

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 9, 1904.

Number 327.

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.

At the convention of the Pennsylvania Bar Association last week, Woodrow Wilson, president of Princeton university, said a very good and timely thing about the legal profession. He characterized it as having fallen to the grade of a mere "bread and butter pursuit." This may be pessimistic, but it is true. Lawyers have as a rule ceased to be the professional men they once were. They have become mere confidential clerks. A corporation wants something done; no matter what, so long as they want it; and their expert legal clerks are expected to do it—by hook or by crook, through city councils, legislatures, Congress and the courts, just as their experts in other departments are expected to accomplish results in those departments. Financial results, not even-handed justice, is the goal of the lawyer to-day. He who gets these results, no matter how (provided he escapes the penitentiary and disbarment) is the successful lawyer; he who does not or will not, may eke out a livelihood with miscellaneous practice, but he can expect no more.

It was a scathing criticism of our public morality which Jacob H. Plain, of Aurora, Ill., a defaulting bank cashier, made when he said to a Chicago Tribune correspondent on the 3d:

I simply did what half your successful cashiers in Chicago have done. In my case the result was disaster; in their case it is success. Everything depends on the turn of the cards. Look at the case of one very prominent banker. Ten years ago he hadn't enough money to pay a hotel bill; to-day he is a mil-

lionaire. Do you think he saved it out of his salary?

The bitterness of this accusation is in its substantial truthfulness. Mr. Plain was highly respected. He was pointed to as an example for the young. True, it was not known that he was then already a defaulter. But if his criminal operations had proved successful, he would still have been held up as an example. His secret "borrowing," all paid back with "scrupulous honesty," and perhaps with interest, would have been regarded as an interesting episode in a remarkably successful career. But he failed. His "borrowings" cannot be returned. He is consequently a criminal and no longer an example to the young. But analyze it all, and why is he no longer an example? Is it because he embezzled, or because his speculations failed? When men like John D. Rockefeller are held up as examples, and fortunes like the Gould fortune are given certificates of good character, it can hardly be said that the misguided Plain would not have been admired as an exemplar of success had his speculations succeeded, even if the fact of his embezzlement had leaked out.

More light is thrown by the coroner's jury at Victor, Colorado, upon the character of the riot there a few days ago and the responsibility for the killing (pp. 145, 156), than that body probably intended. They say that an armed body of miners had assembled and "were appointed special policemen for the city of Victor, and, while the act of deputizing said men gave them temporarily a color of office, the said men congregated and armed themselves for an unlawful purpose." What that "unlawful purpose" may have been this mine-owners' jury do not explain. But the circumstances to

which they allude are well known. A mine owners' mob had assembled in the streets. It was addressed by the secretary of the Mine Owners' association, who urged indiscriminate hangings at lampposts, etc. Soon afterward there was shooting, but by whom no one knows, and the jury only professes to "believe." Now if it is true that under these circumstances the civil authorities were deputizing special policemen, they were performing their sworn duty; and when a coroner's jury holds those deputies responsible for the homicides of that riot, because, and only because, they were duly appointed special deputies and were arming—ostensibly, and so far as appears, actually—to preserve the peace in regular and lawful form, it still further exposes the lawless character of the lynch law government at Victor which the military are supporting. By their own unguarded confession they have indicted the legal posse comitatus.

The animus of this jury is made more manifest by its indictment of Moyer for "aiding, abetting, inciting," etc. At the time of the riot Moyer was in military custody at Telluride, miles and miles away from Victor, and for months had been in such custody there, and in such close custody that his friends could not communicate with him and even the local courts could not reach him. When these circumstances are considered the able dissenting opinion of Judge Steele, of the Supreme Court, who holds that the court ought to maintain the efficacy of the writ of habeas corpus, commands attention, even if it is but as the voice of one sane judge crying out in a wilderness of judicial insanity.

It would appear that the whole performance in Colorado for which

Gov. Peabody is primarily responsible has been in bad faith. His latest action certainly is. When Moyer applied to the Federal court for relief by habeas corpus, Peabody opposed him. But when the writ was allowed, Peabody put Moyer into civil custody before the writ could be served, so as to be able to reply to the Federal court, as he has now done, that Moyer is not in his custody. The purpose of this trifling with the court, was, of course, to prevent an inquiry into the lawless conduct of the State administration.

SOCIALISM, ANARCHISM AND CONSERVATISM.

A signed editorial which I recently contributed to The Public (p. 115) compared radicalism with conservatism, reaching the conclusion that true conservatives strive for the preservation of what they conceive to be good, while true radicals endeavor to overthrow what they conceive to be bad. Both were credited, therefore, with honestly pursuing the same ultimate object with reference to human society; namely, that stability which is not stagnation with that progress which is not mere change.

Let us now make a concrete application of that view of the complementary functions of radicalism and conservatism.

Radicalism indicates the results of its diagnosis of society disorders in the remedies it presents. These are known as anarchism and socialism. Both born of radicalism, they are so intimately associated in the vehement condemnation indiscriminately heaped upon them by alleged expounders of conservatism, that the mass of easily satisfied people look upon and obediently denounce the two as though they were indistinguishable twins, thus avoiding the troublesome duty of really considering them at all.

As a matter of fact, however, socialism and anarchism will have nothing to do with each other; they are as unlike as white and black, and as far apart as the poles. Socialism would subordinate the individual and extend the

powers of government; anarchism would entirely free the individual from government control. All government versus no government! Both radical propositions, to be sure, but absolutely opposed to each other. If one is all right the other is all wrong.

But if neither is all right, then it is likely that neither is all wrong—that there is an element of truth in each. And, as existing institutions recognize that the individual should be in some respects free from government control and in others subject to government control, it is easy to conclude, socialism and anarchy being both condemned either with or without a hearing, that existing institutions are about right. Which pleasing conclusion is so welcome and satisfactory to the average comfortably-circumstanced conservative, so-called, that he has little ear for cries of distress, little patience with warnings of disaster, little interest in what does not appear to bear directly upon his own well-being.

But between the extremes of socialism and anarchy there is dangerous sailing. Rocks of privilege and exploitation on the one hand, and of confusion and strife on the other, leave but a narrow course of safety; and the drift of insidious currents and storms of revolution are constantly threatening. Pessimism knows of these dangers and of the unhappy voyages and disastrous wrecks that have resulted, and looks forward with fear and hopelessness. Optimism has a constant faith that there are safe waters and that they are within reach. But it is an ignorant optimism that knows not of the dangers, and a false optimism that would not guard against them. How to effectively do this, how to provide a compass that will point true, is the problem that conservatism must solve, if it would retain leadership against the claims of radicalism; for uneasiness and discontent are increasing with a growing sense of injustice and they demand that something be done.

Conservatism, being disinclined to accept radical theories, and still less inclined to advocate radical measures, naturally looks for a "happy mean" between two extremes. Therefore, viewing with disfavor anarchism, or "no gov-

ernment," on the one hand, and thorough-going socialism, or "all government," on the other hand, it naturally expects to find the normal relation between the individual and society, a medium between these two extremes. But intelligent conservatism cannot be content with a haphazard median position. If, indeed, both extremes are wrong, then there must be a normal intermediate line, and such line must be laid down as a guide. In other words, the natural law relating to society must be found and followed.

To believe that man's social well-being is not subject to natural law, is as unscientific as to believe that the material world is not governed by such law; and to drift in ignorance of it is fully as dangerous in one case as the other. To contentedly accept the mass of misery under which mankind staggers as the natural effect of God's law, rather than as the consequence only of man's ignorant or willful infraction of it, is a form of paganism which must appeal to the normal mind as utterly inconsistent with the conception of a loving and just God. The truly reverent mind must cling to the thought that it is not God's fault, but man's. And there can be no higher duty than endeavoring to determine, and to get into harmony with, the natural law governing man in his social relations; for such law will govern as inevitably as the law of gravity, whether recognized or not.

Let us note some of the obvious symptoms of disease which conservatism can hardly fail to observe in spite of any so-called optimistic tendency to look only at the best side of the case, and a practical inability to clearly see the worst side from a remote point of view.

First, it will notice an existing concentration of wealth and wealth-power in the hands of a relatively small class that is already startling; and a rate of increasing concentration that is unprecedented in the history of the world.

Second, that notwithstanding the multiplication of the productive power of the average workman of to-day, owing to marvelous discoveries and improvements in

the means of production, he is still compelled to work as hard as ever for practically a bare subsistence; that instead of increased leisure for himself, even his children are forced in increasing numbers and at a critical stage of development, into mills and factories, for long hours and a meager compensation.

Third, that the opportunity to thus work has come to be looked upon quite generally, even by dispirited workmen, as a privilege to be thankful for, and the possible loss of a secured position as an ever-present danger. And this notwithstanding limitless natural opportunities to labor, and a demand for labor products so meagerly supplied that the mass of workers, or would-be-workers, are in constant need often of even the necessities of life.

Can it be reasonably questioned that there are limitless natural opportunities for man to produce, by labor, whatever is necessary to the satisfying of his needs and desires? It is impossible really to believe that nature is at fault so long as its bounties, even as they are now imperfectly known to man's intelligence, have been little more than touched. It has been estimated that a single State of these United States would afford more than ample opportunity for the maintenance of their entire population. The productive power of the average worker, even with the crude facilities of a hundred years ago, was so far in excess of his cost of maintenance, that every addition to the force of workers was gladly welcomed as being obviously beneficial to the country. The fact that this welcome is by no means general now, notwithstanding the greatly increased productive powers of workers, is merely another symptom of the diseased condition of the social system. Nature is bountiful beyond human comprehension; to lay the blame upon her, is so unreasonable as to amount to a cowardly and impious shifting of it.

But with nature offering boundless opportunities, and the mass of mankind capable of producing far more than is needed for their material well-being, why is it that they are practically forced to make the securing of a comfortable existence the main object of

their lives? Why are poverty and the fear of poverty and their complements, wealth-power and inordinate greed, the dominant motives of action? To complacently assume that the material condition of individuals fairly measures their deserts, to close the eyes to obvious facts that disprove it, and the ears to all pleas and demands for consideration and remedy, both reason and the records of history clearly show is to invite disaster, and genuine conservatism must concede at least fair if not sympathetic consideration of the problem.

It is the main purpose of this paper to impress the need of earnestly and honestly studying the problem, not merely as an abstract question, but as one that is pressing for solution both because of present suffering and a threatening crisis; to show that an inert conservatism which now contemptuously ignores unpleasant facts and disquieting propositions of reform should be aroused into an active force that can be effective in preserving the good that has been attained by overthrowing the rapidly growing evil that threatens it. But the subject would be very inadequately presented without following further the lines of conservative investigation suggested.

It has been submitted that it is incumbent on conservatism, in condemning the remedies proposed by the antagonistic branches of radicalism, to point out a logical median line between thorough-going individualism (anarchism) and thorough-going socialism. A position that cannot be defined is too weak to command the respect of positive, logical minds. Herbert Spencer's definition is that each individual "has freedom to do all that he wills, provided that he infringes not the equal freedom of any other"; and the limitation of governmental power implied in this, and which is not accepted by socialism, is one that logical conservatives must accept. This narrows the question to "What powers must be exercised by government to secure to each individual this equal freedom to do as he wills?"

