

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 4, 1904.

Number 322.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

The Chicago traction-case decision made by the Federal judges, Grosscup and Jenkins, is upon the whole a victory for the city, still further clearing the way for immediate municipal ownership, notwithstanding that upon one point the decision supports the contention of the traction companies.

On that point, the question of the effect of the 99-year act upon the earlier grants of traction privileges (vol. vi, p. 468), the city loses. The judges hold in that particular that when the legislature of Illinois in 1859-65 empowered the original corporators to receive street traction franchises from the city of Chicago, it thereby granted those franchises itself, and for the full life of the corporations—99 years. All subsequent grants by the city, prior to the time when the home rule provisions of the constitution of 1870 became operative, are therefore held not to have been grants by the city at all, but to be in effect descriptions of privileges already granted by the State. Consequently the so-called 99-year act is held to protect and to fix the duration of all the street traction franchises in Chicago granted by the city prior to the official declaration of the result of the charter election of 1875, which was made May 3, 1875. The force of the act is held to end there because by virtue of that election the city of Chicago acquired home rule powers pursuant to the new Constitution and legislation under it.

It is not so very long ago that some of the reasoning whereby these judges reached their conclu-

sion in support of the 99-year term would have amazed both bench and bar. For they construe the 99-year grant from the State liberally in favor of the grantee instead of strictly against him. This easy-going method of dealing with a sovereign grant under which enormous powers hostile to public interests are claimed, would have been judicially impossible before the improvident custom of bestowing sovereign grants upon giant corporations had generated business and political conditions that make profitable legal employment and honorable judicial preferment depend largely upon corporate confidence and favor. But under that influence judicial precedents have tended away from more than one wholesome legal principle which once stood between the rights of the people and the greed of plutocratic interests.

In passing upon the point here under consideration the judges in this case lay down substantially the following premises for their reasoning: Chicago possessed no power to grant traction rights in her streets. She assumed, however, to grant such rights and her grantees cured her defective grants by securing the State grant in question. This grant is divisible into three parts—the granting part, the identifying part, and the terms and conditions part. The granting part empowered the corporation to construct and operate traction lines within certain geographical boundaries within the city; and the identifying part allowed the authorized construction and operation to be along such streets “as the common council of said city have authorized . . . or shall from time to time authorize.” The only thing bearing upon the question of duration was the mere grant of corporate life, 99 years,

and the provisions of the terms and conditions part of the act, namely, that the construction and operation authorized is to be in “such manner and upon such terms and conditions, and with such rights and privileges, immunities and exemptions,” as the city has or may “by contract prescribe.” To most intelligent men it would seem absurd to conclude from these premises that the legislature had done anything more than to validate previous city grants upon such conditions and for such duration not exceeding 99 years as the city had contracted for, and to empower the city in its discretion to grant further ones upon such conditions and for such duration not exceeding 99 years as it might thereafter contract for. But Judges Grosscup and Jenkins reason otherwise. From these premises they conclude that the validated city grants were extended in duration by the 99-year act from the shorter period specified therein to 99 years; and that all subsequent city grants under the 99-year act continue for the 99 years, no matter what shorter period may have been specified in the contract which the act authorized the city to make.

To reach that conclusion it seemed necessary to narrow the limiting words of the grant. And this these judges did. “Had the legislature meant,” they argue, “to put within the power and disposition of the common council the period of the grant . . . apt language was at hand to express such purpose.” And because “apt language” of limitation is absent the judges infer absence of purpose. They consequently construe the inapt words of the sovereign grantor liberally in favor of the grantee of this sovereign power. And in doing so they extend the city's contracts beyond the pe-

riods which those contracts specify, in spite of the fact that the State grant empowers the city to determine the traction routes "in such manner and upon such terms and conditions and with such rights and privileges, immunities and exemptions" as it may arrange for with the traction corporations "by contract."

It is quite possible that such enormous latitude might be allowable in passing judgment upon a remedial act of legislation, but in construing a grant of sovereign power, which by such construction is recklessly improvident, it borders close upon the preposterous. Would it not have been much more in harmony with sound principles of construction for the judges to have said: Had the legislature meant to grant this power to a corporation for 99 years instead of granting it for such shorter periods as the city had contracted and might contract for, apt language was at hand to express such purpose; and as apt language for that purpose was not used, the courts must assume, with reference to a grant of this character, that the lesser and not the greater grant was intended by the inapt or uncertain language? When a legislature fails to use apt words in limiting a grant of sovereign power, it is certainly not sound public policy, whatever kind of law it may be, to so construe the ambiguous words of limitation it does use as to make the grant a long one when a shorter one may be reasonably inferred.

