act as watchers at the election. They were authorized to wear conspicuously a badge inscribed "Supreme Court Watcher." This office is quite unknown to the laws of Colorado. It exists, if it exists legally at all, only as a special creation of the court under those loose general powers whereby equity courts appoint receivers, care-takers, etc.

In appointing these watchers the court assumed to clothe them "with all the powers" and to charge them "with the performance of all the duties prescribed by law with reference to statutory watchers"—the watchers allowed by statute to political parties; and the watchers so appointed by the court were required to report the manner in which in their respective voting precincts the election had been conducted and the count made. They were not authorized to interfere with the election in any other manner than as party watchers may.

After the election and upon the reports of these court watchers, persons charged with crimes against the election statutes were brought before the Court in contempt proceedings for violating this injunction order. Upon proof of election crimes several have been convicted of contempt and sentenced to fines ranging as high as \$1,000, and to imprisonment for terms as long as a year.

The same persons are still subject, for the same acts, to conviction and full punishment as criminals under the statutes; which makes possible a considerable extension of punishment beyond the statutory limit, for what is in substance only one offense. Sympathy on that score would probably be wasted on these men; but it is impossible not to consider, with some concern for orderly republican government, the extra-legal potentialities of this new-fangled device for turning equity tribunals, with their vaguely defined powers, into supernumerary criminal courts.

That the men convicted of contempt in these cases were guilty of the statutory crimes charged is probably true. They were, indeed, denied a jury trial, the only way known to the Colorado law (Judge Lynch's law excepted) of determining criminal guilt; but the Supreme Court, composed of three judges, was unanimous in its conclusions as to the criminal facts, although the Democratic judge refused to concur in the decision as to the jurisdiction of the court. This is significant of the truth of the accusations, because, while this judge is a Democrat, and the other two are Republicans, the whole proceeding is distinctly partisan, both in impulse and in purpose.

That phase of the situation cannot

be ignored. The suit was begun under the advice and direction of the personal cabinet of Gov. Peabody, for the manifest purpose, only thinly veiled, of giving color of authority to the Supreme Court to count him back into office for another term if, peradventure, a majority against him should be small enough to be overcome by throwing out the vote of precincts returning adverse majorities and in which fraud had really or apparently been perpetrated.

To understand the animus of the equity suit in question recourse is necessary to the circumstances which made it possible to defeat Peabody, the Republican candidate for governor, in a State which gave Roosevelt, the Republican candidate for President, a heavy majority.

When the strike in the Cripple Creek region (pp. 328, 521) began, violence occurred which the mine owners, backed by the Citizens' Alliance, attributed to strikers, and the strikers attributed to mine-owners and the Citizens' Alliance.

The merits of the controversy need not be here considered. It is enough to say, by way of passing remark, that the local supporters of ex-Senator Bucklin, in his efforts to establish the single tax through home rule in taxation, by the constitutional amendment defeated two years ago (vol. v., p. 664), trace the beginning of the Cripple Creek trouble to the large vote which the labor unions cast for that amendment. They say that the plutocratic organization which fought the Bucklin amendment, and in fighting it encouraged and availed themselves of all the characteristic election frauds that the suit now before the Supreme Court has been begun ostensibly to suppress, abandoned that particular organization only to reorganize as the Citizens' Alliance for the destruction of labor unions in Colorado. This view of the matter finds some confirmation in the phraseology of the begging circulars which the Citizens' Alliance sent out last Fall (p. 435), but it is of little importance in the present connection, although not without interest.

The important facts are undisputed. Before any acts of violence out of the ordinary at the scene of the strike, the mine owners applied to Gov. Peabody for troops. Gov. Peabody furnished the troops, the mine owners agreeing to advance the expense of maintaining them. When the troops arrived on the ground they established martial law and protected the Citizens' Alliance in mobbing labor union men, in forcing the resignation of county officials under threats of assassination, in destroying labor union stores, and otherwise in maintaining a state of class anarchy the character of which is not now denied by Peabody's

friends although they prefer to call it lynch law. The military themselves suppressed a labor newspaper, arbitrarily arrested and imprisoned men for no other known reason than that they were labor unionists, violently deported droves of them from the State for the same reason, and forced an "open shop" mine to suspend operations until its managers would agree to discharge its union men and employ only nonunionists. While this condition was maintained by Gov. Peabody at Cripple Creek, he was maintaining a similar condition at Telluride. Here the protection of the District (or circuit) Court was invoked in habeas corpus proceedings by Gov. Peabody's military prisoners; but the military resisted the court, even marching under arms into the courtroom and training cannon upon the courthouse, at the same time threatening with death any officer of the court who should attempt to execute its order for the release of a prisoner. Finding the local courts powerless, the labor unionists made an appeal to the Supreme Court of the State. This was in the case of Charles H. Moyer (p. 216), the president of the Western Federation of Miners.

It is conceded that Mr. Moyer had committed no crime, civil or military; but he was encouraging the strikers not to give up, so what could be done about it? That was the dilemma which Gov. Peabody had to solve. He solved it under the advice of Mr. Waldron, the same ingenious and forceful lawyer who is engineering the present injunction proceedings. Acting upon Mr. Waldron's advice, Gov. Peabody ordered the troops to arrest Moyer while he was at Telluride. They did so. Pursuant to the same orders they cast him into the "bull pen." All this was without warrant or accusation and solely on the plea of military necessity.

As the district court for the counties that include the Telluride region could not execute its writ of habeas corpus, the military authorities forcibly refusing to obey, an application for the writ in behalf of Moyer was made to the Supreme Court. This court issued the writ, and for a time it was supposed that the military would refuse to obey even the highest tribunal of the State. But better counsels prevailed. Whether the military would have released their prisoner had the final decision of the court been in his favor is doubted, for they produced the prisoner with great military display and pomposity; but Gov. Peabody was not forced to face such an alternative.

After argument one of the judges, the Democrat, was of the opinion that the governor has no power to arrest a citizen without legal cause, nor to suspend the writ of habeas corpus in his own unrestrained discretion. But the other two judges, both Republicans, held that when the governor declares any part of

the State or all parts in a state of insurrection, the courts from lowest to highest thereupon and thereby lose all power to inquire into the legality of the imprisonment of any person arrested by the governor's authority. So the court, by a majority of two to one, decided that the cause and circumstances of Moyer's arrest and imprisonment could not be inquired into. He was accordingly returned to the military "bull pen" at Telluride.

It may well be believed that the whole State was startled by this declaration and exhibition of irresponsible power. In comparison with the assertion of such a prerogative by the Republican governor, sustained by the two Republican judges of the Supreme Court, constituting a majority—[both being regarded as Peabody Republicans, although one is nominally a Democrat, as is Mr. Waldron]—election frauds in Denver, naturally enough, took second place in the minds of men to whom, on their own merits alone such frauds were abhorrent. I say naturally, because election frauds, however exasperating and injurious while they last, leave no injurious consequences; whereas the successful assumption of kingly prerogatives by constitutional executives, even if afterwards repudiated, operates as a precedent which permanently distorts the form and perverts the spirit of republican government. Autocracy by the agents of a republic leaves behind it autocratic scars; corruption by or of the people of a republic leaves behind it only a wholesome lesson.

It was the effect upon popular sentiment of Peabody's assumption of a kingly prerogative that insured his defeat at the polls. Doubtless there was fraudulent voting and fraudulent counting, but Peabody's defeat can be accounted for by other and better reasons.

He was the head and front of the kingly prerogative movement in Colorado, and as such he became the central figure of the campaign. Roosevelt received many a vote from Democrats, Republicans, socialists and labor unionists, which was cast against Peabody. Not only did labor union men vote against Peabody, but so did every one who felt the sting of his assertion of kingly prerogatives. The strength of this opposition was noted by the Republican machine; and the Republican campaign, only perfunctorily made for Roosevelt, was made with all possible vigor for Peabody. This kind of campaign may be explained by what is generally believed and probably is a fact, that the Peabody-Republican machine, together with a little cluster of plutocratic Democrats, the Denver traction crowd, the Colorado Fuel and Iron Co., the railroads, several large mining corporations, and kindred inter-

ests, are naturally affiliated and consciously allied.

It was as part of that campaign that the equity suit in the Supreme Court was instituted, purification of the ballot being evidently not even a secondary motive with the Peabody cabinet. Peabody's re-inauguration, whether or no and right or wrong, was the primary motive originally; retention of control of the Supreme court, since the adoption at this election of a constitutional amendment increases that court from three members to seven by adding new judges, has become the principal object now.

The key to the whole situation on the plutocratic side of it is in the appointment by Peabody and confirmation by the Senate of those two judges. Together with the two Peabody judges already on the Supreme bench, they would make a majority of the newly-organized court.