That the equal freedom of all men to labor and produce as they

will can only be secured to the weaker or less aggressive members of society by government, is denied by anarchism but it is accepted by conservatism. This, indeed, is the main purpose of government, for if equal right to labor and produce be not secured to each individual, he will be wronged to the extent that he is deprived of it. If denied him utterly he could not exist except by charity; if limited by the exactions of tribute he will be to that extent robbed of the fruits of his labor as certainly as if they were taken from him by burglary. It is the proper function of government to protect him from both forms of robbery. If government fails to do this it is inefficient. If it uses its powers directly or indirectly to further one or other, it is to that extent not beneficent but harmful; it establishes injustice instead of justice.

It behooves conservatism to consider how far existing governments fail of their beneficent purpose. To note carefully the main symptoms of disease and to search for adequate causes in the governmental regulation of society; bearing in mind that no errors or wrong-doing in administration, but only deep-seated defect in existing governmental systems can explain evil results that are world-wide. Let conservatism note that the one essential to man's physical well-being is that he shall have freedom to labor and produce as he wills, and see whether or not government regulations secure to him this freedom; whether or not they permit or enforce such restriction of it as to explain the abnormal social conditions existing throughout the world. Let it note that this is a world's problem, not a local issue.

In New York city a reassessment of real estate values was recently completed under Mayor Low's administration in which the figures were in round numbers as follows:

Total of assessed real estate	\$4,797,000,000
Total of improvement values	1,100,000,000
Total of land values.....	3,697,000,000
Total of exempted real estate, public and religious, land and improvements	826,000,000

What do these monstrous land-value figures mean?

We readily understand that it is the capitalized value of the present or prospective income derivable from the bare land so assessed. Assuming that it is capitalized on a four per cent. basis this indicates a net income of \$147,000,000 annually from this bare land, irrespective of the improvements upon it. Let us consider from what source this immense annual payment is drawn, where it goes to, and why.

That it is paid by the users of the land to the legal owners is clear, and that it must be withdrawn from the proceeds of the business carried on by the user is equally so. That it goes to the legal owner is due to governmental regulations which compel it. This payment in no degree relieves the user of the land from the payment, directly and indirectly, of taxes for expenses of government, but it is merely an additional payment which government compels him to make, not for public use, but for the private use of the legal owner. If the legal owner has just claim to it, then government is merely exercising its proper functions; otherwise not. Let us consider his claim.

The improvement value is a labor product, the legal title to which is based upon the equitable right of the laborer to the fruit of his toil and the free transfer of it. It is equitably as well as legally private property.

Land value is now being clearly and generally recognized as having an entirely different basis. It is not a labor product at all but a monopoly value. It is measured not by labor cost but by demand for use; and this demand is created by population. It is, therefore, a value created by society, and not by individuals. With this fact clearly recognized it must be admitted that it is equitably public property and not private property.

This equitable right has, however, been practically set aside by the granting of legal titles by government, giving individuals exclusive control of specified portions of land, subject only to the payment of duly levied taxes thereon. Taxes have been universally so levied upon these portions of land

as to absorb only a fraction of their annual value for use, thus allowing the legal owner to collect full payment and to retain the bulk of it for his individual use. The capitalization of this retained payment approximately determines the assessed land values as quoted above for New York city, and the selling price if so transferred. The present titles have thus been mainly acquired by substantial payments to preceding holders who carry back to original government grants more or less remote. The effect of these titles has been and is to confiscate to private use the main portion of values created by society and equitably belonging to the public.

What is the natural effect of this legal confiscation of public values to private use? It is obviously a present burden of \$147,000,000 annually on the industry of New York city; and it is a corresponding burden upon industry everywhere. The recipients, as such, give nothing in return; it is a pure bounty to them. But the disarrangement of normal conditions resulting is worse in its effects than this great burden. The equal freedom of all men to labor and produce as they will is so far from being secured by such governmental regulations, that access to natural opportunities for labor (among the most important of which are those created under natural law by the close association of men in communities) can only be had by the payment of tribute to individuals. Exploitation and speculation are substituted for free competition and honest enterprise. The disease thus diagnosed adequately accounts not only for the symptoms noted but for many others.

Booker T. Washington tells a story about a slave who one day appeared in a red velvet waistcoat, and straightway was seized and taken before the master to whom it, and he, belonged. Well, Jerome managed to prove that he had not stolen the waistcoat. Calhoun Hamilton stole it and Jerome had bought it from Calhoun for a small sum. "Now, Jerome," the master said, "I admit you're not a thief, but you're a receiver of stolen goods, and that's just as bad." "No, no, sir," said Jerome, "No, no, that is not just as bad by

no means." "Why isn't it just as bad?" asked the master. "Because you wouldn't receive stolen goods yourself, sir, if it was bad." "How do you mean? Me a receiver of stolen goods? Explain yourself," the master commanded. "Well, sir," said Jerome, "you bought and paid for me the same as I bought and paid for that red waistcoat. Well, wasn't I stolen the same as the waistcoat was? Wasn't I stolen out of Africa?"

It is very unlikely that the master saw it so, but the fact is now generally recognized that the master's title to the slave was not made good by the fact that he had bought and paid for him; the slave's title to himself was always the only good title in equity, and it was liable at any time to be made good legally. The selling price of the slave was based upon the legal power of the master to appropriate to his own use a portion of the fruit of the slave's labor which equitably belonged to the slave himself. The only remedy for chattel slavery was to free the slave from this legalized extortion. The proposition that the selling price of land is just as clearly based upon the legal power of the owner to appropriate to his own use a portion of the fruits of others' labor, which equitably belongs to and should be used for the public; and that the only remedy for such tribute slavery is to free society from this legalized extortion, is now demanding consideration. Whether conservatism will be aroused to the necessity of considering it and of providing a conservative but real remedy; or whether it shall be left perhaps to develop another catastrophe such as wiped out chattel slavery, is a question that conservatives, however reluctantly, must apparently take part in deciding.

WALTER G. STEWART.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

INDIA.

Delhi, Ind., April 2.—India, containing one-sixth of the population of the world, should be interesting to us because of its similarity in relationship to our Philippines, and especially because our imperialists at home point with pride to England's rule here.

Let it not be assumed that England rules without criticism and protest. For the last 19 years the most intellec-

tual Indians, mostly college graduates, have assembled in Congress and formulated their complaints in subservient and sycophantic language. A person needs only to read a few of the speeches to feel the deep underlying grudge the Indian harbors. Indeed, one of the ablest writers on India, Meredith Townsend, a man of 50 years' experience in the colony, and a radical thinker whose thoughts are highly prized by leading London periodicals, says that after over 100 years of rule there are not 10,000 natives who, uncoerced and unbribed, would lay down their lives for English sovereignty; that the English are hated most where they are best known in India; and that in the Sepoy mutiny of 1857 the favorite native regiments were the most dangerous and treacherous. "There is no province, no tribe, no native organization in India upon which, in the event of disaster, she [Great Britain] can rely for aid." The Indian empire may be said to be a corporation of less than 1,500 men, who are set to govern and who protect themselves in governing by finding pay for a minute white garrison of 65,000 men.

The Indian's criticism in a nutshell is that England rules India for English gain and not for her benefit. When, for instance, cotton manufacture sprang up in India like a mushroom in the night and increased eight and ten fold in a few years, the British imposed an excise tax thereon, of course in favor of Manchester (England) cotton mills. The Indians here are watching with much eagerness the outcome of Joe Chamberlain's somersault on the tariff issue. If Canada and Australia thereby secure for the purpose of imperial unity preferential treatment for their grain, is India to be treated as a stepchild and thus indirectly be legislated against? Is the poorest land in the world supporting a dense population by the most intense labor in irrigation to bear additional indirect taxation for the sake of British imperial unity? Are the millions of souls periodically required to be sacrificed on the altar of famine and pestilence for the good of India by the love and benevolence of Britania not enough? From 1880 to 1890 the occupancy rights to 1,963,364 acres were offered for sale by reason of default in the payment of taxes, and 1,174,143 acres were returned unsold for want of bidders and bid in by the government. Does this not prove an unbearable rate of taxation? The annual tribute India must pay for British love is \$100,000,000 annually paid in extravagant salaries and liberal pensions. Is it any wonder that this proud, domineering Briton, sapping the life blood of the poor colony, awaiting impatiently the expiration of his service in India for the enjoyment of his half-deserved pension at home, living in this black country only by the grace and assistance financially and physically of the black man, is secretly despised?

But the answer to all this is the "Pax Britannicus"—without British peace there would be anarchy and bloodshed. The Indian replies that the killing of a few hundred thousand in religious conflicts far outweighs in social and religious benefits the slow and blighting process of killing millions by starvation and famine. How did the European gain his civilization but by international, interracial, interreligious conflicts involving the death of many millions of people in the strife? Did it not require strife involving the sacrifice of millions of dollars of property and the blood of hundreds of thousands of men to maintain American unity? These Indians are not stupid people. They claim not only to be equal but even superior in intellect to the Briton and boast that they can pass any examination that the Briton can.

In regard to the judicial system much criticism is offered by the Indian. How can he secure justice when prosecutor and judge are one and the same official? How can native and English fare alike when with a few dozen Englishmen residing in a city (of the 300,000,000 people in India, excluding the white soldiers, there are but 65,000 English in all India), an Englishman is tried by a jury of his peers, Englishmen, and a native by a mixed jury. In the latter case, the wheels of justice hampered and checked at every point by British supervision, modification and nullification, the high offices, civil, military and judicial, all being filled by Englishmen. A bill is even now pending to throw the burden of proof upon the defendant, contrary to every maxim of civilized jurisprudence. In the Assam tea districts, where field labor is hired at \$1.65 per month on a three years' contract, natives are guarded by armed pickets posted on brick walls about the plantation. About two per cent. of such labor deserts with opportunity, when "Pax Britannicus" invokes the goddess of justice to arrest the deserter, contrary to the civilized legal principle that no man shall be imprisoned for debt.

As to education, the census shows that ten per cent. of the males are literate and .006 of the females. The native Congress is agitating general compulsory education, but whoever has watched the course of imperialism knows that it can never exist where education flourishes. The doctrine of imperialism tends toward special privileges, special opportunities, special education, special power, and a corresponding debasement of the privileges and powers of the masses.

The policy of the English government in India, as must necessarily be that of every alien governmental authority, can be foretold upon every measure and at all times accordingly as it tends towards equality or inequality, democracy or aristocracy. In proportion as such legislation encourages the equality or op-

portunity it hastens and deepens the pitfall of its very existence.

One of the means of centralizing the English power is the land tenure system. I do not know what proportion—for statistics concerning English rule are very difficult to obtain—of the land is owned by the government; but I am credibly informed that fully one-half is so owned and leased on terms of 30 years or less at a fixed rental. This enables the government to reward the faithful and punish the unfaithful. It is an approach to the Henry George idea, though not carried out in his spirit. That would be too equitable and destroy the weapon. The present inequitable method of leasing land at a rental depending upon the dyspepsia or gout of the land commissioner, permits the English government to tax the people off the land, thereby minimizing their interest and patriotism in India.

