

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1904.

Number 308.

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.

"Why don't you endow a chair in economics at our university?" This identical question was asked a few years ago by a distinguished educator, a man of national fame in his vocation, of a millionaire who had disclosed to him a profound interest in economic subjects.

As the story is true and at the present time instructively significant, it may be worth the telling. To appreciate its value, however, one must understand that the millionaire actor in it was in principle that very rare bird in the millionaire life of America, a democrat of the Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln type.

"Why don't I endow a chair of economics at your university?" returned the millionaire. "Well, I suppose it might be because I haven't much respect for the kind of economics the universities are teaching." But this reply did not divert the "touch" of the educator. "Oh," said he, "that could be easily arranged to suit you!"

Here was a plain intimation to the millionaire that if he would endow a chair in economics he might have any kind of economics taught from it that he preferred. The question of right or wrong, of truth or falsity, of science or bunco, cut no figure. Only the endowment cut any figure. In this instance the endowment was withheld, because the subject of the "touch" had no more respect for that kind of college administration than he had for the regular brand of college economics. But

it is a common thing now-a-days for millionaires who are not democratic to respond with fabulous gifts to the "touches" of pushing educators; and one cannot but wonder whether these gifts may not be made upon some such tacit understanding as the educator of our story proposed. Do these educators assure these donors that in consideration of their gifts the teaching of the favored college will be arranged to suit them?

It is the suspicion that this may be so, which gives to the dismissal of Oscar Lovell Triggs from the faculty of the Rockefeller-Harper university at Chicago its public importance. So far as the public knows, Mr. Triggs may be incompetent. His popularity among the students and his long connection with the university tend to discredit that assumption: yet questions of competency must be determined by trustees—the public cannot decide them. So far as the public knows, the pronounced democratic spirit of the man may have had nothing to do with his dismissal. It may be that all of us would approve the action of the trustees were we apprised of the facts which the trustees withhold. And whether we would or no, we should all be inclined to say that the responsibility is upon the trustees, and so long as they are worthy of confidence we must accept their conclusions not only as necessarily final but as presumably just. But there's the rub!—that question of confidence. How can the public be confident that Mr. Triggs has been dropped for legitimate educational reasons? How can the public be confident that he has not been dropped in pursuance of some understanding that the teaching force and spirit of the Chicago university shall be "arranged to suit" Mr. Rockefeller?

It is because they reasonably excite suspicions like these that lavish gifts to colleges from the millionaire beneficiaries of rich and rare legal privileges are peculiarly dangerous to the educational interests of a democracy. Such gifts tend to undermine public confidence in the management of the educational institutions upon which they are bestowed. The Chicago university is an example. Notwithstanding the value of the work that this university has done and is doing; notwithstanding the attitude of bold and intelligent defiance to plutocracy which some of its professors maintain as citizens, and the democratic spirit of their teaching; yet there is a well-defined and entirely excusable feeling abroad that when one of these manly professors is dropped from the faculty, the reason is more likely traceable to some arrangement with Mr. Rockefeller than to sound and sincere educational considerations. And so would it be with the University of Nebraska should President Andrews succeed in his arrangements for "touching" Mr. Rockefeller in its behalf. This whole regime of plutocratic paternalism is bringing the administration of American educational tendencies into scandalous discredit.

There is no mistaking the signs of a revival of the movement to force Grover Cleveland's nomination (pp 549, 553) upon the Democratic party. Mr. Cleveland's friend and adviser "Dan," whose surname is Lamont, is reported to be firm in his demand for Cleveland and nobody but Cleveland. Tammany Hall, now under the control of the Rockefeller financial interests, has virtually declared for Cleveland. Strong Republican influences, financial in character, have long had the Cleveland trend; and now that Hanna is

dead they are setting in stronger and swifter than ever in that direction. They have a much more sensitive affinity for Cleveland than for Roosevelt. The most significant of all these pro-Cleveland signs, however, is Cleveland's own undisguised bid for the nomination. His article on "Democracy's Opportunity," is so understood on all hands, except among the innocents of his own worshipful flock; and, indeed, no one possessed of the slightest political sophistication can draw any other principal inference from it.

Mr. Cleveland advocates some good things in this article of his. But he advocates nothing that he couldn't dump, were he President again, as easily as he dumped the anti-protection policy on which he was elected twelve years ago. Nor does he utter a word that would interfere with his serving his good friend, J. Pierpont Morgan, as he served him in 1893 when he abandoned the tariff issue on which his party was united and he had been elected, to substitute for it the money issue on which his party was divided and he had not been elected. He again weakly tries to shift responsibility for Democratic disaster in 1896 to Bryan; but that it was really due to his own treachery is too plainly written in the election returns of 1894, when the party went to pieces under Cleveland, and in those of 1896 when it began to revive under Bryan.

Cleveland has something to say against "obsolete issues and questions no longer challenging popular interest." Yet he demands "tariff reform," a semi-protection issue which is as obsolete as the cautious words themselves are devoid of inspiration. Tariff for revenue only is the mildest form in which the tariff question can ever again excite popular enthusiasm, and for this Mr. Cleveland has no praise. He objects to "redundancy" and "dreariness" in campaign declarations, yet fills his own article with redundancies and worse than redundancies, to

the end that he may seem to say much that is democratic on principle without committing himself to anything. He demands that "the people of the Philippine Islands should be aided in the establishment of a government of their own." Yet when they had a government of their own, and the paramount issue before the American people in a Presidential election was whether the heavy hand of American imperialism should be lifted from that struggling government, Mr. Cleveland remained in his cloister, because he didn't like the anti-imperialist candidate personally and disagreed with him on questions which were not only subordinate but which Mr. Cleveland himself regarded as obsolete. Isn't it rather late in the day for Mr. Cleveland to propose that the Democratic party undo our Philippine wickedness, against the doing of which it protested and resisted at the critical moment but without aid or encouragement from him?

The truth seems to be that Mr. Cleveland foresees possibilities of victory in the coming campaign; and, backed by Lamont, Tammany Hall and the conspirators of Wall street who are Republicans with Republican grafters and Democrats with Democratic grafters but grand-boodlers always, he is reaching out for the plum leaf. Success is really the key note of his article. And what manner of success would it be? There is nothing to base expectations of Democratic success upon except the preference of Wall street—nothing whatever. Roosevelt is popular with the Republican masses, but an object of hatred to Wall street manipulators. Cleveland is unpopular with the Democratic masses, but an object of love, for manifest reasons, to Wall street manipulators and their parasites and dupes. If a genuine democrat were nominated by the Democratic party, he would almost certainly be defeated at the polls; for against him there would be the Republican masses, the Wall street manipu-

lators, and the Cleveland grafters in the Democratic party itself. Cleveland sees this; and so do his whole faction. That is the reason they say the Democratic party can win if it nominates "the right man." They think that Wall street could shift the ballast. By "the right man," they mean one whom the Wall street manipulators would prefer to Roosevelt; and preeminently Cleveland is that man. There, therefore, is Cleveland's opportunity; this alliance with Wall street is the "Democratic opportunity" to which he alludes. It is hardly conceivable, however, that the Democracy of the country, anxious as its politicians are to get up to the public crib, would consummate the deal. Roosevelt and his jingoism are very objectionable, but in contrast with Cleveland and his Wall street partnership, should there be no other alternative, Roosevelt with all his faults would be angelic. Let every democrat pray that this alternative may not arise. Better far another defeat under a Williams, a Garvin, a Johnson, a Bryan—anyone, so only that he be a worthy man and a sincere democrat—than a hope of victory, or even victory itself, under the leadership of a stalking horse for the most corrupt plutocracy the world has ever known.

Some of the Grover Cleveland organs, notably the Chicago Chronicle, which is the property of John R. Walsh (a Chicago banker who was once and is again an aspirant for secretary of the treasury under Cleveland), advocate the repeal of the two-thirds rule in Democratic conventions. This demand is meritorious. Both the two-thirds rule and the unit rule are tools in the hands of political manipulators for subverting the will of the majority. Let both be bundled into one resolution of repeal and wiped out together.

Beginning with repudiating the sentiments of Abraham Lincoln and suppressing the Declaration of Independence, the plutocrats

who control the Republican party have finally placed Washington's farewell address upon their index expurgatorious. When a motion was made in the lower House of Congress on the 22d to recognize the birthday of the Father of his Country, by reading his farewell address, these recreant Republicans, these imperialistic Americans, voted the motion down.

In his address at the Union League Club's Washington birthday celebration on the 22d Elihu Root undertook to give the history of what will be described hereafter as the Panama episode. That this address was intended as a campaign document in justification of the attitude of the party was quite evident from the internal evidence. But what shall be thought of the moral status of a people who can solemnly approve theft when only thinly disguised by the doctrine of "qualified sovereignty." This would justify every act of aggression which may be committed by one interest upon the rights of any other. Such a principle denies natural rights and erects a rule of conduct based upon power animated by desire. It conceives of right and wrong as merely conventional. It is another expression of the doctrine that any act which is legalized, thereby becomes moralized. When imperious desire is supported by power it has always been the practice to legalize spoliation and then despoil. It has sometimes happened that the necessities of the situation demand immediate spoliation without waiting to be pre-legalized; but this difficulty is overcome by retroactive decrees legalizing whatever has been done. Mr. Root's doctrine of the "world's easement" is new, but it also affords considerable scope for thought. It is the doctrine of the "decadent nation" theory of Lord Salisbury. The "rights" of which Mr. Root spoke as being "necessary to make this easement effective" is a feeble imitation of the "implied powers" of constitutional interpretation. If one were able to extirpate that unconscious exercise of the reasoning faculty

which links separate and distinct incidents by the fiber of their principle, it might be a simple matter to silence the questioning raised by Mr. Root's address. But that is unfortunately impossible. One unconsciously strives to distinguish between "qualified sovereignty" of a nation over territory and the "qualified sovereignty" of individuals over personal property upon which porch climbers and sandbaggers cast an envious eye. Under this theory the fact that the owner of a gold watch was a small man and the sandbagger a very large and burly individual (and one who "needed the money" besides), would seem to make it highly improper to question the sandbagger's "easement" or his "right" to make use of any means necessary to make this "easement" effective. "Qualified sovereignty" is the euphemistic phrase under which international petit larceny is justified and our Republic transformed into a "fence."

In describing last week the petition for the repeal of the opinion-penalizing act of Congress under which John Turner, the English labor organizer, is held at Ellis Island for deportation (p. 723), we accidentally omitted the name of Philip Stein, a judicial associate of Judges Tuley, Dunne, Windes and Brown, who were among the signers of the petition. Judge Stein also had signed it.