This key seems to be within Peabody's grasp. Even if he retires from office, his present term continues for a week after the Senate is to organize. He can, therefore, appoint those two judges before his successor's term begins. Should the Senate confirm them, Peabody's appointees would be in place to maintain the plutocratic tendencies of the judiciary for which the present court has made precedents, no matter what policy the new governor might try to inaugurate. For the equity suit now pending would, if its principle is judicially established, enable the Supreme Court, in an equity suit brought in the name of the people on the relation of the attorney general or any other interested citizen, to issue an injunction against the governor himself if he were charged with acts or omissions destructive of the sovereignty of the people.

Whether Peabody's judicial appointees will be confirmed by the Senate before Alva Adams can be seated is the burning question in Denver.

It seems to be understood that the court as now constituted will not go so far as to count Gov. Peabody in. This would be usurpation so spectacular as probably to precipitate a violent revolution. But they may throw out the returns from some precincts as being tainted with fraud, and to such an extent as to give Peabody control of the Senate. That is what is feared by Democrats and expected apparently by the better informed Republicans.

Nor would it be difficult, if the court goes so far as to determine the results of the election under its equity process. The Senate consists of 35 members elected for four years. Every alternate two years 17 and 18 go out of office. It is the turn this year of the 17 to retire. Upon the face of the vote 9 of the Senators-elect are Democrats and 8 Republic-

cans, which would give the Democrats a bare majority. One of the Democrats died last week. His seat belongs to a close district. If the governor calls a special election in December it is impossible to foretell which side will win. But either way the majority will be so narrow for the Democrats, at the best, that a few Denver precincts thrown out would shift the majority over to the interests, corporate and political, which Peabody represents.

The opinion seems to prevail that Mr. Waldron will be able to convince a majority of the present Supreme Court that they have the power in proceedings under the equity suit which they have decided to be within their constitutional jurisdiction, to act as a supervisory returning board and enjoin the counting of returns in precincts which they hold to be tainted with fraud. In this way, even if the result as to Peabody were not affected, and Adams were to become governor without further contest, a Peabody Senate might be secured, and through that a Peabody Supreme Court.

Lawyers generally will be amazed, if not incredulous, at the legal situation here indicated. Familiar as they have become with the judicial departure known as government by injunction, they are not prepared for what must seem to them so complete an overturning and confusion of the principles of political functions and equity jurisprudence.

In Denver itself, neither laymen however intelligent nor lawyers however well informed, seemed able to explain the anomalous situation. They realized that the Supreme Court had undertaken to govern the State by equity process, but could not explain how it had bridged the chasm between equity powers and political functions. What had happened had happened, but how it had happened they knew not. The mystery was clarified, however, in an interview with Mr. Waldron and his partner, both of whom were courteous, precise, lucid and confident in their explanations, while entirely candid as to the possible influence upon their prejudices of their political affiliations.

Their explanation of the equity suit is essentially the same, in my judgment, as the explanation of Moyer's arbitrary imprisonment. It is in execution of a kingly prerogative. Mr. Waldron makes a definite distinction between the equity powers of courts in cases involving individual rights, and the equity powers of the Supreme Court of Colorado in cases involving the reserved sovereignty of the people of the State. In individual cases, property rights must be in jeopardy before an injunction will issue, and no injunction can be issued to enjoin crime. Neither can an injunction be is-

sued in those cases if there is other adequate relief. But when the sovereignty of the people of the State is assailed, the principles of the king's prerogatives under old English law are evoked.

The king, when his prerogatives were assailed, could direct his chancellor to use any or all the machinery of his court to protect those prerogatives. So the people of Colorado, not as a political corporation having property rights to protect, but as a political sovereign having prerogatives to conserve, can come into the Supreme Court, as a tribunal of original jurisdiction invested by the constitution with the power, among other things, to grant injunctions, and demand an injunction, not for the protection of a candidate in any property right he may have in the office, nor for the protection of State property of any kind or in any way, nor because there is no other adequate relief; but solely for the conservation of the kingly prerogatives which American States derive from the common law of England—and this without regard to the fact that the act enjoined may be a crime. Upon the plea, then, that the debauching and falsification of the suffrage is destructive of the prerogatives of the people of a State entitled to a republican form of government, this bill in equity is presented to the court, and the court grants the injunction.

Only a moment's reflection is required to see how far-reaching this prerogative theory of government by injunction is, in its possibilities of centralizing political power in the judiciary. If the people, as the ultimate sovereign, once get into court, fictitiously, in an equity suit "ex relatione"—that is to say, on the complaint of an appropriate person that some prerogative of sovereignty is assailed—the court can, upon this theory, issue and enforce injunctions against any and everybody regarding any or every conceivable act, from private citizens charged with crime all the way up to legislator and governor charged with unconstitutional official purposes. Thus government by injunction would be perfected, Marshall's judicial policy would reach a logical conclusion, and Jefferson's fears of ultimate usurpation by an ambitious judiciary would be realized.

Even the constitutional separation of executive, legislative and judicial departments of government would prove ineffective. If a court of equity, on plea of protecting a kingly prerogative, can summarily convict officials for election crimes, as guilty of contempt of injunctions against those crimes, astute lawyers like Mr. Waldron will soon show it how to convict any other official, even a governor, for

any other alleged malfeasance or non-feasance in office, also summarily as for contempt of an injunction. The whole thing is dangerously revolutionary. But Gov. Peabody, Mr. Waldron and their associates are not responsible for beginning it. They are only carrying out the policy of government by injunction to its logical extreme. And they are carrying it out in the interest of the same kind of all-absorbing corporations under whose influence the policy was begun by President Cleveland's administration.

In the prerogative theory which Mr. Waldron advances, the doctrine of government by injunction first gets a logical foothold. That theory gives to the Debs case a spine of legal principle which it lacked before. In deciding the Debs case the Supreme Court of the United States gave no logical reason for their decision sustaining an injunction against the statutory crime of interfering with the mails. But Mr. Waldron, interpreting that case according to his prerogative theory, cites it as authority for the Denver injunction. In his view, the Federal Courts got their jurisdiction to issue an injunction against Debs upon the principle that he and his associates, by their alleged obstruction of the mails, were attacking a kingly prerogative of the Federal government, for the protection of which the government could call upon its courts of equity, as the English king might once have called upon his chancellor, to issue any writ in their quiver.

Another precedent upon which the Peabody forces rely to sustain their injunction proceedings is the Cunningham case, which was decided by the Supreme Court of Wisconsin in 1892. In that case an injunction was issued restraining a gerrymander made by the legislature, on the ground that the gerrymander was calculated to destroy the republican character of the State government, and was, therefore, subject to injunction from any court empowered to issue an injunction as a writ for the protection of sovereign prerogatives. It is conceded that this precedent was rejected by the Supreme Court of Illinois. But the explanation is made that the Illinois court rejected it, not because such an injunction for such a purpose might not properly issue from a court authorized to issue it, but because the Supreme Court of Illinois has no constitutional power to issue such injunctions. For the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, however, this power is claimed on the basis of the Cunningham case, and the constitution of Wisconsin, unlike that of Illinois, is the same in this respect as the constitution of Colorado.

Among those Republicans in Denver who are unable to justify these extraordinary equity proceedings which Mr. Waldron seems to have invented and two judges of the Supreme Court to have approved, are some who satisfy themselves with the plea of necessity. The Democratic prosecuting attorney, they say, has made it impossible to convict for election frauds by the ordinary processes of the criminal law. This plea of "necessity" may appeal also to others. But it is without force not only in itself, but also because a Republican was elected this year to the office of prosecutor of crimes. It would be easy enough, therefore, for the Republicans to prosecute the offenses of which they complain, without any usurpation of power by the Supreme Court, if honest elections instead of plutocratic power were really the object sought.

It is not probable that the action of the Colorado court in fining and imprisoning men ostensibly for contempt, but really for acts, which, if committed, are criminal, will be allowed to rest. Although the Colorado court has refused to allow appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States, holding that no Federal question is involved, writs of habeas corpus and certiorari from the U. S. Supreme Court will probably accomplish the result. The question is essentially one of jurisdiction. The Colorado court either has jurisdiction over these prisoners in this equity suit, or it has not. This question the Supreme Court of the United States will inquire into on writs of habeas corpus issued upon the principle of the Lange case, which it decided some 30 years ago.

As to the presence in the case of a Federal question, there are probably at least two such questions: (1) On Mr. Waldron's prerogative theory the question of republican form of government is involved; (2) on any theory whatever, the question of depriving citizens of the United States of their liberty without due process of law is involved, for these imprisonment proceedings are not due process of law unless Mr. Waldron's prerogative theory is right. There is, therefore, a fair prospect of an early adjudication by the highest court in the country of the advancing policy of government by injunction in this its most brazen form.