Since the mutiny in 1857 the English do not hesitate to show their distrust of the natives. No natives are permitted inside of any of the numerous forts in the heart of the large cities; natives are employed on guard duty during the day, but at night all must vacate the premises and Englishmen stand guard. There are no batteries of native artillery of any importance. The British troops, before the mutiny one-sixth of the native, are now about one-half. No firearms of any kind are permitted to be purchased or sold by a native without a special license. The English may be successful temporarily in governing 300,000,000 natives, but their policy does not create content nor is it benevolent assimilation.

India enjoys the "Pax Britannicus," but who, being unbiased and unprejudiced, will not concede that it is a blighting, withering, debilitating, degenerating decay? Is the "Pax Britannicus" the explanation of the fact that with the exception of France and Ireland India's population has increased less in percentage than any other civilized or semi-civilized country?

JOHN A. ZANGERLE.

AUSTRALIA.

Corowa, N. S. W., June 3.—As prophesied in my letter of April 22 (p. 118), Mr. Deakin, then the ministerial leader in the Federal House of Representatives, has resigned, and the Labor leader, Mr. Watson, has formed a new ministry.

When this had been done the House adjourned and Mr. Reid, the free trade or Opposition leader, and Mr. Deakin, the leader of the deposed protection or Conservative party, met to try to arrange a coalition. After negotiating for several days, they agreed personally upon a programme, but made no arrangement as to leadership. This tentative programme left the fiscal tariff question in abeyance during the life of the present parliament.

Mr. Reid's followers in the House decided unanimously to support him in connection with the proposed coalition programme; but the extreme protectionist wing of Deakin's party (led by Sir William Lyne), opposed any coalition whatever with the free traders. The majority of the old ministerial party would probably nevertheless have agreed, but Deakin, although he urged his followers to join the coalition, stated he would not take office in a coalition government. After a good deal of discussion the Deakin party refused to join that of Reid.

The Labor party also offered to form a coalition with the Deakinites, but that too was refused; so there are still three parties in the house, as before.

The Watson (Labor) ministry has put before the House a very mild programme for the present. It has dropped the clause to include all public servants in the arbitration bill, upon which it defeated the Deakin ministry, but it will probably try to include all railway employees.

The Victoria State elections were held on June 1st, with this result.

Ministerialists	38
Opposition	11
Labor	19

The Opposition and Labor parties both advocate land value taxation.

ERNEST BRAY.

ST. LOUIS.

St. Louis, Mo., July 6.—There is only one marked difference between the Republican convention recently held at Chicago, and the Democratic convention now in session here. The great corporations control here as they did there. The politicians for plunder are in the saddle here as they were there. The "band wagon" element is dominant here as it was there. But there was no protest there, save La Follette's, and that was promptly suppressed. All was harmony. The whole Republican convention surrendered to its plutocratic masters without so much as a whimper. But here there is a protest, a fight, an effort at least, however ineffective, to prove that not the whole Democratic party is owned by the corporations and bossed by hungry office seekers. Therein is the only important difference between the two conventions.

The atmosphere for days has been an office-hunting atmosphere. It is amazing, the candor with which men, even men supposed to be men of principle and conviction, have brushed off all pretense of principle and boldly avowed either by word or deed, that their only object is to get office, or, as most of them put it, to "get into the band wagon." Here is an instance which is typical in spirit, though slightly unusual in expression. A delegate from Oklahoma was overheard "barking" for Park-

er to a group on the street. One of the group asked:

"What has Parker done to make him a good candidate?"

"It makes no difference what he done," was the response; "it's what he do."

"Well, what will he do?"

"He'll make me marshal of Oklahoma for \$4,000 a year; that what he do," came the answer.

"But what are his principles?"

"Oh, to hell with principle; what I want is the loaves and fishes."

This was an actual occurrence and, its spirit, I repeat, was typical. Precisely the same idea was expressed by William T. McMahan, an old-fashioned Democrat down Cincinnati way, who declared at the caucus of the Ohio delegation that he wanted a candidate who "not only can carry the country, but will take care of you young fellows when he gets in." Mr. McMahan made no other requirement.

Yet he it was who at the same caucus defeated Tom L. Johnson, 26 to 20, for Ohio member of the committee on resolutions. He was McLean's candidate, and this contest between him and Johnson was the first test of strength in the Ohio delegation.

Had the field been clear for a fight in Ohio when the primaries were approaching last Spring, Johnson could have defeated McLean, although it would have required a strenuous primary fight all over the State to do it, for spoils and boodle are alluring bait. But at that time the meretricious Hearst campaign invaded Ohio, and Johnson was forced either to support Hearst, which was simply out of the question (as all self-respecting Hearst men ought by this time to understand), or else to precipitate a conflict between radical Democrats, and so make even greater demoralization. He wisely decided to do neither. Before primaries are on again in Ohio, the air will be pretty well cleared and Johnson's friends will be glad that he reserved his strength for a fight worth making.

The "band wagon" campaigning which has turned over the convention here to professional politicians is bad enough in itself. But in itself it is not the worst of the situation. For behind these spoils-men are the same corporate influences that were behind those of the Republican convention, and that means fat campaign funds. Spoils if successful, and campaign funds anyhow, are a great power in politics.

With the railroads, the Standard Oil company, and the influences of Wall street as represented by August Belmont—with these distinctive powers in the ascendent, well served by "band-waggoners," the convention assembled at noon to-day. Though the attendance was large, there were many empty seats in the galleries. Shuffling noises were so general throughout the day's proceedings that the speaking could be

heard only a few feet from the rostrum. This was partly because it was not very good speaking. The voice of John Sharp Williams is thin and without carrying power; and, although his gestures are impressive and graceful, his presence is not of the kind that commands attention from great audiences. His long drawn-out speech soon became wearisome to an audience which had to strain attention to catch here and there a word.

Unfortunately Mr. Williams's manner of speaking was no worse than the matter of his speech. His speech was the poorest apology for a keynote speech that the enemy could possibly desire. Of the mere stump speech grade, it was defensive in character, evasive as to principle, disgusting in the indecency of its expression of race animosity, and altogether lacking in the qualities that arouse the higher instincts and inspire noble enthusiasms. Mr. Williams has distinctly deteriorated. It is not long since he exhibited signs of statesmanship; but his keynote speech reduces him to the level of the "band wagon" politician.

This is not to say that Mr. Williams's speech was without merit in every detail. He said some good things in a strong way—not many, but some. One of these was his demand that we shall "not make of the army and navy of the United States a constabulary for the collection of European debts from the governments or peoples of South and Central America." But brave words like these can count for little in the speech of a man who, knowing what free trade is and believing in it, as Mr. Williams has heretofore indicated that he does, turns off the tariff issue with a few vague generalities. Much can be excused in Mr. Williams with reference to his views on the race question. His home environment is such that allowances must in fairness be made. But he should realize that whatever his own views on that subject may be, it behooves him not to revive the old sectional and race questions as national issues. His projection into national politics of the "white man's government" proposition with its principle of legalizing status, is intolerable; and his objection to the adjustment of national representation on the basis of suffrage is indefensible. This attitude of his is unfortunate, and so was a certain pervading sentiment in the convention of which he was the spokesman. Not only did Mr. Williams repeat the ante-bellum doctrines of unequal rights which the Democratic party of Toombs represented, but the audience galvanized that old party, when after listening without much emotion to the "Star Spangled Banner," it burst into enthusiastic applause at the strains of "Dixie." This is a little matter in itself, but it is unhappily significant of a great matter. Under all the circumstances it signifies a disposition, and this is confirmed by Mr. Williams's speech, to undo the re-

sults of the civil war with reference to human rights.

That is a dangerous path for the Democratic party to enter upon. It is a dangerous direction for Southern sentiment to take. The civil war ended 40 years ago, and its animosities ought to be forgotten. Anything like hatred for the South should be denounced by every patriotic citizen. But if the South is fairly represented by Williams's speech, it is the South that challenges a rehearing on the humanity issues of the war, and invites a renewal of its animosities. It is one thing for the people of this country to forget the war; it is a very different thing for them to renounce its most vital results.

Williams's speech was quite in line with the platform he is understood to have drawn in behalf of the "band wagon" contingent which Judge Parker represents. This platform, published today in advance, exhibits some of the kind of handiwork for which David B. Hill is notorious. Like Williams's speech, it contains but little that is at once strong and good. In the main, it is vigorous as to wrong things, and weak as to good ones. It is a plain bid for plutocratic support, garnished with "taffy" for the unsophisticated, and interlined with "weasel words." Like the candidate for whom it is made, it is a "confidence" platform, made by "confidence" men, to bunko the confiding.

Three incidents of the first day's session are worthy of note. When Bryan appeared to take his seat with the Nebraska delegation, he received an ovation of applause. Later in the session, at a mention of Cleveland's name by the temporary chairman, there was long continued and frequently repeated applause, in which many Bryan men joined, supposing it was a demonstration for Bryan. Immediately after the close of the chairman's speech, there were general and persistent calls for Bryan. It is asserted that more than a third of the delegates are pledged not to vote for Parker until he gets two-thirds of the convention; but the general impression now is that Parker will be nominated on the first or second ballot. Whether this is a result of "band wagon" tactics, or a genuine probability, no one can safely say.

L. F. P.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, July 7.

The Democratic national convention (pp. 183, 184, 195, 204) met at St. Louis on the 6th. It was called to order by James K. Jones, chairman of the outgoing national committee, and John Sharp Wil-

liams, of Mississippi, was introduced as temporary chairman.

The Prohibition national convention, which met at Indianapolis on the 29th (p. 204) made nominations on the 30th. Until noon of that day there had been a strong movement favoring the nomination of Gen. Nelson A. Miles, but this was dissipated by the following telegram received from him by John G. Woolley, the leader in the Miles movement:

Hon. John G. Woolley, Prohibition National Convention, Indianapolis, Ind.:—Appreciating the good will of yourself and friends, I must earnestly request that my name be not used in the convention and that my letter of June 20 be considered final.

After adopting the platform the convention nominated Silas C. Swallow, of Pennsylvania, for President by acclamation, and George W. Carroll, of Texas, for Vice President, by a vote of 626 to 132.

The platform adopted by the convention describes the destruction of the liquor traffic as the paramount issue in American politics, and demands its abolition. On issues of minor concern it declares in favor of the impartial enforcement of all law, the application of the principles of justice to combinations of labor and of capital, the initiative and referendum, protection of American citizens everywhere and international arbitration, reform of divorce laws, extirpation of polygamy, and suppression of sexual prostitution, mental and moral qualifications for the suffrage, reference of the tariff question to a non-partisan commission, uniformity of laws "for all our country and dependencies," extension and honest administration of the civil service laws, and election of United States senators by popular vote.