Without shame, how is it possible for any loyal American to read the reports from Porto Rico, that the Federal party there is vainly demanding either Statehood or independence? Porto Rico welcomed the American army as her deliverer from Spanish bondage. But now she learns that America has placed her in a bondage more humiliating. Under Spain she sent six members to the Spanish parliament. But under the United States she has no representation in the American Congress, her one solitary delegate to Congress having no vote on any question and no right to speak even on Porto Rican affairs save by courtesy of

the House. Under Spain her natives were natural born citizens of Spain, and therefore capable of becoming naturalized citizens of any other country, including the United States. But under the United States they are not natural born citizens of any country, and are therefore incapable of becoming naturalized citizens anywhere—even of the United States. Truly the Porto Ricans have achieved humiliating distinction as wards of our Republic.

In his funeral oration over Senator Hanna's body, the chaplain of the Senate (the venerable Edward Everett Hale), referred to labor arbitration as mediation "between the men who provide the tools and the workmen who handle them." As a quotation from a Senate chaplain this superficiality might pass for an example in rhetoric. But Mr. Hale is something besides a chaplain. He is an economic thinker. One might like to know, therefore, who Mr. Hale's men are that furnish tools to workmen, if they are not workmen themselves. All artificial tools must be made by workmen. Does Mr. Hale allude, however, to natural tools—to such things, for example, as mineral deposits? Truly no human workmen provide these. But what makes it necessary for any men to provide such tools? Nature provides them abundantly.

Gov. La Follette, of Wisconsin, has demanded of the Wisconsin railroad companies that they furnish a list of all the public officials they are bribing with annual passes. It is to be hoped that Mr. La Follette will be able under the laws of his State to enforce his demand. Giving passes is one of the insidious modes of corruptly influencing legislation, administration and adjudication. No man who holds a public office—be he legislator, executive or judge—can be trusted to deal honestly between railroad interests and the public interests if he holds railroad passes. Not that corrupt officials can be so cheaply bribed, but that this petty bribery breaks

the ice for corrupt negotiations. The railroads give no passes without expecting some kind of advantage or opportunity to secure advantage in return. Even their newspaper passes are made to yield rich returns. Journalistic favor is often useful and when paid for with passes it is marvelously cheap.

Judson Grenell, of Detroit, author of that very lucid book, "Economic Tangles," and who has been for many years intelligently active in editorial work, has undertaken an important mission abroad. Intending to make an extended trip across the water, he is arranging to supply a chain of American newspapers with letters comparing industrial conditions in this country with those in Great Britain, France, Italy and other European countries. Few newspaper men are as well qualified as Mr. Grenell for such a work. Not only is he exceptionally well-equipped by years of reading, observation, investigation and study with reference to industrial subjects, but he has extraordinary ability as a lucid and interesting writer. Mr. Grenell's "Economic Tangles" is a model of clear thinking and verbal simplicity. The work he is now about to do is one that is much needed. Although foreign letters on industrial subjects are not uncommon, they are as a rule dreadful "fakes." Most of them might be written at home with the aid of an encyclopedia and a statistical library, while others are more picturesque than truthful. Mr. Grenell's work may be depended upon for intelligent selection, accuracy of data, and genuine local color.

When Carroll D. Wright declared in a lecture at Buffalo on the 19th that "the decalogue is as good a labor platform as any," he may have been playing to churchly galleries and boxes. Some parts of the decalogue are not exactly industrial. Yet it is quite true that other parts, if divested of paganistic interpretations, would make the best possi-

ble labor platform. "Six days shalt thou labor," would be a good principle to insist upon, unpopular as it would be with the elegant leisure classes. And "thou shalt not steal," would be the best of all for labor purposes. Let stealing cease—stealing of all kinds, institutional and legal plundering as well as petty larceny—and the labor problem would be solved. There would be no chattel slavery, no economic slavery, no monopoly, no interferences of any kind with industry, if the commandment against stealing were faithfully observed.

In the award of The Hague arbitration tribunal in the Venezuelan case there seems to be some sort of echo of Hood's "Haunted House" refrain:

O'er all there hung a shadow and a fear,
A sense of mystery the spirit daunted,
And said as plain as whisper in the ear
The place is haunted.

The award of this peace tribunal is overshadowed by a fateful recognition of that fundamental law of warfare, that "he may take who has the power and he may keep who can." To decide in favor of the nations that resorted to arms, simply because they resorted to arms, and against those that trusted to the methods of peace, certainly suggests "as plain as whisper in the ear," that The Hague tribunal is haunted by the war spectre. There is much force, to be sure, in Wayne MacVeagh's remark that the particular decision is of no importance, the important thing being the fact that eleven nations have come together in arbitration. Nevertheless a precedent has been made not only in favor of arbitration, but also in favor of resorting to war in order to be in good position for securing favorable awards.

"Would you object to stating how you made your first thousand dollars?" said the heart-to-heart interviewer.

"No," answered Senator Sorghum; "but in discussing this matter I want you to draw the line strictly at the first thousand."—Washington Star.

JUDICIAL USURPATION.

The development of government by injunction* is as important as the smothering of an incipient blaze in the neighborhood of a powder magazine.

A court of equity could to-day extend its very strong arm to sell at auction the citizen's goods who is arrested and fined for contempt, without giving rise to anything more than the sensation of a surprise party to the conservative portion of the people. At the extremes of the social scale there would be different opinions as to the civic righteousness of the principle involved. Those who sympathize with the man who is overwhelmed by the opening of the flood gates of justice will say it is right to resist such usurpation of the taxing power, linked with imprisonment for debt. Those at the other extreme would commend the exhibition of nerve and dignity on the part of the official; and could with a clear conscience say that the injunctive process, in the language of Lord Bacon concerning the star chamber, is a sage and beneficent institution. The first named conviction spreads the more rapidly because it is natural for a thing to grow from the ground up.

We are too much inclined to think of the ordinary judge as living in a valley of dry bones. Some talented attorney comes into court and speaks the judge fair: "Breathe me now the breath of life into this long bone, so that my master may become the Samson of society."

All the time the smiling attorney is pleading the cause of abstract justice he has the pass of

*An injunction was granted by a Boston judge on the 12th of February, 1904, which was thus described by the news dispatches of that date: "Justice Loring, of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, has invented a new method of dealing with sympathetic strikes. It is an injunction against the paying of strike benefits by union men in such cases. The injunction, which is a temporary one, was issued to-day against the International Pressmen and Assistants' union. The pressmen have been threatening a sympathetic strike in connection with the contest of the job compositors of this city against members of the United Typothetae of America. By the terms of the injunction they are restrained from bringing about this action. That clause of the injunction referring to strike benefits prohibits their payment to those who have already left their work out of sympathy for the strikers rather than because of any individual grievance against their employers. The striking book and job printers are also enjoined from inciting the pressmen and feeders to leave their present employ."

the corporation he is working for stowed away in his pocket; and ten to one his honor on the bench is in the same fix. The pleader gains his end by concealing as much as he reveals. He aims to apply suggestive treatment. In his genial fashion he would have a Minerva-like idea spring full orbed from the brain of the public servant he addresses to convince him of the possession of surplus power. It must be a comfortable sensation to realize that you are like Robinson Crusoe, monarch of all you survey. Jefferson made the red-headed observation that the less governing we do the better. He had in mind the natural law that the citizen gets stubborn when he is hammered into submission; his adherence to the constitution and the laws ought to be free-will offerings.

The Federal judge, for instance, in swinging round his ample circuit reaches a community afflicted with an industrial boil. Instead of applying Franklin's prudential algebra, and without seeing the patient in consultation, he hears the ex parte complaint of those who stand charged with giving the wrong medicine, and grants the injunction. How much truth and falsehood have been woven together into the woof of persuasion the victim does not know. If he did know he might be prepared to bring a suit for slander. The nurse meets the toiler in the middle of the road and orders him to consent to a bad bargain.

Organized wealth may be seeking to add a cubit to its stature. It manifests no disposition to confess that its gain means labor's loss. The plea is always: "Oh, my Lord, maintain the status quo ante bellum." In the same breath it makes the claim that the splendid new conditions created by combination imply expansive constitutional limitations; whereas strict construction must be used on the rebels in the trenches, shops and herding pens of labor.

Attorney General Knox is on record as saying that the big holding companies have not played the part of alma mater to American prosperity. What they do hold is the big end of the horn of plenty. With equal truth they might be called withholding companies. Their gold mine is the public pocket

book. Sometimes they illustrate a famous line of Browning's:

A man's reach is longer than his grasp.

An injunction does not make the impression of being loaded with the determination to go behind the returns and inquire into the antecedent history of a sore spot. What it actually does is to command the wage worker to look pleasant. Labor disputes never strike a community with splitting suddenness. We ought to be built right to admit, that in the case of a strike involving a few thousands of men, some of the number are honest, God-fearing men, who have a desire to meet obligations. Something has happened to dislocate the hip joint of confidence. The willingness to strike does not imply the desire to strike. Nothing else will fill the bill. The guilty parties do not intend to sever relations with the employer. They know well enough where bread and butter comes from. A striker's offense is rank, it smells to heaven, inasmuch as it seeks to regulate another man's business. Hiring substitutes and resistance thereto are parts of the game. Here is a strategic point both sides undertake to hold against all comers. Persuasion, picketing, mobocracy, agitation, sympathy and money-aid are eagerly sought by the strikers. Employers seek to thrust aside these cobwebs with the new broom called the injunction. It must needs be polyglot for fear it may tackle a tarantula.

Sharp lines of demarcation are visible in the afflicted community as to the disease and the remedy. Outside the local ring in which the combatants engage in their pitched battle is the greater ring where the public is asked to stand as a disinterested spectator. A hungry bull dog has no choice between a sermon and a spanking. Government does not intervene with a helping hand as it aims to do where money is needed to move crops, or where stringency comes down on the money centers like a wolf on the fold. An injunction has been known to punish the least guilty.

Hatching technicalities is a business of the legal departments of the big corporations. Woe unto

the hired servant who allows his master to be beaten in a court of justice. Either he must find a way or make one to stay the hand of the avenger out of the raw material.

The stepfather of a recent injunction had to pay the penalty for carrying his flag too far ahead of the constitution. He must have heard something drop, or he would not, after the fashion of Saint Peter's dog, have returned to his vomit. It is a self-evident fact that the trusts regard themselves as the fifth wheel of the administration, because they pay the freight on Presidential elections.

Intervention from Washington should not be as a thing done in a corner. To charge organized labor with conspiracy and intent to destroy property, on account of a threatened strike, is throwing sand into the public eye. Organized capital scouts the idea that it is under any obligation to the wage worker for his job; yet it coolly asks for an injunction restraining men from quitting its employ in a pinch. Justice should be the same yesterday, to-day and forever.