Meanwhile the State of Colorado is in a shiver of excitable expectation. Alva Adams, the Democratic candidate for governor, is preparing to take the office, and both Democrats and Republicans believe that blood will flow abundantly in the streets of Denver if Gov. Peabody resists him. What

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Dec. 1.

will happen if the Supreme Court refrains from interfering with Adams, but undertakes to regulate the political complexion of the senate by any further novelties in equity jurisprudence, no one ventures even to guess. Apparently, however, that would not excite popular passion to the boiling point.

It is a relief to turn from this long account of circumstances which may possibly culminate in conflicts in Colorado more serious than the political and legal controversies that rack it now, to a State institution that is rapidly forging to the front as one of the great technical schools of the country. It is the Colorado School of Mines, established 30 years ago, and now under the presidency of Victor C. Alderson, formerly dean of the faculty at Armour Institute, Chicago.

This institution is located at Golden, one of the oldest places in Colorado, about 15 miles from Denver, among the ragged but picturesque foothills of the Rocky Mountains. Its students are educated free, if residents of the State; non-residents pay a tuition fee. They come from the far East, as well as the far West; and foreign countries, also, are represented among them.

Looking in upon the 300 students, gathered in the common auditorium, in their class rooms, in the library, or in the laboratories, one gets the impression of mixing with a collection of workmen at their work or in their unions. Although all grades of social and financial standing are represented here, every student appears in a workman's working dress. The custom is enforced by the students themselves, who refuse to tolerate boiled shirts and white collars. However this custom may have originated, or whatever objection there may be to its enforcement even by the students themselves, it is a good custom. These young men are preparing to make high grade workmen of themselves; and their clothing, in keeping with the work they are learning to do, gives an air of self-respecting democratic equality to the institution, which is not the least among its many attractive features. It affords a striking object lesson, moreover, of the fact that clothes do not make the man.

The school is supported by a State tax of one-fifth of a mill on assessed property, and is governed by a board of trustees appointed by the governor and confirmed by the senate. Dr. Alderson has drawn into the faculty a corps of specialists of exceptional abilities and acquirements, and under his administration the institution, beginning now to compete with the best in the country, has justly become an object of great local pride.

L. F. P.

Exciting reports from Denver regarding the political situation there (p. 535) have appeared during the week in the daily press. An explanation of the controversy and a statement of its progress down to the 28th will be found under the head of Editorial Correspondence on page 547. On the 28th it was reported that Gov. Peabody had decided to withdraw from the contest, but on the 29th he made a positive denial. Upon the face of the returns, as reported by the city canvassing board on the 29th, the vote in Denver for Adams, the Democratic candidate, was 33,577 and for Peabody, the Republican candidate, 28,667, a plurality in the city of 4,910 for Adams. The rest of the State gives Adams a plurality of about 5,000, making his plurality in the whole State about 10,000. The plurality for the Republican Presidential electors was in the whole State about 35,000. The latest development is the argument in the Supreme Court on the 30th upon the motion (p. 535) by Gov. Peabody's lawyers to throw out the total vote of Precinct 8 of Ward 7. In support of this motion Peabody's lawyers contend that the court's order relating to watchers was violated in that precinct, and that therefore the vote as a whole should be thrown out without an investigation to determine the number of legal votes cast and without opening the ballot box. No decision has yet been reported; but if the court orders the vote of this precinct to be thrown out the attorneys for Peabody are expected to demand similar action in respect to about 50 precincts in which it is charged that the court's order was violated. All these precincts gave majorities for Adams for governor, and by throwing out the returns it is hoped to overcome Adams's majority in the State. Control of the Senate is, however, probably the principal purpose and expectation.

It is now possible to record the full official vote of Illinois at the recent election (p. 535), the official canvass of the vote of Cook County having been completed on the

26th. For the entire State the full official returns for President and Governor are as follows:

	President.	Governor.
Republican	632,745	634,029
Democratic	328,006	353,382
Prohibitionist	34,759	35,389
People's	6,725	4,364
Socialist Labor	4,708	4,579
Socialist	69,225	59,060
Continental	850	780
Rep. plurality	304,739	300,047
Total Socialist vote:		
1904	73,933	
1900	11,060	
1896	1,147	

Full official returns from Indiana, reported on the 28th, are as follows on the Presidential vote:

Republican	268,289
Democratic	274,315
Prohibitionist	23,496
People's	2,444
Socialist Labor	1,588
Socialist	12,013
Republican plurality	93,944
Total Socialist:	
1904	13,611
1900	3,187
1896	329

From Connecticut on the 30th the following official returns of the Presidential vote were reported:

Republican	111,009
Democratic	72,406
Prohibitionist	1,506
People's	495
Socialist Labor	573
Socialist	4,543
Republican plurality	38,100
Total Socialist:	
1904	5,118
1900	1,937
1896	1,223

From Wisconsin, also on the 30th, the following are the official returns on the Presidency:

Republican	280,164
Democratic	124,107
Prohibitionist	9,770
People's	530
Socialist Labor	223
Socialist	28,220
Republican plurality	156,057
Total Socialist:	
1904	28,443
1900	7,619
1896	1,314

Official returns of the Presidential vote of the two leading parties, in the States tabulated below, are compared in the same table with the Presidential vote of 1900:

	1904.		1900.	
	Roos.	Park.	McK.	Bryan.
Alabama	29,474	79,857	55,634	96,368
Arkansas	46,740	64,434	44,800	81,142
Connecticut	111,009	72,309	102,567	73,967
Delaware	23,705	19,347	22,529	18,858
Florida	8,314	27,046	7,419	28,290
Idaho	47,384	18,420	27,198	29,414
Illinois	632,745	328,006	597,985	503,061
Indiana	368,289	274,315	336,063	309,584
Kansas	210,873	84,800	185,955	162,601
Maryland	106,934	107,477	196,212	122,271
Missouri	321,447	265,847	314,091	351,922
Nebraska	138,558	51,876	121,835	114,013
Ohio	619,997	357,654	543,918	474,882
Oregon	60,453	17,457	46,526	23,385
Pennsylvania	840,949	337,998	712,665	424,222
South Carolina	2,271	52,863	3,379	47,293
Vermont	46,459	9,777	42,568	12,849
Wisconsin	280,164	124,107	265,866	139,285

A careful estimate made by the Chicago Record-Herald of the 27th, based upon the foregoing official returns and a variety of unofficial information, gives the following totals on the Presidential vote of the two leading parties:

	1904.	1900.	1896.
Republican	7,654,891	7,207,923	7,106,779
Democratic	5,200,665	6,358,133	6,502,925
Rep. plural'y	2,454,226	849,790	603,854

It is now definitely known that the Electoral College (p. 520) chosen at the Presidential election will stand as follows:

States	Rep.	Dem.
Alabama	11	11
Arkansas	9	9
California	10	10
Colorado	5	5
Connecticut	7	7
Delaware	3	3
Florida	5	5
Georgia	13	13
Idaho	3	3
Illinois	27	27
Indiana	15	15
Iowa	13	13
Kansas	10	10
Kentucky	13	13
Louisiana	9	9
Maine	6	6
Maryland	1	7
Massachusetts	16	16
Michigan	14	14
Minnesota	11	11
Mississippi	10	10
Missouri	18	18
Montana	3	3
Nebraska	8	8
Nevada	3	3
New Hampshire	4	4
New Jersey	12	12
New York	39	39
North Carolina	12	12
North Dakota	4	4
Ohio	23	23
Oregon	4	4
Pennsylvania	34	34
Rhode Island	4	4
South Carolina	9	9
South Dakota	4	4
Tennessee	12	12
Texas	18	18
Utah	3	3
Vermont	4	4
Virginia	12	12
Washington	5	5
West Virginia	7	7
Wisconsin	13	13
Wyoming	3	3
Total	336	336
Plurality	196	140

It thus appears that the States carried by the Democrats in 1900, but lost to them in 1904 (p. 520), in addition to all that they lost in the former year, are:

Nevada	3
Idaho	3

Montana	3
Missouri	18
Colorado	5
Maryland	1
Total	33

Regarding the parliamentary elections in Italy (p. 505), the reports of a victory for the ministry appear to be confirmed. A feature of the election is reported by the following news dispatch of the 26th from Rome:

The result of the recent general election in Italy has been a source of much gratification to the authorities of the Vatican. Although with two exceptions, at Milan and Beramo, no Catholic candidate has been elected to Parliament, the participation of Catholics in the elections has obtained a large majority for the government and it is felt here that such would not have been the case if the Pope had not permitted Catholics to vote in several districts where the socialists and extremists numbered many followers. As it is, not only the laity but a great number of priests and monks went to the polls, dressed in their distinctive garb, and, as their number in Italy exceeds 100,000, they brought a great many votes to the support of the government candidates.