One point, however, which the judges make in favor of the 99-year term is at least plausible. They quote a clause of the act which they say "would be without reasonable meaning," and which does seem at least of doubtful meaning, upon any other theory than that the term of traction grants was fixed by the act and not left to the city. Of course, force must be given to the entire act, if given to any part of it; and if the 99-year theory is absolutely

necessary to accomplish this, then the 99-year theory must prevail, at least as to interpretation. But other explanations of this clause have been made, and it is by no means certain that Judges Jenkins and Grosscup have adopted the only one which is consistent with the whole act.

All this part of the decision, however, is claimed by friends of immediate municipal ownership in Chicago to be innocuous as a matter of practical concern, because the other important point in controversy is decided against the traction companies. The allusion here is to the "twig and branches" theory. It was contended by the corporations not only that the 99-year act was a grant by the State for 99 years, of all the routes which the city had in the past or might in the future (prior to a change of the law) specify for traction purposes, but also that it was a grant of a traction system under which the company acquired a vested right for traction purposes in all the streets of the city that might enter into the general system of the original grant. In other words, the company claimed that the change to the home rule principle in the State law, occurring with reference to Chicago, May 3, 1875, and the express limitation of all future grants to 20 years, has no effect upon any "branch-and-twig" traction-grant the city had made or might make at any time before 1958; but that such grants fall of their own weight under the protection of the 99-year act, no matter what terms as to duration the city may have specified, and notwithstanding that the State law requires such terms to be no longer than 20 years. This claim was too broad for the Federal judges to sustain when they got together, although Judge Grosscup had intimated pretty freely theretofore that the point strongly appealed to him.

In substance, then, Judges Grosscup and Jenkins have decided two things: (1) All grants by

the city prior to the declaration of the vote at the charter election in 1875, accepted and acted upon by the companies, are inviolable contracts, not for the contractual period of the city grant merely, but for the life of the companies—99 years from 1859; and, (2) as to grants by the city subsequent to the declaration of that vote, May 3, 1875, the duration of the contract is to be determined by its own terms and not by the life term of the corporations. An appeal from both branches of the decision will be taken. The city will appeal as to the first point, and the monopolists as to the second. Until the Supreme Court acts, therefore, the effect of this decision is uncertain. Regardless of the appeal, even, the effect cannot be defined until the making of the formal decree, which is to specify the traction grants that fall under the first branch of the decision. But if the court finds in this respect according to the calculations of the Record-Herald of the 29th, made on the basis of the opinion of the two Federal judges, the traction company will be practically at the mercy of the city. "It is estimated by friends of the city," says the Record-Herald of the date named, "that 85 per cent. of the total mileage is without the operation of the 99-year act. On behalf of the city it is also pointed out that the company is left with only three routes to the center of Chicago from the West Side; that it is deprived of an opportunity for a loop in the heart of Chicago; and that the company's outlying feeders are cut off, making its property of practically little value."

Apropos of this Chicago traction decision, the monstrous injustice of regarding as valid any grant of public power to private use for 99 years should not be overlooked. If a grant for three generations is valid, why not one for a thousand years, or ten thousand? The dead have no right to rule the living. No man and no body or generation of men can justly vote away the rights of any

other man or body or generation of men. No franchise was ever granted by the unanimous consent of all concerned. All new-comers to a town after a franchise has been granted, are thereby governed without their consent during the lifetime of that franchise. The self-evident truth of "government by consent of the governed" invalidates every irrevocable franchise, —every one at least which is of unreasonable duration.

The Hon. Robert Baker's courageous and useful record in Congress is about to be rewarded, so it is reported, by the Democratic Boss of Brooklyn, inspired thereto by Wall street men, with an interdict forbidding his renomination. Political bosses and Wall street men have no use for a Congressman who declines railroad passes. Not that they care so much about the passes per se; but a Congressman who refuses passes, especially if he tells about it, thereby exposes a weakness for being honest and courageous in the public service, and this identifies him unmistakably with the "dangerous classes." It is probable, however, that the premature discovery of the Brooklyn Boss's purpose may frustrate it. At a dinner given to Baker on the 27th in Brooklyn (p. 106), where the subject was mentioned, the demonstration was menacing to Bosses. This dinner is reported by the New York and Brooklyn papers as having been extraordinarily successful and significant. Over 200 were present and the speaking was vigorous and excellent. Among the speakers were Gov. Garvin, of Rhode Island, and Bird S. Coler, the last Democratic candidate for governor of New York, besides Congressman Baker himself. Since Baker's district is a Republican stronghold, any attempt by the plutocrats to prevent his getting the Democratic nomination cannot but testify to his popular strength and indicate the wholesome fear in which he is held by spoilsmen of both parties.