In the original injunction applied to labor disputes, which was sued out in the Massachusetts court A. D. 1888, it was contended that carrying a banner constituted intimidation. That was intended to be a warning to trespassers, and presaged a new-fangled interpretation of existing law, liable to have as startling consequences as the opinion of a Pennsylvania judge, that a natural right to do missionary work among non-strikers did not exist. Human beings are not intimidated by something which cannot exercise force. That banner was not the thing aimed at in reality. We might as sensibly argue that the human voice belongs to Balaam's ass. Banners in a political procession are inimical to the success of a party, but they could not be enjoined any more than a flash of lightning. Men could be found to appeal to court, verily believing they did the cause of good government a service.

A disturbance of the peace was in progress. The day of contract, conciliation, profit-sharing and arbitration had not yet dawned with healing in its wings. As a result

of this pulling of injunctions out of courts of equity with forceps, these latter aids to labor's cause have sprung up and borne fruit, some thirty, some sixty and some an hundred fold.

The judge in his chambers understood that mobocracy is a contagious disorder. Extra constitutional power would be seized by the mob or the court, and the question to be settled on short notice was simply this; Which power could make the most merciful and honest use of oppression? Surgeons, in the press of a great battle, amputate more legs than they would under ordinary circumstances. If the judge used a convex lens in his search for authority, and magnified it until it was made to include a piece of virile municipal legislation, he would reflect that he had jurisdiction, and his act was not subject to review. The mob does not have jurisdiction, and it is in the minority; the majority being conservative enough to stay by the stuff in the social organism as long as possible. A banner to-day might incite to riot to-morrow, and to murder and incendiarism the day following. How much better to have a scapegoat than to invite a deluge of criminal business for the courts. "Take no thought for the-morrow" does not apply to courts.

This kind of an injunction is as far removed as the east is from the west, compared with the starvation injunction of a later date, but they are seed and melon to each other. The English precedent of 1868 was counterfeit. Some American investigator found the bones of this prehistoric giant and constructed a Trojan horse.

Interference with fundamental rights must have been deliberately planned where the disbursing officer of an organization of wage workers was enjoined from paying relief money to members on strike. The right to belong to a lodge is as sacred as the right to belong to a church. There is no necessary connection between a man's occupation and his lodge. One is not the train to the body of the other. His job requires that the wage worker spend the best part of the day on the premises of his employer. Capital is not a schoolmaster to exercise su-

per vision over an employe outside of working hours. Men who disobey the mandate of a court are treated as legal heretics. They are not exactly plain, unvarnished criminals. Courts would fall into disrepute if they had not the power to compel obedience. If the man with the hoe will not be good he must be punished for something. His guilt must be only constructive, since it is not touched by the right to the committing magistrate, counsel, appeal and jury. The trial by jury of a body of strikers caught in the act of refusing to work would be expensive and tedious. Taxpayers would not suffer such a burden to be loaded upon them for any length of time. "What thou doest do quickly to save the enjoiner's face," is the theory of the injunction. An old dodge is to create a diversion in the opposite direction to the real point of attack.

First the injunction was used to protect the private right in civil property. That was accepted as an edible mushroom. Later, organized wealth applied the principle to the preservation of public peace. People may have been astonished at the doctrine, but it worked. Now it has become a pons asinorum to enforce political powers.

Combinations of capital have picketed every avenue of approach to political power. Insistence that it is conspiracy to use the machinery of organized labor to strike ignores the twin fact that it is treason to usurp the functions of government.

Where the occupant of the bench shows the unmistakable proofs of concentrated mental energy by interfering with some of the alleged privileges of capital, he becomes at once persona non grata. It is imperative that he come to his task thoroughly furnished unto every good work, from a biased standpoint. Washington's test for high office is not enough, namely, "ability, integrity and conspicuousness." Industrial conspiracy is proven by a combination which stands a pyramid of money on its apex. An injunction does not often demonstrate its right to existence by removing such a heart clot from the national vitals. Earning capacity and buying capacity for producer

and consumer are measured by the yard-stick of capital. The wage worker has the narrower interest in industry, perhaps, but, such as it is, it represents all that makes life worth living. The few cents which capital seeks to shear off the labor cost of a product per capita can ill be spared. More of this amount in the aggregate will find its way into the channels of trade if it goes into the poor man's pocket than if it goes into the stockholder's private bank account. Over capitalization is heightened robbery of the plain people. Commodity handlers have a lively interest in the continuous activity of the industrial giants. Upon the steady employment of wage workers depends the turning of society on its axis. Fat pocketbooks incline toward big heads. Workingmen have a cast-iron conviction that capital is trying to put the cart before the horse. Those who force industry to the front have to carry a swarm of drones along. It is a granite boulder fact that \$1,100 is required to-day to do the work of \$700 four years ago. One-third of labor's purchasing power has disappeared as mysteriously as Captain Kidd's treasure, or the booty of Ananias and Sapphira. To steal outright amounts to the same thing as to destroy something beyond the hope of recovery which the wage worker needs in his business.

Injunctions have advantages which employers are slow to speak of in public. They put the government in the position of the insurance company. Defense with military power is the alternative to a suit for damages. Either way the cost comes out of the tax payers of the nation, and it is hinted that it will pay in dollars and cents to stand by the government, no matter how severe its repressive measures may seem. The love of money in such a case may be a root of evil.

Strikers are irresponsible, and the court does its best to put the foundation for responsibility somewhere. Monopoly, which squeezes the price of what it buys and inflates the price of what it sells, will practice its system of organized loot in any direction. As an example of how the people are exploited study the coal strike. Say the estimated output for the

current year will be 60,000,000 tons. One dollar per ton increase would make several men multimillionaires. These men, of course, saw the end from the beginning, and initiated an ordered sequence of events as logical as the tale of The House That Jack Built. Where the graft was faulty was in overlooking the tendency of the unexpected to happen. Proposals for government ownership of coal mines and the strike commission have boosted the cause of organized labor.

The people were careful to lodge the taxing power where it would be under the best control. Courts have power to find that the value of stocks and bonds is a fair basis for taxation, but organized wealth finds it easy to rob this wasp of its sting. Violation of equity in this point is presumptive evidence of conspiracy, to the same extent as the determination to strike on the part of organized labor. The court shows a disposition to treat everybody alike in the same way as the Almighty, who does not do for us what we can do for ourselves.

A commission to study government by injunction would be as sensible as a tariff or finance commission.

The injunction having issued against a body of strikers the latter are in contempt if they dare to violate the judge's ipse dixit. It affects others as well as the strikers, who happen to be driven into the industrial whirligig. Suppose the judge who brings forth the injunction could be an eye witness to a head-end collision between the contending forces, in which a striker commits murder. Would the striker be punished for contempt, or would he be reserved for the criminal court to make a horrible example of? It cannot be a doctrine of American jurisprudence that a man must commit murder in order to be entitled to trial by jury.

JAMES E. FREE.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Feb. 25.

Russia has made reply to the American diplomatic note (p 729) with reference to limiting the sphere of hostilities in the war be-

tween Japan and Russia in China. The reply was made public on the 19th. It acquiesces in the American suggestion, but definitely insists that Manchuria must not be considered as excluded from the field of military operations.

Regarding hostilities in Manchuria China has addressed both Russia and Japan. She reiterates her intention to maintain strict neutrality, but warns the combatants that they must respect the sanctity of the royal tombs in Manchuria.

Although the American newspapers have been full of "headline news" of the war (p. 727) during the week there has been no trustworthy war news of importance. That important events have occurred at the seat of the war is not improbable, but the military censorship on both sides is so rigorous that no correspondent can forward really reliable information.

Complaint was formally made on the 23d by Russia to the other Powers, respecting Japan's manner of conducting the war. Russia charges Japan with violating the fundamental rules of international law in five particulars, as follows:

(1). Before the opening of hostilities against Russia Japan landed her troops in the independent empire of Corea, which had declared its neutrality.

(2). With a division of her fleet she made a sudden attack on February 8, that is, three days prior to the declaration of war, on two Russian war ships in the neutral port of Chemulpo. The commanders of these ships had not been notified of the severance of diplomatic relations, as the Japanese maliciously stopped the delivery of Russia's telegrams by the Danish cable, and destroyed telegraphic communication of the Corean government.

(3). Shortly before the opening of hostilities the Japanese captured as prizes of war certain Russian merchant ships in neutral ports of Corea.

(4). Japan declared to the Emperor of Corea through the Japanese minister at Seoul, that Corea would henceforth be under Japanese administration, and she warned the Emperor that in case of his noncompliance Japanese troops would occupy the palace.

(5). Through the French minister at Seoul Japan summoned the Russian representative at the Corean court to leave

the country, with the staffs of the Russian legation and consulate.

Accompanying the foregoing statement is a protest in these terms:

Recognizing that all the above facts constitute a flagrant breach of international law, the Russian government considers it its duty to lodge a protest with all the powers against this procedure of the Japanese government; and it is firmly convinced that all the Powers, valuing the principles which guarantee their relations, will agree with the Russian attitude. At the same time the Russian government considers it necessary to issue a timely warning that, owing to Japan's illegal assumption of power in Corea, the government declares all orders and declarations which may be issued on the part of the Corean government to be invalid.

Since this protest it has been announced that Japan and Corea have made an alliance under which Japan guarantees the independence and integrity of Corea, and Corea in return gives to Japan the right to operate her military forces at will in Corean territory.

The first important decision of the international arbitration tribunal at The Hague (p. 417) was announced on the 22d. It adjusted the priority of claims made against Venezuela (vol. v, p. 728), by 11 nations—Great Britain, Germany, Italy, Spain, the United States and six others. The first three had jointly attacked Venezuela to enforce payment in behalf of their subjects. In consequence Venezuela made a treaty setting aside 30 per cent. of her customs receipts for the benefit of all foreign claimants. A question of priority of payment thereupon arose, the three belligerent nations asserting their right to full payment before any payment to the nations that had asserted their claims peacefully. This is the question that was submitted to arbitration at The Hague. The arbitration tribunal has by its decision of the 22d awarded the priority to the allied assailants—Great Britain, Germany and Italy,—doing so upon the theory that the preliminary negotiations between Venezuela on the one hand, and Great Britain, Germany and Italy on the other, for raising the British-German-Italian blockade, gave the blockading Powers a preference

which no later action could annul, and that the words "all claims against Venezuela," used at that time, included only the claims of the allied Powers. Having placed this construction on the preliminary negotiations the arbitrators avoided a decision of the questions that were raised as to the character of the warlike operations of the blockading Powers or whether they had exhausted all pacific means before employing force.

This decision is criticized in official quarters at Washington on the ground that an award favoring nations that resort to war is calculated to put a premium on war. But Wayne MacVeagh, who represented the peaceable powers before the arbitration tribunal, is reported as saying:

The principal value of the Venezuelan arbitration was in securing the presence before The Hague tribunal of eleven independent nations agreeing to submit their controversy to its decision, and when that was accomplished the only really important result aimed at was secured. The discussion of the question submitted was of no great importance even to the creditor nations and of still less importance to Venezuela, as the decision would be only as to the order of the payment of the various claims, and not at all as to the extent or validity of them, which questions were to be settled by a mixed commission sitting at Caracas.

