

# The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 9, 1904.

Number 301.

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.

Without receding from our principal contention of last week relative to the Iroquois theater fire (p. 609), we are forced by subsequent developments to a consideration of some of the secondary causes of that terrible catastrophe.

Laws designed for the security of life in Chicago theaters and other structures appear to have been wantonly violated. For this the responsibility rests not only upon theater builders and managers and architects, but with even greater weight upon city officials, and with still greater weight upon the business classes of Chicago—the same classes that are loud in their denunciation of crimes of far less magnitude.

We shall explain our meaning in holding the business classes to this awful responsibility. But one step at a time. First, as to the persons immediately responsible for this particular calamity—the builders, architects, and managers of the Iroquois theater. Even the commonest precautions seem to have been neglected. The asbestos curtain was badly hung and was inflammable besides. Exit doors were either locked or rusted fast, and some of them swung in such a way as to obstruct instead of facilitate safe egress. No automatic sprinklers were in place, and there was not a drop of water within reach to extinguish fire. No fire alarm was available. Stairways met so as to churn the converging currents of escaping people like converging currents of water. Fire escapes, so narrow at

the top as to barely accommodate one thin stream of panic-stricken people, were so adjusted to exits as to receive different streams at different altitudes, and yet were no wider at the bottom than at the top. But why enumerate? Had the theater been expressly constructed and equipped for wholesale and horrible slaughter, it could hardly have been adapted to the purpose much better than it was. And many of its dangerous defects were in conscious and not improbably corrupt violation of the safety laws.

But this particular theater was not peculiar in those respects. Some Chicago theaters may be safer; but most of them are not, and some are even more dangerous. It was only blind fate and not greater negligence or turpitude that has made the persons connected with the Iroquois theater so especially and unenviably conspicuous at this time. Had the fire occurred at almost any other Chicago theater during a performance, the calamity would have been similar. And it would have come from similar causes—wanton neglect of reasonable precautions, jaunty indifference to the rights of patrons, and callous neglect of legal requirements. The whole fraternity of theatrical management in Chicago is morally as responsible for the Iroquois disaster as are the managers of that ill-fated theater.

Of the facts upon which this conclusion is based there is but little room for dispute. The Mayor has now closed all the theaters. His orders are so stringent that he will not allow even the ground floors to be occupied by audiences. The necessity is so great that he is as adamant to all appeals, though his action deprives thousands of employment. He will not allow any theater to

open until it has installed safety devices in strict conformity with the law. This seems more like a panic-spasm than wise administration, since the result could be accomplished without much risk by requiring each theater to conform to the law within a reasonable time on pain of being closed in case of neglect. But it testifies most convincingly to the dangerous and lawless conditions that have heretofore been perpetuated with impunity. On the top of this testimony comes an astounding disclosure. It appears that the building department reported in detail the unsafe condition of the Chicago theaters as much as two months ago, and that the facts in this report have been practically disregarded by the building department, the Mayor, and the city council. How is it possible wholly to exonerate any of these authorities?

That brings us to the responsibility of the business classes, which, we repeat, is the weightiest of all. Why did the building department merely report the universal violation of safety laws by the theaters of Chicago instead of also proceeding at once to secure compliance with those laws? Because the head of that department was afraid of arousing the hostility of the business classes by what he thought, and with reason, they would regard as a finicky interference with business interests. And not the theatrical business classes alone, mind you, but the business classes in general; for not only might business in general have been prejudicially affected by enforcing the laws against theaters, but office buildings, churches, stores, and so on, are sinners like the theaters. Why did the Mayor merely refer this damning report to the city council, instead of also proceed-

ing—more considerately than he is doing now, but promptly and energetically—to secure compliance with the safety laws? Because he, too, feared the business classes of the city. As he now says, he would have been mobbed had he taken that course at that time. And so, probably, he would have been; and by a broadcloth mob at that. He could not have relied upon any business-class sentiment of respect for the law. Again, why did the city council merely toss the report over to a committee, and why did the committee merely refer it to a printer and indifferently await the printer's pleasure—why all this piddling over violations of laws so vital to the security of human life? The same reason. The city council, too, was afraid of the business classes.

So we may trace responsibility for the Iroquois catastrophe back from the Iroquois managers to the managers generally whose derelictions they followed; and back from the managers to the officials who winked at these derelictions; and back of the officials to the business classes, whose deadened conscience has latterly become so characteristic of American business men. Among these classes right and wrong have ceased to be distinguishable except momentarily as the distinction may happen to be useful for selfish ends; while respect for law is something which, though the "lower classes" are said to owe it to society, the business classes seem to owe to nobody whenever they are agreed upon its inconvenience or unprofitableness to themselves. With this spirit prevalent, it is certain that any official who had undertaken to enforce the fire laws prior to the Iroquois disaster would have run counter to a business class sentiment reinforced by local advertising mediums, which would probably have ended his career in public life. Officials are culpable, of course, for not having bravely met that obstacle; but the culpability of those who created the obstacle is far

the greater of the two. One of the manifest lessons of the Iroquois calamity is the importance of revitalizing public opinion with a conscience capable of distinguishing right from wrong and disposed impartially to respect laws for the right regulation of social life. This lesson needs to be learned not merely by labor strikers and hold-up men, as your modern pharisee thinks, but it is needed by the business class most of all. Nor is it applicable to Chicago alone:

Incidentally, the vice of free passes is brilliantly illuminated by disclosures regarding the Iroquois theater fire. It was by this means that minor officials were bribed to be good natured about infractions of the law that have proved so disastrous. For instance, an inspector reported the Iroquois as "O. K." only a few minutes before the audience began a terrible struggle for life in this lawlessly equipped theater lawlessly packed with human beings. It is just that sort of inspection, just that sort of official oversight, that free passes encourage. And the free pass evil is not confined to theaters nor to minor officials. How many members of the Chicago city council are not in possession of railroad passes? How often does the Mayor travel without a pass? How many judges in Chicago reject the proffered passes of railroads on whose interests they may have to sit in judgment? How many officials anywhere are without free passes? That these "courtesies" do not effect the bribery of officials with reference to large matters is doubtless true. Corrupt officials do not sell themselves so cheap. But it is beyond dispute that passes do secure small favors—compensating "courtesies;" such, for instance, as the "O. K." of a theater's violation of the law in trifles—trifles which, however, may precipitate calamities. If free passes do not improperly influence judges, inspectors, councilmen, legislators, etc., why do railroad officers and theater managers make them the regular

perquisites of public servants with whom they have official relations? Surely not for their health. The "O. K."-ing of the Iroquois theater just before it burned, tells the story. Passes put public officials in good humor toward law-breakers. The public official who takes them may not know he is bribed; but the theater or railroad manager who gives them, he knows it.

That is reason enough for this resolution offered in the Chicago city council on the 4th by Alderman Dunn:

Whereas, the receipt of gratuities, such as free passage or tickets from railroads, theaters, or other public utilities or places of amusement by city legislators, city officials and employes, is clearly detrimental to the free discharge of official duties; therefore, be it resolved, that it is the sense of this Council that the asking for or receipt of any free pass, ticket, or special favor from railroads or places of amusement be condemned; and, be it further resolved, that this asking or accepting such favors be made a ground for disqualification from municipal office or employment. Resolved, that the judiciary committee of this Council be requested to report the necessary order to bring this resolution into full force and effect.

And it is rather discouraging to be obliged to report that the "reform" council of Chicago has buried Mr. Dunn's excellent resolution in committee, thus following the example of the Democratic caucus in Congress (p. 503) which made a similar disposition of Congressman Baker's resolution pledging the party to refuse railroad passes.

President Roosevelt's special message to Congress is unusually interesting for a presidential message; and, while long, necessarily so because of the mass of its detail and the subtlety of its argument, its substance may be boiled down to Tweed's noted inquiry: "What are you going to do about it?"

And, sure enough, what are we going to do about it? If we concede that the right to recognize new governments is vested in the

President exclusively and absolutely—which is a precedent set by President Cleveland,—nothing remains to do; for in that case Panama is not only an independent nation, but it is one whose sovereignty—if Secretary Hay is right in his theory as to treaty covenants “running with the land”—we are bound by the old Granada treaty to defend. No matter what the American people may wish, no matter what Congress might have been disposed to do, if the President’s irresponsible recognition of this new nation is conclusive, then nothing remains for Congress to do but to attend to details. The President himself will have done the vital thing without so much as “By your leave, Messrs. Congressmen.”

It is upon this basis that Mr. Roosevelt virtually demands of Congress that it fill in the details of the Panama policy which he of his own unbridled will has inaugurated. He has virtually made himself an absolute monarch as to this most important matter. For does he not say:

The only question now before us is that of the ratification of the treaty. For it is to be remembered that a failure to ratify the treaty will not undo what has been done, will not restore Panama to Colombia, and will not alter our obligation to keep the transit open across the Isthmus, and to prevent any outside power from menacing this transit.

And does he not—

repeat that the question actually before this government is not that of the recognition of Panama as an independent republic. That is already an accomplished fact. The question, and the only question, is whether or not we shall build an Isthmian canal.

Take those two admonitions out of his special message, and nothing but a plea for Panama and the Panama canal route remains. But there is power in those admonitions. They are Rooseveltian for Tweed’s less polished but not more defiant phrase.

How did Panama’s independence come to be “an accomplished fact”? Simply through the favor of Mr. Roosevelt. It was by his

orders, as his message shows, that Commander Hubbard, U. S. N., “prevented either party from attacking the other;” that is, that prevented Colombia from coercing a seceding State as we coerced South Carolina in the 60’s. It was by his recognition of the seceding State, regardless of Congress, that this State became a sovereign Power which we are bound by treaty (according to the Hay theory that “the covenant runs with the land”) to protect from the parent Power. So Mr. Roosevelt virtually says to the Senate: You might as well ratify the treaty, for I have already done everything else; and whether you like it or not, “What are you going to do about it?”

Obviously only one of two things can be done. The President’s constitutional authority to put Congress into such a hole can be conceded, in which case, a treaty with Panama must be confirmed whether the confirming power likes it or not. The only alternative is to attack this evil at the roots, by contesting the authority of the President to force his own will upon the country in a matter involving, as the recognition of new nations does, far-reaching questions of treaty obligations, of national honor, and even of war. If the President’s recognition of Panama is constitutionally conclusive he has virtually usurped the war-making authority; for in that case his recognition imposes upon Congress the necessity of making war upon Colombia if Colombia attempts to hold Panama to its repudiated allegiance.