Mr. Baker has issued a challenge

to the Republican party which might well be imitated by radical Democratic candidates elsewhere. It is contained in the following letter:

544 Carlton avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., May 26, 1904. Hon. Jesse Overstreet, Secretary Republican Congressional campaign Committee, Washington, D. C.:

Dear Sir—A news item which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of April 25 has been brought to my attention. It relates to the speech of Hon. William Bourke Cockran of New York, delivered in the House of Representatives on Saturday, April 23, and announces the intention of the Republican campaign committee to print large quantities of the speech for circulation in certain Congressional districts. I have no means of knowing whether this article was inspired or not. Assuming, however, that such announcement was authentic, I respectfully submit this proposition:

Should your committee print this speech, it will, of course, be because convinced that the free trade utterances of Mr. Cockran will lead voters to desert the Democratic and support the Republican candidates. Believing in the circulation of literature rather than "boodle"—especially literature which calls a spade a spade—I shall be glad to assist in the wide distribution of this speech and therefore hereby promise and agree, if your committee will supply the same, to address and mail a copy to every voter in this, the Sixth Congressional District. Being thus circulated under my frank, the voters will understand that I heartily indorse the free trade sentiments therein expressed.

I shall be glad to be favored with an early reply. Yours respectfully,
Robert Baker..

The Republicans were supposed to have suffered great loss in the way of campaign management when Senator Hanna died, but Secretary Cortelyou is well-conditioned to make a good substitute. It must have been somewhat like an inspiration, the idea of turning the job of raising campaign funds and "jollyng" labor union leaders over into the hands of the cabinet officer who is at the head of the Department of Commerce and Labor.

A socialist orator, J. L. Fitts, as reported in Appeal to Reason, had an interesting time in Salisbury, N. C. When he undertook to speak on the street a policeman took him down, and when he appealed to the mayor he met the following decision:

I don't want my people stirred up. I know what is good for them, and have their welfare at heart. You don't look

like you do. I allow candidates and their friends to speak, but you can't. I have that entirely in my charge, and you need not talk any more about it.

The fine, large way in which the mayor talks of "my people" and "their welfare" is worthy of His Majesty Edward VII. or Kaiser Wilhelm, and shows that the "protective spirit" still reigns supreme in Salisbury, as well as in some other places.

It is with profound regret that we note the suspension of City and State of Philadelphia. Under the devoted editorial management of Herbert Welsh, that paper has exerted the most wholesome influence, both in its own commonwealth on local questions, and in the nation on imperialism. It has stood bravely and intelligently for clean politics, equal rights, just laws, and genuine democratic government. Deeply as its suspension is to be deplored its influence while it lived can not be forgotten. After all, with newspapers as with men, the vital consideration always is, not whether they are dead, but whether their work and influence lives and is worthy to live.

That distinguished anti-labor leader, David M. Parry, is reported to have drawn a queer distinction between restriction of competition by labor unions and restriction of competition by protective tariff laws. The matter is put in the form of this question to Mr. Parry and his reply:

Question: As you believe in unrestricted competition in the employment of labor, do you also believe in conducting industrial enterprises in harmony with natural competitive conditions? Do you believe in free trade or protection? If you are a protectionist, how do you harmonize the application of a natural law in employing laborers and the ignoring of this law in conducting a manufacturing enterprise?

Mr. Parry's reply: As an interference with natural law the tariff is to be tolerated because its aim is the advancement of the interests of the whole people; but the interference of organized labor with natural law is not to be tolerated because its aim is the advancement of the interests of only part of the people.

Mr. Parry's reply fixes his stand

ing as a controversialist. There is no reason in him. He must be the original altruistic genius who invented the doctrine that "what's yours is mine and what's mine's my own." Labor unions do not urge their restrictions in the interest of part of the people; they urge them in the interest of all. Just as Mr. Parry would say that the man who pays more for what he buys, on account of protection, will profit by a better market for what he has to sell, so the labor unionist says, and with far more reason, that the man who pays higher wages on account of labor restrictions will profit by a better market for his output, since higher wages makes greater purchasing power. If protection is for the whole people, so is trades unionism.

One might like to know, however, how protection can serve to advance the interests of the whole people. For instance: Imported maple sugar is taxed for protection at the rate of 4 cents a pound, which is equal to \$80 a ton, or \$1,600 for a 20-ton carload. If, then, you buy a 20-ton carload of maple sugar in Canada for \$3,200 and pay \$1,600 in duty upon the importation, you will have invested \$4,800 in that carload of sugar. In order to get your money back you must sell the carload for \$4,800; and in order to make a profit to pay for your work and expense of handling, and for your investment and risk, you must sell it for more than \$4,800. Now whatever that profit may be, two-thirds of it will be on your investment in sugar and one-third on your investment in tax. It is a profit you would not get if there were no tariff, and goes to show that it may be as profitable to sell taxes as to sell goods. But how does that profit on the tax tend to advance the interests of the whole people? Is it not, on the contrary, a profit wrenched out of the American consumers of Canadian maple sugar for the purpose of enabling a few American producers to wrench an extra profit out of the

American consumers of their product? And how do these sugar-eaters get any corresponding advantage? No how. Nor does Mr. Parry wish them to, if they are workingmen; for he objects to their evening-up by combining to raise their wages above the level of natural competition. The natural laws of competition may be suspended by tariffs for the benefit of men like Mr. Parry, but must not be suspended by trade unions for the benefit of employes of men like Mr. Parry. Mr. Parry's rule works only one way, and that is his way. Like a county fair fakir he would fix the thing so as to "catch 'em a-coming and catch 'em a-going."

