

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 2, 1904.

Number 300.

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.

Many explanations of the terrible disaster at the Iroquois theater in Chicago will be given by the newspapers and echoed by excited readers, and much of their scolding of managers and architects and city officials will probably be deserved. So it would seem like "carrying coals to Newcastle" for us to give particular attention to any of the causes for these over-late criticisms.

But there is one explanation which is barely likely to be given through the usual channels of criticism, and to that we invite a little common sense attention. We refer to the impossibility of making an auditorium safe when the builders are forced to wedge it in among other buildings, as theater builders in large cities are forced to do. This is an explanation which lies back of all others. This is a condition which makes such catastrophes inevitable, no matter what minor precautions may be taken.

No such disaster could occur in the Mormon Tabernacle at Salt Lake City. Why? Because an abundance of exits on all sides open immediately into "all out doors." There are no windings and turnings leading into one narrow alley at the rear or one narrow doorway in the front. Let a fire break out or an explosion occur in that structure, and unless the structure itself were destroyed within three minutes, every person in it could reach a place of safety.

Of course it may be impracticable to build theaters in large cities

out "in the open," as the Mormon Tabernacle is built; but it is not impracticable to surround them with open alleys, so that numerous exits may make of all four sides of the building a clear way to the street when occasions of danger require. Nor are architects altogether to blame for not building theaters upon that plan. The Iroquois theater, for instance, had to be built in the form of an L, if built at all upon the chosen site; and one stem of the L was so narrow as to afford only reasonable room for the regulation entrance. Moreover, sites are so inordinately dear in locations appropriate for theaters, that the space necessary for alleys would create a burden of cost so great as to be in itself a formidable if not impossible commercial obstacle.

Therein lies the fundamental cause of such disasters as that of the Iroquois theater. By encouraging investments in sites merely for the purpose of securing the advantages of higher prices, an abnormal scarcity of sites is produced and abnormal concentration results. It is this abnormal concentration, more than anything else or all things else together, that makes of what ought to be but an accident to a building a calamitous destruction of human life. And this is a condition the fault of which lies at no particular man's door. The responsibility rests upon us all, for our persistent and unreasonable ignorance of the natural laws of municipal development.

Public sentiment in Chicago is being stirred to its depths by a "citizens' " movement for the suppression of crime. A large committee has been formed, which is bespangled with prominent names. Sub-committees have been carved out of the larger commit-

tee, a princely fund is being collected by popular subscription, and through the local press a hue and cry is raised.

This is good work. No community can exist in reasonable comfort—much less can it flourish—where crime is rampant. Protection for life, liberty and property is the first essential of civilized life; and none of these rights are secure where crime holds sway. That crime does hold sway in Chicago is evident. It flourishes in many forms, from mere "touching" and pocket-picking all the way up through the various grades of hold-up, house breaking, and city hall "graft," to the tentative traction ordinance now pending before the city council. All are criminal, for each kind is in some way a menace to the security of some one's rights of life, liberty or property.

The only objection to the "citizens' " movement against crime in Chicago is that it is not directed against crime and criminals on principle. It is directed against only some kinds of crime and some grades of criminals. Let us not be misunderstood. We do not criticize the movement and its patrons for confining their present crusade to particular crimes and particular classes. Such criticism would be unjust and foolish. Very often it is necessary to do only one thing at a time. This is especially true of rooting out crime. It must be attacked in detail. The indictment that does lie against the projectors of this movement is not that they are assailing only the lower grades of crime, but that they are not assailing crime, as crime, at all.

The movement is animated by no principle of hostility to crime in general. It is only against cer-

tain species of crime that its projectors are excited and valiant. The crime genus does not arouse their hostility. Some of them, indeed, are even vigilant to protect their own favorite species of this genus. Boastful as they are about their crusade against crime, what they are really fighting is only the "other fellow's game." They are like the little girl of the oft-told but very pertinent story who prayed, "O, Lord, make Martha Smith a good little girl, so that I may take all her playthings away from her and she won't make any fuss about it."

Let the generous doubter compare the attitude of these crime chasers towards vulgar "graft" and pistol hold-ups with their attitude toward the "graft" and hold-up of the Chicago City railway, for instance, of which some of them are expectant beneficiaries. Yet there is really no moral difference between the two kinds. The hold-up man relieves you of your pocket-money and your watch at the point of a pistol. The traction company holds up the city officials with threats of unconscionable litigation for a prize of at least \$200,000,000. Where are these virtuous crime-chasers when that kind of crime flourishes? Do they denounce crime then? Surely it is pertinent to call upon them, before they expand too much with a sense of their virtue, to consider what crime is before they begin to chase criminals, and then to ask the guiltless among them to lead in the chase?

Let us repeat, however, that we are raising no objection to the suppression of vulgar forms of crime. By all means eradicate them. But eradicate them in the right spirit. Eradicate them, not because they happen to disturb you, but because they are a species of the genus crime. Thus you cultivate a disposition to eradicate the whole genus, the species of your own household as well as the species of the slums. Not only is this the right spirit, but it is the only

spirit which can crown any movement against the vulgar species of crime with success. Crusades against all crime can abolish all crime, step by step, if intelligently and sincerely prosecuted; but crusades with one-sided motives, against the crimes of the lower classes of criminals only, can never succeed. So long as trespasses upon the life, liberty and property of the masses are permitted under forms of law, so long will the masses breed vulgar criminals to defy the law.

When you commend your policemen for boasting of "violating the law in order to enforce the law," what are you to expect of men who suffer from what seem to be unfair discriminations? When the police forbid lawful public meetings of the "lower classes," as they have recently done in Paterson, N. J., or break them up, as they did in Chicago prior to the anarchist episode, what are you to expect of the "lower classes" who are thus denied one of the most fundamental of rights? When prisoners without influential friends, arrested without warrant and confined without legal authority, are tortured into making confessions (true or false as may be) in utter defiance of law, and this official criminality is publicly approved or condoned as necessary to successful criminal chasing, what are you to expect of the prisoners and their friends as they begin to realize that the safeguards of the law, nominally for the protection of all, are not for the protection of such as they? These are but surface suggestions. To go fully into even so much as a bare enumeration of the various approved species of crime that tend to produce the species that excite the ire and stimulate the civic enthusiasm of your polite crime-chaser, would require much more space than we can spare. It would take us back to the traction ordinance hold-up and "graft" which some of the wealthiest people of Chicago are coercing the city council's committee into approving. It would

take us even beyond that. We should have to point to the various other sources of unearned incomes of the respectable sort, which are extorted under forms of law from the working forces of society. There is a great measure of truth in the general feeling and common talk among the proscribed criminals that "all is graft," and that their proscribed practices are "in kind the same as those of the respectable gangs who chase them, and in degree milder."

Until the present crusade against crime in Chicago vitalizes itself with a better civic spirit, it will neither deserve nor command success. It cannot command even respect, except in the limited class out of which it springs, while it represents nothing more than it seems to now. Not even a citizens' committee for the suppression of crime can divide its allegiance and yet be worthy of confidence. It cannot be trusted to exterminate the vulgar crimes of the poor while condoning the gilded graft of the rich. Crime is crime, be the criminal rich or poor, of high station or low, official servant or private citizen. Nor is it any the less crime for having been legalized or having become respectable. It consists essentially in depriving men of their natural rights to their own life, their own liberty and their own property. Do the Chicago committee agree to this? Then let them declare their purpose. Do they purpose exterminating crime wherever and however it raises its head, and whether it be sanctioned by law and custom or not? Or are they only sportsmen on a man-hunt in the slums?

Good tidings are brought back to the East by Cornelius N. Bliss, from a trip he has been making over the continent. He says that he found evidences of prosperity everywhere. Travelers generally can find prosperity everywhere—in Pullman cars. But scores of thousands of discharged workmen in the West, who did not ride

with Mr. Bliss in his Pullman, see the immediate future in less brilliant colors.

In this connection it is only fair to state, upon the authority of a trustworthy newspaper correspondent, that "the West is lending money to the East." This report brings up visions of farm-hands loaded down with money which they are lending to eager financiers in Wall street. But the truth is somewhat different. Farm hands have no money to lend. Most farm owners, however, have money on deposit in their local banks; and the local banks are lending to Eastern banks, which are already in distress. Pretty soon the inevitable crash will come, and then the Western country bankers will be unable to collect their Eastern loans. The rest will follow—broken banks and buncoed farmers.

Enough of Congressman Baker's able speech in Congress on the question of labor and prosperity appeared in last week's Public (p. 602) to enable the reader to judge of its merits as a campaign document. Yet many important details were necessarily omitted, which should be brought to the attention of voters. It was a complete and irrefutable reply to Hepburn's buncombe speech of a few days before. For the use of democratic-Democrats no better campaign document could be desired. It is one, moreover, which they can easily circulate. Let them send to their respective congressmen, whether Democrat or Republican, for as many copies as they can re-mail to individuals, and copies ready franked for mailing will be sent them. If a Republican Congressman neglects to comply, let the application be made to the Democrat whose district is nearest that of the applicant. Senators also may be applied to.

It seems that it is not the inordinate demands for better wages that have produced the livery-

men's strike in Chicago, though that reason is exploited for all it is worth and more. The real trouble appears to lie in the landlord "graft." Said J. M. Fay, proprietor of one of the livery companies: "We pay such high rent for our stands at the hotels that the margin of profit is small and we are near the limit." He added: "Similar conditions are faced by other livery stable owners." As "stands at the hotels" consist chiefly of permission to keep cabs standing on the street awaiting custom, it may be seen that this burden on the livery business is chiefly the price of a street monopoly. The hotels take all the business will bear, and the men who do the work are expected to be content with the balance. There is something about this instance which is strikingly significant of the labor and monopoly question as a whole.

CRIME.

We never know all that words mean until we see them translated into acts.

On Christmas Eve Lowell's words—

Lo here

The images ye have made of me

were translated before my eyes with full significance.

I had received an urgent note as follows:

Will you pleas come down hear and try to get me out I will explain to you the reason I am heere when you come please come at once as you know my berth is to morrow and I will be 50 years of age and I would like to spend christmas at home as I am in a terble distress and by your astence I know I can get out for I was toll heer that you could get me aut please come at once your Humble serveant.

I arrived in the yard of the ugly, nasty police jail about five. The prisoners were just lined up—about 200 of them—preparatory to turning in for the night. What they turn into are dark, miserable cell-pens, more fit for pigs than for human beings.

I had time, while the keepers were taking stock of them, to have a good look at the lines, and I saw but one face that was really brutal; all the rest betokened men or

boys who, if washed, clothed, and in their right minds, would look as well as the average number anywhere. But their present unkemptness and clothing almost hid the semblance of humanity. All ages were represented, from boys of 17 to old men of 70. I asked one of the keepers what they were there for. "Mostly vagrants," he said, "sent up for 30 days."

This is not the first-class city jail, where more respectable prisoners are sent for longer terms, or while awaiting trial in higher courts. It is the hell of the lowest courts.