Panama's final recognition by the United States on the 23d, through the ratification by the Senate of the Isthmian canal treaty between this country and the Republic of Panama (p. 554), completes the initiation of that country into the sisterhood of nations. The treaty not only cedes to the United States jurisdiction over the canal, but obligates them to guarantee the independence of Panama. The ratification of this treaty was made by a vote of 66 to 14, as follows:

YEAS.

Republicans: Aldrich, Alger, Allee, Allison, Ankey, Ball, Bard, Beveridge, Burnham, Burrows, Clapp, Clark (Wyo.), Cullom, Depew, Dietrich, Dillingham, Dolliver, Dryden, Elkins, Fairbanks, Foraker, Frye, Fulton, Gallinger, Gamble, Hale, Hansbrough, Heyburn, Hoar, Hopkins, Kean, Kearns, Kittredge, Lodge, Long, McComas, McCumber, Millard, Mitchell, Nelson, Penrose, Perkins, Platt (Conn.), Platt (N. Y.), Proctor,

Quarles, Scott, Smoot, Spooner, Stewart, Warren, Wetmore.

Democrats: Bacon, Berry, Clarke (Ark.), Clay, Cockrell, Foster (La.), Gibson, Latimer, McCreary, McEnery, Mallory, Money, Simmons, Talliaferro.

NAYS.

Bailey, Bate, Blackburn, Carmack, Culberson, Daniel, Dubois, Gorman, Morgan, Newlands, Patterson, Pettus, Teller, Tillman.

Immediately upon the ratification of the treaty a regiment of American infantry, regular army, was ordered to Panama. The official war department bulletin of the 23d read as follows: :

The Third Infantry has been designated for duty in Panama to relieve the marines now stationed on that Isthmus. None of the families of officers or enlisted men will be allowed to accompany the regiment.

Three days prior to the ratification of the treaty with the United States the recently elected President of the Republic of Panama, Dr. Manuel Amador (p. 730), was formally inaugurated before the national constitutional convention, the inauguration occurring on the 20th in the plaza before the cathedral. Following is President Amador's cabinet:

Minister of government and foreign relations—Tomas Arias, Conservative; minister of justice and public instruction—Julio Fabrega, Conservative; minister of finance—Francisco Espriella, Liberal; minister of public works—Manuel Quintero, Liberal.

NEWS NOTES.

—On the 20th Perry Heath resigned his place as secretary of the Republican national committee.

—The price of May wheat rose on the Chicago Board of Trade on the 23d to \$1.08½ per bushel.

—Bourke Cochran was elected to Congress from the Twelfth New York district on the 23d as the successor to Mayor McClellan.

—The first annual convention of the Citizens Industrial Association, of which David M. Parry is president (p. 487) was held at Indianapolis on the 22d.

—The original dispatches regarding the Baltimore fire (p. 713) were in error in reporting the destruction of the courthouse and the custom house. Neither was destroyed.

—Sir Leslie Stephen, president of the London Ethical Society and author of "History of English Thought in the

Eighteenth Century," died at London on the 22d at the age of 72.

—The national committee of the fusion and the middle-of-the-road wings of the Populist party decided at St. Louis on the 23d to hold a joint national convention in Springfield, Ill., on July 4.

—Congressman Charles A. Dick was unanimously nominated on the 24th by the Republican legislative caucus of Ohio as the Republican candidate for Senator to succeed the late Senator Hanna.

—The Russian government has abolished the censorship over outgoing news dispatches. Credit for this is given by Reuter's Telegram company to Melville E. Stone, manager of the American Associated Press.

—Senator Hanna's body was buried at Cleveland on the 19th, after lying in state on the 18th in the auditorium of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. The eulogy was pronounced by Bishop Leonard, who declared the keynote of Senator Hanna's life to have been his integrity. The pall bearers were Gov. Myron T. Herick, Samuel Mather, J. B. Zerbe, W. J. McKinnie, A. B. Hough, Andrew Squire, W. B. Saunders and C. A. Grasselli, all personal friends of the dead Senator. J. Pierpont Morgan was of the family party.

—On the 23d the Cook County (Ill.) special grand jury returned indictments with reference to the Iroquois theater disaster (p. 713) against George Williams, commissioner of buildings, charged with misfeasance in office and held to be directly accountable for the lack of protection in the theater; Edward Laughlin, building inspector, charged with palpable omission of duty in connection with his investigations of the theater; Will J. Davis, senior manager of the Iroquois, charged with manslaughter; Thomas Noonan, business manager of the theater, charged with manslaughter; James E. Cummins, stage carpenter, charged with manslaughter. Regarding its failure to indict Mayor Harrison, the grand jury explained that he personally had not received any report of the violations of the law at the Iroquois, and that "the contingency therefore upon which his liability would arise never happened as far as the jury were able to ascertain."

PRESS OPINIONS.

BRYAN AND THE KANSAS CITY PLATFORM.

The Commoner (Dem.), Feb. 19.—The reorganizers, with the dishonesty that has always characterized their political movements, are shouting that "Bryan wants to make 16 to 1 the paramount issue." They have read what he says and they have read the platform adopted at Kansas City, and they know that 16 to 1 is not regarded as the paramount issue by Mr. Bryan or by the other advocates of that platform. The money question was declared to be the paramount issue in 1896; in 1900 it was expressly declared not to be the paramount issue, but that it is an issue is perfectly

evident to any one who will read the papers published by the reorganizers. These papers show that they regard the money question as an issue in two ways: First, they make that the test in the selection of candidates. The man may favor high tariff or low tariff, or he may have no opinion at all on the tariff question, but he must believe in the gold standard and be willing to allow the financiers to do his thinking for him. And so with other minor questions, but on the money question the candidate to obtain favorable mention must be sound according to Wall street standards. This proves that with the financiers the money question is not only one of the issues, but really the paramount issue. Second, why are the reorganizers so alarmed when silver is mentioned? If it is a dead issue, why make such a fuss over every reference to it? If it is lifeless and has no supporters, how can it justify "conservative Democrats" in bolting? The very fact that the reorganizers are so afraid of the money question is proof that there is life enough in it to prevent its burial by its friends. The truth of the matter is that the reorganizers are trying to deceive the rank and file of the party, and it makes them mad to be discovered and exposed. They know that some phase of the money question is always before Congress, and, lacking the courage to meet the issue honestly, they seek an advantage under cover of deceit. They also know that back of all the surface issues is the controlling one, namely, whether the money changers or the people shall control the government. To surrender the money question would not conciliate the reorganizers. Take the result in Ohio. Tom Johnson expressly denied that he favored free silver, and yet he was as bitterly denounced as if he had been an original silver man. Why? Because he was opposed to the rule of corporate wealth. Mr. Clarke, the Democratic candidate against Mr. Hanna for the Senate, was against the party in 1896; he helped the Republicans that year and last fall avoided the money question. Was that satisfactory to the financiers? Not at all. In spite of the fact that all the Republican papers reproduced his speeches against free silver, he was beaten worse than any senatorial candidate in recent years. Why experiment longer? Concessions and compromises are not expedient even if they were right. Try to draw a platform without reaffirming the Kansas City platform and see what the result will be. No honest statement of the party's position can be made without indorsing the position taken in 1900. The whole aim of the reorganizers is to secure an ambiguous platform with which to fool the people and a presidential candidate under secret pledge to the money magnates. Mr. Bryan will not cooperate with them in this effort, and therefore he is the recipient of their abuse and malice. But neither abuse nor malicious misrepresentation will avail. The issue must be met.

THE LATE SENATOR HANNA.

Cleveland (O.) Press (neut.), Feb. 22.—Hanna's methods were peculiar and inimicable. Scorning diplomacy and the soft measures of conciliation, he yet had power to combine antagonistic elements and turn strife into harmony, chaos into order and jealousies into friendships. No man before him ever succeeded in bringing labor and capital together under one party banner and holding them there through two national and innumerable State campaigns. All the world knows that there is a strong anti-trust element within the Republican party and that its principles are not to be reconciled with those of the Wall street faction. President Roosevelt has sought to make a too short sheet cover both his head and his feet. But for Hanna, he never would have succeeded for three months. It now remains to be seen how prominently this issue will obtrude itself upon the party

and form lines of dissension and cleavage. Perhaps no one would attempt to deny that a very large part of the Republican success under the Hanna regime has been due to the almost unlimited use of money. But back of this ready contribution of money, mind you, there had to lie business confidence. Hanna commanded that as no other political manager in the history of this country has done. The crossroads merchant and the directorates of the mammoth corporations were alike subject to his spell. He trammelled himself with few principles, but these were fixed. With hard sense he recognized and appreciated the tremendous force of the instinct of greed, and he knew how to appeal to it. Man at base is animal, and that part Mark Hanna understood. Through the whole diapason of selfish emotions his sympathetic hand ran with a master touch. He was the cold, practical leader of a materialistic period. Men have amassed millions, corporations have grown richer than the government itself, we have reached out and grasped islands of the sea and the trade of the world. But we look in vain for any principle of human liberty, for any ennobling spirit that he ever advanced, or advocated, or bothered about.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), Feb. 21.—Whatever we may say of Mr. Hanna's political methods, we may believe that he was among those men who really thought that the best kind of government could be obtained when the enormously wealthy men of the country and the powerful financial interests dominated public affairs. He was, at least, not a hypocrite.

THE NEGRO VOTE.

New York Age (Negro), Feb. 18.—We are against the Democratic party because it is against us; but we are not blind to the fact that the Republican party, in many respects, is no better on the race question than the Democratic party, and has been no better since 1876. The Afro-Americans of the northern and western States think about this matter as we do; and Chairman Hanna and Vice Chairman Payne will bear us out in the statement that the hardest job we had on our hands in the campaign of 1900, in the central West, was to get the Afro-American voters in line for the party. We [T. Thos. Fortune] were in the Chicago headquarters and we know. We fooled the Afro-American voters in that campaign. Will we be able to fool them in the next? We doubt it.

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

Chicago Record-Herald (ind. Rep.), Feb. 24.—The admission of the validity of the preferential privileges secured by the three Powers that blockaded the Venezuelan ports, will be a disappointment to many persons who fear that the precedent thus established will have the effect of encouraging strong Powers to resort again to forcible measures in order to secure satisfaction from ill-governed debtor states. There is, however, no good ground for this fear.

CLEVELAND'S ARTICLE.

Chicago Chronicle (Cleveland-Dem.), Feb. 19.—Mr. Cleveland's article is timely and interesting, but what interests Democrats most in him is not what he says but what he is and what he has done. They want just such a leader as he is and they want the platform built to fit the candidate.