The national convention of the People's party met on the 4th at Springfield, Ill. Prior to its meeting ex-Senator Butler, of North Carolina, resigned as chairman of the national committee, owing to inability to attend the convention, and J. A. Edmiston, of Nebraska, called the convention to order. W. H. Weller, of Iowa, formerly a Congressman from that State, was made temporary chairman, and

upon permanent organization J. M. Mallett, of Texas, was elected permanent chairman.

The platform adopted on the 5th declares in substance that—

The issuance of money should be regarded as a purely governmental function, and it should be issued "in such quantities as shall maintain a stability in prices, every dollar to be a full legal tender, none of which shall be a debt redeemable in other money." Governmental postal savings banks should be established. The right of labor to organize should be protected. Legal provision should "be made under which the people may exercise the initiative, referendum, and proportional representation and direct vote for all public officers with the right of recall." "We denounce" "government by injunction and imprisonment without the right of trial by jury." "Land, including all the natural sources of wealth, is a heritage of all the people, and should not be monopolized for speculative purposes, and alien ownership of land should be prohibited." "To prevent unjust discrimination and monopoly the government should own and control the railroads, and those public utilities which in their nature are monopolies. To perfect the postal service, the government should own and operate the general telegraph and telephone systems, and provide a parcels post. As to those trusts and monopolies which are not public utilities or natural monopolies, we demand that those special privileges which they now enjoy, and which alone enable them to exist, should be immediately withdrawn. Corporations, being the creatures of government, should be subjected to such governmental regulation and control as will adequately protect the public. We demand the taxation of monopoly privileges, while they remain in private hands to the extent of the value of the privileges granted. We demand that Congress shall enact a general law uniformly regulating the power and duties of all incorporated companies doing interstate business."

After adopting the platform the convention chose Thomas E. Watson, of Georgia, as the party's candidate for President, and Thomas H. Tibbles, of Nebraska, for the candidate for Vice President. The national committee elected James H. Ferris, of Joliet, Ill., for its chairman, and Charles Q. De France, of Lincoln, Nebraska, for secretary.

At the Republican convention of Michigan, on the 30th, Fred M. Warner was nominated for Gov-

error. On the same day the Republican convention of Vermont nominated Charles J. Bell. The Republican convention of Minnesota, which met on the 30th, with Senator M. E. Clapp as temporary chairman, became involved in a factional contest over the questions of contested seats. Feeling ran very high, and in the midst of the turmoil the convention adjourned for the day after leaving the selection of a credentials committee of fifteen to the temporary chairman. The matter was adjusted over night, and on the 1st, when the convention assembled, it nominated Robert C. Dunn for Governor by acclamation.

No improvement is apparent in the Colorado strike situation (p. 204), but there is important news regarding it. Judge Robert W. Steele, of the Supreme Court of Colorado, who dissented from Justices Gabbert and Campbell (p. 155) in the Moyer case, has filed his dissenting opinion. These two judges held that when the Governor declares any part of the State in insurrection his declaration cannot be disputed; and that whether it be true or false the statement must be taken as true and writs of habeas corpus as ineffective. They therefore left Moyer, the president of the Western Miners' Federation, in the custody of the military, by whom he had been arrested without warrant and was held without charges. Justice Steele declares in his dissenting opinion that—

the court has not construed the Constitution; it has ignored it.

He gives warning that—

if the military authority may deport the miners this year, it can deport the farmers next year.

In summing up he says:

No person who has the slightest claim to respectability should hesitate to approve the action of the Governor in enforcing the law, and I am willing to uphold him and to applaud him so long as he keeps within the lines of the Constitution. But I am not willing to uphold him when, in my opinion, he breaks down the barriers erected by the people for their protection, nor am I willing to accord to the Constitution elastic properties for the purpose of sustaining him, nor to join in the establishment of a precedent which will

not apply to other classes or other conditions when another governor undertakes to exercise the same arbitrary power. I am not willing to concede the power claimed by the Governor and exercised by him, because, in my opinion, such power is not vested in him by the Constitution. The people could never have intended to erect such an engine of oppression. It follows, of course, that if the present Executive is the sole judge of the condition which can call into action the military power of the government and can exercise all means necessary to effectually abate the conditions, and the judicial department cannot inquire into the legality of his acts, that the next governor can, by his ukase, exercise the same arbitrary power. If the military authority may deport the miners this year, it can deport the farmers next year. If a strike, which is not a rebellion, must be so regarded because the Governor says it is, then any condition must be regarded as a rebellion which the Governor declares to be such; and if any condition must be regarded as a rebellion because the Governor says so, then any county in the State may be declared to be in a state of rebellion, whether a rebellion exists or not, and every citizen subjected to arbitrary arrest and detention at the will and pleasure of the head of the executive department. We may then, with each succeeding change in the executive branch of the government have class arrayed against class, and interest against interest; and we shall depend for our liberty, not upon the Constitution, but upon the grace and favor of the Governor and his military subordinates. . . . The authority is overwhelming that the position of the Governor cannot be sustained; that the power of suspending the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus is legislative and not executive; that martial law can only prevail in places where the civil law is overthrown by force, and that it exists only so long as it is necessary to reinstate the courts; that martial law cannot prevail where the courts are open and exercising their functions; that the judicial department will take notice whether the courts are open or have been overthrown by superior force.

Judge Steele therefore disagrees with the other two judges, and holds that Moyer should have been released from military custody.

After the Colorado court had refused, by the decision of two of its three judges to discharge Moyer from military custody, Moyer's lawyers applied for a writ of habeas corpus to the Federal Judge, Thayer, sitting at St. Louis. Gov. Peabody was represented

upon this application by the attorney general of the State, and after an argument of three hours Judge Thayer decided against the Governor and allowed the writ of habeas corpus (p. 184), making it returnable July 5 at St. Louis. Immediately upon that decision and before the writ could be served Gov. Peabody declared the "insurrection" at an end in the county in which Moyer was held by the military, and ordered that he be turned over to the civil authorities. This being done, he was sent by those civil authorities to Teller county, where the "insurrection" still exists, and was there placed nominally in civil custody. When the habeas corpus case came up before Judge Thayer at St. Louis on the 5th Gov. Peabody filed an answer denying that Moyer was in his custody at the time of the service of the writ. Upon the filing of this denial Moyer's lawyers were given 30 days in which to prove Gov. Peabody's answer false.

On the 5th Moyer was released after furnishing bonds for \$10,000 on the charges of murder and inciting riot filed against him at Cripple Creek. He had been a prisoner 103 days and during the greater portion of that time was confined in the bull pen at Telluride on the plea of "military necessity."

At Cripple Creek the coroner's jury, empaneled by the mine-owners representative, who took the place of the duly elected coroner when that official was forced by lynchers to resign (pp. 156, 168), has returned a verdict relative to the deaths caused by the riot at the mass meeting at Victor, held early in the month and immediately after the explosion at Independence. This jury finds that in its opinion the deceased persons were killed by certain individuals whom it names, and then proceeds:

The jury further finds that upon the said day an armed body of men, members of the Western Federation of Miners, assembled at Victor pursuant to a prearranged plan, from different parts of the county, and that said body of men were appointed special policemen for the city of Victor, and while the act of deputizing said men gave them temporarily a color of office, the said men congregated and armed themselves for an unlawful pur-

pose—namely, to commit acts of violence, to override the law and to take human life, and that, in fact, the men so armed and deputized constituted an unlawful assembly or mob. That among those who aided, abetted and incited the commission of said crimes are Charles H. Moyer, William D. Haywood and other members of the Western Federation of Miners.

The Chicago Federation of Labor on the 3d, on motion of Margaret A. Haley, rescinded a previous resolution calling upon President Roosevelt to send troops to Colorado (p. 169), on the ground that this would be a dangerous invasion. In its place the Federation adopted a resolution directing its officers to call a delegate conference of all the central labor bodies of the country to meet at Victor to consider "this new capitalistic method of dealing with organized labor."

News from the seat of war in the far East is meager again. Dispatches from London on the 1st indicated that Kouropatkin was making a stand at Haicheng and Liaoyang, and that the Japanese had captured Ta pass, opening the way to reaching the railroad north of Liaoyang and cutting it off from Mukden. It was reported on the 30th from Shanghai that after a desperate battle about 10 miles north of Port Arthur the Japanese had occupied Wolf mountain and driven the Russians to their next line of defense, close to Port Arthur. There were uncertain reports on the 1st and 2d of the discovery of the Russian fleet from Vladivostok (p. 185) by the Japanese vice admiral, Kamimura; but on the 3d it was conceded in reports from Tokyo that the fleet had eluded him. There were reports also on the 3d from Russian sources that the Japanese force to the east of Liaoyang had been repulsed by Gen. Keller and drawn out of Talin pass. They were said to be retreating, pursued by Keller. On the 4th, according to dispatches from Tokyo, the Japanese in the Motien pass, which lies nearer to Liaoyang than the Ta pass, and like the Ta pass threatens the railway communication between Liaoyang and Mukden, were attacked by two Russian battalions which, after fierce hand to hand fighting, were repulsed with losses double those of the Japanese. The

Russian Gen. Sakharoff claims, according to a dispatch from St. Petersburg, that the Russians "dislodged the Japanese from their intrenchments and occupied the pass," and then, as the enemy "was preparing to deliver a frontal and flank attack, our column retired, as previously instructed." A dispatch from the London Daily Telegraph's correspondent with the Russian army at Liaoyang, dated the 7th, reports continued desperate fighting in the mountains twenty-five miles from Liaoyang. The Japanese seem to be making progress in their attempt to cut the line between Liaoyang and Mukden. The Daily Telegraph says that if the intelligence from Liaoyang can be accepted as true, the most important movement of the war has been reached.

The British invasion of Thibet (p. 135) seems to have met greater obstacles at Gyantse than was at first reported. A dispatch from that place under date of the 6th announces the capture, after a fierce hand-to-hand struggle, of the Gyantse jong (or fort), which they claim is the Gibraltar of the Himalayas. The British lost one officer, and had otherwise only a few wounded, owing to the "open order" they adopted. The fort was defended by 7,000 Thibetans, who were killed, wounded, or taken prisoners. It is reported from London that—

An exchange of views is taking place between the United States and Great Britain with respect to Thibet. Being a dependency of China, the fate of Thibet is of considerable importance, because its acquisition by any power would mean a violation of the principle of the integrity of China, which is the keynote of Secretary Hay's Far Eastern policy, to which Great Britain has given adherence.

NEWS NOTES.

—Nearly 1,500 employes of the Pullman company were "laid off" at the Pullman car shops in Chicago on the 1st.

—Senor Dupuy de Lome, who was Spanish minister at Washington prior to the outbreak of the war between the United States and Spain, died in Paris on the 1st from cerebral hemorrhage.

—Gen. Piet Cronje, the Boer war hero, married at St. Louis on the 4th the widow of one of his comrades at arms, Mrs. Johanna Stertzel. The war had left Gen.

Cronje a widower, as well as made Mrs. Stertzel a widow.

—The supply of silver bullion purchased under the Sherman act is exhausted, and George E. Roberts, the Director of the Mint, asserted in an interview on the 1st that "there will never be another silver dollar coined in this country."