Would that all men might know what devilish work goes on in these lowest courts in all large cities! When one knows, he can but wonder that the Almighty in his wrath does not smite with destruction a civilization which boasts of enlightenment and still permits such hells of injustice to exist under the name of courts of justice.

It is too often some indifferent politician who occupies the so-called seat of justice, some fellow as ignorant of mercy as he is of law. He scowls at the poor wretch brought before him, whom he hardly permits to speak; hears the policeman say he is guilty under ordinance so-and-so; and calls out: "Twenty-five dollars or 30 days; next!" with less feeling than if he were passing judgment on pieces of lumber.

When a judge is to be set on what we call a supreme bench, we use big swelling words about the requirements for so exalted a position. This supreme judge is to sit in courts where every client can employ learned attorneys to defend his interests. In the lowest courts, where poor, helpless sinners come for trial, almost any politician needing a job will answer for judge.

The men I saw lined up this Christmas Eve were the victims of this kind of justice. There they stood, hopeless, helpless—the ultimates of the "other half."

Meanwhile the high officials of the city were engaged in a gala reception, where wine, women and music made all the earth seem lovely; and in churches vesper services were being chanted in celebration of the holy season.

J. H. DILLARD.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Washington, D. C., Dec. 28.—The only significant political incidents of the week are the interviews with Southern Senators which have appeared in the Washington papers wherein they show signs of "crawfishing." With the same devotion to commercial considerations which marked the action of New England towards slavery prior to 1860, chambers of commerce and similiar bodies in Southern cities are calling on their United States Senators to vote to ratify the treaty with Panama, because of the "commercial" advantages to the South that will follow the building of an Isthmian canal. These Senators are being almost pointedly told that this is no time for any fine spun questions of honor. No matter what means were adopted to bring about this made-to-order revolution, this presto-change republic, no matter what treaty may have been entered into in the past under which the United States obligated itself to preserve intact Colombia's sovereignty over the Isthmus, we must shut our eyes to all such questions. The important thing to remember is that there is money in it, that "commercial" considerations alone should control.

It would be interesting to know whether any of the \$40,000,000 to be paid to the old Panama company (a large part of whose stock is undoubtedly held in Wall street) has found its way in small dribblets down among the opinion moulders of the Southern States.

The only other political straw is a long, carefully prepared interview with Congressman S. B. Cooper, of Texas, who is believed to speak for Senator Bailey of his State—heretofore regarded as for Gorman. Cooper intimates that the Gorman boom is losing strength. He hastens to insist that everything points to Gorman as chairman of the national committee to manage the campaign; but declares that he cannot believe Gorman will be nominated, as all who are for the Maryland Senator have an "if" or a "but" connected with their endorsement, and no man can be nominated with "ifs" and "buts."

The announced intention to send Bourke Cockran to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Mayor McClellan, and the further announcement that Congressman Ira E. Rider was to resign to make room for ex-Senator Charles A. Towne, indicated a determination on the part of the present leaders of Tammany Hall to cut a larger figure in the Democratic national convention in 1904 than has on occasions been the case. The expectation presumably was that Bourke Cockran and Charles A. Towne would, during the present session of Congress, deliver such speeches as would attract the attention of the country, so that on the assembling of the

national convention they, as the mouthpieces of Tammany Hall, might wield a large influence there.

The plan has been checked temporarily, at least, by the refusal of Congressman Rider to resign, the Washington Post quoting him as saying "that he has no intention of resigning and that no one has authority to speak for him on the subject and that he intends to serve out his term."

ROBERT BAKER.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Dec. 31.

So far from being at an end, as reported in the news dispatches of a month or so ago (p. 536), the civil war in Santo Domingo has developed into a triangular conflict and become more destructive than ever.

Hardly had the deposed president, Wos y Gil, signed articles of capitulation, which he did on the 24th of November, when a controversy arose between the partisans of ex-President Jiminez and those of Gen. Morales, both of whom had been leaders in the insurrection against Wos y Gil. Morales becoming president of the provisional government which was established upon the surrender of Wos y Gil, Jiminez promptly led an insurrection against it. A severe battle was fought at Santiago de los Caballeros on the 17th of December in which Jiminez was successful. As time went on matters grew worse for the Morales government in its resistance to Jiminez; and meanwhile a third faction, under Gen. Gelletier, formed a second provisional government, opposed to both Morales and Jiminez. This was done at Azua de Compostella, about the 20th. A press dispatch of the 28th summed up the situation as follows:

With two revolutions in progress, two provisional governments endeavoring to establish themselves, an independent body of insurgents in the field, and battles raging at a half-dozen places throughout the republic, the situation in Santo Domingo is more critical than at any time since the outbreak of hostilities several months ago.

Gen. Jiminez was fiercely attacking the city of San Domingo on the 27th.

In consequence of the critical situation in Santo Domingo the

American minister asked his government for the protection of an additional war ship in Dominican waters; and on the 28th Secretary Moody cabled Rear Admiral Lambertson, commanding the South Atlantic squadron at Trinidad, to dispatch one of his vessels to San Domingo at full speed to assist the gunboat Newport in protecting American and other interests.

American affairs in connection with the Panama question (p. 597) seem to be approaching a critical climax. There is no doubt, at any rate, that the President is making war-like preparations. Secret orders are reported to have been issued by the war department to all branches of the service stationed at convenient points on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts to be in readiness to move upon a minute's notice; and transports at New York, San Francisco, Boston and other points are held in readiness for instant movement. Orders were issued on the 29th to four companies of engineers, ten batteries of light artillery, ten regiments of infantry and two of cavalry, to hold themselves in readiness to move. These reports are, of course, not authoritative; but they have the appearance of being well founded.

Another European Power has recognized the Panama republic. This is Great Britain. The occasion was celebrated on the 25th, when the British consul at Panama announced the fact.

The arrival of Wm. I. Buchanan at Panama, and his presentation of credentials from President Roosevelt as American minister (p. 597) to the provisional government of Panama, were reported on the 25th.

In behalf of Colombia, Gen. Reyes, as special envoy from that country to the United States, presented to Secretary Hay on the 24th the Colombian protest against American interference in Panama. No reply has yet been made and the protest has not been authoritatively published. The following unauthoritative summary of the main points of the protest is reported in Washington dispatches:

The United States should conserve the

peace of the Isthmus by not preventing Colombia from compelling the submission of Panama.

The maintenance of order on the Isthmus should have been left to the Power holding sovereignty, which, in this case, is the sovereignty hitherto recognized by the United States, namely, Colombia.

The theory is inadmissible that the United States should permit dismemberment of Colombia merely to prevent temporary disturbance of transit across the Isthmus.

Colombia should not be required to submit to loss of territory simply from fear that interruption of transit might occur by her efforts to prevent such loss.

The sovereignty of a nation is paramount to the purpose of avoiding transitory prejudice to commerce.

The United States could most effectively prevent interruption of transit by notifying the Panamanians to abstain from obstructing the Colombian government in reestablishing order.

If the United States will use its troops to preserve Colombian sovereignty, Colombia will, under martial law, grant full authorization for the construction of the canal.

Colombia asks that, in the event of rejection of its proposition, the United States keep hands off while Colombia reduces Panama to submission, or that the United States grant a money compensation to Colombia for the loss of territory, the amount to be fixed by The Hague tribunal.

Elections for members of the constitutional convention of Panama (p. 584) were held on the 27th. Results in detail are not reported. It is stated, however, that the mixed candidates—Conservatives and Liberals—nominated by the junta, under whose auspices the elections were held, have been triumphantly elected.

In view of the wide-spread reductions of wages in the United States at this time, and a manifest tendency toward more general and further reductions, Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, advises union workmen to resist all reductions. His advice is given in an editorial in the organ of the Federation, in which he says:

We have advised and shall continue to advise our fellow workers to resist reductions in wages by every lawful means within their power, for, as we have said before, "It is better to resist and lose than not to resist at all." Let workmen peaceably accept reductions in their wages and it will be an invitation to repeat the reduction at will, intensifying the depression and provoking an indus-

trial crisis, forcing down workers in the economic and social scale and bringing on fearful poverty, misery and degradation. Resistance on the part of labor to reduction of wages will check to a great degree, and at least demonstrate to ignorant and short-sighted employers that such a course is exceedingly expensive to them and will prevent its repetition.

The most terrible disaster of the year on our side of the world occurred on the 30th at Chicago, with the burning of the Iroquois theater. This theater was of recent construction, having been completed last October, and was regarded as fire proof. A spectacular performance, "Mr. Bluebeard, Jr.," has been running since the opening, to packed houses. On the 30th at the afternoon matinee a very large audience was in attendance, mostly women and children. It is estimated at about 1,900. Toward the end of the performance, a few minutes before 4 o'clock, a sheet of flame burst through the skylight over the stage, carrying with it a heavy volume of black smoke which settled back in thick rolls over the shattered opening in the roof. A moment more and the roof was on fire. As it burned, light drifts of greenish smoke arose as if from an explosion of chemicals. Perhaps two minutes after this seeming explosion, shrieks and screams were heard, and the more fortunate of the audience came pouring out at the front entrance. Meanwhile, according to press reports, the stage had been burning, and flames and smoke and stifling fumes were sweeping the auditorium. The asbestos curtain would not work, some of the exit doors would not open, and the entrapped women and children were dying in crowds. The Chicago Tribune estimates the dead at 571 and the injured at 350. This estimate is doubtless conservative.

NEWS NOTES.

—Ex-Gov. Taft, of the Philippines, sailed on the 24th from Manila for the United States.

—The fifty-third annual convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science met at St. Louis on the 28th.

—Fay Lewis, of Rockford, Ill., offers to mail free of charge a copy of his "City Jail" (p. 575), to any judge, prosecutor

or jailer in the country, upon receipt of five cents for postage.

—Margaret F. Buchanan Sullivan, wife of Alexander Sullivan and for many years a prominent journalist of Chicago, died on the 28th. She was a proficient Greek, Latin and French scholar, as well as an able editorial writer.

—Wm. J. Bryan (p. 598) arrived at Copenhagen on the 25th, and after a long interview with Crown Prince Frederick, left for Berlin, where he was entertained on the 26th by the American ambassador, Mr. Tower. At a reception given in his honor by the American Chamber of Commerce on the same day, he delivered a speech which attracted extraordinary and most favorable attention in the German capital. Mr. Bryan was at The Hague on the 28th and in London on the 29th. He sailed from Liverpool for New York on the 30th on board the Celtic.

PRESS OPINIONS.

IS FREE SPEECH OBSOLETE?