CAUSES OF PERIODIC DEPRESSIONS

(Oak Park, Ill.) Oak Leaves (ind.), Feb. 19.—But from the point of view of the independent citizen, we believe that Mr. Roosevelt's renomination and reelection is most desirable, both because of his character as a man and official and because the country needs to have the best possible kind of a Republican administration in power until the arrival of the next period of financial depression which will ar-

rive during the next presidential term unless it is postponed by the influences of the war in the East. The nation would then learn that good times and bad times have causes that lie deeper than the fluctuations of political parties, and might be induced to turn its attention to the true solution of our periodic financial difficulties.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of Congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 38 of that publication.

Washington, Feb. 15-20, 1904.

Senate.

No business of general interest was done on the 15th. Announcement of the death of Senator Hanna was made on the 16th by Senator Foraker (p. 2167), and arrangements agreed to with reference to funeral services. On the 17th funeral services over the body of the late Senator Hanna were held. The funeral oration (p. 2119) was delivered by the chaplain, Edward Everett Hale. No business of general interest was done on the 18th, and there was no session on the 19th. On the 20th the Panama question was discussed by Mr. Morgan (p. 2215), Mr. Money (p. 2224), and Mr. Spooner (p. 2227).

House.

On the 15th Mr. Shafroth, of Colorado, relinquished his seat (p. 2101) to the contestant, Robert W. Bonyngce. Conference report adjusting disagreements of the two Houses on the urgent deficiency bill was agreed to on the 16th (p. 2119), after which the death of Senator Hanna (p. 2114) was announced. On the 17th the House attended the funeral services of the late Senator Hanna in the Senate chamber (p. 2120), and then adjourned for the day. Consideration of the fortification appropriation bill was begun on the 18th (p. 2136) and passed (p. 2149). On the 19th the naval appropriation bill was taken up (p. 2172) for consideration, which was continued on the 20th (p. 2227), on which day Representative Payne (Rep.), having moved that the House adjourn, Representative Williams (Dem.) asked Mr. Payne (p. 2214) to withdraw this motion in order to allow a motion for "a recess until 12 o'clock Monday morning," and that thereupon the Farewell Address of George Washington be read to the House, and that the House do then adjourn, in order "to pay proper respect to the memory of His Country." Mr. Payne refused, saying: "I think it will be a far more patriotic observance of duty for this Congress to be in session Monday and to provide for the building of a proper navy, than to take a holiday on account of the birthday of George Washington." Mr. Williams thereupon gave notice that on Monday morning he would move adjournment out of regard to the memory of Washington.

Record Notes.

Speech on St. Louis Exposition appropriation by Representative Cowherd (p. 2053). Speech on fortification appropriation bill by Representative John S. Williams (p. 2161). Speech on reciprocity by Representative Wade (p. 2193). Text of statement of Western Federation of Miners regarding the labor troubles in Colorado (p. 2201).

MISCELLANY

DAWN IN THE EAST.

Wake, Asia, wake! The red sun rises fast.
Arm, China, arm thy millions at the wall,
The sleep of silent centuries, at last,
Is broken by a sudden trumpet call.

Serf of the East, in foreign fetters bound,
Crouching submissive 'neath the spoiler's heel,

Up now and harken to the shrilling sound,
Mixed with the thunder and the clash of
steel.

Strike, Asia, strike, to guard thy continent:
Gird on thy sword, thy citadels to save:
Stand on thy frontiers now, or be content,
Now and forever, to be Europe's slave.

Dawn in the East! The red sun flashes
low!
Strike for thine own, the right against the
wrong.

Now, while thy robber reels beneath the
blow,
Dealt by an eastern sword, so deft and
strong.

Brothers of Asia, ye are human, too:
Your right to justice is the same as ours:
Lands, which the Lord has portioned unto
you,
Hold to them now, in face of all the
powers!

Have ye no lives, no liberties to claim?
Have ye no homes, no countries to defend?
Are ye so meek, so cowardly and tame,
Thus to be robbed and wronged until the
end?

Crouch then again beneath the tyrant's
frown:
Be cowards still: be patient, servile, meek:
Europe shall smite you, kneeling humbly
down,
And ever rob and wrong and scorn the
weak.

BERTRAND SHADWELL.

SCARED AMERICA.

An extract from a private letter.

Washington is, as usual, very gay,
and quite as superficial and stupid as in
the days when I knew it much better.

Here is an example of the state of
the public mind. I was out at a supper
when the streets were filled with
newsboys crying an extra edition of
the local papers. There was the usual
excitement, and one rushed out and
bought a copy. It contained the news
of the awful theater fire in Chi-
cago.

"Ah," said one, with a sigh of relief,
"I thought some one had shot the
President. You know since that Eng-
lish fellow, Turner, came over, al-
most any such thing is liable to hap-
pen."

"But," I said, "poor Turner is not
an assassin, nor does he advocate any
such principles."

There was a pause of astonishment
that anyone should defend such an
awful person. Then a big-stomached
gentleman, to whom I have the priv-
ilege of being related, remarked with
the official tone of one having author-
ity: "All anarchists and socialists are
the same. They are assassins and en-
emies of society by trade and should
be exterminated, as one would ex-
terminate wolves or bears." These are

the exact words of a man of education
and of considerable weight with the
powers at present existing.

Of a similar nature was a little in-
cident on the steamer coming over. I
was wearing a red Swedish cap of
wool, somewhat after the style of the
conventional liberty cap. A gentle-
man, much traveled and attentive,
came up and excused himself for mak-
ing a personal remark.

"But that cap of yours—I would not
wear it when we near New York. The
officials might see it, and, mistaking
you for a socialist, make consider-
able trouble."

And, of a fact, the questions that are
asked an arriving passenger in New
York are worthy of an article.

THE SUPERIORITY OF CONSCIENCE AS A MOTIVE TO KINDNESS.

A friend who was in the midst of the
unhappy scenes of the recent theater
disaster in Chicago has described in
glowing terms the universal sympathy
and quickness to serve that she dis-
cerned on all hands, in all classes and
conditions of men, at the time and dur-
ing the days that followed the catas-
trophe. The physician, the shop-
keeper, the man on the street, the po-
liceman, the newsboy, were trans-
formed into spirits of kindness, and
seemed to be anxious to help to alle-
viate distress and suffering. To the
credit of our race be it said that this
is a common picture of the heart of the
average human being when the emo-
tions are stirred in their more pro-
found strata. Extraordinary condi-
tions surprise men out of themselves
as they are known in the jostling thor-
oughfare or the trafficking market
place. Or shall we say that they are
surprised, at least in many cases, into
a revelation of themselves as they are
on their private side, and are led to
show to humanity at large feelings
which they ordinarily reserve for those
of their own hearths and homes? However
this may be, the spirit of loving
kindness among men comes only
by flashes. Communal charity is a thing
too ethereal to be much in evidence in
the glare of our modern life.

And yet why should frank love for
one another be too good for human
nature's daily food? Why should it re-
quire a gigantic calamity to show that
a man has a heart under his coat? The
absence of right feelings and right re-
lations among men is to be attributed
to the private or individual dishonor-
ing of Divine ideals. Lack of
love is largely due to lack
of light. Men exclude the light

of life from their inner conscious-
ness, and as a result their common
days are filled with maudlin sensations
and sordid pursuits instead of noble
sympathies and productive kindnesses.
The consciousness of spiritual truth—
the truth of man's heritage in God and
his indefeasible brotherhood with other
men—creates a voluntary conscience
which is allied to cosmic righteousness,
and makes its possessor an integral
factor for good and use in whatsoever
environment he may be flung. The man
with a spiritually quickened conscience
is permanently kind to his fellow men.
He makes it a study to know what is
right and just in the community and in
his personal relations; and he is held
to the lines of graciousness and useful-
ness by a life which he feels to be his
own, but yet which is above himself.
—New-Church Messenger for Feb. 10.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

"KEEP EVERLASTINGLY AT IT."

President Andrews and the other of-
ficials of the Cleveland Electric Rail-
way company will not consider for a
moment the proposition of accepting
the proposed Thompson franchise, if it
calls for seven tickets for a quarter,
one transfer and a cross-town transfer,
a percentage of gross receipts to the
city and the customary participation
in the cost of paving the streets on
which the company has lines.

Mayor Johnson does not take much
stock in Councilman Thompson's plan,
either. The mayor's first objection to
the scheme is that the company will
never agree to it, and his second ob-
jection is that it is not an equitable
adjustment. The mayor spoke emphat-
ically on this latter feature of Mr.
Thompson's plan last evening.

"I will never be in favor," said he,
"of any street railway fare plan which
makes a discrimination between the
fellow who has the price of one fare
and the fellow who has the price of
several. Because one man has a quar-
ter to invest in street car tickets is no
reason why he should ride for three and
four-sevenths cents, while the man who
hasn't the quarter to spare must pay
a nickel. I want to see a uniform fare
system. I want the job-lot ticket fea-
ture eliminated. I would prefer to see
a uniform fare of four cents on Cleve-
land lines, rather than a five-cent fare
with a choice of seven tickets for a
quarter."

"Don't you think that any person
who can afford to patronize street cars
at all can afford to buy tickets in
quarter lots?" Mr. Johnson was asked.
"I certainly do not," he replied, "and
right there is where everyone makes a

mistake. There are thousands of people in Cleveland who haven't the money to invest in tickets. These people pay single fares, and they will continue to pay single fares, no matter what the saving in tickets may be. This is the class of street car patrons I want to see benefited. These are the people who are most entitled to any concessions that the street car company may grant. This is one of the best features of the zone plan. It treated everybody alike, rich and poor. Mr. Thompson's plan is unfair, and I do not think that it will be seriously considered either by the council or the street railway company.

"But if it falls the council should not be discouraged. There is only one way to reach a conclusion in this matter and that is by keeping everlastingly at it. Any legislation that keeps the question before the people is good legislation, and I hope we will have enough new ideas from other councilmen to keep the pot boiling."—Cleveland Plain Dealer of Feb. 15.

LINCOLN AND HIS PARTY.

Written by Louis F. Post for the Lincoln's birthday number of the Johnstown (Pa.) Daily Democrat, February 14, 1904, and reproduced by permission of the editor of the Democrat, Warren Worth Bailey.

Political history plays fantastic tricks. Who could have foretold, for instance, that the party which Thomas Jefferson founded upon the principle of human equality before the law, would become the great protagonist of human slavery in American politics? Yet that metamorphosis, amazing as it was, is more than equaled by the one which the party of Lincoln has undergone.

Lincoln led the young Republican party in a victorious assault upon the slave power, as Jefferson had led the young Democratic party in a victorious assault upon the Imperial Federalists. It was the same fight on another field, the same victory in another form. But as Lincoln lived to see the party of Jefferson abandon its democratic principles and swing over to the side of chattel slavery, so we to-day have seen the party of Lincoln repudiate its democratic mission and swing over to the support of systems of servitude, which, though more subtle in form than chattel slavery, are no less repugnant to democratic principle. What the slave oligarchy, with its vast plantations and hordes of human chattels, was to Jefferson's degenerate party of 50 years ago, the plutocracy of to-day, with its enormous special privileges and an abjectly dependent people, is to Lincoln's de-

generate party now. Jefferson's party had so far fallen as to promote pro-slavery policies and boldly to enact pro-slavery laws. Lincoln's party has so far fallen as to promote policies of economic privilege and boldly to legislate for class interests. The one sold itself to slave drivers; the other has sold itself to slave makers.