—George Frederick Watts, the great English painter, died of bronchitis on the 1st. Mr. Watts was born in 1829. Among his many important works "Love and Death" is perhaps the best known. Most of the great Englishmen of the last century were sitters to Watts, and this series of wonderful portraits is his bequest to the National Gallery of London.

—Great increases in the Negro population of the United States are shown in the final bulletin of the census bureau issued July 1. The Negroes of the United States, Alaska, Hawaii and Porto Rico, number 9,204,531. Negroes form one-third of the population of the South, while in the North they are about one-fortieth of the population of the cities and one-nineteenth of the country.

—A dispatch from Vienna under date of the 3d announces the death of Dr. Theodore Herzl, founder of the Zionist movement, and since 1890 the President of the Zionist Congress. Dr. Herzl's purpose, as outlined in his book, "The Jewish State," was to secure from the sultan the privilege of slowly acquiring the Holy Land by purchase, and then to parcel out the country into farms on long-time payments. He did not expect prosperous Jews to go to Zion, but his plan contemplated solving the question of the Jewish poor and of restoring Judea to some of its ancient glories.

—More than 2,300 Illinois inmates of prisons and reformatories were forced into idleness on the beginning of this month, through the placing of an injunction on a new State law which should have gone into operation on the 1st. The law prohibits contract labor in the prisons and provides a system of employment whereby the convicts may labor for the State. The injunction, secured two weeks ago from Judge Humphrey in the federal court in Springfield, restrains the expenditure of State money under the new law till it shall have been tested. Thus the State is prevented by the State law from working the convicts by contract, and by the injunction from employing them under the new State law.

—The Scandinavian-American steamship Norge, which left Copenhagen, June 22, for New York, with 694 passengers, mostly Norwegians and Danes, and a crew of 71 foundered in a fog early in the morning of June 29, on or near Rockall reef, about 290 miles off the west coast of Scotland. The ship went down about 20 minutes after striking on the rocks. The water was rough and only four boats got away. Capt. Gundel went

down with his ship, and came up, and though injured, kept afloat until picked up by one of the boats. One hundred and twenty-eight survivors, some of them having been starving in the open boats for six days, have been picked up by passing steamers and other craft, and landed at various points along the British coast, leaving 638 persons unaccounted for and supposedly lost.

—The Chicago Tribune presents the following statistics of "Fourth of July" casualties for this year for the whole United States, revised to 2:30 a. m. July 6.

Dead	52
Injured	3,049

The causes of injuries are given as follows:

Fireworks	1,110
Cannon	249
Firearms	446
Gun powder	673
Toy pistols	283
Runaways	93

The fire loss is estimated at \$317,700. The death roll this year is one less than that of 1903, but the number injured is 616 smaller, and the fire loss of last year was estimated at \$80,000 greater than this year.

—George Rice, of Marietta, O., who has been fighting the Standard Oil Company for 20 years, has begun an action in the New Jersey courts, at Trenton, to dissolve that corporation and distribute its assets among its shareholders. Mr. Rice's fight first attracted public attention when in 1879 and 1880 he appeared before legislative committees in Ohio seeking relief from the alleged discriminations which he charged threatened to put him out of business. Later Mr. Rice applied to the United States court for relief, but found none. He pressed his charges vigorously before the Interstate Commerce commission, but the plea of lack of jurisdiction prevented substantial results. One hundred railroads were involved directly or indirectly in his proceedings. In 1892 he secured an order from the Ohio courts for a dissolution of the corporation, but he charges that this has been evaded. Now, when he is nearly 70 years of age, he sees hope of success in the decision of the United States Supreme Court in what he regards as a parallel case—that of the great Railroad Merger.

PRESS OPINIONS.

PARKER THE RETICENT.

The Commoner (Dem.), June 24.—Before the papers began to boom him it was known that he was being discussed in financial circles, and 18 months ago Mr. Morgan was reported to have declared him a sane and suitable man before the papers began to discuss the possibilities of his candidacy. We have had one J. Pierpont Morgan president, and he did the Democratic party more harm than all the Republican presidents since the war. When the Republicans elect a Wall street man, the Democrats can denounce him, and gain recruits by so doing. When the Democrats are unfortunate enough to have a

Wall street man president, they have to either denounce him or apologize for him, and no matter which they do, they have to bear the odium of his administration. No wonder Mr. Cleveland speaks highly of Judge Parker. He is on the inside, and knows that Mr. Parker is satisfactory to Morgan and Belmont and the other financial magnates who run the Cleveland administration, and yet while it is as plain as day that the Parker boom finds its source in Wall street, there are many Democrats who are trying to argue themselves into believing that Judge Parker would be a good man to harmonize on. He has the same environment that Mr. Cleveland had, and it can be set down as a certainty that Wall street always finds out a man's views before it supports him, however much these views may be concealed from the public generally.

THE COLORADO REVOLUTION.

The (Cleveland, Ohio) Leader (Rep.), July 2.—Although he was the only justice to dissent from the recent decision of the Colorado Supreme Court sustaining the Governor in the exercise of arbitrary power, Justice Robert W. Steele is ungenerously right. Surely his dissenting opinion, which has just been published, after nearly a month of careful consideration, will meet with the approval of all fair-minded and liberty-loving people.

Springfield (Mass.) Republican (Ind.), June 24.—The men in Colorado and elsewhere, who are preaching and acting upon the inevitableness of a class war in this country, and detesting a resort to arms on behalf of property and privilege, are more dangerous to the peace and order of the nation and the right and permanent settlement of controversies arising among classes, than the John Astors whom we have been accustomed to put in prison when we do not hang.

Omaha (Neb.) Workers' Gazette (Lab.), June 25.—Guess where this language comes from: "Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law." Why, you ignoramus, that is a question from an antiquated document called the Constitution of the United States. "To hold with the constitution," is the way it was expressed in Colorado.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), June 25.—The national guard, being in the pay of the mine owners, has addressed itself to protecting the interests of its employers rather than to conserving the welfare of the public.

It might have been expected to insist upon a general disarmament. It might have been expected to deprive both parties of their weapons and then to remain on the scene till all difficulties had been peacefully adjusted. It might have been expected to discover and punish the individual perpetrators of specific crimes.

Instead of insisting upon a general disarmament, it has acted simply as a reinforcement to the armed forces of the Mine Owners' association and the Citizens' alliance. Instead of standing between the two lawless, belligerent parties as the executive representative of the impartial majesty of the State, it has aligned itself so definitely with the mine owners that Gen. Bell was not ashamed to say: "One deportation after another will be made until there is no one left who is persona non grata with the mine owners and the alliance." Instead of running down the guilty it has herded innocent and guilty together in bull pens, it has made arrests for lese majeste—that is, for abusing the national guard—it has plundered stores and offices, it has suppressed and destroyed printing establishments, it has deported propertyless citizens on frivolous charges of vagabondage, and it has closed peacefully operated mines, the employees of which belonged to the union. In other words, it has abandoned its function of maintaining peace and has adopted the function of destroying one group of citizens for the benefit of another.

MR. ROOT ON EXECUTIVE USURPATION.

The (N. Y.) Nation (Ind.), June 26.—Mr. Root's address before the Yale Law School on Monday will hardly be dedicated when it is published in full, to President Roosevelt. It would be too much like the Humorist's fancy of writing a 'Life of Naboth,

with some account of his Vineyard,' and dedicating it to His Majesty King Ahab! For Mr. Root's measured and weighty words on the dangers to the common weal which arise from the ignoring by those in high office of the limitations of their power by law, can have only one personal bearing. If they mean anything, they mean a condemnation of Mr. Roosevelt's tendencies. In a more sober dress, Mr. Root presents the same thought which, clothed in Bourke Cockran's glittering rhetoric, impelled the House of Representatives to frenzied applause—namely, the peril of executive usurpation and the duty of resisting it. It is a needed and courageous utterance which Mr. Root has made. It will carry far and do good—all the more so if it causes the ears of a certain "great officer" to tingle.

TAXATION DISCRIMINATION.

Cincinnati Evening Post (Ind.), June 27.—One of the arguments against the system of taxes that obtains in nearly every State in the Union is that it puts a penalty on the individual who cannot hide his possessions. His neighbor calmly lies about his property and escapes. No one doubts the truth of this statement. A case in point is found in Nebraska. George H. Josslyn, who owns a \$500,000 home in Omaha, is largely interested in the Western Newspaper Union. His interest was placed on the tax duplicate at \$200,000, notwithstanding the fact that, as a company, the concern had already been taxed in every State in which it owns property. Its presses, engines, buildings, accounts, material, had all been covered by the taxgatherer. And Nebraska arbitrarily taxed Mr. Josslyn again, for he refused to swear that he did not own the property. Result: A war between a State and an individual. Mr. Josslyn has left Nebraska. He has boarded up his place in Omaha and turned his cows loose in the beautiful grounds. He has purchased a new home in another State, and asserts that he will dismantle his house stone by stone rather than abandon his silent protest against unjust and discriminating taxation. We shall have rows of this nature and wholesale injustice as long as a system is in vogue that puts a premium on lying. We shall have trouble so long as there is discrimination in the matter of assessing public dues. After all, the Henry George idea of placing all taxes on and doesn't lock so wild. It could not be worse than the present system.

"ANARCHY" AND "FREEDOM."

London Daily News (Lib.), May 20.—We think—indeed, we are sure—that the story of mingled stupidity and tyranny which we tell this morning in the words of the victim, Mr. John Turner, will have aroused widespread disgust and indignation in the United States, in whose name the offense was committed. We would not make a mountain of a molehill, and we lay no stress on the irksome conditions of the imprisonment which Mr. Turner suffered on Ellis island, in the bay of New York. By consenting to leave the country as an outcast he could at any moment have regained his liberty; but, urged by his friends in the country, he insisted on staying and fighting the matter out until released on bail. The discreditableness of such an arrest and such an imprisonment should be possible under any circumstances. An instructive point for us in this country led to Mr. Turner's imprisonment was that of the immigration department—an institution with which we are threatened here, and which has managed to do grave harm to the national reputation of the Australian Commonwealth, where there is an especially malignant organization of the kind. But this by the way. The point is that Mr. Turner, because his opinions are those of the school of political philosophy sometimes called "philosophic anarchism," and subscribed to by such men as Tolstoy and Kropotkin, has been treated as if he were an avowed conspirator against the lives of all who bear rule. The law of the United States on this subject, it seems, is such as to compel the judges to uphold this action of the immigration committee. This is the same jurisdiction that affords an asylum to the convicted criminal and escaped convict Lynelchaun. With Mr. Turner's opinions we have nothing to do; but we are bound to express our regret that such things should be done in the name of a

people to whom liberty of thought should be especially dear.

HOW THE FOREIGNER PAYS THE TAX.

Paterson (N. J.) News, May 6.—Some years ago the aldermen had a fit of folly. The circus license was \$250, and the city treasury benefited to that extent when a circus came to town. The aldermen raised the circus license to \$500, and the result was that not only has the city never received a cent of license money from circuses since that day, but every Patersonian who visits a circus has to pay ten cents car fare in addition to the cost of the circus ticket. It is estimated that this cost the citizens \$2,500 yesterday.