King Victor Emmanuel opened the Italian parliament on the 30th.

The German reichstag met again on the 29th after a recess, the session being opened with a speech by the president of the reichstag, Count von Ballestrem.

On the 24th the memorial of the Russian Zemstvos delegates (p. 535) was presented by the minister of the interior, Prince Sviatopolk-Mirsky, to the Czar. The delegates had dispersed on the 23d. Mirsky having forbidden the arrest of newspaper men for printing the memorial it will spread in print throughout Russia. A dispatch of the 24th from St. Petersburg to the New York Herald interprets the memorial as embodying the following articles:

Article I. That at the present moment the government is completely out of touch with the Russian people and their wants

Article II. That the government, in the opinion of the commission, has proceeded too far in the distrust which it has shown towards the establishment of anything like self-government

Article III. That the bureaucracy and centralization of government in St. Petersburg has to a great extent alienated the people from the throne.

Article IV. Not yet worked out in detail.

Article V. That, in order that Russia may be governed properly, there must be absolute freedom of conscience, religion, speech, and press.

Article VI. That all inhabitants of Russia, without regard being had to position and religion, and no matter as to what class they belong, must enjoy equal and the same civil and political rights; inasmuch as the bulk of the Russian nation consists of peasants, these latter must have the same access to the courts of justice as other people.

Article VII. That every person, irrespective of position, shall have the right to vote for members of the zemstvos, or be himself elected thereto.

Article VIII. Not yet worked out, but deals with the recommendation that there shall be two legislative houses, not of the British plan, but a lower house to consist of members of the zemstvos and an upper house to be modeled on that of the American senate. As it is of such immense importance, this point is still under discussion.

Article IX. That every person shall have the right, through his member of the legislative body, to have a voice in the formation of new legislation, the general control of the government, and confirmation of the budget.

Article X. That in order that the recommendation made by the commission may be brought into force in such a way as to be of the greatest benefit to the people, a general plebiscite should be taken all over Russia.

Whether this is a condensation of the memorial heretofore reported (p. 536), made by another interpreter, or a substitute adopted by the Zemstvo delegates, or a series of supplementary clauses, is not quite clear.

Encouragement is derived by the constitutionalists from the fact that on the 25th four members of the Zemstvo delegates—or, as the meeting is now called, the Zemstvo Congress,—were received by the Czar in the imperial palace at Tzarskoe-Selo, they having gone there at his request to explain the causes and purpose of the memorial. They were the same four delegates who had been appointed by the Congress (p. 537) to present the memorial to the minister of the interior.

Fighting before Port Arthur (p. 521) continues, but the Russians are still in possession. No news at once important and reliable is at hand.

From Mukden (p. 535) there are



frequent reports of skirmishing, but no change in the situation has occurred.

The text of the treaty between Russia and Great Britain, for the arbitration of the North Sea incident, namely, the firing by the Russian fleet upon a fleet of British fishing vessels (p. 521), was published at London on the 28th. For future reference we quote it in full:

His Britannic Majesty's government and the Imperial Russian government, having agreed to enter into an international commission of inquiry assembled conformably to articles 9 to 14 of The Hague convention of July 29, 1899, for the pacific settlement of international disputes, the task of elucidating by means of an impartial and conscientious investigation the questions of fact connected with the incident which occurred during the night of Oct. 21-22, 1904, in the North Sea (on which occasion the firing of guns on the Russian fleet caused the loss of a boat and the death of two persons belonging to British fishing fleet, as well as damages to other boats of that fleet and injuries to the crews of some of those boats), the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto, have agreed upon the following provisions:

Article 1. The international commission of inquiry shall be composed of five members (commissioners), of whom two shall be officers of high rank in the British and Imperial Russian navies, respectively. The government of France and of the United States shall each be requested to select one of their naval officers of high rank as a member of the commission. The fifth member shall be chosen by agreement between the four members above mentioned. In the event of no agreement being arrived at between the four commissioners as to the selection of the fifth member of the commission his Imperial and royal majesty, the Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary, will be invited to select him. Each of the two high contracting parties shall likewise appoint a legal adviser to advise the commissioners and an agent officially empowered to take part in the labors of the commission.

Art. 2. The commission shall inquire into and report on all circumstances relative to the North Sea incident and particularly on the question as to where the responsibility lies and the degree of blame attaching to subjects of the two high contracting parties or to subjects of other countries in the event of their responsibility being established by the inquiry.

Art. 3. The commission shall settle the details of procedure which it will follow for the purpose of accomplishing

the task with which it has been intrusted.

Art. 4. The two high contracting parties undertake to supply the commission to the utmost of their ability with all the means and facilities necessary in order to enable it to acquaint itself thoroughly with and appreciate correctly the matters in dispute.

Art. 5. The commission shall assemble in Paris as soon as possible after the signature of this agreement.

Art. 6. The commission shall present its report to the two high contracting parties, signed by all the members of the commission.

Art. 7. The commission shall take all its decisions by a majority of the votes of the five commissioners.

Art. 8. The two high contracting parties undertake each to bear on reciprocal terms the expense of the inquiry made by it previous to the assembly of the commission. The expenses incurred by the international commission after the date of its assembly in organizing its staff and conducting the investigations which it will have to make shall be equally shared by the two governments.

In faith whereof the undersigned have signed the present agreement (declaration) and affixed their seals to it. Done in duplicate at St. Petersburg Nov. 25, 1904.

Admiral Dewey has asked to be excused from accepting appointment as the representative of the United States on the Commission upon the ground that his rank would make him the presiding member and as such compel him to decide embarrassing points.

Russia has informally notified the United States of her decision not to participate in a second Hague conference proposed by President Roosevelt (p. 475), so long as her war with Japan continues. The notification was delivered orally on the 30th by the Russian ambassador at Washington to Secretary Hay. Washington dispatches of the 30th explain:

Although different in form the Russian reply does not differ in effect from that of Great Britain, France and most other European powers that have answered the invitation. While Russia is the first power specifically to suggest a postponement until the close of the war, all the powers in expressing their approval of the proposition reserved for future pourparlers the time when the conference should be held. For the present it is probable the American government will rest on its oars. When the far Eastern war enters on its final stage this government will be prepared to follow up its invitation. In the meantime, should Russia's attitude change

she will find the American government ready to lead the powers immediately to The Hague for the second conference. It can be stated this government is well pleased with the reception its note has received. The powers signatory to The Hague convention have been officially committed to a second conference at some future time. In his note Secretary Hay purposely omitted suggesting a date for the conference. Denmark has informally accepted the invitation.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—Mme. Francisca Janauschek, the famous actress, died at Amityville, L. I., on the 29th, at the age of 74 years.

—At the session of the convention of the American Federation of Labor in San Francisco (pp. 521, 537) on the 26th, Samuel Gompers was reelected to the presidency of the Federation.

—John Most was arrested by the police in St. Louis on the 28th, when he was about to deliver a public lecture on "Anarchism—Its Aims and Principles." No accusation is reported.

—Plans for organizing the employers of labor of the United States against labor unions were formulated on the 30th at the session in New York city of the convention of the Citizens' Industrial Association. David M. Parry, of Indianapolis, was elected president.

—A New York labor law which prohibits a contractor of city, county, or State work, from employing his working men more than eight hours a day on such work, was declared unconstitutional by the Court of Appeals of that State on the 29th, on the ground that the law deprives contractors of their property (the right to contract freely) without due process of law.

—The Circuit Court of the United States at Cleveland decided on the 28th that the Denison street franchise of the Forest City Railway Company—the 3-cent line which Mayor Johnson has for nearly four years tried to establish against the opposition of the combined monopoly lines of that city (vol. vi, p. 679), is invalid. An injunction against the 3-cent company is sustained. The case will be appealed.

—At a meeting of the New England Anti-Imperialist League at Boston on the 28th the name of the organization was changed to Anti-Imperialist League, and vice-presidents from various states were elected. A clause was added to the effect that the league means to oppose the forcible extension of sovereignty of the United States over foreign peoples and in particular to work constantly for the early and complete independence of the Philippine Islands.

—Five years of penal servitude was the sentence imposed last week by a

court martial of the German army, at Berlin, upon two private soldiers found guilty of having disarmed a drunken corporal who in a public place swung his sword violently in a crowd and directly assaulted two young women with whom the soldiers were dancing. The same court martial sentenced the corporal to three months' imprisonment. In the case of the privates the prosecutor is reported to have said: "The German military law does not know of self-defense against a superior. A military subordinate must silently allow himself to be killed. The only way of reparation is subsequent complaint."