Gov. Garvin’s inaugural message to the legislature of Rhode Island is a model of terseness, literary form and statesmanship. Among his recommendations is an amendment to the State constitution empowering 5,000 citizens to propose constitutional amendments for referendum adoption. He reminds the legislature that the passage of this amendment was solicited two years ago by 28 organizations—labor, reform and

religious — representing many thousands of citizens, and yet the petitions were ignored. His rebuke of the last legislature for refusing to act upon the bribery corruption, to which he had called attention, is stinging, notwithstanding its mild terms and calm tone. Another of his especially valuable recommendations is the Purdy plan of apportioning State taxes — namely, in proportion to the actual expenditures of the respective towns for local purposes. He takes occasion also to condemn the growing practice in legislative bodies of burying important minority measures in committee, a procedure which he truly describes as “a maltreatment of representatives and their constituents, and unfair to the whole people of the State.” But best of all is the spirit in which Gov. Garvin asks the Rhode Island legislature to approach the performance of its duties. “In this, the 258th year of the General Assemblies of Rhode Island,” he writes, “may we be able to say of every act performed, It is just.”

The lower courts of Oregon, which held that the initiative and referendum amendment to the State constitution had not been properly adopted and was therefore invalid (p. 215) have been overruled by the highest court of the State. This decision was rendered on the 21st of last month. The case arose over an act of the legislature affecting the city of Portland. To forestall a referendum petition, the legislature declared the act to be emergent, which, by the terms of the referendum amendment, enabled the legislature to give it immediate effect. It was a legislative trick for evading referendum possibilities. Upon coming into the courts the law was defended on two general grounds. It was argued, first, that the referendum amendment was invalid. This point was overruled by the Supreme Court. Secondly, it was argued that if the amendment were valid, the emergency declaration by the legislature could not be inquired into by

the judiciary, and this point the Supreme Court sustained.

When the case came up to the Supreme Court the validity of the referendum amendment was contested on two grounds: First, that the legislature had submitted it while another proposed amendment was pending, which the State constitution forbids; and, secondly, that it is in conflict with the provisions of the Federal Constitution which guarantee to every State a republican form of government. Both contentions were rejected by the court. As to the first, the court held that the obstructing amendment had lapsed from legislative inaction, and that therefore the way was clear for the referendum amendment. The opinion of the court on the second contention is of such widespread interest and importance that it will bear liberal quotation:

Nor do we think the amendment void because in conflict with section 4, article 4, of the Constitution of the United States, guaranteeing to every State a republican form of government. The purpose of this provision of the Constitution is to protect the people of the several States against aristocratic and monarchical invasions, and against insurrections and domestic violence, and to prevent them from abolishing a republican form of government. Cooley, Const. Lim. (7 ed.) 45; 2 Story, Const. (5 ed.) p. 1815. But it does not forbid them from amending or changing their constitution in any way they may see fit, so long as none of these results is accomplished. No particular style of government is designated in the Constitution as republican, nor is the exact form in any way prescribed. A republican form of government is a government administered by representatives chosen or appointed by the people or by their authority. Mr. Madison says it is "a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people, and is administered by persons holding their offices during pleasure, for a limited period, or during good behavior." The Federalist, 302. And, in discussing the section of the Constitution of the United States now under consideration, he says: "But the authority extends no further than to a guaranty of a republican form of government, which supposes a pre-existing government of the form which is to be guaranteed. As long, therefore, as the existing republican forms are continued by the States, they

are guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. Whenever the States may choose to substitute other republican forms, they have a right to do so, and to claim the Federal guaranty for the latter. The only restriction imposed on them is that they shall not exchange republican for anti-republican constitutions."—Id. 342.

Now, the initiative and referendum amendment does not abolish or destroy the republican form of government, or substitute another in its place. The representative character of government still remains. The people have simply reserved to themselves a larger share of legislative power, but they have not overthrown the republican form of government, or substituted another in its place. The government is still divided into the legislative, executive and judicial departments, the duties of which are discharged by representatives selected by the people. Under this amendment, it is true, the people may exercise a legislative power, and may, in effect, vote or defeat bills passed and approved by the legislature and the Governor; but the legislative and executive departments are not destroyed, nor are their powers or authority materially curtailed. Laws proposed and enacted by the people under the initiative clause of the amendment are subject to the same constitutional limitations as other statutes, and may be amended or repealed by the legislature at will. The veto power of the governor is not abridged in any way, except as to such laws as the legislature may refer to the people. The provisions of the amendment that "the veto power of the governor shall not extend to measures referred to the people" must necessarily be confined to the measures which the legislature may refer, and cannot apply to acts upon which the referendum may be invoked by petition. The governor is required under the constitution to exercise his veto power, if at all, within five days after the act shall have been presented to him, unless the general adjournment of the legislature shall prevent its return within that time, in which case he shall exercise his right within five days after the adjournment. He must necessarily act, therefore, before the time expires within which a referendum by petition on any act of the legislature may be invoked, and before it can be known whether it will be invoked or not. Unless, therefore, he has a right to veto any act submitted to him, except such as the legislature may specially refer to the people, one of the safeguards against hasty or ill-advised legislation which is everywhere regarded as essential is removed—a result manifestly not contemplated by the amendment.

The fly in this ointment is the sinister intimation of the Oregon

court that democratic government, in so far as it may be direct and not representative, or may do away with fixed constitutional inhibitions, would be as obnoxious to the clause of the Federal Constitution regarding republican forms as are monarchies. It would truly be a surprising discovery should we find that the Federal Constitution protects democratic forms of government when not representative. But not more surprising, perhaps, than other recent discoveries in American constitutional law.

An analysis of the two recent British by-elections—those at Dulwich and Lewisham (boroughs of London), which have been widely hailed as Chamberlain victories, indicates that they are the kind of victories that are disastrous to the victors. At the last previous election (1895) in the former borough, the Tory vote was 5,218, while on December 15 last it was 5,819—a gain of 11½ per cent. But the Liberal vote grew from 2,176 to 4,382, a gain of 101 per cent. At Lewisham the disproportion is not so great, but even there it is large. The Tory vote in 1892 (the last previous election) was 5,309; on December 15 it was 7,709, a gain of 45.15 per cent. But the Liberal vote increased from 2,895 to 5,679—a gain of 97 per cent. In spite of this the London Daily Mail (which has finally thrown off the mask) jubilates over these two elections as "protection" victories. If the general election should show corresponding changes in all counties and boroughs, Chamberlain would be badly beaten.

Protectionist logic is of the whirligig order. Don't we all remember how the free trade gold of Great Britain used to flood our shores in the interest of free trade politics? So said protectionists. It is the other way now in England. Protectionists are claiming that British free trade is being encouraged by protection gold from Germany. "Now you see it and now you don't," is characteristic

of protection logic and protection prosperity, as well as of the more vulgar thimbleric.

The aroma of Wall street hung about the viands and impregnated the political atmosphere at the dinner to Mayor McClellan in New York on the 4th. One whiff should be enough to warn everybody that New York is no place for the national convention. To hold the convention there would be as good as announcing its owners, and that would be fatal at the election.

The drastic policy of Mayor Harrison with reference to the local theaters and public halls calls for more than passing mention. His appalling consciousness of past neglect seems to have thrown him completely off his balance. There is no other way of accounting for his peremptory closing of theaters and public halls, regardless of the great loss and intense suffering that this must cause and is now causing. There is no excuse for such a spasm. A requirement that the safety ordinances be fully complied with in a reasonable time, that the specially dangerous parts of the theaters be not used meanwhile, and that all immediately available precautions be taken, would have been wise administration. But what has been done is childish and reckless. We recognize the plea that it is the duty of administrative officers to enforce the laws as they find them, and if Mayor Harrison were doing this on principle and not under the spur of personal irritation, we should cordially sympathize with him. But he is not doing it on principle. Not only has he confessedly allowed these ordinances to be ignored in the past, but he is deliberately ignoring them now. It is only theaters and public halls that he orders closed. Yet, upon his own statement, churches and department stores are notorious violators of the same ordinances. Why not close them, too?

When asked why, by one of the theater managers, Mayor Harri-

son replied that the matter was under consideration by the council, and that it was for the council to say what should be done. But why for the council to say in the case of churches and department stores, and for the Mayor to say in the case of theaters and halls? These laws should be enforced impartially against all, if against any. But here is a situation in which, with rational precautions, reasonable time should be allowed to churches, department stores, halls and theaters to comply with the safety laws which all have so long been permitted to ignore. Not that there should be any toleration of the vicious doctrine of vested rights in wrong doing, but revolutionary changes should be made with as little disturbance as possible. Let the laws be strictly enforced; but when enforcement has long been lax let some notice precede a change of policy.

#### IMPERIALISM AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

There seem to be many who have failed to recognize any practical connection between imperialism and the internal social problems of a country. We are apt to think of imperialism as affecting only the foreign policy of the nation, and thus we fail to see its relation to home affairs, except, of course, as it increases government expenditures.

If we seek to get below the surface of vanity and hurrah, and try seriously to discover the real philosophy of the imperialistic movement, what, let us ask, is the impelling motive? Think of what England has added to her territory since 1870: an area of 4,754,000 square miles and an estimated population of 88 millions! Why this immense expansion? What strong forces are back of it? Manifest destiny and Anglo-Saxon push are words: what is the thing? Mr. Hobson, an English writer, in his book, "Imperialism: A Study," has given the answer.

"It is not too much to say," he writes, "that the modern foreign policy of Great Britain is primarily

a struggle for profitable markets of investment. To a larger extent every year Great Britain is becoming a nation living upon tribute from abroad, and the classes who enjoy this tribute have an ever increasing incentive to employ the public policy, the public purse, and the public force to extend the field of their private investments, and to safeguard and improve their existing investments."

In other words it is in the growth of concentrated capital and the consequent desire for profitable foreign trade and investment that we find the explanation of colonial expansion. It is for foreign markets and the exploitation of weaker peoples that battleships are multiplied, taxes increased, expenditures quadrupled, lives sacrificed, and principles trampled under foot. It is for extending trade influence at the behest of financial rulers that the natural spread of civilization and self-government is disregarded and a domineering tyranny established over unwilling subjects.