New York Daily News (ind.), Dec. 20.—The Mayor of Paterson's refusal to permit American citizens to assemble in public meeting for the purpose of endorsing the Cooper Union resolutions relating to the case of John Turner arouses no public indignation, provokes no comment. It was an arbitrary denial of the right of petition, but what of that? A people that cares so little for its liberties as to make no protest against the monstrous usurpation of power by administrative officers that penalizes thought itself, cannot be expected to insist on the right of free speech. The Mayor of Paterson told Hugh O. Pentecost and other members of the Free Speech league that he "would not allow any discussion" of the law under which Turner was arrested; and he prevented by force the holding of a meeting by orderly citizens because he did not approve their opinions. So the American people have lost the right to discuss anything that Congress, in its infinite wisdom, may see fit to do; and any addequate clothed with a little brief authority may declare himself their master and disperse them with clubs when they meet. Americans submit to these things, not because they are profoundly respectful to the forms of law, for that they are not when the law and their desires conflict; but because the invasions of their liberties have not affected the personal comfort of masses of people, and they are indifferent to principles which their forefathers held to be of supreme importance.

CRIME AND COMMON SENSE.

Kansas City World (ind.), Dec. 26.—Two men are sent to the workhouse under penalty of ten days, \$10 and costs. At the end of ten days one pays his fine and is released. The other has no money, and stays in prison 20 days longer. Technically, then, he is imprisoned for being poor—jailed for debt. That is the view that Harris R. Cooley, director of charities in Cleveland, takes of it, and he says: "If the good of the offenders or of society demands that the prisoners should be held 30 days, they should be so held, regardless of social or financial standing." Cooley is a minister, built on the broad-gauge plan. He was allowed to work out his own plans with the Cleveland workhouse, and faced a storm of abuse for his alleged coddling of criminals. In two years he

caused the pardoning or paroling of 1,106 prisoners. The previous administration pardoned but 84 in a like period. Of course, there were abuses of this pardoning prodigality. You can't progress in any line without meeting with more or less obstruction. Of course, there were men who lost their fear of the workhouse, and who failed to reform when they had a chance to be good. But in the main the plan, which was based on fairness and a desire to keep out or help out of prison those men who could be rescued by kindness, has been a success. Crime in Cleveland has shown no increase. Of the pardoned and paroled, 173 have returned to the workhouse for later offenses, but the percentage of returns is far less than under the old system. The average number of prisoners in the workhouse has been cut down from nearly 500 to less than half that number, and it is but fair to presume that the rest are quietly working out their own salvation as useful members of society. The Cooley plan is worth trying in any city.

SENATOR HOAR.

Springfield Republican (ind.), Dec. 25 (weekly ed.).—If Massachusetts were to put a purely commercial value upon Senator Hoar—which heaven forbid—it would have to be conceded that he was a paying investment for the State. He says things and does things that distinguish the old Commonwealth, or that “keep her in the public eye,” as an enterprising manager might say. Charles Sumner was always doing the same thing, only in a different way characteristic of the man. Both Sumner and Hoar have had a faculty of running athwart party sentiment and discipline at times, and both have made themselves eminent in our political history by their appeals to the conscience of the nation. Sumner, however, carried his independent proclivities to their logical conclusion, while Mr. Hoar has invariably held fast to his party allegiance when a supreme test came. There is nothing in Mr. Hoar's record to justify one in thinking that he will have a serious break with his Republican colleagues on the Panama issue, although he might vote against the Panama treaty, as he did against the Paris treaty, if his anxious inquiries are not satisfactorily answered. Whatever he does, however, in this matter, his service in challenging the morality and legality of the operations thus far is of immense value.

NEIGHBORHOOD DEMOCRACY.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Dec. 28.—The unanimous and commendable action of the Board of Education in permitting the use of our public school buildings as “neighborhood centers” makes them in a true sense the property of the people. To restrict these costly structures, built and maintained at public expense, to the comparatively few hours devoted to formal education is a policy which the intelligent citizen cannot approve. Wherever the people of a neighborhood are willing to meet the extra expense of opening a school building—outside of school hours—for a proper purpose, and also are ready to secure the board of education against either incidental or accidental wear and tear, the privilege of using such building should be open to them. This the board has now established, and it is hoped the innovation may become a settled and helpful custom.

Accurately and strictly speaking, there is no foundation in nature or in natural law why a set of words or parchment should convey the dominion of land.—Blackstone.

MISCELLANY

THE SLAVE-CHILDREN OF OUR FREE LAND.

Ye who have children playing in their gladness,
Watch yonder child who toils in mute despair,
In mine, or mill, or near some cruel furnace!
How would you like to see your own child there?

Is there for fettered childhood no salvation?
In life's fair springtime must the heart grow old?

Open thine eyes for once, my slumbering nation,
For Christ's dear sake that crime of crimes behold!

Before they faint wrap the flag round the children;
From reeking mill take them to God's pure air;
They'll make thy future, be it strong or feeble,
They are thy future, be it foul or fair.

They are thy future, let me once more say it,
Brain, heart and muscle of thy growing years;
Take them, oh, take them now from greed's inferno,
Give childhood's joy in place of pangs and fears.

For Mammon's use alone upon mere babies
Are pressed the weight and power of labor's gyves;
But marble structures crammed with gilded volumes
Will not atone for darkened, ruined lives.

By every moan of childhood, Mammon-blighted,
By every needless grave that shames our land,
By every mill-worn life, uncheered, unlighted,
Justice will rise and her full pay demand.

The One who loved and cherished little children,
Who bade them come, and all their fears beguiled,
Said once, in tones that pierce our craven silence,
Thrice curst is he who sins against a child,
—Mary McNabb Johnston, in Boyce's Weekly.

A FABLE OF THE FUTURE.

For The Public.

In the year 2000 a monopolist, who had cornered the entire globe, was found in tears.

“What's the matter?” inquired his wife.

“Matter enough!” replied the monopolist.

“After I've worked hard all my life, and at last attained the summit of my ambition, the human race threatens to

strike. This interference with private enterprise is becoming intolerable.”

LOUIS WALLIS.

AFTER ITS KIND.

A man bored a hole in a tree and a woodpecker came and lived in it.

“The tree has conceived,” said the man, “and has brought forth a bird.”

Next year the woodpecker went away, and two flying squirrels lived in the tree.

“What a curious thing,” said the man, “is Heredity.”—Bolton Hall, in The Independent.

PARABLE OF THE MUDDY WATER.

For The Public.

And it came to pass that when Adam and Eve were evicted from the Garden, they raised Cain, and others who were Abel to continue the industry to this day. And the sons and daughters of Adam became scattered over the whole earth, many of them dwelling in the Bad Lands and desert places.

Some who had long-lived together on the banks of a little stream, had much trouble with polluted drinking water. The wise men of the village often took council together to purify it. Many ways did they try, spending much coin of the realm, putting sweet flavors into it; boiling, settling, filtering many barrels, which they poured back into the stream, hoping to improve it all; but each morning the water was as muddy as ever.

One day there came down from the hills above a man whom the rulers of the synagogue and the “best people” called “disturber of the peace,” and “anarchist,” for short, because he suggested radical things their grandfathers had not done, to purify the waters; even to go up stream and barbecue a large fat sow named Land Monopoly, and watch her numerous pigs—trusts, coal, iron, oil, tariff, patents and franchise (monopoly)—vanish from their accustomed wallow in the brook.

GEO. W. PATTERSON.

ALPHONSE AND GASTON.

“I insist, my dear Marcus, that you shall continue in the chairmanship of the Republican national committee.”

“I protest, my dear Theodore, that my health will not permit it.”

“But, my dear Marcus, the national committee will be an impossibility without the inspiration of your presence.”

“Indeed, my dear Theodore, you flatter me, but I must retire for a period and rest. I wish to return instantly to that dear Cleveland, Ohio.”

"I shall expire with grief if you do not remain, my dear Marcus. You owe it to yourself and your country to help the Roosevelt campaign."

"I shall be racked with rheumatism if I do, my dear Theodore. I have already managed two campaigns."

"Ah! but those campaigns were not mine, but another's, my dear Marcus. It will be impossible for me to exist another instant if you do not do as I desire."

"The honor would be too great, my dear Theodore. Ask —"

"— is an ass, my dear Marcus."

"He is an unmitigated bore, my dear Theodore."

Let the catastrophe come on. The pleasant little scene has been enacted for lo! these many months, but it never becomes tiresome. It is beautifully, classically humorous. We shall be sorry when it stops at last.—San Francisco Star.

A MAN AFTER MR. MULLIGAN'S OWN HEART.

For The Public.

"Good maarn'n this maarn'n, Mистер Donovan."

"Good maarn'n, Mистер Mulligan."

"It's a foine day this maarn'n."

"'Tis indade, sorr."

"Phwat's th' news?"

"Noth n atahl atahl—only iverybody do be bladgin' about this Bill-phwat's 'is name? Oi don' know; Pannyma Bill, Oi think it is they call 'im."

"Ach! Donovan! Ye're crayzee. Hould yer toong till Oi iexplain it till ye. Sure, Rosyfell's the lad afther me own heart!—It's a wurr'd'an' a blow—an' the blow comes furrst. Coloomby wudn't lave us dig the ditch across the isthmus. So, wan day some fellys wrote to 'm, an' sez they: 'Mr. Rosyfell, we hov the boolge an Coloomby. We hov the anner t' announce t' ye that the bran new Raypooblic av Pannyma wuz baarn yesterday. Thure'll be a schlaughther sale av canal rootes tomorry. Are yez an? Don't delay, but coom airly an' get yer pick.'"

"D'ye think wud he go, Mulligan?"

"D'ye think wud a dook schwim, Donovan? An' he wint. An' begorra, there'll be ditch digg'n t' bate the band!"

"Ye're talkun'!"

"Dade Oi am, Donovan. Faith, Rosyfell is a jainyus. All the greaat shtatesmin av th' coontry hov been want'n' t' get hould av Cuby fer many a year pasht, an' it tuk Rosyfell to tatch thim how to do ut. There'll be a captain av indushtry in New Yaark. An' he'll say to his proivate secretary, sez 'e: 'Put an a clane collar an' nicktoy, an' go down t'

Cuby. Go into the roorial districts whare the paypl' are poor an' discontinued. An' be sure ye pay yer legitimate expinsis. Pay liberally—the paypl' are poor an' Oi wudn't rist aisy in me conscience if anny thing Oi doone shud add to their grievious burrdens. Take about three millyun 500 dollars wid ye; an' if that won't pay yer legitimate expinsis, sind fer more. Don't be a burrden to those poor paypl'. Buy ivery acre av land in that geographycalculable section av the oiland. Get nixt to the young pathriots av infloonce among the paypl'. Point thim to the glorious achievemints of the silf-sacrifoising pathriots av Pannamother. Tell thim in glowing turums av the univarsal dimmycratic tindincy av the age. Let thim rear a raypooblic upon the solid foundation av their blashted hopes, whose fame and glory will go rolling down the carridors av toime, loike a twinty-five thousand dollar autymobillier phwin the chaffer has got rattled. Call a convintion, elect a prisident, an inside guard, an outside guard and a polisman; and thare is yer goovermint de factory. Wire Rosyfell, an' he'll sind the govermint de Jewry by return cable; to be followed by a fleet av warships, to protict the U. S. coaling station, besoides kaping the mother country from shpanking her raycalcitrant childher."