Along with these paradoxical changes of a century in American politics, a still more fundamental change has been insidiously accomplished. Slowly, persistently, progressively, the Hamiltonism which Jefferson routed in politics at the elections of 1800, has recovered all the ground it lost then, and much more besides. Though driven completely out of politics at that time, so completely that the Federalist party, the party of Hamilton, soon ceased to exist, Hamiltonism had secured control of the Supreme Court, which laboriously planted the pernicious roots of Hamiltonism deep in the fresh soil of our national jurisprudence. To revive its hold upon politics, Hamiltonism then needed nothing more than the military necessities of civil warfare; and the occasion for these was recklessly furnished by the degenerate party of Jefferson when it had fallen wholly under the influence of the slave power.

After two generations of Americans had been insidiously fed upon Hamiltonism through court decisions, and a third had become accustomed to its operation in the exceptional circumstances of military necessity, that imperial policy was sufficiently equipped for another conflict with democracy in the political arena. Accordingly, Hamiltonism has again sprung into politics. Having gained possession of the Republican party, the Hamiltonian ideals of the old Federalist party have crowded out the democratic ideals of Lincoln and Jefferson. The party of Lincoln has become the party of Hamilton.

Lincoln's faith in "government of the people, by the people, for the people," he had inherited from Jefferson, not from Hamilton. Hamiltonism tolerates no ideals of equality, except as listless summer dreams. It is the modern American name for that old class doctrine which may be defined in the terms of our day as "government of the people, by the wealthy, for the wealthy." What Charles I. died for, the divine right of kings; what the fatuous advisers of Louis XVI. drove that fabled monarch to the guillotine for, the divine right of privileged classes; what the slave oligarchy of the United States represented in its crudest and rawest form, unbridled power—those are the things in principle that Hamiltonism

involves. The form changes with time and varies with place, the issue shifts with circumstances; but the principle is always and everywhere the same. It is exploitation through legal privilege.

The modern American name for this is properly Hamiltonism, for its purposeful supporters of to-day are invariably Hamiltonians. Without exception they are inspired by Hamilton's aristocratic ideals. It is into the control of such men that the Republican party has fallen. From the Jeffersonian party of Lincoln, it has become the Hamiltonian party of — well, of anyone you please among the great modern chevaliers d'industrie.

If Lincoln's party, once so gloriously democratic, must sink into this plutocratic degradation, at any rate let Lincoln's name and memory be preserved by the democratic spirit of our people. Instead of encouraging future generations to identify him with the Hamiltonian Rockefellers and Morgans and Hannas who have captured his party, let patriotic Americans place him by the side of Jefferson, from whom he drew his inspiration; and with his fervor and in his words let them send up the democratic prayer that "government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

MR. SHAFROTH'S SPEECH ON WITHDRAWAL.

An extract from the Congressional Record, proceedings of the House of Representatives, on Monday, February 15, 1904.

MR. SHAFROTH—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

THE SPEAKER—The gentleman will state it.

MR. SHAFROTH—It relates to the right of a Member to a seat in this House.

THE SPEAKER—The gentleman will proceed.

MR. SHAFROTH—Mr. Speaker, in the contested election case of Robert W. Bonyng against John R. Shafroth it was stipulated and agreed by contestant and contestee that the ballots cast at that election in the 29 contested precincts should be brought before the Committee on Elections of this House and opened for the first time in the presence of its Members. The ballots were those cast at the general election of 1902 for State officers and Representatives in Congress. The object was that the original arrangement, form and condition of the ballots should first be seen by the committee. The ballots were shipped to the Clerk of the House of Representatives at the joint expense of contestant and contestee.

At the first meeting of the committee for the hearing of this case the ballots were presented for inspection. A subcommittee was appointed to ascertain how many illegal ballots were contained therein. It was agreed that in order to facilitate their work their sessions should be secret. The subcommittee opened the ballots from three precincts, and finding that it took one week to examine them, asked the House for authority to employ an expert, which was granted. Since that time the expert has been examining the ballots, and on Thursday last made his report to the committee. The committee then ordered that each of the parties should have one week's time in which to examine the ballots, and if then either of us desired to send for the expert for the purpose of examining him that we should have that privilege. After that the case was to be set for argument before the committee.

On Thursday afternoon I commenced examining the ballots, and continued doing so during Thursday, Friday and Saturday. I do not believe that 2,732 illegal votes were cast (that being my majority as returned), yet my examination disclosed the fact that the assurances which I had received as to the regularity of the votes in many of the precincts were not true, and that there were illegal votes therein which tainted the polls, and the polls so tainted gave me a greater plurality than my returned majority in the district.

The fact was a bitter disappointment to me, but nevertheless true.

The law is that when a poll is tainted by fraud and it is impossible to purge the poll of the fraudulent votes, the vote of the entire precinct, legal and illegal, must be thrown out.

The committee has given me every opportunity to ascertain the illegal vote so as to save the valid vote in those precincts. Until I saw the ballots last Thursday, I thought the illegal vote could be detected and separated from the legal vote, but I must confess that my inspection has convinced me that it is impossible to do so in this case.

The law being as I have stated, and the number of precincts tainted containing majorities for me greater than my returned majority, I must say that if I were a judge upon the bench considering this case I would be compelled to find against myself, and as the vote in the contested precincts aggregates less than one-tenth of the vote in the Congressional district, I would be compelled to find that according to law Mr. Bonyng is entitled to the seat. (Applause.)

I did my best to have an honest election. My law partner, with my approval, organized a citizens' committee composed of both Republicans and Democrats who desire a fair election. The headquarters of that committee, as shown by the evidence in this case, were in the law offices of Rogers, Shafroth & Gregg, Denver, Col.

I have always been in favor of pure politics, and when the test is applied to an election at which I was voted for as one of the candidates upon the ticket I should not shirk my duty or change my convictions concerning honest elections.

I therefore will say to the Committee on Elections No. 2 and to the members of this house that they can seat Mr. Bonyng at their earliest convenience.

As this is the last time I will have the opportunity of addressing the House, I want to thank the Committee on Elections No. 2, and particularly the chairman, Mr. Olmsted, and the subcommittee, Mr. Miller, Mr. Currier and Mr. Sullivan, for the fair and impartial manner in which they proceeded to investigate this case. Every suggestion which I made as to the investigation was readily concurred in.

I wish also to say that I appreciate the repeated declarations of Mr. Bonyng in the record that I was not a party to or in any manner connected with any of the frauds or irregularities charged. I also desire to thank the Members of this House for the uniform courtesy and evidences of respect which I have received during the eight years of my service in Congress. I have formed friendships here upon both sides of the Chamber which I shall cherish through life. I fully appreciate the high character of the men who compose this body, but it is only when I am about to leave that I fully realize the distinguished honor it is to serve as a Member in the greatest legislative body on the face of the globe. Wishing you all a happy and prosperous future, I will say good-by. (Loud applause.)

A UNITED DEMOCRACY.

An address delivered by Hon. Lucius F. C. Garvin, Governor of Rhode Island, etc., before the Young Men's Democratic club, in Providence, Feb. 22, 1904.

From 1894 to 1900, inclusive, the Democratic party was weak and divided. This was true both nationally and in this State.

Beginning in 1901, there has been a steady growth locally, in vigor, numbers and unity, and both in the election of last November and of the pre-

ceding year, the two parties have been very equally matched. Not only have the two wings of the Democratic party here moved in harmony, but numerous recruits of the very best quality have been drawn from the Republican ranks.

These forces have been able to unite because they agreed upon local issues. Dissatisfied and solidified because of the abuses of power by the dominant party, they readily joined forces for constitutional reform.

What has been done in the State may, and logically will, occur upon the larger, the national stage. The majority of the people of this country have had enough, and more than enough, of foreign complications and exploitations to the neglect of domestic concerns. Regular Democrats, bolting Democrats, and a multitude of Republicans, are demanding the restoration of a government by and for the people. They are tired of the despotism of unscrupulous trusts and corporations, and regard the means made use of by the dominant party to restrain them as trivial and futile.

They believe that the repeal of the numerous laws conferring special privileges, and the substitution thereof of a few general, simple and just laws, are both right and pressingly expedient, and that in this way the government can most highly subserve the welfare of its citizens. Republican orators and editors, assuming the role of the philosopher, are asserting that the Democratic party is hopelessly divided; but the wish is father to the thought. The Gold Democrats will never return, we are told. Why not? In 1896, bimetallism was made the leading plank in the party platform. Since campaigns are usually fought upon one issue, any members of a party who are strongly opposed to that issue, are justified if they withdraw from the party for the time being. Many sterling Democrats did so withdraw in 1896, some of whom returned four years later when imperialism became the dominant question. No doubt a portion of those who withdrew in 1896 and remained away in 1900, were Democrats only in name. They should be in some other party, and a good proportion of them are now safely and satisfactorily at home in the Republican domicile.

Hundreds of thousands of Democrats, who really preferred monometallism to bimetallism, voted for Mr. Bryan in 1896. They, too, were justified in so doing for the reason that, whilst the free coinage of silver was then the most prominent issue, it was not, in their opinion, the most important.

For my part, I can see no reason why the great body of the Democrats who

supported Palmer and Buckner in 1896 should not now be welcomed back into the ranks of the regular Democratic organization. In a reunion of this character, I can perceive no sacrifice of principle whatsoever.

The live issues of the day are the tariff, the trusts and our foreign policy.

All Democrats of every stripe agree that the tariff should be so altered as to no longer shelter the trusts, that it should be made impossible for any American industry to sell to foreigners more cheaply than to our own citizens, and that import taxes upon the raw materials of many industries are a serious obstacle to the sale of their products abroad.

All democrats are opposed to private monopolies of every kind, including the trusts, and believe that much more effective measures can be found for their destruction than any which have been applied or recommended by the present administration.

All Democrats are agreed that our foreign policy should be in harmony with the principles upon which this government is founded, and that the constitutional liberty which has been our boast should be extended to every inch of American soil.

Only the money question remains as a bone of contention. In its old form, as between the single standard and the double standard, the question, for the present, at least, is not pressing or vital. It never was a question of principle, but only a difference of opinion as to the better means of reaching the common end, a sound and stable currency.

There remains the difference as to the reaffirmation of recent national platforms. This certainly is a very small matter to divide upon. Manifestly, it is a question of expediency only, and any supporters of Mr. Bryan who would prefer to indorse the Kansas City platform, may well yield that inconsequent preference for the sake of harmony and union.