All this has become as true of America as of England. We have not an equal necessity of looking abroad, because of our larger home market; but we are looking abroad. It may be that the home market of America still takes 96 per cent. of all manufactured articles, only 4 per cent. going to foreign markets; but already we find that the extension of foreign trade and the competition in foreign markets are begetting and fostering our imperialism. And at the same time, as has been the case in England, they are beginning to be used as an argument for resisting the demands of laborers for better pay and shorter hours. This argument is being dinned into the ears of British workingmen, and in due time it will be dinned more and more into the ears of American workingmen. Furthermore, the same argument is used to excuse the monopolistic methods of trusts. In an article, for example, in one of the current reviews, a writer concludes a lengthy discussion of the Standard Oil Company by telling how this company sells about 60 per cent of the oil exported, how its power at home enables it to compete in foreign fields, and how it sells abroad at a lower price than at home

only where it comes into competition with Russia in the eastern market.

But in a still more intimate way the purpose and methods of imperialism connect themselves with social problems at home. Readers of *The Public* may, perhaps, remember a book on Poverty reviewed some time since in these columns. It was a minute study of the English city of York, in which place the author found that over 40 per cent. of the population were virtually paupers. Now suppose England, instead of overwhelming the Boers, had given her thought and effort to enabling these people to become purchasers of her goods! Well does Mr. Hobson speak of the "absurdity of spending half our financial resources in fighting to secure foreign markets at a time when hungry mouths, ill-clad backs, ill-furnished houses, indicate countless unsatisfied material wants among our own population." Imperialism turns its back on these conditions in the home market. It does not seek to increase this market by a better distribution of wealth at home. It goes about, at the cost of the nation's revenue and lives, seeking foreign markets and foreign investments.

Imperialism talks much about the spread of civilization. When we shall have attended better to social conditions at home, then and then only shall we have a civilization worthy to spread. But imperialists do not think so; the present civilization is good enough for them, and they want more of the same kind. So the great financial forces that in both England and America, through the Tory and Republican parties, are whistling patriotism and prosperity to the neglect of the conditions of ill-distributed wealth at home, are the same forces that are backing the policy of Imperialism.

Let us recognize the fact that there are many good men in these parties who have not considered the full purport of this policy. There are others who have been carried along by the impulse of a mistaken patriotism, or by the force of cleverly manipulated public opinion. To all these we must appeal to pause and think how

false the policy of Imperialism is both in spirit and in method. Its spirit is driving us to acts of cruelty and to the sacrifice of the optimistic principles of democratic government. Its method is to divert attention and to turn away from the betterment of social conditions at home, while it seeks new fields to exploit abroad.

J. H. DILLARD.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Jan. 7.

The long expected clash of war between Russia and Japan over the Korean question (p. 213), a clash in which Great Britain, France, Germany and even the United States may possibly become involved, seems now most imminent. In the news dispatches it is freely predicted. Yet the authentic disclosures are thus far insufficient for a rational judgment either as to the probability of early hostilities or as to the immediate or nominal causes therefor.

In the western hemisphere the burning question of the week is the Panama complication (p. 612). President Roosevelt has devoted to it a long special message to Congress, which was read before both Houses on the 4th, upon their re-assembling after the holiday recess. In this message he reviews the subject vigorously from the Administration point of view, concluding with a declaration that the recognition of Panama as an independent republic is "already an accomplished fact," and therefore that the only open question is "whether or not we shall build an Isthmian canal."

Along with his special message the President transmitted a letter received by Secretary Hay from Gen. Reyes, the Colombian special envoy, and Mr. Hay's reply, which indicates the policy of the Administration with reference to Colombia's right to resist the secession of Panama. Gen. Reyes wrote (under date of Dec. 8):

I have the honor to address your excellency for the purpose of stating respectfully that I have received from my government instructions to inquire what

attitude would be assumed by the government of the United States in the event which may take place of Colombian troops or forces under the Colombian flag making their appearance on the Isthmus, or attempting a landing on the territory for the defense of the sovereignty and integrity of Colombia, and respecting the railroad line and the terminal points, in accordance with the stipulation of the treaty of 1846, which my country is ever ready to observe.

Secretary Hay's reply (dated Dec. 11) was as follows:

I have quoted your question textually, and in reference to it am instructed by the President to bring to the attention of your excellency the following facts: That the Republic of Panama proclaimed its independence on the 3d of last month; that, in consequence of this movement, the independence of Panama has been recognized by this government and by many others; that a treaty has been signed between the United States and Panama, which has been ratified by the latter state, and is now waiting ratification by the American Senate; that by the provisions of the said treaty the United States agrees to maintain the independence of the Republic of Panama; that although the treaty has not yet become law by the action of the Senate, there are already inchoate rights and duties created by it which place the responsibility of preserving peace and order on the Isthmus in the hands of the government of the United States and of Panama, even if such responsibility were not imposed by the historical events of the last fifty years. In view of these facts I am instructed to say to your excellency that the government of the United States would regard with the gravest concern any invasion of the territory of Panama by Colombian troops, for the reason that bloodshed and disorder would inevitably result throughout the whole extent of the Isthmus, and for the broader reason that in the opinion of the President the time has come, in the interest of universal commerce and civilization, to close the chapter of sanguinary and ruinous civil war in Panama.

A general debate upon the subject was precipitated by the message in the Senate on the 4th, led by Senator Morgan in opposition to the President's policy with reference to the recognition of Panama. Senator Morgan is reported to have declared that President Roosevelt's interference in Colombia's affairs on the Isthmus was not warranted by the Constitution and to have asserted that if there is to be a general policy on the part of the United States of upholding civilization that policy must be undertaken



by Congress. He is quoted as saying, also, that "neither the President nor the President and the Senate, as the treaty-making power of the United States, has the lawful power to wage or declare war against any foreign power without the consent of Congress, when such country is at peace with the United States." In this connection he is reported as declaring that he might yield in his judgment that no ship should ever pass through the Isthmus of Panama, but he could not assent to the breaking down of our fixed policy of neutrality between belligerents, or to enlarging the diplomatic powers of the President by construction until they reach the whole height of usurpation. He urged his colleagues from the South to note that the President's attitude is intended to force them to vote for the Panama route; and for himself he insisted that he was not opposing the President on slight ground, but because he believed the course of the President to be such as to threaten the honor and integrity of the United States.

The principal debater in support of the Administration was Senator Lodge, who spoke on the 5th. He is reported to have quoted a number of authorities in support of his position that the President has not departed from beaten paths in recognizing the independent government of Panama, and to have laid down the general proposition that "a revolted state may be recognized as sovereign or independent by a neutral power without departing from its attitude of neutrality." Replying to the objection that the President had gone beyond his authority in nominating a minister to Panama, Mr. Lodge quoted a number of instances to show that the early Presidents made nominations to other countries without the authority of Congress.

In the course of his Panama speech in the Senate on the 6th Senator Lodge made some remarkable statements with reference to the administration of President Cleveland. The immediate occasion for these statements was a dinner at New York, on the 4th, in honor of the inauguration of

Mayor McClellan. Several prominent men who had been invited did not attend, among them being Judge Parker and ex-President Cleveland. The latter wrote a letter declining on the ground of "a vexatious indisposition." But Mr. Olney, of Boston, Mr. Cleveland's former cabinet officer, who did attend, made a speech in which he urged Mr. Cleveland's nomination by the Democratic party for the presidency. Alluding to these circumstances, Senator Lodge said:

This morning I had the pleasure of reading the account of a great banquet in New York. Among others present was a very distinguished citizen of my own State, whom I am very proud and happy to call my personal friend. I very rarely agree with him on any political question, but he made a single statement last night with which I think I am in more or less agreement. He referred in a picturesque way to the dreadful career that has been run by the Republican party since it came into power in 1896. He said they have passed from a needless war with Spain to a wanton war with Colombia. Needless war with Spain. Mr. President, I am inclined to think that adjective was well chosen. If, when the first stirrings for independence had come in that land, the administration of Mr. Cleveland had behaved with sense and courage; if they had told Spain that the time had come when the United States could no longer hold back and that Cuba must be free, I believed then and I believe now that Cuba would have obtained her independence, perhaps after some protracted negotiations, but without any war by us. I have always believed that if that administration, instead of taking counsel with the Minister of Spain, a great sugar planter in Cuba, had been guided by a sound, brave American spirit before Spain had squandered blood and treasure in the island, we might, indeed, have been saved from the war. And I look forward with great interest and great pleasure to the picture that was drawn at that dinner by the ex-Secretary of State when he eulogized the last Democratic President. Apparently, in twenty years he is the only candidate they can produce, and Mr. Olney seems to think he is the only one that can run. Whatever his strength or whatever his weakness, I cannot refrain from saying that his nomination would present me at least with one great source of pleasure. His administration has never been discussed. I do not regard the Democratic party—this, I suppose, is a partisan remark, but I shall make it—as always abounding in good sense, but they had too much sense to fight the campaign of 1896 on Mr. Cleveland's administration, and we were deprived of the opportunity of discussing it. We can say what we will about the silver issue, but it was a better issue for the Democratic party to

meet the country on than what had gone before; and when I saw the accounts of this delightful banquet in New York and read those inspiring speeches and observed the Democratic party once more through its chosen leaders there preparing to stand across the pathway of American progress and proposing to put at their head the man who held power last in their name, I confess my spirits rose higher than ever about Republican prospects. I thought of what a pleasure it would be to contrast the policy which tried to set up Liliuokalani in Hawaii with the policy of the Republican party which has made those islands a part of the United States; to contrast the tariff which they passed and which their own President called the tariff of perfidy and dishonor with the tariff we passed; to examine the history of the loans which they made in a time of profound peace to the bankers of New York with an interest rate far above what the United States could borrow at, even then, and contrast them with the loans which we made in time of war; to compare that era of panic and depression with the prosperity which followed. The whole field bristles with delightful contrasts. I think that nothing could be happier for us than to have our Democratic friends nominate the last Democratic reform President, with the agreeable record of his last administration as a theme for debate, on a policy of sustaining Colombia and opposing the United States in digging the canal at Panama.