"It's a promoter ye augh' to be, Mulligan."

"Incade it is, Donovan. Wid Rosyfell to back me, Oi'd hov a whole lither av young raypooblics insoide av three months—wid commercial adwantages correspond'n."

HORACE CLIFTON.

WHAT THE GIANTS BUILD

An extract from "Symbol Psychology: A New Interpretation of Race Traditions," by Adolph Roeder, just published by Harper & Bros. See review on page 590 of Public of December 19.

Think for a moment of the story of the building of Valhal. The giants bullded it. The tremendous forces of earth and mind build the dwelling place of the gods. It was impossible to understand this story until we attained our present day culture and development. But now we see; now we comprehend. Look abroad upon the vast reaches of man's utilization of the gigantic nature forces! See what man has done with them! They do every conceivable thing for him. He makes the giant fact called "wind" drive his boats and his windmills; the giant "gravitation" runs his water wheels and his gravity cars and a thousand and one other things; and the giant "electricity" lights his houses and his

towns, drives his dynamos and his trolleys, lifts his elevators and cooks his food, and talks over miles of space, clicks his messages across the sea—with wires and without—and does all kinds of intelligent, but unintelligible things for him. These are giants, for they are as big as the globe—aye, and bigger—mirabile dictu—the sentence "There were giants in those days" is no more true than the equally remarkable sentence "There are giants in these days."

* * * * *

The giant forces of nature build the machine, and—~~it~~ displaces man. There is the most serious plaint which the laborer raises against the machine. It does the work of a dozen, of a hundred, of two hundred, and, of course, these are thrown out of work, but—a machine can only displace a machine. No two bodies of entirely different nature can displace each other. A chair cannot displace a thought and a stone cannot displace a filial obligation or a parental duty. So a machine can displace only a machine—and if man were only a human machine, then, of course, he can be displaced by a machine, and rightly so, for God did not design him ultimately to be a machine. He was a machine, collectively, after he had outgrown the animal stage. He admitted it; he called his political mechanism a machine; the church, he felt, was an ecclesiastical mechanism; he spoke of the machinery of business—if he was collectively a machine, he must needs be individually a machine, and can it be doubted that he assumed that attitude? Look at the man in the trench—the man of mechanical employment—and tell me, is that fulfilling the design of God? When God created man, did he design him to be an eating and sleeping animal, a digging and trenching machine? Not at all. As soon as possible God would certainly introduce the machine to do the machine work and set man free to do the human work. The man displaced grumbles at first; but the machine shortens hours, it limits labor, it reduces wear and tear, and it gives men time to cultivate their mental side. They may not do it as yet, but ultimately, when the mechanical side of things can be attended to by a handful of men, man will be free to grow into that manhood which can come only when the giants have built the palace of the gods, for manhood in its aggregate is "the gods." And the giants build the palace of the gods because they set men free from mechanical lines by putting machines in the

places designed by God for machines, and not for men, from the beginning.

This is the story of the Scandinavian buildings, and this the age in which it is being accomplished, whence springs the deep and otherwise almost inexplicable interest in Wagner's "Niebelungen Ring."

NEW YORK NEWS FACTORIES.

A letter published in the December number of Liberty.

The arrest of John Turner and his threatened deportation under the new Anti-Anarchist law have brought the general subject of Anarchism prominently before the public; and at this time, while a great deal of stuff is being printed in the daily papers on the subject, the following account of a personal interview with the editor of the New York "Times" may be of interest, as indicating, to some extent, at least, the attitude of the press toward Anarchy.

As the readers of Liberty know, the newspaper accounts of the meeting which Mr. Turner was addressing at the time of his arrest were absolutely false. Therefore, having been present at the meeting and knowing the actual facts of the case, I called on the editor of the "Times," the principal offender, with a request that he print a letter of correction in his paper.

When I approached the editor in his sanctum, and stated my errand, he looked up and said:

"Well, we don't care to do anything much for these Anarchists, unless it is to see them safely to the electric chair."

When I remonstrated that, regardless of his personal opinion of the Anarchists, if his paper was going to print anything at all about them, common decency and fairness dictated that it should tell the truth, he remarked:

"We don't consider that these people are entitled to fairness any more than a pack of mad dogs."

And in the course of his further remarks he volunteered the information that Anarchists were "people banded together for purposes of assassination," who were "everybody's enemies."

In spite of these strong statements, the editor printed my letter, but without comment.

Of course I know there is nothing new in all this. Misrepresentation and calumny, I suppose, are the lot of every radical movement. But, when the editor of so important and influential a newspaper as the "Times," in

an amazing burst of frankness, comes out with statements the only inference from which is that he would stoop to any means to injure a cause he assumes to be "everybody's enemy," the occasion seems to furnish a good opportunity (which I hope the editor of Liberty will not miss) for someone to follow Dr. Dowie's example and "get after" him.

The following facts may also be of interest to those who are not well acquainted with newspaper methods of getting news. In the course of my investigations of this matter, I traced the responsibility for the original story of the so-called "raid" on the Turner meeting to the New York City News Association, a branch of the Associated Press. From the manager of that association I learned that the story as it appeared in the "Times," "Press," and "Journal," and from them was copied broadcast over the country, was written by a young "space grabber," who was "anxious to get on the regular staff," and therefore, "in his youthful enthusiasm to please, wrote the story in the manner he thought most likely to please."

According to the direct admissions of the manager, the reporter was "most likely not in the hall at all, but got his facts from some policemen who took part in the affair, and who wanted to get a little glory for himself by making out there had been a riot." (The quotations mark literal statements.)

Thus are newspapers "made."

WM. G. LIGHTBOURN.
New York, November 10, 1903.

UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL.

Printed from the Original MS.

Dear John: I'm surprised, John, that you like my boy William Jennings Bryan. Of course Billy is a fine fellow, and I had half a notion once or twice to have him for President, but—he's an anti-imperialist, John, bad!

Of course he is good to look at—handsome fellow, prime of life, always appears well, talks well, acts well, good judgment, good humor, belongs to church, and has a good reputation at home; but, John, did you notice that under jaw of his? He means all those blamed Christian things he says, and I'm afraid of him. He's a dangerous man; and as to Christian principles, with Bryan at the helm to carry 'em out, John, I'm agin 'em! Heaven hereafter, says I; not now. But we had to work; and it was a close call for the devil last election, I tell you!

You see, this Bryan is an awful strong

man. He's a power. The more bad words you throw at him the better he looks. He don't have any mean streaks, and the boys drop in behind him like sheep after the bell wether. He don't understand it, nor they don't; but it's so. He's a natural leader of men, and so big the boys ain't ashamed to foller him after they get into line. And then he is so plausible, makes you think he's right, confound him! Makes you think he's right!

Well, he was a-leadin' the crowd, last election, on ways already greased by Washington, Jefferson and Abe Lincoln, not to say anything about Christ an' the Declaration of Independence; and something had to be done. You see it was so fixed that you had to stand up and be counted for Christ and Bryan, or stand up for the devil and shoot Filipinos. Then I called out my Christian ministers. It was a fine card. It was pretty tough sometimes; some of 'em wouldn't stand fer it, but they was largely wild ones, already teeterin' on the verges of respectability. Most of the cloth stood manfully with the Old Boy; and when the smoke cleared away, the Filipino where was he! Ask of the winds which all around with fragments strew the ministree. I thought at first Bryan was gone, too, and was kind o' sorry, for gone, he's a fine feller; but he ain't. Looks to me as if every time I beat him he gets bigger.

Then when he went abroad I thought again he was done for. Choate introduced him and apologized for him. Threw him on the bargain counter and said at least he could say he was an honest man. Choate's mistake was in ever letting him get that mouth of his open to show what he was. Bryan makes one little speech at the Thanksgiving dinner in London, stampedes the dinner and captures Europe. It was the '96 convention over again; and you, John, were just as big an old fool as any wild Democrat of the lot. Suppose he did set a high and ideal mark for men and nations. Suppose he did himself mark high, and head and shoulders above my present administration. That's the trouble with him—I admit it—strenuous in principle, brilliant and able, courteous and affable, fearless and daring, he is to-day the Chevalier Bayard of the western world and the knightliest man in it. I admit it, and I have a sneaking liking for him myself and pride in him; but how the dickens can I keep on a-representin' him as a scrub politician if you, John, set the seal of respectability and approval on him? Answer me that!

Why, the 400 will be goin' for him next. Make him the fashion once, and with his present lead—thunder!

UNCLE SAM.

THE OBLIGATIONS WHICH REST UPON THIS NATION.

An extract from the address of the Hon. William Jennings Bryan at the Thanksgiving banquet given by Hon. Joseph Choate, ambassador to the Court of St. James, at the Hotel Cecil, London, November 26, 1903, as published in *The Commoner* of December 18.

We sometimes feel that we have a sort of proprietary interest in the principles of government set forth in the Declaration of Independence. That is a document which we have given to the world, and yet the principles set forth therein were not invented by an American. Thomas Jefferson expressed them in felicitous language and put them into permanent form, but the principles had been known before. The doctrine that all men are created equal, that they are endowed with inalienable rights, that governments were instituted amongst men to secure these rights, and that they derived their just power from the consent of the governed—this doctrine which stands four square with all the world was not conceived in the United States, it did not spring from the American mind—aye, it did not come so much from any mind as it was an emanation from the heart, and it had been in the hearts of men for ages. (Cheers.)

Before Columbus turned the prow of his ship towards the west on that eventful voyage, before the barons wrested Magna Charta from King John—yes, before the Roman legions landed on the shores of this island—aye, before Homer sang—that sentiment had nestled in the heart of man, and nerved him to resist the oppressor. That sentiment was not even of human origin. Our own great Lincoln declared that it was God Himself who implanted in every human heart the love of liberty. Yes, when God created man, when He gave him life, He linked to life the love of liberty, and what God hath joined together let no man put asunder. (Cheers.)

We have received great blessings from God and from all the world, and what is our duty? We cannot make return to those from whom those gifts were received. It is not in our power to make return to the Father above. Nor can we make return to those who have sacrificed so much for our advancement. The child can never make full return to the mother whose life

trembled in the balance at its birth, and whose kindness and care guarded it in all the years of infancy. The student cannot make full return to the teacher who awakened the mind, and aroused an ambition for a broader intellectual life. The adult cannot make full return to the patriarch whose noble life gave inspiration and incentive. So a generation cannot make return to the generation gone; it must make its return to the generations to come. Our nation must discharge its debt not to the dead, but to the living.

How can our country discharge this great debt? In but one way, and that is by giving to the world something equal in value to that which it has received from the world.

And what is the greatest gift that man can bestow upon man? Feed a man and he will hunger again; give him clothing and his clothing will wear out; but give him a noble ideal, and that ideal will be with him through every waking hour, lifting him to a higher plane of life, and giving him a broader conception of his relations to his fellows.