Speaking for myself, I think that no party should ever reaffirm a former platform. If a party holds the same views to-day as a year ago, then let it express them in the same language, if thought desirable; but as a matter of fact seldom would two conventions or committees make use of the same form of words upon any subject. Political conditions never remain unchanged for two successive years, and the new circumstances call for a new expression. If the members of the committee on resolutions of the last national convention were reappointed at St. Louis, they would draw up a different platform, and

be consistent in so doing. To do otherwise would be to put new wine into old bottles.

Moreover, the Democratic convention of next July should invite to its support, not merely the stalwarts of four and eight years ago, and the real Democrats who held aloof during those elections, but also that great multitude of Republicans, who, being at heart democrats, believe in a government by the people, rather than that which now obtains, a government by monopolies.

To restore either our State or nation to the control of a majority of the voters is an Herculean task. It can only be done by the united and determined action of all those who have a living faith in our form of government. It calls for the best energies of both laborers and capitalists, of the highly educated and the common people. To bring about such union, we are called upon to devote our every effort, and, short of an abandonment of principle, to make any personal sacrifice to patriotism.

MULLIGAN ON SUBSIDIES.

Mulligan and Donovan were "on time," as usual, and Flynn's tobacco box had been depleted by two pipefuls of tobacco, which were not yet half smoked, when Brooks entered. It was a cold night, and Mulligan's cordial hail and invitations were strongly seconded by the cozy comfort of the glowing fire in the big stove, and the cheery faces of his two friends. At this moment Mr. Smeel, editor of the Daily Patriot, entered, and, greeting Brooks familiarly, selected a cigar. Brooks had already lighted his, and, when Smeel had done the same, he suggested that they step down to the stove and get warmed before going out. Smeel promptly acquiesced, and, locking arms with Brooks, laughingly remarked, as they sauntered down the room: "Any port in a storm!" A Democratic haven isn't so bad, on a cold night like this!"

"No," retorted Brooks, with a show of equal good humor, "the Democratic haven is the only safe retreat from Republican storms!"

"Good alvn'n", Mistor Smeel," said Mulligan, as the two gentlemen came up. "Is ut a Dimmycrat Mistor Brooks wud be mak'n' av ye?"

"Oh, I'm a democrat already," answered Smeel. "The difference is that my kind of democracy is spelt with a small d, and Brooks' begins with a—anarchy! ha! ha! ha!" and Mr. Smeel seemed to enjoy himself.

"I belave," said Mulligan, "th' divil begins wid a schmall d, too, and an angel wid a!"

"Ha!" (It was Donovan. He couldn't help it. That great big "Ha!" burst forth from his mouth like a clap of thunder. He choked back the rest of them, the easier by means of resorting to his trick of snatching off his hat and scratching his head and contorting his features). "And yet," continued Mulligan, "it might be ye wudn't take me wurrud f'r ut, if I was to tell ye thot I'm an angel."

"Oh, you're all right, Mulligan," said Smeel, in a patronizing tone, and with a furtive glance seaward!

Now, Mulligan was a good-natured man, but high-spirited, and could not easily brook patronage, especially from an intellectual inferior; but from such a creature as Smeel! It was too much.

"Is ut quite safe f'r ye to give yer indorsement, Mistor Schmeel, to a mon thot confesses to be'n' the same kind av an 'anarchist' thot Mistor Brooks is?"

"I hope, Mr. Mulligan, you are not going to take offense at a joke," said Smeel, deprecatingly.

"Oh, ut's jok'n' ye was?"

"Why, certainly."

"And were ye jok'n' the half hunder times ye've said the same t'ing in yer editorials, in the Daily Patriot?"

"Oh, but you must remember, Mr. Mulligan, that all's fair in war; and politics is war."

"Websther gives a difinition av a saart av politics thot agrees wid yer shtatmint; an' ut's this: 'Artful an' dishonest management to secure the soocess av political measures or partty schemes; political thrickery.' But 'e says thot this is politics in a 'bad sense.' His furrst difinition av politics is: 'The science av governmint: thot part av ethics which has to do wid the rigulation an' governmint av a nation or shtate, the priservation av uts safety, peace and prosperity; the defense av uts existence and roights agin furrin contrhol or conquest, the augmintation av uts stren't' an' reay-soorces, an' the protiction av uts citizens in their roights, wid the priservation and improovemint av their morals.'

"And if ye are jokin' whin ye call a dimmycrat an anarchist, how are we to know whether ye are jok'n' or not whin ye write in support av the ship soobsidy job, as ye did in yestherday's paaper?"

"Well, to set your mind at rest on that score, Mr. Mulligan, I'll say that I was never more serious than I am in supporting that measure."

"And ye think the min that thried to put t'rough the bill lasht year were prompted be purely pathriotic motives?"

"Most certainly."

"Ye must 'ave forgotten the raison the bill failed to pass, Misther Schmeel," said Mulligan.

Smeel's face reddened, and his eyes wandered, distinctly, but he came to the scratch with: "Oh, the bill was defective, that's true."

"A thrifle defective," said Mulligan. "It was—accidntally—so framed be its promoters that all av the schwag wud 'ave gon' to thimsilves—a striking ividence av the pathriotic and intirely disinteristid motives av the gin-temin!"

"Oh, well, human nature is pretty much alike, the world over; we're all more or less selfish, Mr. Mulligan."

"Thru' f'r you, Misther Schmeel; but that fact has no riference to the quistion. Ye might as well say that we're all human beings. What ye must have is honest legislation be silfish human beings for silfish human beings. Ye admit that the soobsidy crowd thried to hold up the governmint lasht winter, and we don't deny thof the Daily Pathriot is uphold'n' that same gang in uts schem'n' f'r a soobsidy this winter."

Smeel was irritated. He seemed to feel, however, that he could not retreat, with dignity, at this point, though he would gladly have made for another "port." Apparently for the sole purpose of gaining time, he said, mechanically: "What is 'subsidy,' anyhow?"

"Soobsidy," answered Mulligan, "soobsidy is a confession that the business it is intended to promote will not pay, of itself, and thus, it is a notification to the paypl', in advance, thof their contribution to ut will be a dead loss. Soobsidy puts upan the public the burden av support'n' an unprofitable business. Soobsidy is gold shot into a mine by government, and taken out again by proivate individuals. Soobsidy is a bonus paid by governmint to proivate individuals for do'n' someth'n' thof isn't worth while. Soobsidy, Misther Schmeel, is a method be which the privileged classes seek to enlarge their benefits at the ixpinse av the paypl'. Soobsidy, wance established, tends, like all privilege, to become 'vested right,' and, again, like all special privilege, the greater its burrden to the public, the greater its benefits to the few, and the harder its beneficiaries and their friends will foight f'r its continyance;

thof's what soobsidy is, accord'n' to my t'ink'n', Misther Smeel."

"We're paying now two hundred millions a year to foreign ship-owners," said Smeel; "why shouldn't we do the business and keep the money?"

"Thru' f'r you, Misther Schmeel. Why don't we do ut, thin?"

"Our ship owners can't compete against that price," answered Smeel.

"And so ye want us to pay thof price, an' a soobsidy on top av ut, do ye?"

"But our ship owners could do it at a less price, if they got the subsidy."

"Whats the difference? Lave thim charge the same price, an' go widout the soobsidy."

"Oh, but you don't understand," exclaimed Smeel, with a show of impatience.

"Sav'n' yer prisince, Misther Schmeel, I'm t'ink'n' thof if all the readers ov the Daily Pathriot understud, there wudn't be anny more editorials in ut in suppoort av thof soobsidy grab!"

"Ha!" (It was Donovan again).

"I'm afraid we never shall be able to agree," said Smeel, as he sidled, smilingly, toward the door.

"Not till ye preach democracy, wid a schmall d, anyhow!" cried Mulligan, "an', begorra, ye'll hov to larn what thof is befoor ye'll be able to preach ut!"

"Ha!"—by Donovan.

Bang!—the door behind Smeel.

After a few moments of silence, Mulligan said: "Schmeel talks about the ship owners making a smaller charge, becaase ov the soobsidy. Who ever heard av a business thof didn't charge all thof the thraffic wud bear? Besides grant'n', f'r argymint's sake, thof the rates wud be less, it ud be becaase the paypl' had paid the difference, an' a profit to boot, in the shape av soobsidy. I'm think'n' a pound av feathers weighs as mooch as a pound av oiron—a dollar in soobsidy costs as mooch as a dollar in freight charges."

"Who wud pay the soobsidy?" asked Donovan.

"The paypl'," answered Mulligan. "And so, you see, two hunder millions and a big soobsidy being less nor two hunder millions alone, the paypl' wud be benefited to thof ixtint!"

Donovan scratched his head, puckered his mouth and knitted his brows. Mulligan's arithmetic did not sound just right to him, somehow. Finally, he said: "I t'ink I'd rayther hov the two hunder millions and the soobsidy, nor the two hunder millions widout the soobsidy."

"Do ye so?" exclaimed Mulligan. "Begorra! thof's phwhat's the matther wid Schmeel!"

"We are passing through a period of moral chaos," said Brooks. "Wickedness has, by sudden and impetuous onslaught, captured the strongholds of civilization, and shackled the capitulating officers with bribes. The masses, betrayed, disarmed, the machinery of social organization wrested from them, stand dismayed, and, for the time, helpless. Unprincipled time-servers rise to positions of power, under such circumstances. Wolves of that character are not to be embarrassed by logic, or by citation of natural law. No need to call their attention to the fact that water does not run up hill; they are not to be argued out of their dinners. Wealth, that once was the reward of honest industry, is now become a gambler's stake. The protection of the law is withdrawn from the weak, its menace, from the strong. Moral depravity is so widespread that, if a public man is detected in being honest, he is made the butt of ridicule by the dominant element of the press. Vice is enriched, virtue impoverished. Mammon rides, dragging Honor at his horse's heels, and Smeel and his stripe, applaud—and thrive. Not that they love vice more than virtue—they would applaud the latter as loudly, if it happened to be dominant—but because they love themselves, and nothing higher.

"Don't be discouraged, Mulligan; it takes time for a disrupted society to become reorganized, and to agree upon a plan of action; but the voice of the outraged people will yet be heard, and honest men will live in repute once more."

"I belave you, Misther Brooks," said Mulligan, "an' ut's good t' hear a serious mon schpake, wanst in a while."

"But the thrubble is," said Donovan, "thof while a serious mon is schpak'n', Misther Schmeel is wroif'n' editoroorials!"

"Donovan," exclaimed Mulligan, as he arose to depart, "ye'll be arristed some day, f'r usin' language unbecom'n' a gintlemon!"

HORACE CLIFTON.

YYEYOSU TAKAGAWA, ETC.

There was a great swell in Japan.
Whose name on a Tuesday began—
It lasted through Sunday
Till twilight on Monday,
And sounded like stones in a can.
—Harvard Lampoon.