Martial law with strict press censorship has been established in another of the strike regions (p. 567) of Colorado,—the more westerly region, namely, San Miguel county, of which Telluride is the county seat. But little has been heard from either region for nearly a month. The later reports have indicated the end of all trouble. A dispatch of the 19th from Denver to the Chicago Record-Herald, for example, declared that all—

indications are that the striking miners have lost their fight in Colorado, both in the gold and silver and in the coal mines. The strike atmosphere is clearing daily, and it is believed that the military campaign of the State authorities has resulted in a complete defeat for the unions. There are more men seeking work than there is employment for. Governor Peabody has ordered a general reduction of the militia forces at Telluride and Cripple Creek, owing to the fact that the nonunion men are in the majority in these districts, and are believed to be amply able to take care of themselves. Several mines and mills are running to their full capacity.

Notwithstanding the pacific purport of that dispatch, the Gov-

ernor issued a proclamation on the 4th which declares San Miguel county to be in a state of insurrection and gives to the military full authority to use arbitrary measures. Accordingly Major Zeph T. Hill, commander of the military at Telluride, has established a strict press censorship and taken control of both telegraph and telephone lines. He has also made at least 22 military arrests. Among the prisoners are General Eugene Engley, who was representing the miners' union as counsel; Guy M. Miller, president of the local union; J. C. Union, president of the local order of miners, and Henry Manke, a prominent union leader. Major Hill announced that the prisoners would be taken out of San Miguel county and forbidden to return during the continuance of martial law. The fact of these arrests is the only news of importance that has found its way through the censor's office.

In consequence of the Iroquois theater fire of last week (p 609), the Chicago authorities have adopted drastic measures for future safety. Eighteen theaters and music halls were ordered closed on the 1st for having no asbestos curtain, as required by city ordinances, and on the 2d a general order closing all theaters, 36 in number—was issued, to be in force until they comply with the terms of the safety ordinances. An extension of the order was made on the 4th which closes some 350 halls where public meetings and dances are held. It is believed that some of the closed theaters and halls will not be open for months, while others must be so radically remodeled as to make complete rebuilding necessary. The closing orders are not to be confined to theaters, but are to extend to churches, stores, etc., unless these buildings are made to comply with the law. In explanation of his action Mayor Harrison made the following statement for publication. We quote from the Chicago Tribune:

I am tired of packing responsibility for this city. I will not do it any longer. The city ordinances shall be enforced. I will give the city council a chance to amend and revise them. If the aldermen do not revise them I will enforce them as they stand. If they do amend them I will enforce them as amended.

The council can use its own judgment. If the aldermen do not change the laws they will be enforced as they are. I will close every building which does not conform. That means churches, factories, office buildings and stores. I cannot help it if the enforcement of ordinances works a hardship. Every building which does not meet requirements shall be closed. I have taken responsibility long enough. Before this fire if I had attempted to enforce the law I should have been mobbed. Now I will do it. The council can find out what laws it wants. I will enforce them.

Applications by theater managers to admit audiences to the first floor only, in order to avoid the necessity of discharging employees, have been denied. Responding to a theatrical deputation which asked this privilege, the Mayor said:

Gentlemen, I have had enough criticism and abuse for the nonenforcement of ordinances, and I do not propose to shoulder the load any longer. The theater ordinance must be lived up to in its minutest particular, and not one of you at present can satisfy its requirements. Your quest is useless. I cannot modify this order in the slightest degree.

In his official message to the city council on the 4th, the Mayor explained:

Because of serious violations of the city building ordinances I have felt it my duty to order the closing of all theaters in the city until the provisions of the ordinance respecting this class of places of amusement are thoroughly complied with. Before these theaters are permitted to reopen it seems to me advisable an inspection and report of each individual theater should be made by an authority in whose competence and reliability the public can place absolute reliance.

Such a committee was accordingly appointed.

Meanwhile numerous arrests have been made and extensive investigations are in progress for the purpose of fixing the responsibility for the disaster which has caused the closing of these theaters. The number of deaths thus far ascertained is 591. Nearly all the bodies have been identified. In the list of identifications are the names of 41 public-school teachers and 99 public-school pupils.

Two disasters have followed that of the Iroquois theater fire, which would in themselves have

attracted wide attention but for the greater calamity. One was the almost total destruction by fire on the 4th of the Iowa capitol at Des Moines. The other was the wreck of a transcontinental passenger train on the Rock Island railway about five miles west of Topeka, Kansas, early in the morning of the 6th. The wreck was caused by a head-on collision with a freight train, and 17 people were killed.

Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, has advanced the traction reform movement in that city (p. 520) another stage by securing the introduction into the city council on the 28th of two low-fare ordinances. One of them, the "McKenna" ordinance, is designed to reduce fares to three cents on all lines operating under unexpired franchises which do not specify a 5-cent fare. The other, the "Kohl" ordinance, grants renewals of certain franchises about to expire—those on Woodland and Central avenues—but grants them to the 3-cent fare company, which is building a line on Denison avenue, instead of to the old 5-cent fare company. The proposed ordinances were referred to the committee on street railways, the board of public service, the city solicitor and the mayor.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—The Ohio legislature organized on the 4th.

—Frederick Pabst, the Milwaukee brewer, died in Milwaukee on the 1st at the age of 67.

—Wm. T. Stead began the publication at London on the 4th of an afternoon paper (The Daily Paper), of unique make-up.

—The Socialist party have selected May 1 as the day and Chicago as the place for holding their national convention.

—President Roosevelt has named William H. Taft, late governor of the Philippines, to succeed Elihu Root as Secretary of War.

—A dollar dinner to Wm. J. Bryan, by way of welcome on his return from Europe, is to be given at the Lindell hotel, Lincoln, on the 18th.

—Gen. James Longstreet, the famous military leader in the Confederate service during the Civil War, died at Gainesville, Ga., on the 2d at the age of 83.

—Luke E. Wright, vice governor of the Philippines, has been nominated by



President Roosevelt as governor to succeed Wm. H. Taft; Henry C. Ide, of Vermont, is named for vice governor.

—The Rev. Dr. Thomas Kerr, pastor emeritus of the Church of Christian Union at Rockford, Ill.—the Christian church without a creed, of which the Rev. Robert C. Bryant is active pastor—died at Rockford on the 4th.

—Among those who perished in the Iroquois theater fire at Chicago, were the 13-year-old daughter of M. T. Moloney, who was attorney general of Illinois in Gov. Altgeld's administration; the wife and two children of Henri V. Lemenager, formerly of Chicago but now of Washington; and C. D. James, of Davenport, Ia.

—A decision of the United States Supreme Court, rendered on the 4th, holds that Porto Ricans are not aliens within the meaning of the immigration law and that therefore they may freely come into the United States. The decision does not hold, however, that they are citizens of the United States. That point was held to be not involved in the case.

—The monthly statement of the United States treasury department (see p. 568) for December shows on hand December 31, 1903:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash .....	229,374,565.28
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$379,374,565.28</b>
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1903.....	384,394,275.58
<b>Decrease .....</b>	<b>\$5,019,710.30</b>

—The monthly treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government (see p. 568) for the six months ending December 31, 1903, shows the following:

<b>Receipts:</b>	
Tariff .....	\$133,799,486.72
Internal revenue .....	122,723,977.61
Miscellaneous .....	21,314,007.89
	<b>\$277,837,472.52</b>
<b>Expenses:</b>	
Civic and misc.....	\$67,149,981.73
War .....	62,127,306.82
Navy .....	49,794,724.90
Indians .....	5,556,241.47
Pensions .....	72,809,154.99
Interest .....	11,974,199.96
	<b>\$269,411,609.87</b>
<b>Deficit .....</b>	<b>\$ 8,425,862.65</b>

**PRESS OPINIONS.**

**OUR WAR WITH COLOMBIA.**

The Nation (Ind.), Dec. 24.—“No sheep can bite me and live,” said a soldier, who came into camp bringing the carcass of one on his back, after an order against plundering had been issued. In like spirit, Secretary Moody now says: “Let the Colombians take the initiative.” The initiative in what? If the secretary means war, it is too late for the Colombians to take it now, because we took it seven weeks ago. When we sent cruisers to the Isthmus to prevent the Colombians from suppressing insurrections in their own territory, we forestalled any claim they might ever make to the initiative.

**THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.**

Columbus (O.) Press (Dem.), Jan. 5.—The spirit of the entire message is defense, excuse, apology and self-glorification for an act he fails to justify except by the argument of kings—that might makes right.

... Did you ever see the bully at school strutting around with a chip on his shoulder daring the smaller boys to knock it off? There you have a type of the real interpretation of this extraordinary language of an extraordinary President in an extraordinary message. . . . It is only special pleading to declare that the United States had no part in the revolution. In one thing the United States played the stellar part—in doing for the secessionists what the greatest Powers of Europe sought to do, but did not dare to do openly, in all the four years that ensued after the secession of South Carolina—and Roosevelt did this within 48 hours after the revolutionists declared for independence.

**MISCELLANY**

**GOD'S TENANTS ALL.**

The greater portion of a speech delivered by the Hon. L. A. Russell at the Crank Club banquet given in Cleveland in honor of Governor-Elect Myron T. Herrick, November 17, as published in the Catholic Universe. The speech was “dedicated to Myron T. Herrick, Governor-elect of all Ohio, without asking his permission; just to put him wise.” The Governor-elect was unavoidably absent from the banquet.

Those who call themselves,  
As others call them,  
And as they are,  
Landowners,  
Are much less than half of all,  
Those who work their land  
Are less than half the owners.  
Those who sell the use for rent  
And call themselves  
As others call them,  
And as they are,  
Landierds,  
Make up the tale of owners.

The land must be worked,  
The mines must be dug,  
The seas must be crossed,  
The roads must be built.

Tramping the road,  
Sailing the sea,  
Delving the mine,  
Tilling the land,

These must all continue,  
Each man must die,  
Each man loves his life;  
And, because he must  
To save his life:

He will till the land,  
And delve the mine,  
And sail the sea,  
And tramp the road.  
Since Eden till now  
This has been true.

From now till doom  
Shall crack for each,  
It will be true, I reckon.

Is this right?  
Abundantly.  
How proved right?  
By its blessed fruit,  
By the long and happy lives  
It brings to men, and their  
Increasing children.

What title have they  
To Land and Mine and Sea and Road?  
The maker of them both,  
All, and this earth,  
Put them together, saying

By his grand silence  
To the ear of each:  
“Root, little pig, or die.”  
“If a man will not work,  
Neither shall he eat.”