I know, therefore, of no greater service that my country can render to the world than to furnish to the world the highest ideal that the world has known. That ideal must be so far above us that it will keep us looking upward all our lives, and so far in advance of us that we shall never overtake it. I know of no better illustration, no better symbol, of an ideal life than the living spring, pouring forth constantly of that which refreshes and invigorates, not the stagnant pool which receives contribution from all the land around and around and gives forth nothing. (Cheers.)

Our nation must make a large contribution to the welfare of the world, and it is no reflection upon those who have gone before to say that we ought to do better than they have done. We would not meet the responsibilities of to-day if we did not build still higher the social structure to which they devoted their lives. (Cheers.)

LUCIUS FAYETTE CLARK GARVIN,
GOVERNOR OF RHODE ISLAND, ETC.

Lucius F. C. Garvin was born in Knoxville, Tenn., November 13, 1841. His father, James Garvin, of Vermont, was professor in East Tennessee university. The son prepared for college at a Friends' school in Greensboro, N. C., and graduated from Amherst in 1862. He served in the civil war as a private in the Fifty-first Mas-

sachusetts volunteers. He graduated from Harvard medical school in 1867 and began the practice of his profession in the factory village of Lonsdale, where he has since resided. He went into the homes of the people, curing their physical ills. It was but a short step for him to turn his attention to the ills and abuses of government under which they lived. Until 1876 he was a Republican. His political views changed because in national affairs he believed in the doctrine of free trade, equal rights to all and special privileges to none. He was also influenced by the fact that Rhode Island was an oligarchy instead of a republic, with a restricted suffrage based on property, and a representation so unfair that it rivaled or surpassed the rotten boroughs of England as they existed before the reform bill of 1832. For years Dr. Garvin conducted an agitation for equal rights and the extension of the suffrage to foreign-born citizens, thereby attracting attention to the unfair conditions and gradually building up a personal following.

In 1883 he was first elected to represent his town, Cumberland, in the general assembly, and served for 16 years, 13 in the house and three in the senate. During these years he was the chief advocate of reform in the legislature. To him, largely, was due the passage of the ten-hour and ballot-reform laws, the amendment granting suffrage to the foreign-born, and similar legislation. He was thrice the nominee for Congress in the second district. Defeated there, he has at last been thrice nominated and [twice] elected as governor.

His year in office has been less an administration than an agitation. Notwithstanding his overwhelming vote, the Republican party still controlled the legislature. By a law passed in 1901 the senate has the power of appointment; and as it is notoriously controlled by the "machine," the "boss" is virtually dictator. A majority of the senate can be, and is, elected by less than 5,000 votes. Shorn of all real executive power, most men would have sat still. Not so Dr. Garvin. By press and platform he has kept up a steady fire of attack on the political evils of the State. His friends have often been dismayed at his boldness. His political enemies have accused him of besmirching the fair name of the State. But he has kept both his temper and his course unflinchingly. He is undoubtedly a doctrinaire, not an

opportunist. He stands for liberty rather than law. He advocates political more than moral reforms.—The World To-Day, for November.

THE MISTAKE OF MODERN CIVILIZATION, AND HOW ITS CORRECTION WOULD ADVANCE BOTH CAPITAL AND LABOR.

An abstract of an address before the Inter-Parish Debating association, of Fall River, Mass., December 16, 1903, by the Hon. L. F. C. Garvin, governor of Rhode Island, etc.

Gov. Garvin began his address with a full statement of what he believed to be the fundamental mistake of Modern Civilization. This mistake consists in an unwise and unjust system of taxation which engenders certain artificial and law-made monopolies.

The remedy he proposed is the exemption from taxation of all personal property and improvements. Such taxes, he showed, are paid out of interest, which is the return to the capital, and out of wages, which is the return to labor.

A reduction of wages has just occurred in Southern New England, acquiesced in by the operatives affected, because the returns to the capital invested in the manufacture of cotton fabrics are now admittedly small.

What are the influences which always handicap capital, and which from time to time become so strong as to lead to prolonged business depressions?

They are high taxes, high cost of power and raw materials, and high-priced land, which limits the opportunity for the investment of capital, and finally the diversion of wealth into monopolistic enterprises which, by promising quick and vast returns, foster a spirit of speculation.

All of these impediments to a legitimate production of wealth are magnified, if not created, by the taxes we lay upon commodities. One of the effects of the annual fines placed upon the products of capital and labor is to discourage and materially lessen the amount of wealth produced. Every product upon which a fine is laid, whether it is a horse, a stock of goods, or a building, is thereby augmented in price. Every such increase of price falls upon the consumer, taking from him a part of his wages, and, if he has saved anything for investment, a part of his interest.

In some towns in Massachusetts the local taxes amount to two per cent. of the assessed value of the property. Not infrequently all of the taxable property of widows and orphans consists of personality. Now if the guardian makes his investments carefully the very highest

return he can expect to secure is six per centum. Therefore, upon an estate of \$20,000, the annual income will be \$1,200, of which sum, if the law be enforced, \$400 will go to the municipality in taxes. When it is considered that these local taxes are but a part, and a minor part, of the total loss to the individual from our tax laws, we may form some comprehension of the burden they impose as a whole.

In one city of this country the folly of local taxes upon personal property is fully understood. For many years Philadelphia has exempted personal property, including machinery, from taxation. Not only has no injury resulted, but the Quaker city has become the Mecca of men whose wealth consisted of personal property, and in the course of time, no doubt, that wealth has found its way into real estate to the advantage of the municipality and the increase of its taxable property. Not only has Philadelphia not suffered in consequence, but it stands first among the great cities of the United States as a manufacturing center. By the census of 1890 the amount of capital per capita invested in manufactures was: In Boston, \$263; in New York, \$281; in Chicago, \$327; in Philadelphia, \$358.

The unwisdom of taxing personal property has long been known to political economists, and has given rise to the saying: "Nothing should be taxed that can run away." Equally true is it that nothing should be taxed that can stay away. Our so-called taxes upon improvements, which are nothing but annual fines imposed upon the enterprising, are the rankest folly, and no section of the country is suffering from them more than is New England.

That manufacturers realize the incubus upon their business of taxes upon mills, tenement houses and machinery, is proved by their efforts to have their plants exempted from taxation. In Rhode Island quite a number of valuable manufacturing establishments are relieved of all taxes for a period of ten years. In some of the Southern States a standing invitation is extended to capitalists to invest through laws exempting their plants from all taxes. This policy accounts in part for the fact that the chief industry of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, the manufacture of cotton fabrics, is growing far more rapidly in the South than in New England.

Our policy, therefore, is plain. It is to exempt from taxation by a simple State law personal property and improvements of all kinds. Such exemption would necessitate an increase of the amount of taxes now levied upon

land values. Taking taxes off the products of labor and capital lowers their price to the consumer, imposing taxes upon land also lowers its selling price to the user; so that in two ways both capital and laborer will find their income materially increased as compared with their expenditure.

As a practical legislative measure, a law should be passed enabling any town or city which so desired to exempt from local taxation all personal property and improvements; in other words, to derive all local revenue from a tax on land values only.

This is the direct method by which New England may maintain her high standing as a manufacturing center.

"FROM NARROW THINGS TO GREAT."

A Latin phrase has come down to us, from how far a past I do not know, which brings a sense of larger room and deeper breaths of windy air, and peace. "De angusta ad augusta"—"from narrow things to great." By implication we are urged to make the journey.

And what of that journey? It is truly "into a far country," but it is neither long nor arduous. It is not "the thorny way that leads to the stars," of the other Latin phrase. It is a way of pleasantness which leads to a land of peace.

For the narrow things—"the narrow things of the house," as Horace calls some of them—are just the outside things, separated in our thought of them from the inside forces which should be their souls.

Drudgery, sordidness and petty fears are of the narrow things of the house which darken and contract the lives of many good women who are carefully paying tithes of mint and anise and cummin. They are doing the right things. They are carefully and economically ordering their houses and making pleasant homes for those they love. But they think of their work as laborious, and monotonously reiterative, and as a hindrance to their intellectual and spiritual development.

And yet right there in labors for the great, simple, primitive needs of human life lies the very work which is the outside expression of the most tremendous things God does for man.

Food, clothing, shelter—these are the things alike necessary to primeval and savage man, and to the most civilized man of the latest hour. Spiritual food, clothing and shelter we never make for ourselves; the Divine Father always provides them for us in their entirety—

a statement of Swedenborg's which has only to be pondered over to be recognized as inevitably true. But here in this world He leaves to us the management of the activities which shall produce from the well-stored and pliable environment in which He places us all the things of which we have need.

Food, clothing and shelter—as general commercial products, undifferentiated for individual needs, they are supplied by general social and largely masculine labor. To the woman in the main falls the selection, the differentiation from the mass, of what is needed to make the individual home. From selected commercial products she creates the outside of the home function—the warmth and light and order—which comfort and protect and give opportunity for the development and the best productive labor of the immature and the mature human beings under her care; the clothing which gives not only protection, but furnishes also an outward expression of lives which she better than any other understands; and best of all, the food—oh, wonder, that this should be deemed the greatest drudgery of all—the food, which is needed so often and so vitally, because it is the outward expression of the essentials of the life which must be given us hour by hour and moment by moment by the Lord God Himself, or we should absolutely spiritually and physically perish. So divine a thing is the partaking of spiritual food that to him who will open the doors of his soul it is promised that the Lord will come in, “and will sup with him, and he with Me.” And “the holiest act of worship” is the sacrament of the Holy Supper, which is the symbol of this reception of the heavenly Guest—the union of God and man.

The preparation and arrangement and ordering of all things pertaining to shelter, clothing and food—the selection, the harmonizing and the cleansing—these are the matters which, looked at from above downward, and from within outward, are seen to be the loveliest services the earth offers as occupations for our activities. Looked at from the outside only, with no vision or feeling for the souls of them, these things—just these things—become the drudgery, the “domestic cares,” “the narrow things of the house,” which darken and imprison so much of feminine life.

But the doors of this prison are not locked; the shutters are not barred. To a touch, and in an instant, they yield.

You are making or mending little clothes, binding up a cut finger or teaching how a door may be closed noiseless-

ly; you are washing garments or making bread. You have not time to think of spiritual things; you are not learned in “correspondences.” No matter; you may pass from the narrow things to the great by recognizing the act you are doing as the ultimate expression, the outside form, of what is being done within for the inner life of those for whom it is your privilege to labor. You do not have to think it all carefully out. Just recognize gladly in your soul that it is so, and let yourself feel that you are being permitted to cooperate on the outer plane of life with God Himself on the inner plane of life. Then the doors and windows of your prison swing wide. The sunlight pours down in; flowers blossom, and the sound of music is in your ears. Your homely activity becomes glorified. Your affections long to express themselves in further service. There comes a great peace. And then fears—the many little fears, of marauders, of stalking disease, of deprivation, of being left alone—these melt away like mists in the sunshine. The Great Friend now abides in your house; of what will you be afraid?