THERE IS GOLD IN THIBET.

India (London), June 3.—We notice, by the way, that during the past few days both the "Daily News" and the "Westminster Gazette" have reflected with equanimity that any rate there are no goldfields in Thibet. No equanimity could be more completely displaced. There are goldfields in Thibet, and the fact has certainly not escaped the notice of the financial journals.

MISCELLANY

AFTER DEATH IN ARABIA.

He who died at Azan sends
This to comfort all his friends.

Faithful friends! It lies, I know,
Pale and white and cold as snow;
And ye say: "Abdallah's dead!"
Weeping at the feet and head,
I can see your falling tears,
I can hear your sighs and prayers;
Yet I smile, and whisper this:
"I am not the thing you kiss;
Cease your tears, and let it lie—
It was mine—it is not I."

Sweet friends! what the women lave
For its last bed of the grave,
Is a tent which I am quitting,
Is a garment no more fitting,
Is a cage, from which, at last,
Like a hawk my soul hath passed.
Love the inmate, not the room—
The wearer, not the garb—the plume
Of the falcon—not the bars
Which kept him from these splendid stars.

Loving friends! Be wise, and dry
Straightway every weeping eye—
What ye lift upon the bier
Is not worth a wistful tear.
'Tis an empty seashell, one
Out of which the pearl has gone;
The shell is broken, it lies there;
The pearl, the all, the soul, is here.
'Tis an earthen jar, whose lid
Allah sealed, the while it hid
That treasure of his treasury—
A mind that loved him; let it lie.
Let the shard be earth's once more,
Since the gold shines in his store!

Allah glorious! Allah good!
Now thy world is understood;
Now the long, long wonder ends;
Yet ye weep, my loving friends,
While the man whom ye call dead
In unspoken bliss instead
Lives and loves you; lost, 'tis true,
By such light as shines for you;
But in light ye cannot see
Of unfulfilled felicity,
In enlarging paradise
Lives a life that never dies.

Farewell, friends! yet not farewell;
Where I am ye too shall dwell.
I am gone before your face,
A moment's time, a little space.

When ye come where I have stepped
Ye will wonder why ye wept;
Ye will know, by wise love taught,
That here is all, and there is naught.
Weep awhile, if ye are fain—
Sunshine still must follow rain,
Only not at death—for death
Now I know, is that first breath
Which our souls draw when we enter
Life, which is of all life center.

Be ye certain all seems love
Viewed from Allah's throne above;
Be ye stout of heart, and come
Bravely onward to your home!
La Allah illa Allah! yea!
Thou love divine! thou love alway!

He that died at Azan gave
This to those who made his grave.
—Sir Edwin Arnold.

HISTORIC HINTS.

"What are you reading, son?" asked
a Roman merchant one day.

"A description from one of the Sybilline books," he replied. "It is there foretold that an invasion from the North will come upon our empire, when it becomes corrupt, and some say it is so now."

"Drop it, my son, drop it," said the old gentleman, hastily. "These people are always foreseeing something, generally unpleasant. Why, we are getting richer and richer, and our boundaries are extending in every direction. Every day I meet a king or two at dinner."

"But there are barbarians, are there not?"

"Oh, yes, a few million or so, who shake to see the sunshine on our Roman eagles."

The son closed the book with a troubled expression.

"Suppose they should—" he murmured.

And they did.—"An Optimist," in The Denver Catholic.

CENTENARY THOUGHTS ON RICHARD COBDEN.

From the editorial columns of the New York Nation of June 9, 1904.

Cobden was a mighty and triumphant reformer. The material he dealt with he had absolutely at command; and Tory antagonists who thought to put him down in the Commons found to their dismay how formidable was his armament of exact knowledge. Cobden was also, in Bagehot's happy phrase, a "sensitive agitator." Londoners who first heard him were amazed. They looked for a burly demagogue—the man who had been rousing the North of England—and they found a slight and modest gentleman, scrupulously, almost painfully, fair in argument, who would not will-

ingly misrepresent a single fact or vilify one of his opponents. His appeal was ever to reason and to the humane instincts. Coming to the point swiftly and sticking to it with astonishing tenacity, he was the great persuader of his generation. Showing himself impregnable in his facts, he came to be regarded as a man whose opinions were as little to be challenged. It was, therefore, only a deserved tribute to his mastery of detail and his invincible logic in driving home the truth, which Sir Robert Peel paid when he said at the passage of the corn law repeal: "The name which ought to be and will be associated with the success of these measures is the name of Richard Cobden."

THE SITUATION IN COLORADO.

From an editorial in the Weekly Republican of Springfield, Mass., for June 17.

Practically speaking the mining regions of Colorado, where military rule prevails, are in the possession and government of a mob. The mob in this case is composed of the "best citizens," and is representative particularly of the property interests. Hence its extraordinary proceedings are viewed elsewhere with astonishment, but not alarm. If it were otherwise composed this country would be in a panic. If it were a mob of the propertyless classes which had thus gained the upper hand in the State of Colorado, and were closing the courts, compelling judges to decamp, locking up crimeless citizens in bull-pens, driving others out of the State by hundreds, dumping them without food and shelter on the prairie of an adjoining State, and destroying their property, and means of livelihood, this country would shake from end to end with consternation.

But we shall do well to view the rise and progress of this mob of the "better classes" with deeper feeling than one of astonishment. It is to be regarded with alarm. Right and justice and law are no less menaced and outraged in this case than they would be in the other. Think of these acts of wholesale deportation of men admittedly guilty of no offense save that of belonging to a labor union, which it is lawful for them to do! Think of separating them from their families and dumping them on a shelterless plain, where in turn they are taken in hand by the authorities there and started back—being kicked back and forth as if they had no more right to a place on earth than an ownerless cur. Think of compelling a whole city council to resign and clear out because of suspected sympathy with labor unionism—of forcing judges to make themselves scarce because they

would maintain the rule of civil law—of going from man to man and public official to public official with the question: Are you in sympathy with the right of labor to organize?—which, if answered in the affirmative, brings an enforced command to get away and never come back! Does anybody suppose a well-dressed mob, any more than one in overalls, can thus outrage justice and humanity without deplorable consequences? It is impossible.

GEORGE THE THIRD RISEN FROM THE DEAD IN THE PERSON OF COLORADO'S BANKER-GOVERNOR.

In speaking of the Colorado labor war in *Cincinnati*, July 3, Herbert S. Bigelow said in part:

Read again the Declaration of Independence and think of Colorado. When the firecrackers give out, here is a suggestion for the patriotic.

For George III. substitute the names of the mine owners. To be more specific, substitute the name of the Standard Oil monopoly, since this is the power behind the throne in Colorado. Then note how many of those indictments against King George apply literally to this new tyranny.

He has refused his consent to laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

In Colorado the legislature passed an eight-hour law. The mine owners refused to obey it. The unions asked the courts to enforce the law. The Supreme Court of the State declared it unconstitutional. The unions secured the submission of a constitutional amendment. The people adopted it by more than two-thirds majority. It then became the duty of the Legislature to pass the Enabling Act. But a powerful lobby of the mine owners was there. The Legislature gallied along for months and then adjourned without heeding the mandate of the people. This was an act of insurrection on the part of the Legislature. When the monopolists hire legislatures to betray the people they bring republican institutions into contempt and sow the seeds of anarchy.

It is said that when the bloodhounds were put upon the trail of the Independence assassins, they went straight to the house of the company's detective. But they should have gone to the capitol building at Denver. It was there, in the lobby of the legislature, that the wire was pulled that discharged the pistol into the dynamite. Those who tamper with legislatures and subvert popular government are worse than assassins, as they are more dangerous.

For their crimes they gain wealth and honor, and then, with hypocritical zeal for the law, they help to prosecute the men whom they have provoked to deeds of desperation.

He has made judges dependent on his will alone.

This is Fourth of July, 1904—not 1776. Yet two weeks ago to-morrow the president of the Miners' Union was arraigned for murder in a Colorado court. Who was the judge to try him? One elected by the people? No, the duly elected prosecutor had been deposed by a mob. Before this mob-appointed judge the mob-appointed prosecutor brought his prisoner. George Washington would have been as likely to get justice before the star chamber of the English king as President Moyer is to receive justice at the hands of the revolutionary appointees of the Standard Oil crowd.

He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power.

George III. has risen from the dead in the person of Colorado's banker-governor. The Supreme Court of the State was the good angel that called him back to life. That court has decided that the governor may destroy all civil government and exercise absolutely despotic power whenever a state of insurrection exists.

And what was still more obliging in the court, it decided that the governor is the sole judge as to when occasion requires that he cease to be a public servant and assume the role of despot.

With gunpowder and bunting we celebrate a victory which brought us political independence a century and more ago. But while we drown our thoughts in the noise, tyranny is busy with new chains. In those days of our youth we thought our political freedom was the cause of our prosperity. We did not understand that it was the unmonopolized bounty of nature which gave us prosperity, nor did we foresee that with the monopoly of these natural resources the old world tyranny was bound to arise in spite of our boasted liberty.

Slowly the dreadful truth is beginning to dawn. The thoughtful see it now, and adversity will increase the number of thinkers. We must make haste to use the political freedom which we still possess. Let the railroads become public property. Let the mines be treated as a common inheritance. Let labor cooperate to furnish the capital with which to work them. Can this economic freedom be won before political freedom is lost? On this issue hangs the fate of the republic.

THE "BALANCE OF TRADE" FALLACY.

From a speech made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the Parliament of the Canadian Dominion, at Ottawa, June 14, 1904, as reported by the *Montreal Daily Herald*, of June 15, 1904.

To tell us simply that the balance of trade is against us with our neighbors, is no argument at all. We must look behind the balance, and because this old fallacy has been put forward, let us consider it. Bast Bastien in one of his books gives a very striking example of how the balance of trade works. A ship left France in 1840 or thereabouts loaded for New Orleans, with a cargo of articles from Paris valued at 200,000 francs. She reached New Orleans. The freight on these goods amounted to ten per cent., and the customs duty to 30 per cent., and they were sold at 20 per cent. profit. The sale, therefore, realized 352,000 francs. The money was immediately invested in cotton and the same ship came back to Havre with a cargo of cotton. The duty in France is ten per cent. The cargo was charged in France with ten per cent. freight and sold at 20 per cent. profit, realizing 464,000 francs. Therefore, the shipper made a double profit. He made a profit on his outward cargo of articles de Paris and also upon his inward cargo of cotton. He made over 100,000 francs altogether and enriched himself and his country to that extent.

But how did the entries balance in the customs? In the customs returns there appeared an export value of 200,000 francs and an entry of imports to the value of 352,000 francs, showing thereby a balance of trade against France of 152,000 francs. Therefore, France, according to the argument of honorable gentlemen opposite, was a loser by the operation. But what followed? That same gentleman, encouraged by his first experience, thought he would tempt fortune again and he shipped another cargo of the same goods to New Orleans valued at 200,000 francs. Then an occurrence happened which would cheer the hearts of my honorable friends on the other side. The entry in the customs returns showed an export of 200,000 francs from France, but the ship was lost at sea and, therefore, the balance of trade remained in favor of France to the extent of 200,000 francs. This is a fit illustration of the logic of honorable gentlemen opposite.