When a man wants to murder a tiger, he calls it sport; when the

tiger wants to murder him, he calls it ferocity. The distinction between Crime and Justice is no greater.

—Bernard Shaw.

BALLAD OF THE BAD COLD.

Now, there was a man with a red, red nose
And a weak and watery eye;
He stood on the street, with a patient pose,
While the cars went hurrying by,
And he read a paper and stamped his toes
And softly kerchiefed his crimson nose.

A friend soon joined him in waiting there,
And asked: "What's the latest row?
And what has been taken, and when and where?"

And the man said: "Kooche-ah-chow!"
And the friend said: "Jiminy! You don't say?"

Now what do you think will be done to-day?"

The man turned then, and he sighed: "I think

That the next is Oo-chooly-choo!
I mean—ah-choo!" and a quivering blink
Closed his eyes as the tears came through.
"Perhaps, but it seems quite a hefty plan,
I don't think they will," said the other man.

"It isn't—Ah-chee!" cried the red-nosed man,

"But it's Ooo-chy-oo-akkety-wow!"
"That's just what I said when the war began."

Said the friend, "they're doing it now!"
But the other answered: "O, can't you see
It is Woo! Ooo! Yoosh-wishy-oof-ka-
whee!"

"No, no. You're wrong," said the friend at that.

"Why, the place is too far away
From the seat of war, and I'll bet my hat
It will not be attacked to-day."

And the man with a nose that was ruby red
Just gurgled and groaned and shook his head.

"I don't mean the war," were the words he said.

"I thought you were asking of me
What I took for this cold that is in my head

And I told you—Whhoo! Yoo! Chawee!"
And the friend then snickered and said,
said he:

"You sneeze like a class in geography!"
—W. D. Nesbit, in Chicago Tribune.

Why cannot a nation behave like a gentleman?—Whim.

BOOKS

THE OLD CHARTIST AND CORN LAW FIGHTS.

History repeats itself so persistently, not in details of course but in generals, that the intelligently-told story of almost any period of political agitation in any country is certain to be full of lessons for almost any later political agitation in almost any other country. Influenced by this fact, B. O. Flower, well known for many years as the editor of the *Arena*, has told the story ("How England Averted a Revolution by Force." Trenton, N. J.: Albert Brandt. Price \$1.25 net, and \$1.35 by mail) of the agitations in England that marked the first ten years of Queen Victoria's

reign. He tells this story not for the story's sake, but in order to sound a warning and point a moral with reference to our own time and country. Yet the story of Chartism and free trade in the British politics of early Victorian days was never more interestingly told than in this book—which, by the way, is as inviting typographically as it is interesting and valuable in subject matter.

Mr. Flower realizes that in our own country to-day we are engaged in a struggle for equal rights, as our fathers were in the infancy of the Republic. He realizes also that instead of being the leader of Liberty's hosts as our Republic was then, it has drifted toward the rear. He is confident, however, that sooner or later the rights of the people will be successfully asserted; and he declares himself one of those who desire to see this accomplished by peaceful and orderly means. It is for the purpose of impressing those views upon thoughtful Americans that he writes this history. One of its features is a striking contrast of the violent methods of defeated Chartism with the peaceable methods of the victorious anti-corn law movement—two movements that were in spirit identical, both being democratic revolts against legal privilege.

Chartism was an outgrowth of the Reform bill movement of the early 'thirties. That bill was a Liberal party measure. One of its objects was to secure influential representation in parliament for the middle classes. Prominent among the influences which forced it upon parliament was the agitation of the working classes by whom the measure was regarded as the first step toward their own enfranchisement. But when the middle class had won this fight their representatives in parliament turned a deaf ear to the demands of the working classes, and the working classes framed the People's Charter. Aided by members of the middle classes who resented the treachery of their representatives, the working classes backed up the charter by two petitions. One had 1,200,000 signatures. The other had millions of signatures. They demanded the passage of the Charter by parliament.

The Chartist movement, perfectly legitimate in purpose, was peaceable in method until the classes in power treated it lawlessly. They broke up its peaceable meetings and arrested its speakers. This official lawlessness met with lawless resistance, and riots resulted. In consequence, the Chartist movement fell into disrepute and the People's Charter was overwhelmingly defeated in the House of Commons.

About that time the anti-corn-law movement began. Its immediate aim was the repeal of the protective tariff on grain, but its speeches and literature cut deep down to the fundamental principles of democracy. It was the Chartist movement in another dress and under more judicious leadership. The

meetings and speakers in this movement, too, were lawlessly assailed by the authorities. But the response was different. Instead of succeeding in inciting violence, the lawless officials found their lawlessness submitted to with patience. But the facts were fully published. In this way the sympathy of the law-abiding and peaceable-minded was secured for the movement instead of being turned against it. To this policy of peace, perhaps more than to any other one thing, Mr. Flower attributes the success of the anti-corn law movement.

He also directs attention to the fact that the anti-corn law movement achieved its success against the opposition of the privileged classes and their parasites, in spite of a dormant public opinion, without a newspaper press other than one organ, and with the entire press of the country united against the movement for purposes of suppression and misrepresentation.

But for this victory against odds greater than American democracy faces now, "we can easily see," says Mr. Flower, "how England might have witnessed all the horrors of a bloody revolution." The disinherited masses were hot with passion at the injustice to which they were subjected, while the beneficiaries of this injustice were like their kind always and everywhere. "The beneficiaries of special privileges," writes Mr. Flower, "are always ready to fight to the death, even when by so doing they endanger the nation's welfare, rather than yield that for which they make no adequate return, and which is frequently in its very nature oppressive and unjust."

The appendix to this book has the merit, so unusual with appendixes, of being interesting to read as well as useful for reference. It contains the typical poems and songs of the anti-corn law and the Chartist agitations. Mackay's famous fable (a tract used in the anti-corn law agitation) of the tailor-ruled land, is also reproduced, as is the full text of the petition for the People's Charter.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—"History of the German Struggle for Liberty" (third volume—1815 to 1848). By Poultney Bigelow. New York and London: Harper & Brothers. Price, \$2.25 net. To be reviewed.

PERIODICALS.

To the Pacific Monthly (Portland) for February, C. E. S. Wood contributes a discussion on anarchy and anarchists.

"Divine Immanence," an article by the Rev. Dr. James Boyd, in which religion is considered scientifically, leads in the *Arena* for February. It furnishes food for thinking to the "scientists" who exclude the most important facts from some of their inductions.

The Craftsman for February is a greatly improved number of a magazine that has always deservedly ranked high. Its illustrations are beautiful in design and elegantly produced; and withal, the subject matter is as interesting as the typography is inviting. The silversmith's art is one of the subjects, mission architecture is an-



THE LIBERAL PARTY'S OPPORTUNITY.

British Producer (to Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman)—"The chance of your life, sir! Adopt this policy heartily and you'll sweep the country!"

other, another is the adaptation of ornament, and in "A Forgotten Art," the story of ships' figureheads is told and illustrated.

The current winter number of the Single Tax Review is especially interesting. The original articles are from Edward Howell Putnam, Ernest Crosby, James A. Warren and Henry George, Jr.,—the latter dealing with the story of Herbert Spencer's recantation. Grace Isabel Colbron writes of the single tax movement in Germany, and Edward T. Weeks contributes the first of a series of brief articles in exposition of the principles and methods of application of the single tax.

The editor of the Nebraska Independent has been sending to that paper a series of most interesting letters from New York. Speaking of the increased cost of living, he says: "But the greatest increase in anything is in rents. The result of the rise in rents is that fairly prosperous people are slowly being driven from respectable neighborhoods toward the slums, where many thousands of them will finally land if there is not a change for the better." The same copy of the Independent republishes Mr. E. T. Weeks's excellent leaflet on the "Tenets of the Single Tax." J. H. D.

The Outlook of February 13, in an article on "Political Candidates," expresses the opinion that the two wings of the Democratic party will not be able to unite—certainly not on a platform, even if a compromise candidate should be found. The article rather insists upon Mr. Bryan's socialistic tendency, an impeachment which he would probably deny. In the same number there is a very favorable review of Mr. Louis F. Post's "Ethics of Democracy." If the writer of the article alluded to above would digest this book, he might be interested in seeing a solution to the conflict between Mr. Cleveland's "individualism" and Mr. Bryan's "socialistic tendency." J. H. D.

Speaking of sympathies in the present war between Russia and Japan, the New York Evening Post, which has the faculty of thinking for itself instead of going hurrahing with this or that crowd, remarks

as follows: "What we have on either side is a nation coveting the lands of another, and calling it destiny, or, in President Roosevelt's phrase, 'the interests of civilization.' Strictly speaking, Japan and Russia are going to war because they cannot agree upon the division of the property of third parties. Considered merely as one land-grabbing power against another, we do not see that 'American sympathies' have any call to flow out to either." J. H. D.

President Eliot's address before the Central Labor Union, of Boston, closed with some wise platitudes which are well worth repeating occasionally. "How, then," he asks, "shall democratic society contemplate these new and formidable industrial and social commotions? Calmly and courageously, as witnessing a worldwide conflict in which certain democratic qualities of ancient date are greatly needed, and are to be ultimately manifested. These qualities are an abiding confidence in freedom, publicity, discussion and fair play, a love of vigor and efficiency, and a firm faith that free institutions will prove to be also fundamentally righteous and consequently conducive in the highest degree to public welfare and happiness." This is all very well. But what of real value is to be found in the address? There is not a word to indicate that Dr. Eliot has a conception of the best aspirations of "labor." "Labor," he says, "is a commodity which should be salable for future delivery." But he does not think of a future when labor will not be a commodity. There are some things which even a president of Harvard does not know or dream of. J. H. D.

The Public

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

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

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

ATTORNEYS.

EWING & RING, ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS, HOUSTON, TEXAS. Presler K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

FRED. CYRUS KRUBUSCHER, COUNSELLOR AT LAW, BENNETT BLDG., 99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan, Tel. Call, 404 Cortlandt, Rooms 1111-1114, NEW YORK.

CONTRACTORS.

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

SOCIALISM vs. SINGLE TAX

The Turner Hall Debate between Post, Harding and White for the Single Tax, and Untermyer, Stedman and Simons for Socialism, is now ready and selling rapidly. It is a handsome book of 72 pages, including eight full-page portraits. Price 25c, five for a dollar, a dozen for two dollars, postage included. Address CHARLES H. KERR & CO. (Co-operative) 56 Fifth Ave., Chicago

NOTICE OF CHANGE.

The reception and ball given by the ladies of the Henry George Association are changed to rooms of the Woman's Business Club, 230 South Clark street, just north of Grand Pacific Hotel, nine o'clock Friday evening, February 26.

THE PUBLIC

WILL BE SENT ON TRIAL for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of four weeks for 10 CENTS