That is enough.  
God gave it to us,  
That is our title.  
How, then, does one man  
Fence a field and keep another out  
Of the gift of God to us?  
How does he hold the mine?  
How keep the sea?  
How hold the road?

You answer me:  
“By sin, and force and fraud,  
By stealth, and weak compliance  
Of the injured.  
Then by lapse of time  
And the conjoined act  
Of the strong possessors  
To frame their iniquity into law,  
Whereby their children now  
Bar us out, under the power of all,  
Which is the law,  
Till we are barren  
Of the gift of God  
Others enjoy.”

To this, your answer,  
I make full and fair denial,  
It is not so.  
By your answer  
The House of Want  
To  
The House of Have  
Does hideous wrong.

For you are suffering,  
And in your pain  
Are blinded by your pain.

I say:—Listen,  
While I point you to the truth,  
You may yet see, and  
“The truth shall make you free”  
From pain,

And in time,  
O less time than you fear,  
Shall give you abundant entrance  
To the House of Have;  
Emptying the House of Want,  
Where you now dwell

In pain,  
Oh listen!  
From the beginning,  
All those who heard and heeded  
The silent order of the God

Who gave us all:  
“To work and save or perish,”  
All innocently, and openly,  
Fell to work upon the gift of God  
Each for himself.

And full well knowing  
God had given them  
The land,  
And not the loaf;  
The sea,  
And not the ship;  
The mine,  
And not the rail or coin;  
The place,  
And not the path,

They each, with diligence and prudent  
care,  
Applied their work to the land  
For the loaf,  
To the sea for the ship,  
To the mine for the rail and coin,  
To the earth and sea,  
And blazed the path, and used it  
Time and again in that self way, till  
It has grown the road, with tunnels

And bridges and charted stars, whereon  
And through, over and by, we tramp, with  
Steamships, automobiles, palace cars and  
yachts,  
Street cars, canoes, ox-carts, or on  
foot. . . .

As time went on  
Each for himself, against nature, grew,  
All naturally and innocently  
Without sin or force or fraud  
Or stealth, or any weak compliance,  
Or framing iniquity into law,  
To families.

Now, each for himself, had widened  
Into each for self, for wife, for children  
and the old.

As time still passed, and "each" grew old  
and died,

His children, taught by him,  
Took from his hand the tools he fashioned,  
And the field he tilled, his vine and fig tree,  
The ship he builded, the mine he dug,  
The road he tramped, and all roads and  
seas,

For them to tramp, and said at will,  
By inheritance.

God's law and gift, as certain  
As the place, for vine and fig tree.

No framing iniquity into law  
By the strong possessors  
Against the weak was here.  
Only the confirming  
Of the title God gave the Fathers  
To the children

Of all those who took and used  
The Creator's gift. . . .

I pray you note  
I am not here saying all those who took  
And used God's gift, were, or are thereby  
Purified or sanctified, or freed from sin or  
force,

Or fraud, or stealth, or receiving weak  
Compliance, or framing iniquity into law.

Only this I say:  
None of these things originated  
The right of property in man in severalty,  
To God's free gift;  
The right to possess, control, exclude  
All others from, enjoy, sell, transmit  
And use to the full.  
Only work did that, and wisdom.

God's gift to man  
Of the world whereon to live  
Stands to-day as when He gave it,  
Only by far improved and grown  
By the successive labor of His creatures.  
His silent order

When he put men on it  
Resounds far louder now  
And grows in loudness  
With each passing year,

"Work or Perish;"

"I have never seen the righteous forsaken  
Nor his seed begging bread." . . .

You House of Want,  
You are nearly all the people,  
You have all power.  
Will you let the House of Have divide and  
then abuse you?

Strike from your Constitution  
The lying futile word:  
"All property shall be taxed."  
Frame into law this little piece of right-  
eousness:

"All expenses which are common and pub-  
lic  
Shall be paid by a Tax  
Upon the value of the land.  
Each one in severalty;  
Each shall pay in the proportion

The value of the land he owns  
Bears to the value of all the  
Land in the district which the  
Common public expense relates to.  
No other tax shall be paid,  
Except on licenses for special privileges,  
And an inheritance and income tax.  
In fixing the value of each parcel  
No regard shall be had to the value of any  
Man-made improvement on it, and all par-  
cels

Shall be assessed by a uniform and impar-  
tial rule."

The divine beauty  
Of the Single Tax  
On land value only,  
After its simplicity,

Appears to me, not in the fact  
That each taxpayer, under it,  
Must pay in the exact proportion  
That he monopolizes land value.  
Though this, of course, is enough  
To recommend it to all statesmen  
Far beyond any and all  
Other systems of revenue raising  
For public common expenses.

But is this:  
After the tax is paid to the treasurer,  
Each taxpayer has in his own  
Hand and absolute control,  
The power to recoup from the  
Non-Taxpayers all that he has  
Paid beyond his own just, equitable and  
proper share

Of all public burden of common expense.  
No man can live who does not  
Pay to Landowners for what he consumes  
Of fire, food, clothes, house and light.  
And this at last is what each ought to pay,  
Of the common public expense;  
What he elects to consume  
Of the property God gave to all,  
And all have made.

If a man be incapable, a  
Prisoner or a pauper, in  
Respect for such ones some one in charity  
Will pay for what he consumes,  
Or he will die.

"If a man will not work  
Neither shall he eat."

And in this:

No man, in practice, could  
Monopolize such land  
Nor hold it long under  
The Single Tax,  
Unless he used it.  
He must milk the land  
Or let go of it.

#### GREATEST ENEMY OF INDUSTRY.

The great enemy of the building in-  
dustry is high land values; these values  
going into the pockets of private indi-  
viduals. A grocery merchant in St.  
Louis recently complained that he had  
conducted a store for ten years beside a  
vacant lot; at the end of that ten years  
he found he was very little ahead of  
his starting point, while the owner of  
the lot next door sold it at an advance  
of \$6,000. He inquired how it was  
that the "dead cat man," as he called  
him, because of the occasional pres-  
ence of defunct felines on the lot,—why  
he should profit \$6,000 for doing noth-  
ing while he, the groceryman, had la-  
bored those ten years and earned only  
a bare living. The reply was that the

groceryman had made a mistake in  
working; that he should have started  
in by owning land, doing nothing but  
letting others work for him, and this  
is true.

The land system is the constant pres-  
sure against industry which forces  
those who labor to live at the starvation  
point, and fattens the idlers who do  
nothing. The only way to correct this  
evil is to vote to raise taxes on land to  
the full rental value, and strike the  
taxes off from personal property. The  
first effect to follow from such a change  
would be a building boom.—Buffalo  
Builder and Contractor.

#### IMPERIALISTIC OPTIMISM.

For The Public.

Two neighbors who differed on Poli-  
tics, were discussing the merits of some  
apples they were eating.

"I don't think," remarked the Jeffer-  
sonian, "that apples this year have as  
good a flavor as usual."

"Maybe not," conceded the Hamilton-  
ian; but instantly fearing this remark  
might be construed as an admission that  
prosperity was on the wane, he deftly  
forstalled criticism by asking: "Haven't  
you noticed, though, that Apple Worms,  
this year, taste sweeter than usual?"

This Imperialistic Method of maintain-  
ing an equilibrium had the desired effect,  
and the abashed Pessimist accepted the  
rebuke in silence.

Moral: Never Find Fault as long as  
there is *anything* to be thankful for.

T. W. GRAHAM.

#### THE TRIBUTE PAID BY INDIA.

Neither in the British nor in the  
Indian Budget is there any mention of  
a tribute paid by India. Yet as a matter  
of fact payments are made which, as  
they are without economic return, have  
according to John Stuart Mill the effects  
of a tribute.

These payments consist of various  
items:

Interest on debt borrowed in Eu-  
rope, part incurred in useful works  
and part for military expenditure and  
wars beyond the frontier;

Home charges for the maintenance  
of the India office, etc.;

Pensions and pay during furloughs—  
the necessary result of alien adminis-  
tration, which, however able, is some-  
times ignorant, always expensive, and  
never really popular.

To these items must be added the  
savings of British residents in India,  
which, instead of being spent in the  
country, are transmitted to Europe.

This state of affairs leaves its mark  
on the trade returns of India. Every

year there is a great excess of exports and imports. In the year 1901-02 this excess amounted to more than £21,000,000.

Now, this is not only a serious loss to the country, but it is not the whole loss. In his "Principles of Political Economy" (Bk. III., ch. 21, sect. 4), Mill shows that in consequence of the tribute there must be an excess of exports to pay it. Foreign countries must, therefore, be induced to accept a greater quantity of exports than they would take, if there were no tribute to be paid and this can only be done

by offering these exports on cheaper terms, or in other words, by paying dearer for foreign commodities.

The result is that a country which makes regular payments to foreign countries, besides losing what it pays, loses also something more by the less advantageous terms on which it is forced to exchange its productions for foreign commodities.

How long can India support this loss? How can India be other than poor while this drain of wealth continues?—India for Dec. 18, 1903.

#### AN INTERVIEW WITH TOM L. JOHNSON.

"Speculation as to your attitude in politics is a matter of general interest. What, if any, effect will the recent defeat that you have sustained produce upon your future political action?"

"In announcing as I did a few years ago my intention of devoting myself to certain political ideals, I did it with a full appreciation of the task, and reckoned on not only one defeat but possibly a long line of defeats. Again I repeat, that while Truth may lose some battles, it never lost a war. The man that lightly contemplates the overthrow of special privilege is surely shortsighted and reasons without either sufficient knowledge or careful consideration."

"The eye of the nation has been resting upon you as a favorite son of Democracy. What about your leadership of the Democratic party?"

"No one can rightfully accuse me of ever having encouraged the thought of leadership. I have at no time aspired to do more than fight the battles of today; to undertake the work that I saw must be accomplished in my own city and State which would lead to the placing of our party upon a solid foundation. In order to do that, a stand had to be taken against those who assume the cloak of Democracy for selfish political advancement; and it was necessary to point out clearly the needs of the people; to show them that the Democratic party—tested by its ful-

fillment of every pledge—was the one hope to which they might turn. To accomplish this end we have fought for the fulfillment of every pre-election promise, and to the best of our ability, have weeded out those people who by their past acts had shown that they could not be trusted to aid in the progress of true Democracy. There is no hope that the people will ever place their affairs in the hands of the Democratic party as long as it is dominated by those who are opposed to the very principles for which Democracy should and does stand."