### PRESS OPINIONS.

#### COLORADO.

Buñaro (N. Y.) Enquirer (Dem.), Nov. 26.—Notwithstanding the loud tone in which the people condemned Peabodyism, a desperate and reckless attempt is apparently being made to steal the State legislature and ultimately to deprive the newly-elected Governor Adams of his office. It is a bold and almost unprecedented exhibition of political highwaymanship, which, should it prevail, would almost warrant resort to physical force on the part of the Democratic candidate and his friends to protect their interests.

#### THE MASSACHUSETTS ELECTION.

The Lawrence (Mass.) Sentinel (Dem.), Nov. 20.—The election of Mr. Douglas, shoemaker, as Governor of Massachusetts, on a platform of tariff revision and reciprocity with Canada seems to have stirred the Republicans all up, and they now earnestly declare that they are going to cut down the tariff just as soon as they can get at it, and never had any other idea in their heads. Perhaps the Democratic party, like Samson, will be able to say more fulminances in its defeat than it was able to dispose of during the years of its victories.

Aberdeen (Wash.) Herald (Dem.), Nov. 24.—Several metropolitan journals of alleged independent leanings profess to see in the victory of W. L. Douglas, Governor-elect of Massachusetts, nothing more than the result of advertising. It is true that Mr. Douglas is a great advertiser, and doubtless true that he profited by his efforts to secure publicity for his wares. But there is another and a better explanation for his great victory. Mr. Douglas stood for something more than a mere desire to secure political advantage. He is a man of convictions and has no hesitancy in announcing his position on any question.

#### THE RUSSIAN ZEMSTVOS CONGRESS.

New York Nation (ind.), Nov. 24.—As such an assemblage is well-nigh unprecedented in all the history of the empire, its programme, once published, becomes a bill of rights, and its voice that of a States-General. And history will record this of the zemstvos presidents, whatever the immediate fortune of their plan.

#### ROOSEVELT AND GEORGE.

Nashville Daily News (Dem.), Nov. 16.—The New York World comforts itself with the reflection that Theodore Roosevelt once ran behind Henry George in New York. Theodore Roosevelt is still a long way behind the author of "Progress and Poverty."

#### THE TREASURY DEFICIT.

New York Nation (ind.), Nov. 24.—Secretary Shaw's call for \$25,000,000 of government funds deposited in the banks was ex-

pected, and is necessary. It is the readiest way of covering the current deficit in the Treasury. One can imagine, however, the sinister comments that would have been made had Judge Parker been elected and such a call followed so promptly. "There," people would have said, "you already see what havoc a Democratic administration is going to work with the business of the country." And there would have been dire talk of an increasing Treasury shortage, shrinkage in commerce, and prospective panic. Such pessimistic words would not have been justified then any more than they are now; but it is remarkable that what, under Democratic auspices, would have excited grave concern, now passes without causing a ripple. At the same time, the problem of making both ends meet in national housekeeping remains the same; and this Treasury call is the first reaping of the harvest of unskillful Republican financiering during the past few years.

### MISCELLANY

#### "I DREAD THE STREETS."

Mr. R. H. Wellington held an inquest at Westminster on Charles Henry Thomas, a general laborer, who committed suicide. The deceased had tramped miles in search of work, and came back with his feet blistered and bleeding as a result. In the morning he complained of pains in the head, adding that he had been walking about all day and all night. He left a note, saying: "I cannot face walking about all night. I dread the streets."—Daily News.

I dread the streets, the dark and the cold,  
The chilling frowns of hustling mobs;  
The ribald young, the withered old,  
The cur that whines, the thief that robs.  
Where striding Hunger holds his sway,  
And Sin dull Sorrow careless meets;  
The goal of Life's despairing day—  
I dread the streets.

I dread the streets, their sullen gloom,  
The echoing pave of oath and curse;  
The belfries that ring out my doom,  
In metal accents, grim and terse;  
The silent hours, a-dragging slow,  
No pulse of gladness in their beats;  
Gray sky above, black Death below—  
I dread the streets.

I dread the streets, the mist, the rain,  
The shambling hordes who never smile,  
The outcast ranks on Ruin's plain,  
The weary tramp o'er midnight mile,  
Beneath the Pharisee's reproof  
My half-born hope of help retreats;  
I fear that Christian's glance aloof—  
I dread the streets.

I dread the streets, my refuge stern,  
Where no soft star shines message fond,  
That starving wretches here may learn  
Of comfort in a world beyond;  
Each biting wind, each shrieking blast,  
With shivering note my fate repeats,  
Till heart is dead and faith is past—  
I dread the streets.

I dread the streets, whose dim lamps peer  
On huddled wrecks of human shame,  
My homeless home their visits drear  
Till Destiny my soul shall claim.  
Laugh on, O, World, in mocking glee,  
Disdain Life's sadness, take its sweets,  
No wasteful thought bestow on me—  
I dread the streets.

—T. McDonald Rendie, in London Opinion.

#### BAKER ON THE WARPATH.

Congressman (No Pass) Baker met a friend on Fulton street this morning.

"Anything doing?" asked the friend.  
"Yes," replied the congressman, "there's a lot doing. We are going to clean up the Democratic party. We're going to drive all the monopolists into the Republican party."

"You'd better look out," said the friend, "or you'll make it unanimous next time."

"Not at all, not at all," Mr. Baker responded. "When we have driven the McCarrens and the Belmonts and the Sheehans into the Republican party, lots of good Republicans will come over to us."—Brooklyn Daily Times of Nov. 25.

#### M. LE COLONEL BRYAN.

Not long ago there appeared in a paper published in the south of France an amusing account of the life and exploits of Col. Bryan that no doubt this gentleman fully enjoyed.

The story was written by the Paris correspondent of a country paper. It is based, so the writer says, on information he got from friends of Mr. Bryan who are prominent in Paris.

A Western wag filled the Frenchman with startling information, and how he must have smiled when there appeared the following in cold print:

"M. le Colonel Bryan first came into fame as one of the strange, half-savage band of cowboys who roamed over the Far West, fighting the Indians and wild beasts. Imitating, perhaps, the custom of the Indian chiefs, each of the cowboys bore a nickname based on some of his exploits as a hunter and fighter. Thus M. le Colonel Bryan's title among his rough, but brave and sturdy comrades was Silver Bill the Dead Shot. After the treaty of peace was signed with the Indians at Chicago in 1896, Col. Bryan went out of the cattle business and became one of the bonanza farmers of the West. He can now sit on his back stoop, as the rear veranda is called in America, and look over his fields of corn stretching further than the eye can reach in every direction. As a result of his early training on the plains, where he spent months at a time without an opportunity of talking to another human being, the former candidate for president is exceedingly taciturn and can hardly be persuaded to express his opinion on the issues of a campaign. He is the author of a book of adventure called "The First Battle," in which some of his encounters with the

Indians of the Tammany and other tribes are described at length.

In the effort to partially neutralize the strength of M. le Colonel among the cowboys and Indians who make up the largest part of the voting population west of the Alleghany mountains, the Republicans have M. le Roosevelt for president. M. le Roosevelt is one of the leading cowboys of America and is especially famous for once having vanquished a grizzly bear in single combat. During the last campaign M. le Colonel Roosevelt has ridden a series of horses all over the country, giving exhibitions of rough riding such as were seen in Paris a year or more ago under the direction of another American statesman. — American Philippine Review.

#### NEWSPAPER GAMBLING.

At Cincinnati, Ohio, November 27, 1904, at the Vine Street Congregational church, the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow, discussed that form of gambling which is carried on by many newspapers under the guise of guessing contests.

One of our church members told me a few weeks ago that he was competing for the prizes offered by a Cincinnati paper for the best guess on the election in Ohio, and that if he won the big prize he would give us a handsome donation. This contingency seemed sufficiently remote, so we did not have to decide upon the propriety of accepting such a gift.

It was as remote as a wedding fee I was once promised. After the wedding, the groom explained that he had nothing with which to pay me, but that his wife was expecting a rich inheritance from Europe, and that when her ship came in he would see that I was not forgotten. As he apparently had staked everything on those prospects, it seemed small in me not to be willing to take the chance. At any rate, since the ceremony had been performed, I agreed to the terms.

The essence of gambling is this. A man risks something, in the hope of gaining more at the expense of another. The objection to gambling is two-fold. It is likely to develop into an uncontrollable vice. Moreover, it is a wolfish thing in that those who gamble have no hope of gain save by the misfortune of others.

Take the newspaper guessing contests. There are three reasons why a self-respecting man ought not to participate in them.

1.—The vulture spirits that exploit the public with these schemes will find no lack of carrion, but a self-respect-

ing man will take some satisfaction in that he has not contributed to the success of the swindle.