From the narrow things to the great! It is not a far journey, and it leads from the shadows of life to life itself.—Alice Thacher Post, in the New Church Messenger.

AMERICAN GOODS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

THEY ARE SOLD THERE AT HALF THE PRICES CHARGED HERE.

The Iron Age, of December 17, contains information as to manufactured goods sold in South Africa and the countries from which they are exported. In many lines American goods outsell those from every other country. This appears to be true of brooms and brushes, cycles, carriages, clocks and watches, furniture, lamps, weights and scales, builders' hardware, tools and implements, fencing wire, wire nails, pipes and tubes, stoves, hand pumps, horse shoes, steel ropes, paints and colors, etc.

Of course none of these articles are sold for export at the high prices at which they are sold in the United States. Usually the United States price is about 50 per cent. higher than the export price, but, in many lines of goods, the American price is double the export price. This is true of clocks and watches, steel rope and of some kinds of hardware and tools.

In regard to wire nails the Iron Age says:

Of the total importations about 50 per cent. come from the United States, 25 per cent. from Belgium and Germany, and 25 per cent. from Great Britain. Belgium and Germany beat Great Britain in price,

and the United States beats all three. Even with equal freights American wire is ten shillings per ton cheaper than British.

In speaking of shovels the Iron Age says:

Shovels are divided between Great Britain, America and Germany. Great Britain's share predominates. The American round end D-handled shovel still sells, owing to its superior finish and low prices. It costs one shilling six pence in New York and can be sold wholesale in Johannesburg at three shillings three pence.

Looking up the prices of shovels in the Iron Age, we find that the Association list of November 15, 1902, is still quoted and that the discount is 40 per cent. This list price appears in the Iron Age of November 13, 1902. The only shovels there quoted that answer to the description of those sold in South Africa are made by the Wright Shovel company and are listed at \$17 per dozen, for the smallest size. This would make the American price 90 cents each, as against 36½ cents each for export. There is not a shovel of any description listed at less than eight dollars per dozen, or 40 cents each net.

It is, therefore, reasonably certain that our shovel trust is selling shovels for export at half or less than half the prices charged at home.

Trusts come high, but, apparently, we must have them or we would not put our tariff as high as possible and then decide to “stand pat.” And the American farmer and workmen say “amen” every election day to this programme.

BYRON W. HOLT.

A SOUTH AFRICAN VIEW OF MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S POLICY.

The third of a series of interviews appearing in the Natal (South Africa) Advertiser, upon the current fiscal controversy, published in the Advertiser of November 18, 1903.

INTERVIEW WITH MR. HENRY ANCKETILL, MEMBER OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NATAL.

Although opposed to Mr. Chamberlain's policy, for Mr. Ancketill is a Free Trader in the most radical sense, Mr. Ancketill's observations are of an especially interesting character as departing somewhat from the conventional lines upon which the discussion of Mr. Chamberlain's policy has proceeded. The “other side of the question,” which Mr. Ancketill propounds, is not free trade in the abstract meaning of the term as generally understood; but an elaborate extension of the principle in a direction which is hardly contemplated by the present controversy—one at the same time which has a more or less close relation to the subject which is being discussed.

Mr. Ancketill is well known to be one of those public critics who are called in current political terminology "land reformers." It follows that he is a free trader, and his alternative to the modified protection which Mr. Chamberlain proposes is not adherence to the free trade system which at present exists, but the institution of an all-round, general taxation of land values.

"I consider the taxation of land values the fundamental cure, the ultimate panacea, the be-all and end-all of the whole of our commercial troubles," said Mr. Ancketill. "In the first place," he continued, "I believe Mr. Chamberlain to be wrong, if only on the merits of the arguments he has used. I need not go closely into them, for it is not with Mr. Chamberlain's yea or nay that I intend to concern myself, but I will simply mention the fact that in his recent speeches he has ignored the home trade altogether; and also that in my opinion he has not given sufficient attention to our shipping and carrying trade. To proceed, I should like to point out that, with regard to his assertion that British trade has been practically stagnant for the past 30 years, recent blue books show us that during the last 40 years British shipping has itself increased from 4,000,000 tons to 10,000,000. Between 1868 and 1901 the earnings of trades and professions have advanced from £173,000,000 to £487,000,000; the price of food to the British workman has fallen by 30 per cent. in the last 24 years, and wages have increased since 1870 by nearly 14 per cent.; and lastly what we get from the foreigner is chiefly food and raw material to be manufactured at home."

"But Mr. Chamberlain has shown that our English exports have latterly been chiefly raw materials and that manufactures have been decreasing."

"Assuming that to be so," Mr. Ancketill replied, "there is still an enormous balance between the two. As to that balance being retained I see no reason whatever for anticipating any decline. If the tendency exists, as you say it does, I put my finger at once upon the remedy—tax land values."

"And what do you conceive to be the relation between the taxation of land values and the extension of imperial commerce?"

"The relation is this. If the chancellor of the exchequer by his next budget were to impose a tax upon land values, a large quantity of land would at once come into the market, the existing conditions of class privilege would be rendered impossible, the land

would have to be rendered commercially remunerative, and as a natural consequence, industry and production would be stimulated, and we should have a state of affairs in which there would be more work than workers instead of the present artificial anomaly of more workers than work. Wages would rise, commodities would become cheaper, and the British manufacturers would be able to hold their own against foreign competitors with all their so-called advantages of tariff protection."

"The nation is faced with a necessity for immediate action, Mr. Ancketill. This great reform you suggest will take almost a cycle of years to develop."

"Not at all. As I say, the chancellor of the exchequer could do it in his next budget, just as he would be able to bring in regulations for a protective tariff. But however that may be, I believe the nation will be forced, not, perhaps, by commercial necessity, not perhaps by motives of sentiment, but by the sheer logic of circumstances, into the recognition of the principle of taxing land values as the solution of all the fiscal and social problems that at present engage our attention. I find it difficult to explain how I know this to be so, but I see it myself most clearly."

The interviewer ventured to remind Mr. Ancketill that the present controversy centered about a national choice between two alternatives—free trade or protection—and that he had brought into the discussion an element which, while of the most engrossing interest, was slightly irrelevant.

"Then I accept neither the one nor the other," Mr. Ancketill retorted. "They are both bad, for our free trade is only a partial free trade, and still a species of modified protection, but while I should prefer even that to the other, I stand upon a rock and I won't be pushed off."

Seeing that the conversation tended to run in a somewhat academical channel, the interviewer turned to another aspect of the question, and Mr. Ancketill was asked to express his opinion on the imperial bearing of Mr. Chamberlain's proposals.

"I don't believe the colonies want this protection and reciprocity. They have not asked for it, and I don't think the idea has ever been in their minds. If it is there now it is only because Chamberlain has put it there."

"Canada has given Great Britain a 33 1-3 per cent. preference; South Africa a preference of 25 per cent., and New Zealand proposes to follow their example. Don't you consider these con-

cessions to be an invitation from the colonies to establish reciprocal sentiment between the mother country and themselves?"

"No. It is not my opinion that the colonies intended to exact, or even to invite, a quid pro quo when those tariff provisions were made. It was an expression of their acknowledgment to the mother country for what they had themselves received in the way of benefits from England. I am certain that that sentiment—the sentiment of gratitude and allegiance—will bind the empire together far more closely than any involved system of inter-colonial protective tariffs could ever do. Chamberlain has had a nightmare—he has been led into a morass by an 'ignis fatuus,' and he is trying to take the nation with him."

"What, then, do you consider to be his motive?"

"Well, I should always regard the motive with Chamberlain as having a good deal of the personal character about it. This fiscal outcry owes its inception largely, I believe, to the fear of the aristocratic and landowning class at home of the imminence of land taxation, and Chamberlain, having been of late years accessible to that kind of influence, has been, I imagine, swayed by it to a very considerable extent. Then, I believe, also, that he has been actuated by his insatiable ambition for power. But, excluding the personal motive, I believe, also, that the imperial idea is very strong with him, and that he is conducting his fiscal campaign with the honest conviction that what he proposes will advance the interests of the empire. Whatever his motives may be, and whatever may be the effect of what he is doing, he is carrying out a very real and valuable work, in my opinion, by educating the masses, not only upon their commercial relations with other countries, but in the direction of encouraging inquiry into those deeper problems of economic and social significance which are the product of past ignorance and present prejudice."

"And supposing your ideals are to be reached, Mr. Ancketill, what is to happen to England and the colonies in the meantime?"

"With free land, free trade and free people, Great Britain will continue prosperous, because she will be doing what is right. As long as England dares to do right and fears to do wrong, her material welfare is assured, for her past prosperity has rested upon her moral integrity."

The interviewer again ventured to

suggest that this was a business proposition, which required to be dealt with after business methods, and that the question at issue was one of commercial profit and loss, as well as imperial policy.

"Well," rejoined Mr. Ancketill, "the argument is a rather interminable one, isn't it? But I return to my starting point, and there I stay. The anomalous, unrighteous system of land tenure in England, combined with the existence of an equally unrighteous regime of class privilege and class oppression, is at the root of the whole matter, and the evil will not be removed until the cause has been first attacked and then eradicated."

In the same issue of the Advertiser with the above, appeared the following editorial on the interview:

FISCAL REFORM AND LAND TAXATION.

The interview with Mr. Henry Ancketill, M. L. A., on the subject of the fiscal controversy, which appears in another column, while many of Mr. Ancketill's remarks do not bear directly upon the points at issue, contains a good deal which is interesting and suggestive. Mr. Ancketill finds the solution of all commercial disabilities, whether they spring from causes associated with fiscal policy or are to be ascribed to any other reason, in the reform of land taxation. Mr. Ancketill is a land reformer of the most ardent type, and it does not surprise us to find him applying his universal panacea to the commercial ills for which Mr. Chamberlain is endeavoring to prescribe; but we are afraid he speaks too confidently, and takes altogether too optimistic a view of the immediate possibility of carrying out a reform such as he suggests. Mr. Ancketill says the chancellor of the exchequer could tax land values in his next budget. We fear not. The all-powerful vested land interests which control the legislature at home would place too formidable an obstacle in the way. Land Taxation is one of those social problems which will have to be dealt with in the near or far future, but its solution will be of a progressive nature, and one that is not to be attained in the interval between one budget and another. If the solution of the fiscal problem is to be made dependent upon this remedy, no reform need be expected for the next decade, or perhaps two. And, in our view, though not in that of Mr. Ancketill, by that time the evil would probably be past remedy. We are not surprised to find Mr. Ancketill opposed to the Chamberlain policy, and he is, of

course, absolutely entitled to his opinions and to express them. But it is worthy of note that three out of the four Durban members are entirely in sympathy with that policy, and in that they represent the views of the constituency generally.

THE SHOOTING STAR, OR THE ORIGIN OF THE SUICIDE.

Now she was a little cloud-lady—
He was a little star-man;
And they lived on love in the heavens
above

As only real sweethearts can.