"Considering the result as a whole, what lessons do you gather from the campaign?"

"That the Democrats have made some astonishing gains, with the independent voters, and suffered some losses among other classes that are but temporary."

"Will the three-cent railroad fare question come up again?"

"Undoubtedly."

"Will home rule continue to be a question of interest?"

"Yes, and outside of a national election, together with the question of an equitable system of taxation, it will attract the attention of the people of this State more than any other issue."

Cleveland, Ohio, Dec. 28, 1903.

#### FIRE INSPECTION IN CLEVELAND.

Telegraphic news from Cleveland, Ohio, published in Chicago Chronicle of Jan. 3.

City Electrician Dunn thinks the Iroquois theater fire was due to defective electrical apparatus. Mr. Dunn forms this opinion from his inspection of the electrical appliances of the Bluebeard company made when the play was given in Cleveland two months ago.

"I inspected the electrical apparatus when the company reached here," said Mr. Dunn. "Fully one-third of it was deficient and I condemned it and ordered that none of it be used in Cleveland."

"Despite this fact one piece which was used, although I did not sanction its use, almost caused a disastrous fire here. As the electricity was turned on at an afternoon performance a wire became crossed. In an instant every lamp in the piece was smashed to bits and the scenery about it was set afire."

"The operator let the apparatus drop to the stage, where it was picked up and carried to the wings. For three days this burned piece lay in the hallway leading to the opera house stage."

"Two fires were caused by the electrical appliances of the company, but neither was serious. Both were due to

short circuiting of wires, but fuse boxes were attached and the fires amounted to nothing."

#### A BETTER THAN MILITARY HEROISM.

From the Chicago Chronicle's account of the fire at the Iroquois theater, Dec. 30, 1903.

Robert Smith, a little elevator boy, made three trips through the dense flame and smoke to the roof of the stage and down, carrying to safety the girls who had been caught there. At the bottom of the elevator shaft they were caught by a chain gang of ten men stretching 20 feet to the door, headed by Archie Barnard, chief electrician, whose hair and clothes were on fire. They were carried over the chain and thrown out of the door. . . .

The elevator boy stuck to his post, and by his coolness saved many lives. On the first of three trips through the smoke and flames to the dressing-rooms on the upper tiers he found Nellie Reed, who was in the sixth tier and had inhaled so much smoke that she had fallen to the floor. The elevator was full.

"Please, oh, please, take me down," she pleaded.

"Keep cool and stay where you are," Smith told her. "I will get you on my next trip and you will get out all right."

The same advice was given to the other girls who had to wait, and in two more trips all of them were taken to the stage floor and turned over to the human chain formed by the men. . . .

On his second trip up with the elevator young Smith ascended into an atmosphere that was so thick with smoke that he could not see nor breathe. He found Miss Reed on the sixth floor and then took on another load of girls from the fifth. By the time he had come down with these, the flames and smoke were threatening the men in the chain. The clothing of Barnard and William Price was on fire and their hair was burning. Nevertheless they threw the girls out and waited for the third load.

This load came near not arriving. The smoke was so thick that Smith had to find the girls and drag them into the elevator and by the time he had done this he was almost overcome. The elevator was burning at the place where the controller was located, and Smith had to place his left hand in the flame to start the car. The hand was badly burned, but the car was started and came down in time for the girls to receive assistance from the

men who were waiting. When the last girl was out the men left the building: . . .

"I stuck to the car until the ropes parted," said young Smith, "and then I began to get faint. Some one reached in and pulled me out just in time to save my life. The larger part of the girls were in the dressing-rooms when the fire broke out, and they all tried to get out at once. A great many tried to crowd into the elevator and it was hard work to keep it going. I made as many trips as I could, I guess."—Chronicle of December 31.

Another stage hero of the fire was James Dougherty, a fly man. During the heat of the blaze on the stage he climbed to the flies and with a hatchet severed the ropes that held the scenery.

One by one the burning "drapes" fell to the stage and then Dougherty, imprisoned in the loft, leaped 40 feet to the burning stage below and crawled to the door, where he succeeded in reaching the street. He fractured his leg and suffered severe burns, but last night he was reported to be out of danger.—Chronicle of January 1.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S PANAMA POLICY.

The President's Panama policy was discussed at the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, January 3, by the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow.

It happens as it happened of old!  
Still Naboth's vineyard we behold!  
—Goethe's Faust.

These are the words of Mephistopheles.

Faust had turned reformer. He had conceived the project of benefiting mankind by building dikes and canals, and thus making habitable vast regions hitherto overrun by the sea. In this worthy enterprise he was balked by an aged couple who refused to sell their homestead, a location which Faust needed in his scheme of improvement.

This ancient pair looked with distrust upon Faust's innovations. They did not wish to give themselves the pain of new thoughts and new ways. Faust became very impatient, and confessed to Mephistopheles that one "grows tired, at last, of being just."

This was the Devil's opportunity. He suggested a resort to force. Faust replied: "Then go, and clean them out with speed."

#### A MODERN PARALLEL.

Now note a modern parallel. The scheme of improvement to-day contemplates the cutting of a canal across the Isthmus of Panama. But the Colom-

bians did not wish to sell. It appears that Mephistopheles whispered into the ear of the President the same advice which he gave to Faust. It is now known that when the Panama revolution broke out the President had written, and was on the eve of presenting to Congress, a message in which he proposed that since Colombia would not sell the isthmus, we should go down with troops and seize it. The revolution changed things. But the President was just about to say to the army as Faust said to the Devil:

Then go, and clean them out with speed!

But we must say this for Faust, that he soon repented of his crime. When the Devil returned from this forcible ejection to tell his story of pillage and murder, Faust repudiated the unholy work, saying:

Exchange I meant, not robbery.  
The inconsiderate, savage blow  
I curse! Bear ye the guilt and go!  
THE PRESIDENT'S DEFENSE.

But the President's argument is as ingenious as any which Mephistopheles could have invented. The onward march of civilization requires that canal. Virtually we are civilization. If the Colombians reject our offer, shall we permit them to stand in our—that is, in civilization's—way? But little Colombia asks: "What gives you the right to speak for civilization?" The answer is: "Our navy."

"But," says the President, "it is unreasonable to allow these Colombians to block the way to progress, because, forsooth, the accident of position has placed them in control of the isthmus."

#### SHALL WE EVICT THE ASTORS?

Very well, Mr. President, suppose we take another case. Here is Manhattan Island. Like the isthmus, it is a favored spot on the earth's surface, because civilization has great need of it. Its location and not its owners have made it valuable. These owners collect millions a year in ground rents as the tribute which they exact from the inhabitants of the island. Does the President propose that we call out the militia and evict the Astors? Henry George proposed to evict them peaceably by gradually saddling upon their ground rents the total burden of taxation. If the President believed in this Single Tax principle, if he saw the injustice of allowing toll-gates anywhere on the highways of civilization, we might find a kind of brutal consistency in his Panama policy. But we cannot enthuse over that type of statesman who rushes off in great haste to force upon other people a principle which is constitutionally violated at

home. Suppose Colombia were Russia, Mr. President?

You can find a brave and generous man here and there, but where is the nation that is above playing the bully and the coward?

#### DONOVAN RECITES AN ORIGINAL POEM,

WHICH REMINDS MULLIGAN OF A SERMON, WHICH HE REHEARSES TO THE COMPANY.

For The Public.

Mr. Donovan came in rather later than usual, and did not join in the conversation so freely as was his wont. He seemed preoccupied; and Mulligan noticed that his lips moved, occasionally, as if he were talking to himself. Naturally reprobating such unsocial conduct on the part of a boon companion, he finally said:

"Buy me a tickud, Donovan."

"Put me nixt!" butted in Mr. Flynn, the storekeeper.

"Phwat the divil d' yous fellys know about poethry?" ejaculated Donovan, with malapropos and disconcerting abruptness.

"Poethry! the man's crayzee!" exclaimed Mulligan, taking the pipe from his mouth, and forgetting to close the latter, in his surprise.

"Is ut nutty y'are, Donovan?" inquired Mr. Flynn, with mock solicitude.

"Indade Oi'm not," said Donovan, "but Oi've composed a pome—"

"Out wid ut, thin," cried Mulligan; "sure, it's meself that composed many a foine pome—befoor Oi was married!"

"Kape sthills, thin, an' Oi'll raycite ut t' yez." Whereupon everybody expressed eagerness to hear it, and pressed the hesitating, blushing bard to proceed, which, at last, he did:

"Ye'll know," he precluded, "the toitle av the pome is . . ."

ME PANAMA HAT AN' MEGYURL.

"Oi made a foine Panama hat—"

"Is that the pome ye're rayceoitin' now?" interjected Mulligan.

"It is."

"All roight; on'y Oi t'ought ye was talkin' troo ye're panama hat! Begin agin, plaze, f'r Oi've losht the conniction."

"Will yez kape sthills, thin?"

"Sure t'ing," answered Mulligan, and Donovan resumed:

"Oi made a foine Panama hat, And that hat made me luk loike a flat—"

"The hat didn't hov mooch to do," murmured Mulligan.

"Begorra!" added Mr. Flynn, "Oi'm t'ink'n he was none the worse for the hat!" whereupon Donovan, in dudgeon, started for the front door.

"Howld on, Donovan!" cried Mulli-

gan, "Ol hov the price av two o' thim in me clothes."

After much ado, the poet was pacified, and consented to proceed with the recitation, though warning everybody that the slightest interruption would put an irrevocable period to the reading. He began once more at the beginning:

"Ol made a foine Panama hat,  
And that hat made me luk loike a flat.  
Me gyurl wisht a dhrink,  
But too hoigh was the brink  
Av the spring, and so phwat do ye think—  
Ol made a foine pan o' me hat,  
And gave her a dhrink out o' that!"

Mulligan once more slowly removed his pipe, and, turning his head with much deliberation, solemnly looked upon Mr. Flynn. The latter was non-committal. Then were those large, reproving eyes turned upon the now apprehensive Donovan. A few moments of ominous silence followed, during which time poor Donovan seemed to wish he was on the farther side of the front door—indeed, he cast furtive glances in that direction several times—but, though evidently upon the dizzy verge of panic, he managed to stand his ground. He perceptibly started, when Mulligan's voice invaded the awful silence:

"Hov ye a bottle in ye're pockud, Donovan?"