Let us discard this bugbear of the trade balance because it is utter nonsense.

SECRETARY SHAW DISTORTS FACTS AND FIGURES.

Secretary Shaw, the spokesman for the administration, made another one of his exuberant speeches at the Auditorium in Chicago on June 21. As in his recent Wilmington (Del.) speech, he made some striking and even startling statements, and quoted statistics in his usual free and easy manner.

In his Wilmington speech he admitted that the cost of living was high, but promised that before the campaign had proceeded far the Republican party would produce figures "from the highest authority" showing that "the average wages have increased in larger proportion than the average articles of ordinary household consumption." He said that "high-priced living expenses is preferable to employment for only a portion of our people." He failed to observe that at the present time living expenses are extremely high, while a large proportion of our workers are unemployed. In Wilmington and Philadelphia alone there are probably within a radius of 20 miles 200,000 factory workers now idle in the textile, leather and other mills in these cities. It is not probable that these 200,000 or more idle hands, almost within the sound of the secretary's voice, shouted "Amen" when the secretary closed his peroration with: "But may the good Lord deliver us from another period when living expenses are cheap." In his Chicago speech of Tuesday evening he reeled off figures, some of which may be true, but many of which certainly are false; and made some admissions on the subject of export prices which, coming from such a high Republican is most refreshing. Thus he said:

Our opponents lay much stress upon the fact that some American manufactures are sold abroad cheaper than at home. Our friends sometimes have joined our opponents in recommending a removal of the tariff from all such articles. It is useless to deny, and, in my judgment, unwise, to apologize, and a little short of foolishness to attempt to remedy the assumed evil in the manner proposed by the opposition.

He then proceeded to quote from the industrial commission, which reported that "\$4,000,000 worth of merchandise, the product of American factories, is annually sold abroad cheaper than in the domestic market." He then said that as "we manufacture \$13,000,000,000 worth per annum our exports sold abroad cheaper than at home are only one-thirteenth of one per cent. of the output of our factories."

Secretary Shaw is either a novice with figures or he is entirely willing to fool the voters with big statistics which he knows are not true. It is hardly possible that our secretary of the treasury does not know that we do not produce \$13,000,000,000 worth of manufactured goods in a year ready for final consumers, or anything like this amount. Our census statistics of manufactures contain many duplications. Thus we have manufactures of cloth goods and of clothing; of iron and steel and of foundry products, machinery, etc.; of lumber and of furniture, of leather and of boots and shoes. In these few industries the duplications amount to \$2,000,000,000 or \$3,000,000,000. Were it possible to take out the duplications, that is, the products of one mill that are sold as raw material to another mill, it is probable that the total value of finished manufactured products would not be more than half of \$13,000,000,000. Whether or not our census figures have been stuffed in order to make a great showing for protection can only be surmised.

The statement that only \$4,000,000 worth of our manufactured goods are sold abroad cheaper than at home is ridiculous. It is entirely safe to say that ten or twenty times this amount of iron and steel goods alone are sold abroad at prices from ten to sixty per cent. below the prices at which they are sold in this country. In fact there are single items in our exports of iron and steel sold abroad at lower prices which amount to more than \$4,000,000. Thus, during the ten months ending April 30, 1904, we sold for export 208,000,000 pounds of wire valued at \$4,777,000. It is reasonably certain that every pound and every dollar's worth of this wire was sold abroad at prices below those prevailing in this country, and that the average difference was not less than 25 to 30 per cent. Similar statements might be made in regard to the items of builders' hardware and sewing machines. All, or practically all, are sold to foreigners at bargain-counter prices. Nearly \$2,000,000 worth of steel rails were sold abroad during these ten months at an average price of about \$20 per ton, the trust keeping the price in this country steadily at \$28. Millions of dollars' worth of structural iron and steel, billets, bars, etc., were sold abroad at a price probably averaging ten dollars per ton less than the domestic price. Ship plates have been selling abroad at \$26 to \$30 per ton, and in this coun-

try at \$38 to \$40 during the last year. Secretary Shaw quotes the report of the industrial commission. He evidently had not read the testimony of Mr. Charles M. Schwab, president of the United States Steel corporation, before the industrial commission, May 11, 1901. Mr. Schwab told the commission frankly that all kinds of iron and steel goods were invariably sold for export at prices lower than home prices. When asked: "Is it a fact generally true of all exporters in this country that they do sell at lower prices in foreign markets than they do in the home market?" he answered: "That is true, perfectly true."

The secretary will find this testimony in Volume 13, pages 448-487. It may interest him.

The secretary says that "while our people complain of this practice, I think it defensible. But whether defensible or not, I know that foreign producers do the same thing."

It is not denied that the practice of selling goods for export at prices far below domestic prices prevails in nearly all highly protected countries. It is a part of the protective system. But it is a miserable, hypocritical, outrageous system wherever it prevails. It compels consumers to pay extra tariff taxes to support an industry that shows its ingratitude by charging its benefactors two prices for its products. All the countries on earth could not make this system right.

Continuing, the secretary says:

For my part, I am willing to pay any reasonable price for the small amount of barbed wire which I consume, provided the wheat from my field, the dairy products from my herd, and the meat from my stall shall feed the men who mine the coal and iron and the artisans who produce the wire to fence the farms of South America.

But suppose that, upon inquiry, the secretary should find that while he was paying two prices for his barbed wire because of protection, he was selling his wheat and other products in a free trade market and was getting no benefit whatever from protection; would he then be willing to pay high protection prices for his fencing wire? If the secretary can induce the farmers of this country to think along these lines he will have accomplished a great work.

BYRON W. HOLT.

Human right is basic. Human welfare is a product of human right. Men will promote their own welfare if their rights are not interfered with.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

A CONSTRUCTIVE DEMOCRACY.

Address of Gov. Luclius F. C. Garvin, of Rhode Island, before the Tammany Society, July 4, 1904, Tammany Hall, New York city.

To-day we celebrate the birth of a great nation whose government is conducted by means of political parties. Of the two leading national parties it is often said that the one is constructive and the other destructive.

The distinction thus drawn is misleading. Since the decade next preceding the civil war the Democratic party has held simultaneously the executive and both branches of congress but once, and then for a period of only two years. On that occasion the party majority in the senate was not only slender, but unreliable.

Quite naturally the first effort of the party, which had been out of power for 35 years, was to remove abuses. The removal of the debris of an old building must necessarily precede the erection of a new one. So the repeal of bad laws naturally preceded the enactment of good ones.

Only superficially can the abrogation of the force act and the reduction of tariff taxes be called destructive. And when, as a substitute for loss of revenue, a tax upon incomes was enacted, certainly here was legislation fully entitled to the designation constructive.

However, it must be admitted that, partly owing to its far greater opportunity and partly no doubt to its inherent character, the Republican party has shown itself to be the more constructive. **But to project and built up is not deserving of commendation unless the thing constructed is in itself desirable.** To erect a tariff wall for the purpose of obstructing trade with other countries, although it may call for much ingenuity, is in no sense praiseworthy; and the higher and stronger the wall the more the injury and the greater the condemnation.

Along with and as a result of the constructive policy of the Republican party we find the country overrun with trusts and other monopolies; the national civil service, neglectful of such duties as the inspection of steamboats, but honeycombed with theft and graft; society, itself continually disturbed by strikes, lockouts and other signs of industrial upheaval. **It would be far better for the country if the party in power were less actively and perniciously constructive in the ways to which its energies have been directed.**

Nevertheless, it is true that the national Democracy should be prepared to build up as well as to pull down. Now, whilst in the minority and ask-

ing to be entrusted with the government, it should state in specific terms a few of the things it intends to construct.

The government certainly needs to step forward; it needs to do things which never have been done before. By consensus of the competent we are aware that the political situation has long been bad and is continually growing worse. This administration and its immediate predecessor have carried us forward from the principles upon which this government was founded and whose first announcement we are here to commemorate. These principles are, that the people can be trusted to govern themselves; that equity and not favoritism should be the keynote of the nation; that legislators should really represent their constituents; and that all public officials should serve, rather than lord it over, those who have given them power.

These ends can be secured by carrying out the intent of the statesman who gave birth to the republic, and especially of him who was at once the father of the Great Declaration and of the Democratic party.

To the election of United States senators by the people the Democratic party is already committed. This policy is constructive, is of the first importance and is right.

The requirement from trusts of a national license in order to engage in interstate commerce, as has been proposed by Mr. Bryan, would be more effective and more constructive than all that has been done or attempted by Republican congresses and administrations.

The Democratic party should commit itself to a genuine and workable reciprocity. Not by the transfer of legislative powers to the president, or even to the treaty-making power, but by a simple law declaring free trade with the other American countries, whenever, and at the same moment that, any such country reciprocates by admitting our products free.

In order that the people may rule in our republic two things are essential.

Two Essential Reforms.

First. A majority of the people should possess the power at all times and with due deliberation to change the organic law; for, to use the words of Washington: "The basis of our political system is the right of the people to make and alter their constitutions of government." To accomplish this aim of the Father of His Country, it is necessary that the national Constitution should be so amended that a reasonable minority

of the voters of the United States, not exceeding 5 per centum of all, should be given the power to propose specific and particular amendments to that Constitution and have them adopted or rejected by majority vote at any congressional election. This is the most fundamental and the most constructive reform possible under our form of government. It should be placed in the Democratic platform to be adopted this week at St. Louis. Against this constructive legislation there can be found no argument whatsoever, unless one chooses to take the aristocratic stand that the people cannot be trusted.

Second. The other essential reform, also radical and constructive in its nature, does not require an amendment to the national Constitution, but only an act of Congress. It embraces the simple proposition that the political parties of every State should be represented in the national house of representatives in proportion to the number of votes cast by the parties respectively. That is to say, if one of the large political parties cast in any State 40 per cent. of the total vote for congressmen, then that party should have 40 per cent. of the congressional delegation from that State. If a small party casts 10 per cent. of the total vote of a State for congressmen then it should elect 10 per cent. of the congressional delegation; and so on. In 1900 the Democratic presidential votes in New York State amounted to 44 per cent. of its total vote. For congressmen a much larger percentage was cast by Democrats; but that party had in the Fifty-seventh congress, elected on the same day, only 38 per cent. of the New York delegation. That is to say, there were but 13 Democratic congressmen from New York when in equity there should have been at least 15, and 21 Republican congressmen when there should have been 18 or less. The Prohibitionists would have elected one instead of none.