2.—Whoever takes part in the contest must contribute to the prize money, tho' it is almost a certainty that he will get none of it. Those who do win will probably spend their money in riotous living, or have their heads turned by unearned riches; and it would be humiliating to know that one's own money had gone to swell the heads and spread the feathers of such as these.

3.—Finally, I think of the people who live in comparative poverty and who grasp at these chances like drowning men at straws; who attack their savings, who mortgage their future wages, who pawn their keepsakes that they may buy chances. A pawnbroker told me that the Cincinnati Enquirer guessing contest increased his business two thousand dollars a year. The people fly into this game like moths into a flame. When it is over, they come down to earth with a thud. Whoever enters one of these contests says by his conduct: "I am something of both fool and knave." He becomes the patron of a scheme, which subjects the weak and the thoughtless to temptation, in the vain but vicious hope of reaping a fortune out of their folly.

It is well to pay for what one gets, and to hope for nothing which one cannot earn. If honest industry does not bring satisfactory rewards, and it does not, it is better to aid the social progress which will prove a blessing to all, than to be consumed with the gambler's ambition to win in a game which of necessity means somebody's loss.

#### WHAT BRYAN SAYS.

Nobody is going to give his intelligence wholly into Mr. Bryan's keeping. No party will implicitly follow his lead. He does not expect it. But he is a greater personage, a more convincing prophet, to-day than he was ever before. And that puts him in the first rank of our national figures.

Whoever has followed Democratic fortunes in the past and looks to Democratic action in the future, will hear first what Bryan has to say.

In straightforward fashion he has already challenged the attention of the country with his proposals, center of which is the dictum, "Private monopoly must be extinguished." Amen.

Private monopoly must be extinguished. Well said.

Express and telegraphs are private monopoly. They must be made public servants. Railroads for themselves and for favored patrons wield the powers of private monopoly. Those powers must be taken from them. Bryan says by State ownership; others say by Federal ownership; others still advocate government control without ownership; there is a cult that advances the idea of private operation under government ownership, making the railways literally a highway.

Those alternatives are to be decided by expediency, and there will be a deal of debate before the people reach a conclusion. The true principle has been stated when the demand is voiced for extinction of private monopoly. That is the most important new business before the American people.

Other features of Bryan's programme may be estimated of more or less consequence. He would have direct election of all judges and postmasters. We believe rather in representative government. The people would choose better if they had fewer officers to elect. Neither a political convention nor the mass of voters can pass with discrimination upon a multitude of offices. Not one man in ten voted intelligently on the lieutenant governor of Minnesota, nor one in a hundred on the attorney general, the railroad commissioners and the judges.

That is to say, Republicans voted for the Republican candidates, and Democrats for the Democratic candidates, without inspection. Assume that the men elected were the better choice, it was not upon weighing of their merits that they were chosen and their rivals rejected.

And not one man in a thousand, no, not one in ten thousand, could give a respectable reason for his preference if a list of federal judges was submitted for his choice.

Bryan advocates the income tax. We move to lay it on the table. Private monopoly must be extinguished.

Bryan believes that some time the question of bimetallism will come forward again, and whenever it does he is in favor of it. It is a matter of no earthly interest at present. We should have said there was no excuse for dragging it in now, except that several distinguished gentlemen insisted on the importance of sustaining the gold standard while nobody disputed. We would urge Mr. Bryan to forget it. Why should we concern ourselves over the color of the chips used for money when Mr. Rockefeller gets

them all anyway? Private monopoly must be extinguished.

Well, in all these respects the Democratic party must make up its judgments. Where it judges truly it will in the end see its motions prevail; and where it judges amiss it must expect the same course of rejection that has visited it aforesaid; sometimes deservedly, and sometimes because the people were too slow of comprehension.

Possibly the Republicans, having immediate power, may anticipate the Democrats in carrying out righteous and necessary policies. If they do, so much the better. Righteous motions should not be unwelcome to any Democrat, simply because they proceed from some other source. Possibly, while Republicans remain obdurately attached to present policies, the Democrats may equally fail to take up the vital changes necessary to salvation. In that case some new movement must inherit the vitality that lies in the right purposes thus put forward.

That is none of Bryan's business nor ours. It is the part of every man who perceives these things to be good, to urge them however he can upon whomsoever he can reach. Bryan enjoys a peculiar opportunity of setting forth his views before a large number.

In this much he is right, eternally right. Private monopoly must be extinguished. And he is doing a good work in laying before the people his views, and aiding in getting to a conclusion the means to be employed.—Goodhue County News of Nov. 19, 1904.

#### MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

##### REFORMATION OR PUNISHMENT.

It will be remembered by the people of Cleveland what a fierce howl was sent up from various quarters when the humane treatment of workhouse prisoners was started by Director Cooley, backed by Mayor Johnson. The idea was new and it was thought that there was not enough punishment and vengeance being visited upon the poor unfortunates who are sent to our local penitentiary.

But the course went right on. All who were thought worthy, or who seemed likely to make an attempt at reformation were let go and the results have been more than could have been anticipated.

Now come forward the state board of charities and commend what has

been done by Johnson and Cooley. They say the system ought to be still further extended, that the parole system at the Mansfield reformatory has been found very beneficial and that it is the only way to bring about any desirable results with prisoners. They ought always to be paroled when they show indications of reformation and as soon as the reformation seems to be confirmed they ought to be pardoned.

Thus are we gradually emerging from darkness of the old sort of prison life into the better light and Cleveland has been one of the first to adopt the new way of doing, thanks to Mayor Johnson and Director Cooley.

The time ought to be near at hand when the jails shall not be nearly so crowded as at present. It will not be so profitable perhaps for sheriffs in Ohio towns who board the prisoners, but it will be much better for society.—Editorial in Cleveland Recorder of Nov. 16.

##### THE CITY SOLICITOR'S REFORMATION OF THE "SUNRISE" COURTS.

City Solicitor Baker yesterday afternoon expressed himself as generally satisfied, in discussing the workings of the municipal code in its dealings with his office, but more particularly that section which placed the police prosecutor's office under his jurisdiction. The question had been asked as to the operation of the plan, which has now been in force for a year and a half.

"In my judgment the consolidation of my office and that of the police prosecutor has proved an effective arrangement. Perhaps no part of the city's complicated and extensive business is more important or more delicate than the prosecution of the delinquent and unfortunate classes before its police magistrates.

"Two police courts are in daily session, dealing with arrests averaging perhaps 200 a day. The offenses charged vary from simple cases of intoxication, for which the offenders are arrested either to prevent disturbance or as a protection to the defendant against his own inability to take care of himself, to the preliminary hearings of persons charged with the gravest infractions of the laws of the State.

"The persons with whom the police prosecutor has to deal, aggregating in all perhaps 30,000 persons annually arrested, and at least an equal number of persons for whose arrest no warrant is ever issued, include the young and old, the corrigible and incorrigible, the fortunate and the vicious. The exercise of sound discrimination against the indiscriminate arrest and imprison-

ment of all violators of more or less petty, though necessary legal restrictions, is daily required, while vigilance is always necessary to secure the enforcement of the law and to bring about that respect for the rights and property of other people without which no organized society can exist in peace and safety.

"Through the co-operation of the judges of the police court, and the officers of the police department, my assistants in the prosecutor's office have been able, I believe, to install several substantial and beneficial reforms in its administration, the most notable of these being the so-called 'sunrise' court, by which the persons arrested for intoxication, and having no previous criminal record, are permitted to sign waivers of their right to be present when tried, coupled with the pleas of guilty, and, upon being sufficiently restored to be able to take care of themselves, to be released by the officers in charge of the several precinct stations, thus enabling the defendants to return to their places of employment without the humiliation of arraignment in the police court and association with the more or less hardened offenders.

"These waivers and pleas are presented regularly each morning in the police court, and, in the absence of any charge by the police officers of aggravating circumstances, the defendants are uniformly discharged.

"By this plan the self-respect of first offenders is so far saved that it affords a stimulus for better conduct, and the actual number of persons to be dealt with in police court is so reduced that more time is afforded for the examination of cases requiring more attention and care."—Cleveland Plain Dealer of Nov. 20.

##### PROBATIONARY MARRIAGE.

An extract from a private letter.

Those radical thinkers who advocate a temporary union before permanent marriage because of existing social prejudices, usually suggest a clandestine arrangement. A clandestine arrangement is not a true test of compatibility. Permanent living together means two people living under normal conditions, with the different interests of life more or less properly proportioned. These normal conditions involve social life, for man's highest function is to fill his place as a member of the social whole. The vital necessity of any partnership where comradeship is the aim, is the sharing of mutual sympathies and interests.