"Ol hov not. For phoy d'ye ax me that?"

"'Becase, sorr, Ol tho't,  
If a bottle ye'd got,  
Ye jabbering, half-witted flat,  
Ye mought give us 'a dhrink out o' that!'"

"Give me you yet, Mulligan!" cried Flynn; and the floor shook from the laughter of the crowd, in which Donovan, game and good-hearted, joined with merry zest.

After the pipes had been refilled from Flynn's box, which always stood upon the counter, near the stove, open to the welcome access of his customers; after a few exclamations anent the bitter wind, that moaned, and screamed, like a despairing woman's wail, far away, in the wild, black night; after Flynn had replenished the fire, and its happy, laughing roar had assured the company a half hour's warm comfort, Mulligan said:

"Schpeakin' o' panama hats, Donovan, Ol'm moinded av a sarmon Ol heard, maybe 'twas a year ago, Ol don't know. The praicher was praichin' about the sarvint bein' abajnt to his masther. 'Farchint is the sarvint av to-day,' he siz; 'phwhin the masthers air benivolent and philinthropic, the loike o' which was niver known befor in the histhry av the wurruld,' sez 'e. 'Here is the United Shtates Shteel Carperation Invoitint' its humble sarvints to become

capitalists alongside av 'm,' he sez. 'Moindful av the fact,' he sez, 'that a braave yeomanry is its country's proide, and that ivery mon's a brick in the Schpartan walls, those dimycratic and thruly pathriotic gintlemin hov found a way be which t' uplift an' make more thruly silf-rispietful, an' more surely silf-supporting, the haarny-handid sons av tile,' sez 'e. 'They air sell'n shtock t' the wurrukmin an aisy tarrums, and at a proice thot's equivelivelint t'n advance in waages,' sez 'e. 'An' thot,' sez 'e, 'widout anny demand or rayquist av anny koind on the paart av the im-plyeezis. O me frin's, sez 'e, 'me heart schwills wid grattychude t' thim thare hoigh-tone captains av indhustry, if yuse hov'nt the sinse t' feel an' confiss the ginnyrus impulse yerselves!' sez 'e. An' he sthuck 'is hand into 'is buzzum and brought out a schpick an' schpan new hankercher, unfolded it, graceful-loike, and tinderly woiped a big salt tear from the off side av his nose. Ol t'aught 'e was goin' t' busht out croyin' in schpoite av hissilf. His nostrils twiched two or t'ree toimes, an' his chin quivered wanst or twicht, but he came in frish on the homestretch.

"An' now phwat? Ye know Dinis Hinnesy, me own fursht coos'n. He is an imployee av the shteel company; an' he invistid a wad av 'is money in schteel schtocks, on the haarny-handed-son-av-tile uplift'n' plan av those hoigh-toned pathriots; and lasht week he sold out, an' deposited some av his money in the sav'n's bank."

"An' phwat about the rist av 'is wad?" asked Donovan.

"It wint t' hlip build a loibrary in Rock Oisland."

"An' is Dinis's name over the dure?" asked Donovan.

"It is," said Mulligan, knocking the ashes from his pipe, rising, and putting on his overcoat, preparatory to going home. "It is—but they schpelt it wrong; they schpelt it C-a-r-n-e-g-i-e."

HORACE CLIFTON.

#### THE RISKS OF THE WORKERS.

Much has been written from time to time of the risks of the capitalist, and his timidity in seeking investments when financial or industrial storms appear imminent; and workingmen are continually being warned not to do this or that or the other thing, for fear it may cause the withdrawal of capital from production, leaving labor to starve for lack of employment. There is some truth in this, but it must not be forgotten that the capitalist is not the only one taking risks. Few occupations are not without some special danger natural to the occupation. Some-

times behind the most innocent-looking employment there lurks a deadly enemy to the worker's health.

The life insurance companies of the world know more of the risks taken by laborers than do the laborers themselves. The safety of their capital depends upon the accuracy of their information, and they have at great expense collected statistics showing the dangerousness of all ordinary occupations. This work is not yet concluded, the actuaries being still engaged in collecting and tabulating their information. Enough is known, however, to enable the insurance companies, with comparative accuracy, to place insurance on the lives of the workers, and to regulate their charges so as to cover the actual risks. Some occupations are tabooed entirely, while others are practically put on the "blacklist," through the cost of the insurance. It is found that so many men out of every thousand with each occupation die on the average every year. The average occupied man is then said to die with this average rapidity. Specific occupations are then grouped, and the average death rate in each of them is computed.

Latest compilations made show that the cutlery manufacturing trade is exceedingly dangerous. In every such factory the air is laden with metal dust caused by the grinding of the steel, and this being carried into the lungs produces asthma, and eventually consumption. The grinders bending over their work inhale such quantities of the dust that they rarely live above the age of 40, while a needle polisher who begins to work at his trade at 17 may feel that he is unusually fortunate if he is alive at 37.

One of the most terrible diseases is that which attacks wool sorters and all who handle untanned skins, for not only do they breathe the poisonous fumes which arise from the skins before they have been preserved, and which is apt to cause consumption or diphtheria, but they are also subject to anthrax.

The glass-blower, no matter how strong his constitution, cannot long escape the certain death of his trade. Life insurance companies are reluctant to take risks in this occupation. In all glass factories millions of jagged fragments of glass are constantly floating in the air. These, being inhaled, wound the lungs, causing hemorrhage and premature death. Glass workers are also apt to grow dumb through a peculiar complaint induced by handling glass, and which attacks the jaws and ends in paralysis. In mirror factories,

in addition to the danger already mentioned there is that of mercurial poisoning. This deadens the sight, and mortality among those who have worked in glass for more than 20 years is, according to recent actuarial tables, more than 60 per cent.

The occupation of the miner is dangerous both from its liability to accident and from his inevitable susceptibility to certain dread diseases. No other class of men suffer so heavily from consumption, and the life underground is apt to produce blindness and ague. Coal miners are the healthiest of all miners. They are unusually free from phthisis, and they suffer inappreciably from alcoholism. In recent years, too, the liability among coal miners to accident has decreased very considerably.

If you are employed on a railroad as a brakeman or a switchman, many insurance companies will not insure you at all. If you are a powdermaker, or a sawyer in a big mill, or a marine diver, the possibilities are that you can get no insurance. And none of these occupations, except possibly that of the marine diver, pays wages above the average for labor requiring that degree of skill. If you are an engineer, a fireman or an officer on the lakes; or a telegraph repairer, a pilot, a city fireman, a manufacturing chemist, or a logger and chopper, you can get insured only by paying big rates. The occupations are labeled as "hazardous." The insurance companies are right. Let the reader note the maimed hands of the employes of a big lumber mill; let him walk through a factory in which many different kinds of machinery are used, and the number of missing fingers and thumbs will amaze him. Those who have lost limbs are to be found in the homes of their children, living on their charity.

While some employments carry no extra risks, the conditions under which the employes labor are such as daily threaten life. No matter how well provided with fire-escapes a factory may be, for example, it is inevitable that in the excitement of proximity to a burning building, accidents will happen that end in death.

The man who works on high places seems to suffer from troubles very similar to those of the diver. The man who works in cellars and basements, on the other hand, is liable at any time to be struck by a malignant fever. If he recovers from this he is left weak and decrepit for the remainder of his life. The mortality among ordinary laborers exceeds that among the average of men by about 25 per cent.

The workers in match factories suffer from a peculiar complaint known as "phossy jaw." This was at one time the most deadly of all trade maladies, but matchmakers studied the problem and they now use a newly invented kind of phosphorus which reduces the number of fatal cases to a minimum. Nevertheless, a large number of workers in these factories succumb to this trouble every year, and insurance companies are extremely loath to insure the life of any man in a match factory. The symptoms of "phossy jaw" are a crumbling away of the jawbone, this ending ultimately in total paralysis and death.

In deciding the rate of wages for an industry, it is probable that intuitively some account is taken of the risks involved, but it is also a fact that, through the ignorance of the workers themselves of the risks being run, as well as the necessity of employment of some kind, even though death is lurking near, that the wage rate seldom covers the risks run. Only when the capitalist steps in and becomes an insurer does the fact become known that certain industries are extra hazardous. The actuaries have no interest in stating these risks greater than they are, therefore it would not be unfair for employers and employed in arriving at wage rates to have reference to the actual risks, and to rely in great measure on the tables life insurance has laboriously built up from actual facts.—Judson Grenell, in Saturday Blade.

Socrates told Ischomachus that he would have been much ashamed of his poverty if he had not once seen an admiring crowd following a fine horse and discussing its good points. "I asked the groom," he said, "if the horse was rich, and he looked at me as if I was crazy, and answered: 'How on earth can a horse be rich?' And at that I breathed again, hearing that it is possible even for a penniless horse to be a good horse, if he has naturally a good character."—The Whim.

Those ultra conscientious folks who fear that the administration, in its seemingly somewhat unconventional methods of dealing with Colombia, has violated the treaty of 1846, should learn, for their own peace of mind, the convenient art of applying the statute of limitation.

G. T. E.

Such is the perversity of human nature that small nations there are who decline to be involved in difficulties with

great Christian powers, no matter how many missionaries are sent among them.

But it is not in the purpose of the fit to give over surviving, let the obstacles be whatsoever.

Thus the Right of International Eminent Domain comes into being, and the earth, and the fullness thereof, is the Lord's peoples'.—Life.

"Do you approve of Morganizing?"

"Not as a rule," replied Col. Snodgrass, "but when I hear the Nestor from the south speak on the Canal question, I can't help hoping that he is Morganizing the Senate."

G. T. E.

In an object lesson on the "Cat," the teacher asked:

"What boy can tell me to what family the cat belongs?"

A hand was raised.

"Well?" asked the teacher.

"I think the cat belongs to the family that owns it," was the diminutive pupil's answer.—Philadelphia Times.

"One would think," said the taxpayer to the city official, "that a fellow who was as anxious to get into that office as you were would be willing to stay there at least an hour a day."

That seemed to be logical, too, but sometimes it doesn't work out that way.—Chicago Evening Post.

Dick—What made you drop out of society?

Jerry—We didn't drop out; it slid from under us.—Detroit Free Press.