But the lady was fickle, you see—
As cloud-ladies are in June—
And it happened like this: she granted a
kiss

One day to the man in the moon.

And the little star-man understood—
The little star-man withdrew;
And right then and there, away up in the
air,

He shot himself far from view!

—Charles Lowell Howard, in *Life*.

Duty is not transferable. We cannot worship God by telephone or fight the battles of righteousness by substitutes. Religion reaches into every detail of life and includes our duty as citizens. We may serve God at the ballot box as certainly as in the church. The man who evades his duty as a citizen by leaving the conduct of affairs in the hands of the professionals is guilty before God. Suffrage is not only a privilege, but an obligation, and the man who holds himself too good to vote is too bad for the kingdom of Heaven.—Rev. L. A. Crandall, of Chicago.

The author of the "Strenuous Life" was moved with a feeling of mingled exaltation and vexation when he learned that his book was having a suddenly largely increased sale.

"Of course," he murmured, "I don't object to the royalties and the popularity that are coming my way, but it would be annoying if the increasing sales are caused by a Colombian demand."

G. T. E.

"Many a man would give a great deal for your opportunities," said the earnestly ambitious man.

"Of course," answered Senator Sorghum. "I had to give a great deal for 'em myself."—Washington Star.

Gen. Wood's place in history may not be high, but it will be roomy.

G. T. E.

"Aim high," said the successful business man.

"That's jest like a feller that don't know nothin' 'bout shootin'," comment-

ed the backwoodsman. "Most every boy with his first gun aims so derved high he don't git nothin', an' it looks to me like it's that way in business sometimes."—Chicago Evening Post.

Wearing an emblem of loyalty may be laudable, but the adherents of the administration in the next Republican convention should be warned that they will not be able to get their heads together if they wear Panamas.

G. T. E.

"Are you aware that you are being criticised for using money in politics?"

"Yes," answered Senator Sorghum. "If you use money they criticise you, and if you don't they forget all about you."—Washington Star.

BOOKS

SOCIAL EVOLUTION.

In "An Examination of Society from the Standpoint of Evolution" (Columbus, O.: The Argus Press. Price, \$1.75 net), Louis Wallis elaborates into a book the theory he outlined in a magazine article, "The Capitalization of Social Development," which was reviewed editorially in these columns (vol. v., p. 212) a year or more ago, by John Z. White. The book neither removes nor modifies any of the causes for Mr. White's just criticism. It rather accentuates them.

Mr. Wallis undertakes to rest what is commonly known as the "single tax" reform upon the materialistic hypothesis, and to harmonize it with the theory of "scientific socialism." He accordingly accounts for civilization, by an upward process of evolution from animality through slavery and land monopoly by means of "cleavage."

By "cleavage" Mr. Wallis refers to what he claims to be the governing principle of sociological development. Although the material universe was always abundantly supplied with all that man requires, this was only a potential condition. Man must have "capital" in order to produce what is needed for civilization. But he would never accumulate "capital" if his primitive freedom were perpetuated. Hence the necessity for and the beneficence of "cleavage"—the development of an exploiting or upper, and an exploited or lower, class.

The first manifestation of the principle of "cleavage" is in slavery. The upper class enslaves the lower, and thereby forces it to produce "capital," which contributes to the advance of civilization. In course of time slavery loses its potency, and becomes obstructive to progress instead of accelerating it; and in harmony with the general principle of evolutionary science, it then goes the way of the unfit for survival. Meanwhile, however, "cleavage" mani-

feats itself in more subtle fashion. Land monopoly differentiates the exploiting from the exploited class, and much more economically and effectively forces the latter to supply the "capital" which the former accumulates and utilizes.

It is at this point that Mr. Wallis parts company with "scientific socialism." Socialism, insisting that land monopoly is losing its potency and that "capitalism" has taken its place, predicts an uprising of the lower class to appropriate the accumulated "capital." But Mr. Wallis finds in land monopoly, not in "capital," the "cleavage" producing power; and, concluding that its evolutionary uses have come to an end with the sufficient accumulation of "capital," the need for which alone has vitalized it in the past, he would henceforth have society give conscious direction to the hitherto consciousness and conscienceless evolutionary process. This, he would do by abolishing land monopoly. His method is the same as that of Henry George—the "single tax."

It is significant that the same "scientific" method should yield results so radically different as Karl Marx socialism and Henry George single taxism. We are not prepared to say which has "slipped a cog" in his reasoning, Marx or Wallis. But one thing is clear. Both have brought confusion into the most important sphere of their inquiry by their unanalytical concept of "capital." To the socialist, "capital" includes every productive agency except labor, and it includes part of that. For accumulated knowledge of productive principles and methods, and skill in their application, together with natural resources, are all comprised, along with such artificial products as machinery, in the socialistic concept. Consequently, the socialist thinks of "capital" as something which has been transmitted from generation to generation, time out of mind, in expanding volume. It is the inheritance of the ages. Mr. Wallis differs from socialists in this respect only in one particular. He excludes natural opportunities from the category of capital. In agreement with Henry George, he classifies them as land. But he includes, along with machines, "a vast amount of technical knowledge and training in the minds of experts"! He also includes the network of social organization. Thanks to that definition, Mr. Wallis is able to convince himself that "capital" is almost entirely a social product of past and present generations."

Let us not be understood as criticising mere terms. Our objection to Mr. Wallis's definition of "capital" refers not to any infelicity in choosing a term nor to the liberties he takes in defining it, but to the incongruity of his classification of things. His concept of "capital" includes three things as different from one another for the pur-

poses of truly scientific reasoning in the economics of sociology, as are the concepts four, five and six for the purposes of scientific reasoning in mathematics. One of these is artificial implements; another is accumulated knowledge; the third is social organization. How can really scientific reasoning in economics possibly proceed from premises which identify as one and the same thing, economically, such manifestly different things? Here we have an absolute identification of a characteristic of society as a whole (social organization), an acquirement of the individual man (knowledge and skill), and a concrete product of human effort (artificial implements). All these things may be necessary to the development of civilization, and the development of any one may promote the development of the others. But they are different things none the less.

In an army, for illustration, the military knowledge and skill of its rank and file, their organization into a co-operative body, and their munitions of war, are all necessary to military efficiency; but military knowledge and skill are one thing, military organization is another, and military equipment is another still. Though we may include them all in the one term "army," when comparing military science as a whole with some other science, we must be more analytical when studying the nature of military science itself. So we may include accumulated knowledge, social organization, artificial implements, and natural opportunities in the term "capital," when comparing sociology as a whole with something else. But any study of sociology itself must adopt a finer analysis.

The fact that one of these different things may be traded for another—as a machine for opportunity to acquire an education—makes no difference. The education does not therefore fall into the same economic category with the machine. If it did, we should have no trouble in proving that in slavery countries or eras men also are in the same economic category with machines. Where slavery exists you can trade a machine for a man. In like manner (as, indeed, socialists contend), a building site is in the same economic category with machines; for you can trade a machine for a building site. Thus we might include in the one term "capital" all productive land (a natural implement), all productive machines (artificial implements), all personal knowledge and skill (individual acquirements), and all social organization (cooperative phenomena). We should thereby abolish every economic distinction, and by confusing every economic difference make intelligible economic study quite impossible. Men are men, whether skilled or unskilled, educated or uneducated, bond or free.

The globe on which we live is something different from men. Machines, which are produced by men from the natural storehouses of the globe, are different from either.

Of Mr. Wallis's theory of society (whether his by original invention or legitimate adoption), that it is "a collectivism under individual forms," we need say but a word. It is a painfully "scientific" formula for the simple and obvious truth that society results from division of labor through individual trading. With his materialistic hypothesis for sociology we need not deal at all. Since it is the hypothesis of the dominant schools, his error in that respect is theirs as well as his. If he rejects intuitional deductions, and therefore finds no place in sociology for morality and spirituality, except as a development from what is non-moral and non-spiritual, so do they. If the tradition that God made an intellectual and moral being out of clay, seems foolish to him in comparison with the "scientific" assumption that the clay itself did it, so do the schools. And if by adopting the hypothesis of the schools as to the origin of things sociological, he either leads them, with reference to the present and the future, into rational avenues of thought, or closes up the irrational for them, let us rejoice.

This book by Mr. Wallis is evidently a product of wide reading, hard study, a conscientious purpose, and a spirit of devotion to truth which lifts him high above his scholastic idea of the origin of things. Its subject matter is interesting, and the style scholarly and attractive. Students of sociology and political economy will find it suggestive, and teachers of these subjects will need to familiarize themselves with its argument. Of special interest as an historical study is the long chapter (which ought to be broken up into shorter ones) on "Oriental Civilization," especially the part that traces the development of Jewish civilization. It would have been more useful as an historical study for sociological purposes, if the author had grasped the symbolic values of the Jewish story and laid less stress upon the mere external narrative.

"POOR?"

There is a novel in every man's thoughts as well as in the incidents of his career. The most humdrum of human lives is vital with interest to the man who lives it; then why not to the rest of the world, if he tells the story so that others may know him as he knows himself. But there's the rub. Anybody may live an interesting story, but only an artist can tell it.

Some such thought must have influenced the anonymous author of "Poor? A New Political Standard for a True Democracy for a Millionaire Age. By A. N. Unknown" (New York: Continental Publishing Co., 24-26 Murray street).

He has sought to make the work-a-day life and commonplace adventures of a thoughtful workingman of somewhat varied vocations, as interesting to his readers as they have been to himself; and to do so has cast about for something effectively idiosyncratic in the way of style. The style he adopts is of that impressionist order which has the same recommendatory quality in literature as in painting—that it keeps you guessing. Inasmuch, however, as no one bothers to guess at anything unless he is interested, it must be conceded that this style excites interest; but it is open to the objection that the interest it excites is apt to be with reference to the style rather than to the subject. That objection applies to "Poór?"

Had the writer adopted a simple style, in harmony with the simplicity of his subject, he might have added another to those matter-of-fact stories of the common life and common thought of today which are none the less interesting for being matter-of-fact and common. For there are glimpses visible through his affectedly jerky composition, of a real workingman's life developing a real human character. The author's ideal is the working class, of which he is, or assumes to be one, and to which he attributes exalted virtues. One might criticize this view; for the working class is composed of men, and men are pretty much alike no matter in what class you find them. But criticism is headed off by the impressionist style of the book. The critic who should venture to criticize the philosophy of an impressionist author would be fit to expound a joke.

Many excellent quotations might be made from "Unknown's" cogitations. For example: "There is nothing more useful in the world than an ideal, if mixed with a little rock-bottomed common sense." The spirit of the book is fairly indicated by its appeal to "the man who rejoices in the inheritance of freedom, who hates oppression, who regards the degrading system of caste in this country as the worst enemy of the nation and of manhood, who glories in doing his part to make ours a nation of freemen, where the laborer demands and obtains the cream of his industry instead of giving it to the few who do not earn it." It is addressed to "every man, rich or poor, who desires justice, who has the courage to stand on his own feet, who believes independence is worth what it cost—in fact is a sincere, patriotic American at heart."