A clandestine partnership does not ad-

mit of a rational proportion between the life of personal affections and passions, and the active life of the two individuals functioning as members of society, with the broader relations this would make possible. Because of the necessity of hiding their relations, and the consequent exciting effect upon the passions, of the mystery thus involved, and because of lack of opportunity for mutual work together in their social world,—this secret relation assumes undue proportions and is not normal in its effects.

So it is not a fair test of married life, and any little reaction of one against the other easily results in an estrangement. The unduly close, or abnormally distant relations of the couple, of necessity, lead to magnification of annoying incidents, so that too great a demand is made on human self-control, just because there lack the thousand little daily bonds to weigh in the balance. It is impossible for two people to live together without some moments of estrangement, and mutual giving up and self-control is required, even in an ordinary friendship.

Then again, we are all inheritors of our past; no matter how much we may think we are emancipated from old traditions and beliefs, we are unconsciously influenced by them, and under certain circumstances easily revert to them as an excuse for our weak inability to live up to our advanced ideas. A man may think he believes in a "free woman," and yet, after the first enthusiasm of his affection has passed, he easily leaves her because his traditions do not sanction her actions and his inherited social conscience exonerates him from blame, as does his social world. It is easy for him to think that "legally" he owes her nothing, since he has been accustomed to measure right and wrong by civil law.

Moreover, the union of a man and woman only becomes absolutely complete and perfect when their oneness becomes incarnate in a child of their love. Then, too, the mutual self-sacrifice for the child gives a strong common interest, and creates sympathy between them in spite of some slight personal incompatibility. In our present society the reason for secrecy in probationary arrangements is to save the couple, or particularly the woman, from almost absolute social isolation, and in case marriage does not follow, to protect the woman from the future of a social outcast. The above facts demand that the couple forego this culminating and most chastening experience of life together, and so the probationary period is not a fair test. If we had a "free society," these objections would be removed, and a couple might work to-

gether openly and lead a normally balanced life. But granting this, if separation should take place after a child is born, what a wrong to the child, for no state, no impersonal protection (which of necessity becomes perfunctory in its duties), could make up to the human soul for the love and tenderness of father and mother. No one who loves, and who knows the needs of a little child, could for one moment bear the thought of a state rearing of children. If that means simply that the state bears the expense, while the mother nurtures and trains the child, the injustice would not be so great, but even then it would lose much from the lack of the father's influence, too. The parents ought to share the great responsibility of educating the human life which is a part of them both.

But, be society what it may, there is a deeper and unanswerable reason why temporary marriages are not best. Every true woman feels physically and spiritually bound to her first love (and there is natural law back of this); he is always enshrined in the holy of holies of her heart. She may pull the veil tight and almost forget the presence there; she may even love another honestly and live happily and usefully with him, but more often her whole life is bound up and limited by the first all-absorbing passion of her life.

We have only to interpret the evidence of great fictions and of history, to realize the truth of this. Certainly it has a meaning for the advocates of great freedom in love, if they will but see it. Though the fundamental objections to experimental marriages come from the point of view of the woman, since man is so often lacking in paternal instinct, and one might say, always lacking in the instinct of fidelity; yet a man can only reach a high development through consideration for the general good of individuals, and of society. If these are all militated against by probationary marriage, he should be willing to deny himself somewhat.

Men should remember that the ones to champion a cause are not those who lose nothing by it, and whose natural tendencies may even be indulged under its high-sounding mottoes. Any great movement for the general good must take its rise from those who have everything to lose personally, before we can feel that the cause is for the world's advancement. The saviors of society have ever found that they must lose their lives to save their souls. We are all our "brothers' keepers."

The young lawyer is a necessity but frequently, like necessity, he knows no law.—Philadelphia Record.

#### THE MIRSKY REGIME IN RUSSIA.

An editorial published in the Springfield Republican of November 25, 1904.

It would be by far too daring a parallel if one were to compare the first national assembling of the representatives of the zemstvos, or provincial assemblies, in Russia with the convening of the states-general of France in 1789, which was the initial step in the French revolution. The conditions in the two countries are not the same, and the Russian national assemblage of the representatives of the zemstvos will be by no means a body having the political and traditional status of the states-general of France. Yet, allowing for all important differences, it is impressive to note certain points of similarity in the two cases.

France had been ruled by a despotic monarch for generations when Louis XVI. found his government beset with grave difficulties, especially financial ones, and confronted by an increasing discontent and poverty of the people. All schemes for removing the embarrassments of the government and alleviating the burdens of the masses having failed, the king, as a last resort, convened the states-general, consisting of the representatives of the three estates, or orders of citizens, which had not been in session since 1618. The essential point for one to grasp is that after generations of absolutist rule, a break-down of autocratic government had taken place, and in that emergency the autocrat turned back to the representative idea of government, or to the people, for help in carrying on the state. When the states-general was convened, no one realized what the consequences would be; no one dreamed that within five years the autocratic monarch would have been displaced by a republic of a democratic type. The convening of the states-general came too late for an orderly period of change and reform; but that fact need not obscure the point that in its distress, under the unbearable burden of government, the autocracy was finally forced to stretch out its hands toward the people.

The political parallel between the France of Louis XVI. and Necker and the Russia of Nicholas II. and Prince Mirsky must be found, if at all, therefore, in the fact that in the later emergency and distress, if not the actual breakdown, of an autocratic government the despot again shows a tendency to turn toward the people. It is not necessary to exaggerate the difficulties of the present government of Russia: in view of its financial credit in inter-

national money markets and its vigor in carrying on a great war 6,000 miles distant from the imperial capital, there is no reason to think that the government of Nicholas II. is sunk to any such decrepitude as was that of Louis XVI. Yet who can doubt that the domestic and foreign difficulties of the Russian autocracy have brought about the liberal policy of which Prince Mirsky is now the personal embodiment, by the will of his imperial master?

In a sense, the recent national assemblage of the presidents of the zemstvos, under the diffection of the minister of the interior, was more revolutionary than was the mere act of the reconvening of the states-general of France, for the national gathering of the zemstvos has never taken place before. The historical importance of the gathering may easily be overestimated, and its ultimate results may prove deeply disappointing, for its business is to be of a comparatively parochial nature, but how much significance the bare event may possess in the minds of Russian reactionaries is seen in their intense opposition. They, at least, seem to appreciate the gravity of initial steps, however timid they may be. We can only surmise the bitterness of the struggle over this matter that has raged around the emperor, but the reports from St. Petersburg can hardly have been overdrawn. After the assassination of Alexander II. his plans for developing the self-governing powers and functions of the zemstvos were thrust into the background and the extreme reaction against liberal ideas has prevailed substantially from that day to this. The present czar could not support the ideas of his new minister of the interior, the successor of the extreme reactionary Plehve, without encountering fierce opposition in the bureaucracy. Of that we may be sure. The very character of the issue raised against the gathering by the conservatives, therefore, tends to transform what might have been relatively an unimportant event into one of the uncommon magnitude. The world, if not too skeptical, may now discern in this assemblage of the presidents of the 38 zemstvos of Russia, for the consideration of some of Russia's internal affairs, a hopeful step toward the decentralization of the government and the introduction of a more liberal, if not a representative or constitutional, regime.

Few things are more improbable than that Russia will suffer from a violent revolution in government, like that in France over a century ago. True, there

are writers and observers who press the parallel between the two autocracies to that point—in anticipation—but when one considers the comparative helplessness nowadays of undisciplined mobs or levies against governments in the acquirement and use of the complicate modern material of war, a successful uprising or rebellion in a popular cause against the Russian autocracy seems beyond the range of probability. And so, if there is any basis of hope in Prince Mirsky's cautious liberalism, whose effects were so interestingly described in the Associated Press dispatches from St. Petersburg last week, the outcome will be orderly and evolutionary rather than violent and revolutionary.

That the czar has been moved to call Prince Mirsky to his side and to support his progressive policy is due, no doubt, largely to the complete failure of reaction and oppression under Plehve, who was murdered, to the growing difficulties of the government in peace and war, at home and abroad, and to the odium, almost world-wide, which envelops the Russian autocracy in Christendom and which the present war has strikingly revealed. It is not a fantastic idea that the Japanese are doing more to reform Russia than everything else in the world. In any event, whatever the cause, whatever the result, the czar deserves credit in the minds of impartial people for not plunging to still farther extremes of reaction after the assassination of Plehve. Instead, he did an act of high statesmanship in summoning a cautious and enlightened liberal like Prince Mirsky to the great post of minister of the interior and in allowing him to inaugurate a new domestic regime in Russia.

Teddy's knowledge of the Constitution is like that of the boy who was asked if he had ever gone through algebra. He replied: "Yes, but it was in the night-time, and I didn't see much of it!"—Macon Telegraph.