## BOOKS

### WATSON'S JEFFERSON.

"American historians, endeavoring to be dignified, leaned a little too far, and became dull." So says Mr. Watson at the beginning of his twelfth chapter, and many readers will agree with him. Most historians of the early periods of American history are indeed painfully dull, and as to the school histories—as Watson says of Woodrow Wilson's much-advertised five-volume book—"we will change the subject."

As to Watson's Jefferson ("Life and Times of Thomas Jefferson," by Thomas E. Watson, Appletons, \$2.50) critics may be able to find vulnerable pickings here and there, but not one of them will dare to call the book dull. It is intensely interesting from cover to cover. It is written in the honest, straightforward, rich but unconventional style known to readers of the "Story of France" and "Napoleon." There is the same sure confidence of



conviction, the same refreshing absence of pretense of disinterestedness, which many vainly affect, and in their affectation make their partiality the more offensive. Mr. Watson is frankly an admirer and defender of Jefferson, and his book will stand as a brilliant interpretation and appreciation of its great subject.

It seems to me, however, hardly equal to the author's other work, certainly not to the splendid second volume of the "France," which is one of the most vivid and discerning specimens of historical writing in the language. The "Life of Jefferson" includes the Times in its title, which gives liberty for digression; but there is, it must be confessed, a lack of complete continuity, and some chapters seem to be drawn in rather by special purpose than by necessity. These chapters are not lacking in interest, but they detract from the effectiveness of the book as a whole. It is too evident that the author holds a brief for the South as to its part in the Revolutionary period of American history. This is perhaps well, as a balance to the too predominating New England color in most histories, but it might be wished that the balance were less strained. However, there is excuse. New England has been over-vain and self-assertive. In both history and literature, and Watson's book may perhaps prove to be a happy counter-irritant.

As to Jefferson himself, it may confidently be asserted that one will get from Mr. Watson's Life the best general view of the man that has been presented, and for the very natural reason that Mr. Watson is himself a man who is democrat enough to understand Jefferson. That many who have written about Jefferson could not understand him—Roosevelt for example—Mr. Watson shows very conclusively. Democracy is of the heart as well as of the head, and Jefferson was a democrat in heart. He was a democrat by nature, as Mr. Watson shows, and drew his inspiration from his being, and not from France. Why he was such a genuine democrat, opposing every instinct of the aristocratic Virginian—who knows? The wind bloweth where it listeth, Jefferson might have taken primogeniture and the established church as other well-born Virginians did, but he did not. His life would have been far easier had he done so, but he did not. It was born in him to oppose special privilege, this is all that can be said. It is absurd, as Mr. Watson shows, to date Jefferson's democracy from his contact with the French revolution and French philosophy.

In viewing Jefferson the man, Mr. Watson is very candid in stating the great statesman's religious views. It is well known that Jefferson rejected—though he was a deeply religious man in the truest sense of the word—all of

that which we falsely call the supernatural. It should always be stated in connection with Jefferson's sayings on this subject that he was among the first-fruits of the modern scientific spirit. This spirit, a century after it struck Jefferson, is still immersed in secondary causes, and fancies, because it explains these, that it explains everything. Science does not yet see that although it talks of the chemistry of soils, the red of the rose is still a mystery; that although it talks of combustion, the light of a gas jet is as wonderful as ever; that although it gives names to volts and ohms, electricity is still occult. Science still satisfies itself with explanation of secondary causes. What wonder then that Jefferson, whose keen intellect was open to all of the new influences of science that were first beginning to flow, should have been carried away by its spirit of independent opposition to the "supernatural," as the word was understood in his day, was an almost inevitable incident of his openmindedness and his naturally scientific disposition. This should be taken into account whenever his religious views are discussed.

Among the subjects of Mr. Watson's interesting asides are the Constitution and the Federal courts. Speaking of the leaders who made the Constitution, he says: "It is all a mistake to say that they meant to establish a rule of the people. On the contrary, they meant to make it impossible for the people to control the government." Is it not easy to see to-day that this is true? Can we not see that Hamilton and Marshall have done their work? "As surely," says Mr. Watson, "as harvest is due to the sower, Alexander Hamilton was the father of plutocracy, the trust and the lobby."

As to the Federal courts, he tells of Jefferson's foreboding and dread of their exorbitant power. "From the time," he says, "that he first realized the unique position of the Federal judiciary in our system, Mr. Jefferson was its bitter enemy. It violated all his ideas of democracy. . . . A body so independent of the popular will, and clothed with the tremendous power of setting aside the statutes of every State and of the United States, was by the very law of its nature antagonistic to the principle upon which democratic government is founded." Continuing, he says: "Jefferson dreaded it, prophesied against it, bewailed its irresistible power. Reading his gloomy forecasts, one almost believes he anticipated government by injunction and the advent of the deputy marshal."

But it would be impossible in a brief review to call attention to half the interesting features of this biography. If anyone wishes to read a book that will give the clear-sighted views of a genuine believer in popular sovereignty upon the beginnings of our govern-

ment, a book that will give a sympathetic insight into the mind of the superior thinker of those times, a book that will tell these things with the interest of a well-written novel, let him read Watson's "Life and Times of Thomas Jefferson."

There are a number of slips in the proofreading which it is to be hoped a new edition will correct.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—Cattle (The Human Species). By Archle Bell, Cleveland, O. A bit of Whitmanesque verse, strenuous, severe and revolutionary. The spirit is disclosed by this quotation: "Cattle? O, Lord, Thou knowest who the cattle are! They do not dwell in the hovels of poverty and filth, they do not toil in the factories from morn till eve, they do not lie awake at night wondering what of grief awaits them on the morrow—Nay, they are in the palaces of the rich."

—Ben Blunt, His Life and Story. Greatly Abridged and Truly Told with Much Thrilling and Ingenious Comment Thereon. An Historical Romance. By Speed Mosby, Jefferson City, Mo. To be reviewed.

—The Immortality of Animals, and the Relation of Man as Guardian, from a Biblical and Philosophical Hypotheses. By E. D. Bruckner, M. D., Philadelphia: Geo. W. Jacobs & Co. To be reviewed.

PERIODICALS.

Besides Henry George's second article on "Modern Methods of Finance," which deals with the copper combine, Pearson's for January offers an interesting historical article by Edward N. Valandigham. It is the story of the first "dark horse" in American politics. Pearson's lighter stories are as interesting as usual.

Although comparisons, especially of the living, are odious, it may be said that Thomas Hardy is the greatest of living novelists. He is also a poet, and in his poetry no less than in his later novels he shows that he does not admire things as they are in civilization and society. "Mr. Hardy's poems," says a writer of Literary Chat in the January Munsey, "are of a world which God—he seems to assume the existence of a God just for his own sinister purpose—has forgotten." This is a criticism entirely beside the mark. Mr. Hardy makes no assumption of a God forgetting the world, but there is a strong implication that the world is forgetting God.—J. H. D.

William C. Whitney, ex-cabinet minister and horse racer; John W. Gates,

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.



AN INITIAL DIFFICULTY.

Chamberlain—Now Mr. Bull, the very first necessity of the case is that you consent swallow this.  
 Mr. Bull—And that is precisely what I positively refuse to do under any circumstances!

Phillips, of Chicago, "Corn King;" Brown, of New Orleans, "Cotton King," and others of their kind, take their place along side of Pat Sheedy, Al Adams, Canfield and John Kelly, "a speculator who deals in chips instead of wheat," in an interesting article by James L. Ford in the January Leslie's Monthly on "The Gambling Spirit, the poison pervading our modern American life. Leslie's Monthly is deservedly taking high rank for the value and interest as well as for the literary excellence of its contents. Its short stories are as good in their kind as are the articles on subjects of a more serious nature.—J. H. D.

Mr. Bryan, speaking of Lord Rosebery in an interesting letter published in the Commoner of December 25, said: "His reception at the Surrey theater, South London, was as cordial as Mr. Chamberlain's reception at Cardiff. With all the arts of the orator he repelled the attacks of Mr. Chamberlain and arraigned the policy of the Conservatives. He denied that there was any excuse, to use his words, for the 'lamentations of the modern Jeremiah.'" Thus we see that the Liberals in England and the standpatters, who are willing to shout for prosperity as it is, and to deny that there is any excuse for complaints. Lord Rosebery ought to read the Yellow Van, the People of the Abyss, the works of Booth and Rowntree, and then perhaps he might see that the strength of Chamberlain is the poverty of the people and the cowardice of his own Liberals. Mr. Chamberlain is right

—landlordism and protection go well together.—J. H. D.

Under an appropriate heading—"The Philosophy of Freedom"—the Nebraska Independent continues to publish an open forum for Single Taxers. Mr. J. C. Barnes, of Hindsboro, Ill., is the leading contributor to this department in the issue of December 24, his subject being the "Paramount Issue." Mr. Barnes begins his letter: "I see you put the money question paramount to all other questions. I did, too, until I learned of the single tax." The Independent, in a note, takes issue with Mr. Barnes, claiming that "until we make a radical change in our revenue laws, which include the coining of money, the single tax—as many single taxers present it—is lame." The writer does not explain what he means by the insertion "as many single taxers present it," nor is it clear from his own sentences about "money" and "coin" why he should make the money question, however important, the paramount issue.—J. H. D.

**SOCIALISM vs. SINGLE TAX**

A verbatim report of the Turner Hall Debate between Louis F. Post, Henry H. Harding and John Z. White, Single Taxers, and Ernest Untermyann, Seymour Steadman and A. M. Simons, Socialists, will be published in book form on Jan. 21, 1904, and advance orders will receive prompt attention. The volume will contain full-page portraits of Karl Marx, Henry George, and the six debaters, and will be handsomely printed on fine book paper with stiff paper cover. Price 25 cents, five copies for \$1.00, twelve copies for \$2.00, postage included. Address: CHARLES H. KEER & CO., 56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.

**CONTRACTORS.**

G. H. ATKINSON & CO., CONTRACTORS,  
 JERSEY CITY, N. J.  
 Electric Light, Telephone and Municipal Work.  
 Trolley Roads Built and Financed.

**The Public**

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

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.  
 Frelsey E. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

**HENRY B. TAWRESEY,**

ATTORNEY-AT-LAW,  
 1106 Real Estate Trust Building, S. E. Cor. Broad and Chestnut Sts., Philadelphia.

**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.

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 palatable 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

**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 Unity Building, CHICAGO