In many other States the congressional representation was far less fair. For illustration compare the actual representation in that congress with what ought to have been the representation from the following important States:

	In 57th Congress		Ought to Have Been	
	Dem.	Rep.	Dem.	Rep.
New Jersey	2	6	3	5
Indiana	4	9	6	7
Connecticut	0	4	1	3
Ohio	4	17	9	12
Pennsylvania	4	26	11	19
Massachusetts	3	10	5	8
Michigan	0	12	5	7
Wisconsin	0	10	4	6
Minnesota	0	7	3	4
	17	101	47	71

There are persons who apprehend that

our form of government may not succeed. But until the time arrives when each party, whether large or small, has no more and no less than its due proportion of every legislative body, republican government will not really have been tried, much less proved a failure.

In the summer of 1902, President Roosevelt in his tour of New England, charged his hearers over and over again not to expect much from legislation. The burden of his discourses was: The government can do little for you; you must depend upon your own exertions. It has been my experience that government can do a great deal for favored individuals. It can and does by special legislation convert United States senators and many others into multi-millionaires. It is within the power of the party of the people to call a halt to the creation of rich monopolists and their correlatives, tramps, strikes, involuntary poverty and recurring periods of commercial depression.

The enormous wealth produced by the people of this country should be more equally distributed. All that the masses need is fair play. All that the American people want is fair play; and that they ought to have. That the government should assure them. That it is the duty of a constructive Democracy to demand and work for. **The energies of this great people should be bent, not to the exploitation of other peoples, but to the amelioration of the condition of our own people.**

WHEN CLEVELAND TALKS.

For The Public.

When Cleveland talks, get down the Un-
abridged,
And diligently try to learn what mean
The turgid words that ponderously spout
To make his lengthy, puzzling sentences.
And when he has concluded, look with care
For "moonshine," "nil," for "nothing,"
"emptiness,"

For "nullity," and other kindred words.

G. T. EVANS.

"Alas!" moaned the plain, or garden poet. "I put my most soulful thoughts on paper, but my messages fall before the eyes of the unthinking canaille. They laugh at everything I write."

"Alas!" moaned the humorous poet, "I wish I had your luck!"—Judge.

The tenderest of men has expressed the value of a human soul in that parable of the loving shepherd who leaves the ninety and nine that are safe in the fold to find the one that is lost. Who can

see those human hives where poverty and misery dwell without thinking how rare in our civilization is that true Christian spirit which looks with pity upon each saddened and repressed life that languishes upon the earth.—H. S. Bigelow.

BOOKS

TROOPER PETER HALKET—A BOOK OF GENIUS.

Now and then, in the midst of the multitude of more or less useful books of the day, comes a work of real genius, one that irresistibly rouses the soul of any reader, however lethargic it may have grown to be. Such a book, if it be true—and it must almost necessarily be true, since truth is three-fourths of its power—is a genuine refreshment to the human soul. No matter how painful its revelations may be, it has in it a real delight; for the soul of the dullest of us, unless it be well-nigh dead, rejoices in being quickened into fuller life by the stirrings of another soul filled with the passion of a great theme. Such a quickening book is Olive Schreiner's Trooper Peter Halket (Little, Brown & Co., Boston, \$1.25). Its dedication will tell to many the quality of the book—

"To a Great, Good Man,
Sir George Grey,

Once Governor of the Cape Colony, who, during his rule in South Africa, bound himself to the Dutchmen, Englishmen, and Natives he governed, by an incorruptible justice and a broad humanity."

There is not much story, but no one can start the book without the wish to keep on with it, and if one is compelled to put it down, he will be drawn back at the first spare moment. The book has the attractive force of a genuine, positive passion for righteousness, which is all the stronger because it is free from wildness and raving. The quiet scene on the veldt, the trooper by his lonely fire, his dreams of exploitation and wealth in the path of Barney Barnato and Cecil Rhodes, the appearance of the stranger, their conversation, the gradual awakening of the trooper—all this, as told in the first half of the book, is hardly to be surpassed in modern literature. The latter part, showing the completeness of the trooper's conversion and the low aims, the degradation, of petty officers engaged in the spread of "civilization," is quite as strong and striking, though not so thoughtful and suggestive as the first part.

There are two classes of people that ought especially to read this little book, preachers and soldiers. Preachers, because it discloses the new conscience, which is yet as old as the time when cannibalism began to cease. Soldiers, because it would help them to see themselves as some others see them,

in their dealings with those who are in their power.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—"Drifting, or the Romance of an Octopus." By Sub Rosa. Chicago: Elysian Fields Publishing Company. Price, \$1.50 To be reviewed.

PAMPHLETS.

Mr. William Lloyd Garrison's brief address accepting the secretaryship of the American Free Trade League is a genuine, stirring pronunciamento. Whoever believes in free trade, and is doing nothing (not even a dollar a year) to bring it forward, ought to read this paper as a tonic. The pro-tariff people are alert enough. "No camel's head," says Mr. Garrison, "gets into their tent, and the mild tariff reformer meets with the same rugged and inimitable resistance that greets the radical free trader. 'I take off my hat,'" he continues, "to the Home Market Club and to Mr. Albert Clarke. For alertness, for solidarity, for weaving defenses of triple steel around their opulent wards, where shall their match be found? Certainly not where a like spirit is wanting, and men attempt to drive horses of which they are afraid. It is a human mystery why advocates of justice take the proverbial attitude of petitioners standing humbly, cap in hand, while spoilsmen have no hinges in their knees." The address is published in Bulletin 8, of the Free Trader, which also contains an appeal and various reports. Copies may be had by addressing the secretary of the league, 808 Pacoed building, Boston.

The pamphlet of Dr. David J. Doherty, of Chicago, on conditions in the Philippines (printed as Senate document 170 of the Fifty-eighth Congress, second session), begins with an acknowledgment by the author, a prominent anti-imperialist, that he has changed his views in some respects. He has "become convinced that Mr. McKinley was actuated by the loftiest principle; that there was no other prudent course open to us except to take the islands from Spain; that the Filipino people, while perhaps capable at this time of conducting a government on the level of a South American republic, will be benefited, and they themselves concede that they will be benefited, by a reasonable period of American tutelage; that the use of English in their schools has not been a violence but a blessing to them; that the civil government of the Philippines is a justifiable expedient permissible because temporary, and most praiseworthy on account of its broad and high aims, its self-sacrificing devotion to its duties and their interests; and finally that my friends, the anti-imperialists, ought to be its supporters, both for the work it has done and for the enemies it has made." If Dr. Doherty ever believed otherwise than as he here states, and based his opinions upon the essential principles of the Declaration of Independence, the reader of his pamphlet may not unreasonably wonder how the facts therein reported could have caused him to change. They tend to confirm rather than to weaken the anti-imperialist position.

PERIODICALS.

"Why" for June has some excellent editorials on current affairs, and continues its interesting account of John Z. White's single-tax lecturing tour.

The modern decriers of Macaulay as a historian will be surprised to read in the Independent Review the following story said to have been related by the late Lord Acton: "I was once with two eminent men, the late bishop of Oxford and the present bishop of London (Stubbs and Creighton). On another occasion I was with two far more eminent men, the two most learned men in the world. I need hardly tell you their names; they were Mommsen and Harnack. On each occasion the question arose who was the greatest historian the world had ever produced. On each occasion the name first mentioned, and on each occasion the name finally agreed upon, was that of Macaulay." J. H. D.

There is something needed in the literary, or rather in the reading, world, which might also pay. It would be most interest-

The Public

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

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

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

ATTORNEYS.

EWING & KING,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
HOUSTON, TEXAS.
Presley K. Ewing. Henry F. King

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.,
50 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 404 Cortlandt, Rooms 3011-3012,
NEW YORK.

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

CONTRACTORS.

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

THE ARTFUL LODGER.

ing to see the experiment tried. Namely, a weekly review of books that would honestly try to tell the truth about them. There is at least one weekly in America, the Nation, which is candid in its reviews, but the books it reviews are not often books for general readers. What is needed is an honest review of books that are expected to have a large circle of readers. Of such books there is hardly any real criticism. The following from the London Saturday Review, about this "vice of sloshy reviewing" is too literally true:

"Criticisms in general are become testimonials, mere suppressions of the bad, and thus necessarily give one no idea of the value of the book and very little of its nature."
J. H. D.

The Arena (Boston and Trenton) for July makes a strong bid for its old place as the leader, among American magazines, of radical thought and fearless expression. Under its new publisher, Albert Brandt, it has acquired a new typographical dress, much more attractive than the old one; and with B. O. Flower again in complete editorial control, aided by Dan Beard, the illustrator and cartoonist, it promises well to take a high place among the magazines that are both serviceable and interesting. An exceedingly well told story of personal experience, with a professionally authenticated vein of psychologic science running through it—"The Confessions of a Dip-somaniac"—leads in the July number. Among the other articles are a critique on the tendencies of recent fiction and a lucid explanation of the British invasion of Tibet. Daniel L. Cruice writes with picturesque vigor of Chicago politics, while Mr. Flower, in "Dan Beard: The Man and His Art," furnishes a fine setting for a collection of Beard's radical cartoons. This

is followed appropriately by a symposium on Beard's "Moonlight," by Albert Bigelow Falne, Irving Bacheider, Hamlin Garland, Henry George, Jr., and Bolton Hall. One of the Arena articles is startling. We refer to "A Socialism in Our Midst," by Capt. W. E. P. French, of the United States Army. It describes the regular army as being in its major features a working model of socialism, doing so sympathetically from the socialist point of view and with marked ability. We doubt if most of Capt. French's comrades, either in the army or in socialism, will be pleased with his impressive parallel.

PUBLICATIONS OF L. S. DICKEY & CO. 1601 Unity Building, - CHICAGO.

ETHICS OF DEMOCRACY.—By Louis F. Post. 400 pages, silk cloth, deckle edges, gilt top. Price, \$2.00 net. By mail, \$2.12.

BISOCIALISM.—The Reign of the Man at the Margin. By Oliver R. Trowbridge. 400 pages, in cloth. Price, \$1.50 net. By mail \$1.60.

COMPLETE WORKS OF HENRY GEORGE, LIBRARY EDITION.—just issued in ten volumes, with Life of Henry George, by Henry George, Jr. Uncut edges, green buckram. Price, \$17.50 per set.

THE PROPHET OF SAN FRANCISCO.—A Monograph, by Louis F. Post, 80 pages. Per copy, 20c postpaid.

All of above sent to any address in the United States, for \$31 on monthly installments of \$2. Delivered in Canada and Mexico will be made without additional charge other than for customs duties, and to other foreign countries without additional charge other than for customs duties and expressage.

L. S. DICKEY & CO.,
1601 Unity Bldg., Chicago.

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

Emerson Binding Covers in which **THE PUBLIC** may be filed away week by week, making at the end of the year a reasonably well-bound volume, may be ordered through this office. Price, 80 cents, postpaid.

Campaign Subscriptions

THE PUBLIC will be sent during the campaign to persons not now on its subscription list, for

FORTY CENTS

This will include the issue of November 19, 1904. Address: **BOX 687, CHICAGO.**

Volume VI of The Public

Complete Volumes, including index, sent post paid at Regular Subscription price, \$2.00.

BOUND VOLUMES, PRICE, \$3.00, by Express, prepaid, \$3.50, are ready for delivery. Address,

PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.