"You are an hour late this morning, Sam."

"Yes, sah, I know it, sah."

"Well, what excuse have you?"

"I was kicked by a mule on my way here, sah."

"That ought not to have detained you an hour, Sam."

"Well, you see, boss, it wouldn't have if he'd only have kicked me in dis direction, but he kicked me de other way!"

—Yonkers Statesman.

Doctor's Wife—Aren't you going to take your instrument case?

Doctor—No; the patient is a plum-

ber. I'm going to send back for the instruments and charge him for the time.—San Francisco Star.

#### INDURATED FOOLISHNESS.

Vested rights is our special weakness. If any shadowy, fictitious claim can be tortured into a vested right we will sit up nights to defend it, and pay the cost of riveting it onto our frame forever.

Vested rights—there is no such thing.

Any right that can't stand alone, sturdy and naked before the world, without the wrapping of parchment

shrouds to hold it together from total collapse—a right like that is no right at all, but rather a vested wrong.

The older it is and the mustier, the more we cherish these vested

rights

of paying somebody tribute.

Which again is the sign of the

cheerful chump.

—Goodhue County News, of Red Wing, Minn.

#### BOOKS

##### THE LIFE OF TENNYSON.

The toll and wear of daily life sometimes almost overwhelm the best of us. We try to keep up a brave front. We preach good cheer to ourselves, and have it preached to us. It is the healthy fashion. But all of us who are honest with ourselves know that there are times when the burdens of life and the pettiness of environment weigh heavily. At such times what we need is to be lifted into a higher atmosphere. We need the subtle influence of souls who have been where we have been, and know that, however deep the valley, the strongest have passed hither and thither across it, and never lost faith that they could find again the path that leads to the heights. Such passings through the valley and findings of higher paths are the main story of all true and great biographies. And therefore it is that such books, next to a living friend, become at times our best companions. They are always ready. We may open them at any moment and get into the best society that the world has seen.

Some such feeling Andrew Lang must have had when he wrote his noble sonnet upon Homer's matchless biography of Ulysses:

"Men turn, and see the stars, and feel the free

Shrill wind beyond the close of heavy flowers,

And through the music of the languid hours

They hear like ocean on a western beach

The surge and thunder of the Odyssey."

This life of Tennyson by his son Hallam (Macmillan Co., 2 vols.), is a book that one may turn to at any moment and pass at once into high company—a company not of fictitious rank and worth, but of great ones who have looked at

life and seen it whole, of great ones who have lived, not in the surface of the passing show, but in all the heights and depths of human thoughts and passions.

Perhaps the most interesting parts of the book are the reported talks—talks, as Horace says:

"Not gossip 'bout our neighbors' houses, Or if 'tis generally thought That Lepos dances well or not. But what concerns us nearer, and is harmful not to understand, Whether by wealth or worth, 'tis plain, That men to happiness attain?"

There are talks with Carlyle, Jowett, Browning and many others. And only a little less good are the letters, giving us insight into the minds of the men of supremest worth in England during most of the nineteenth century.

What strikes one most forcibly is the freedom and candor of expression not only as to thoughts about life and public matters, but as to personal feelings of depression or cheer, as the case might be. It is this intimate intercourse with such men, this knowledge of their ups and downs, which makes such a book both a comfort and delight to the least of us.

Some adverse criticism of the book would be easy. The material is not always well put together, and there is lack of notes in explanation of allusions here and there which one would like to know more about. But all in all the book is one to have and to hold and to associate with on any convenient occasion.

Tennyson himself stands out in strong lines, as a supreme figure of his time, seeing the glory of his day, and also the weakness and danger of an age that is passing through phases of uncertain faith. Mr. Goldwin Smith, in one of his enlightening articles, writing in the American Historical Review on English Poetry and English History, says Tennyson had nothing definite to teach. He thinks Tennyson's line, "There's something in this world amiss will be unriddled by and by," was his prevailing mental attitude. But this seems to be going rather too far. Tennyson of course felt the spirit of inquiry and science, but what poet has given finer utterance to the final unity of truth? The more one studies Tennyson in his poems and in his life, the more is one likely to agree with what Froude said in a letter to Hallam Tennyson after the poet's death: "Your father, in my estimate, stands and will stand far away by the side of Shakespeare, above all other English poets, with this relative superiority even to Shakespeare, that he speaks the thoughts, and speaks to the perplexities and misgivings, of his own age."

J. H. DILLARD.

PERIODICALS.

The Ladies' Home Journal for December is full of Christmas, and will

be liked all the better so. One of the best of the contributions is a Christmas kindergarten story by Myra Kelly, entitled the Gifts of the Philosophers. The Longfellow picture, illustrating the line, "Home-keeping hearts are happiest," is very beautiful. The artist, W. L. Taylor, whether or not he means to be, is one of the best preachers in America. J. H. D.

What will happen in Russia no one can tell, but it seems that something of a more liberal policy is surely to be advanced in the near future. Already a marked change of attitude toward outraged Finland is observable. "Moreover," says the Outlook, "censorship has been relaxed in Russia itself, and the newspapers are speaking out with a frankness which has not been known in the country for years past."

J. H. D.

The New York Independent in its issue of November 17 has some very entertaining reviews of books by the authors themselves. Mr. Ghent's review of his recently published "Mass and Class" is a most delightful bit of foolery. "There is also to be noted," he says, in enumerating the defects of his book, "a deplorable tendency to make light of the teachings of savants, such as college professors, theological doctors and the like. The audacity, not to say impertinence, of pitting such unschooled opinions against the disciplined conclusions of official teachers cannot be too severely condemned."

J. H. D.

The Literary Digest of November 26 quotes the New York Evening Mail on the Lack of Vital Poetry. Our poets, says the Mail, are "turning out verses which fulfill the same function in a magazine that a rubber-plant does in a dining-room. . . . The Americans," the writer continues, "are working out new and large problems on this hemisphere, and they give themselves the credit of a restlessly active political life. But you would never guess it

Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow's Dates for the Henry George Lecture Ass'n.

Table listing dates and locations for the Henry George Lecture Ass'n. Locations include New York City, Ann Arbor, Mt. Pleasant, Cadillac, Manistee, Muskegon, Kalamazoo, Oshkosh, Wausau, Stevens Point, Marshfield, Coiby, Abbotsford, Duluth, Stillwater, River Falls, St. Paul and Minneapolis, Banquet, Chicago, Milwaukee, Port Atkinson, Beloit, Reedsburg, La Crosse, Wirota, Red Wing, Grand Rapids, Eikhart, and Detroit.

from their poets. The whole breed of them seems to have taken to the woods." The Mail should have made at least one exception. There is no lack of vitality in Edwin Markham. He at least gives evidence of grasping the modern situation. His poem in the Independent of November 24. "Give Thanks, O Heart," is a noble production.

Give thanks, O heart, for the high souls That point us to the deathless goals— For all the courage of their cry That echoes down from sky to sky— Lincoln, Mazzini, Lamennais, Living the thing that others pray; Cromwell, St. Francis and the rest, Bearing the God-fire in the breast.

J. H. D.

The New York Independent of November 24 has an editorial entitled a Privileged Class, protesting against the permitted lawlessness of college students. "Mr. Dooley," says the Independent, "defines a diploma as a license to wear a Mother Hubbard on the street without interference from the police." If this were all, continues the editorial, there need be no protest. "But the Princeton boys can sack a Fall River steambot and the Columbia students can gut a restaurant, and other students can break up public entertainments, because they know enough to pass an entrance examination and are rich enough to pay a tui-

NOTICE TO READERS.

If you have been reading The Public on trial, this notice may interest you. Your regular subscription for three or six months or a year, if sent in before January 1, 1905, will begin at once and continue until three or six months or a year, as the case may be, after January 1, 1905. Thus \$2 will give you the paper from receipt of your subscription until January 1, 1906; \$1 will give it to you from receipt of subscription until July 1, 1905; and 50 cents will give it to you from receipt of subscription until April 1, 1905. The same offer is open to all persons not already on the regular subscription list of The Public.

SOUTHERN TAX REFORM BUREAU. Box 888 Station R. NEW ORLEANS, LA. Literature and information on the SINGLE TAX furnished FREE on application. Contributions to expenses will be welcomed.

SIX RACY AND SPICY

10 cts. each. "Six Racy and Spicy from the Straight Edge," done into dainty booklets. 50c for the six. The Church of Divine Satisfaction: The Honorable Charles Rockingham Dinkens: The Ghost of Murdered Love: The Silly Old Dragon: The Highest of all Arts: The Philosophy of Toys. STRAIGHT EDGE PRESS, 1 Abingdon St., New York.