CROSBY AND TOLSTOY.

Two of Ernest Crosby's books lie before us. One is a low priced but rich English reprint, paper cover (London: Francis Riddell Henderson, 26 Paternoster Square), of the now familiar "Plain Talk in Psalm and Parable." An edition has been imported by the Comrade Cooperative company (No. 11

Cooper Square, New York), which retails the book at 40 cents a copy.

The other book (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 30 Lafayette Place), is a little volume of 93 pages, entitled "Tolstoy and His Message." It tells the story of the great Russian democrat as only Crosby, among all writers of the English tongue, is capable of telling it. This latest of Crosby's contributions to the literature of the social life makes an excellent introduction to the reading of Tolstoy's works. It is indispensable to any one who, without reading his works with studious care, would know something of the thought and purpose of the man.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—Glimpses of the Real. By James Arthur Edgerton. Denver, Col.: The Reed Publishing Co. To be reviewed.

—Ezrahaddon, and Other Tales. By Leo Tolstoy. Translated by Louise and Aymer Maude, with an introduction containing letters by Tolstoy. Written and translated for the benefit of the Jews impoverished by riots in Kishinef and Gomel. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. Price 40 cents net. To be reviewed.

PERIODICALS.

A debt of gratitude is due Harper's Weekly for maintaining the fine aroma of a distinctly Christmas edition. All of the Illustrated weeklies published so-called Christmas numbers, but Harper's alone shows something of the old-time Christmas spirit—a spirit the world cannot afford to lose. Along with the religious association of the season there is a poetry in Christmas which sweetens life for old and young. However conscious we may be of the sordidness and morbidity of so much of the world's charity and justice, we shall do well all the more to cherish the season which has been hallowed by the words of peace and good will.

J. H. D.

The Louisiana Planter and Sugar Manufacturer complains of "the attitude of some of the rice men, who are willing to sacrifice our domestic sugar industry to the reciprocity idea, with the hope of furthering their own interests by increasing their market for rice." The Planter is always candid and straightforward, and it knows far more about protection than the rice men, who are very short-sighted

if they do not stand-in with the sugar men. "United we stand, divided we fall," is a good protection maxim which the rice men must learn. "The time will come," continues the Planter, "when they will need our assistance in maintaining the rice duties just as we need theirs in maintaining our own industry." J. H. D.

"At times one quite loses hope. I see that at the lunch for the Czar at Oxford the cigars were provided for at 415 a 100. But the worst is people don't seem troubled. They don't see it." Such bits of conversation as this, forming most interesting reading, make up an article in the December Contemporary, entitled "Some Sayings of Bishop Westcott." "I have studied hymns a great deal," said the bishop one day, "and in a great many cases I cannot understand what they mean; and I don't think the writers did, either." It is in such familiar talk that we get at the heart of such a man, rather than in his formal works. Another delightful article in the same number of this Review gives some entertaining reminiscences of Theodore Mommsen.

J. H. D.

The Non-Resistance doctrine is very interestingly discussed by Kemper Boccock in the December number of Hammer and Pen (New York). His conclusion is that nothing in the teaching of Jesus is opposed to a resort to the use of the machinery of the state to right wrongs—as a last resort. "We do not believe," he says, "that Jesus taught an impracticable gospel. If he prohibited individual resistance to evil by the personal attack method, he provided the social remedy for the evil, placed it within the Christian's reach and gave him the right of ultimate appeal to it, in order that there might be no excuse for individuals' quarrels or violence." As to the amount of force that may be used, Mr. Boccock seems to accept "sheriffs and keys," but not "soldiers and muskets." Just how he would draw the line is not very clear.

J. H. D.

That delightfully independent writer, G. K. Chesterton, whose clever book on Browning was recently reviewed in The Public, continues to say unorthodox things

LABRIOLA'S ESSAYS

on the Materialistic Conception of History.

The greatest socialist book that has appeared since Marx's Capital. Written by a socialist professor in the University of Rome, published in the leading countries of continental Europe and translated by Charles H. Kerr from the latest Paris edition. Extra cloth, gold stamping, 246 pages; \$1.00 postpaid. CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, 56 Fifth Ave., CHICAGO

NOW READY FOR DELIVERY

ETHICS OF DEMOCRACY

A Series of Optimistic Essays on the Natural Laws of Human Society.

By LOUIS F. POST

The volume is beautifully printed on high-grade dull-finished paper, uncut pages, gilt top, etc., and bound in fine blue cloth with gold lettering. Pp. 396.

Price per copy, \$2.00. (Net, delivered.)

MOODY PUBLISHING CO., Publishers, 25 Nassau St., NEW YORK 1601 Cully Building, CHICAGO

REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE

Henry George Association

OF CHICAGO,

Handel Hall, 40 East Randolph Street.

Every Thursday Evening, 8 o'clock.

Every Sunday Afternoon, 3:30 o'clock.

DANCE On Friday Evening, Jan. 15, 1904, the members and friends of **JAN. 15 THE HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION** will give a dance at Schiller Hall, 103 Randolph Street. Invitations will be issued by Miss Leonora Beck, 30 So 10th Wood Street. Dr. Anna M. Lund, 1018 Masonic Temple, Phone Central 3291, Miss Nellie Carlin, 1322 Ashland Blk., Phone Central 925.

Clubs of Three

To extend the circulation of The Public among new readers, and at the same time to relieve of expense such regular readers, or others, as take the trouble to procure us new subscriptions, we will supply three subscriptions for the price of two, on the following terms:

A Club of Three Annual Subscriptions (at least two of them new).....	\$4.00
A Club of Three Semi-Annual Subscriptions (at least two of them new).....	\$3.00
A Club of Three Quarterly Subscriptions (at least two of them new).....	\$1.00

Any person soliciting new subscribers will be allowed the same terms. For every two new subscriptions for which he forwards us cash at regular rates we will honor his order for a third subscription free.

Make all Checks, Money Orders, etc., payable to

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.,
Box 687, CHICAGO, ILL.



A PUZZLE.

Mr. Bull—Bless my soul! Is this really my friend Jonathan, the champion of liberty, or is it Rooshia dressed up in 'is clothes?

In the London Daily News. The following, for example, has been made merry over by some critics—and yet is he not right? "The supposition," he says, "that a man has to know what he is talking about in the scholarly sense seems to me quite ridiculous. It is like saying that a man ought to be a meteorologist before he is allowed to say to his friends that it is a fine day. Whether he understands meteorology or not, the day is fine to him; whether I understand political science or not, the Times's leading articles are palpably ridiculous to me. About the really important things men have always claimed a common and general right to judge." In this day of so much solemn and pretentious specialization, it may be that Mr. Chesterton's point is well taken and is withal quite timely. J. H. D.

Few reviews of a more general character contain as much of interesting matter for even the general reader as the American Law Review (St. Louis). The November-December number prints a part of the notable report made last summer to the American Bar association by the committee of which Walter S. Logan was chairman. There is also an address delivered at the same meeting by William A. Glasgow, of Roanoke, Va., which is well worth reading. Mr. Glasgow asks the question: "Is not the liberty and in-

dependence of the individual threatened by a tendency to a paternal government?" His opposition to paternalism is, however, like Herbert Spencer's, weakened by failure to account for the cause of the rise of this spirit. He does not seem to see that a decline of freedom of self-employment has led to the false effort for relief from oppression by means of government protection. If natural opportunities, which have increased so enormously in value with the growth of the country, were not so increasingly monopolized, the great body of workers might retain their independence without vainly flying to the government for this and that special legislation. The notes in this Review are always interesting. On p. 920 will be found a quotation from a decision by Chief Justice Clark, of North Carolina, giving a list of the laws against child labor in the various states. J. H. D.

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

JOHN MITCHELL, President of the coal miners, is acknowledged to be one of the foremost leaders in the Trade Union Movement in the world. No student of modern economic forces can afford to ignore this movement, therefore get and read his book on **ORGANIZED LABOR**.

Cloth, \$1.75; Blue Seal, \$2.75
Half Morocco, 3.75
Full Morocco, Autograph Copy 5.00

GEO. A. SCHILLING, Room 519,
85 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

The Third Debate between the Single Taxers and Socialists takes place at Lincoln Turner Hall, 1351 Diversey Boulevard, corner Sheffield Avenue, on Sunday afternoon, 3 o'clock, January 3, 1904. Question—"Resolved that the Working Classes should take up the Propaganda of the Single Tax rather than that of Socialism." John Z. White and Henry Hutchins Hardinge, affirmative; A. M. Simons and Seymour Steadman, negative. This debate will be repeated in the Elgin Opera House, Elgin, Ill., on Monday evening, January 4, 1904.

DEBATES The Socialists and Single Taxers have arranged for the following debates:

ELGIN—Monday, January 4, 8 p. m. A. M. Simons and Seymour Steadman represent the Socialists; John Z. White and Henry H. Hardinge represent the Single Taxers.

ROCKFORD—Wednesday, January 6, '04. A. M. Simons for the Socialists; John Z. White for the Single Taxers.

STREATOR—Friday, January 8, '04. A. M. Simons vs. John Z. White.



JOHN Z. WHITE.

The Henry George Association of Chicago

has arranged to place MR. JOHN Z. WHITE in the lecture field for work in the U. S. and Canada. For dates and particulars address

F. H. MONROE, President,
206—134 Washington St.
CHICAGO, ILL.

The Public

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

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

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

ATTORNEYS.

EWING & RING,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
HOUSTON, TEXAS.

Frealey K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

HENRY B. TAWRESEY,
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW.

1106 Real Estate Trust Building, S. E. Cor. Broad and Chestnut Sts., Philadelphia.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.,
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 404 Cortlandt. Rooms 1311-1312,
NEW YORK.

CONTRACTORS.

G. H. ATKINSON & CO., CONTRACTORS,
JERSEY CITY, N. J.

Electric Light, Telephone and Municipal Work.
Trolley Roads Built and Financed.

Now Ready for Delivery

BISOCIALISM:

The Reign of the Man at the Margin

By OLIVER R. TROWBRIDGE

An entirely new and original work on economics.

It treats of the positive theory of value, and of an entirely new and palpably correct theory of interest. It for the first time furnishes a scientific means for determining the proper scope of Economic Science, and discusses all its phases and phenomena in a complete and consistent manner.

It points out clearly the distinctive economic principles which dominate the established order, and also those involved in anarchism and in the different forms of socialism. It discusses the economic principles involved in all the leading reform movements since the civil war. A thoughtful, scholarly work. Price, \$1.50 net.

BISOCIALISM is a masterpiece. It is a book to make the quibblers squirm. The professors are challenged on their own ground.

JOHN Z. WHITE.

NEW YORK: 35 Nassau Street
MOODY PUBLISHING CO.
CHICAGO: 79 Dearborn Street