THE ECONOMIC LESSON OF THE ROMAN CAMPAGNA.

In view of the juggling with statistics that is so common, and of the possibility of infinite and interminable juggling, may it not be true that Luigi Cossa pricked the "historical method" of economic study at a very vulnerable point when he said that it reduced political economy to a mere narrative of facts? And mighty slippery and elusive facts, too.

It seems to me that the historical method is rather a means of covering up, than of clearing up, the truth. I am persuaded that no more effective means of misleading seekers after economic truth could be devised.

If an exponent of the historical school, knowing the history, millenniums long, of the Roman Campagna, can say:

If we are asked whether this doctrine of rent, and the consequences which Ricardo deduced from it, are true, we must answer that they are hypothetically true in the most advanced industrial communities, and there only. * * * but that even in those communities neither safe inference nor sound action can be built upon them—

if a member of the historic school can say this, in the light of the history of the Roman Campagna, is it not a fair question to ask, "Will the time ever come when he, or his kind, will say anything that human society can afford to listen to? If the stretch of time through which the latifundia have grown

mosquitoes and sheep, to the extinction of human beings, is not enough to convince the "historical" student that the so-called Ricardian law of rent is valid, and that safe inference and sound action can be built upon it, about how many thousand years more will be required to furnish him a sufficient historical background from which to flash the dazzling splendor of his economic revelation?

Prof. Rudolfo Lanciani, writing in the *Youth's Companion*, says: "We may gather an idea of the activity which prevailed in an ancient farm from the following extract from the official gazette—*Acta Diurna*—published in Rome at the time of Caligula, reproduced by Petronius Arbiter in his "Supper of Trimalchio:"

On June 25, in Trimalchio's farm by Cumae, were born 70 children, of whom 30 were of the male sex. The same day 50,000 modii of wheat (about 100,000 gallons) were removed from the thrashing floors to the granaries; 500 young oxen were broken. The same day one of the slaves, named Mithridates, was executed by crucifixion, because he had cursed the sacred name of the Emperor (Caligula), and lastly, 10,000,000 sesterces (about \$400,000) were deposited in the safes.

That was about eighteen hundred and fifty years ago, and what a population that farm must have supported! Seventy children born in one day! Think what herds of cattle there must have been, when five hundred young oxen were broken on a single day. A hundred thousand gallons of wheat put into the granaries, and four hundred thousand dollars put in the safe!

To-day a handful of men do all the work of one of those ten-thousand-acre farms. Why? Because the owner of land finds it more profitable to himself to raise sheep, cattle, horses and hay than to let human beings live upon it.

"Since the days of the Empire," continues Prof. Lanciani, "the state and condition of the Campagna have only altered for the worse." And now the hovels which the few laborers inhabit "are unfit for human beings to live and die in."

The totally unsheltered cattle, horses and sheep must withstand "the inclemency of the weather, no matter whether it freezes hard

for forty-one consecutive days, as in 1878, or rains for seven consecutive weeks, as in 1884."

Many of the greatest farms have been entirely denuded of trees, and the laborers are obliged to buy or steal fuel.

The corn land is worked only every third year to save fertilizing.

The regular population of a Roman farm consists of a massaro, or manager-in-chief, of three or four cowboys, of three or four shepherds, of a few plowmen, and of one or two cartmen, who carry the milk to the city in the early morning and come back in the cool of the evening with provisions.

"The hired hands [harvest hands], like the cattle, have no shelter in the farm buildings. They sleep in caves or in huts, or under a tent, or in the open air, and they furnish, therefore, a considerable percentage of the general death rate of the country."

The rents have all gone to a small number of people during those two thousand years, and now the laborer on the land must steal his fuel, or go without, and is reduced to the alternative of sleeping in the open air, or in a cave, or of looking elsewhere for a job; which is to say that he must accept whatever the landlord may choose to give, or die. For it is certain that he would take a better job elsewhere if he could get it.

In that fertile territory, in the heart of the Old World, pasturage and sheep prevail, while agriculture and human population decline.

The Italian government has been trying to improve conditions in the Campagna, and has divided up great farms among the peasantry. Prof. Lanciani says that the landlords do not get half the income from the land under this plan that they did before, and that "experienced colonists from Lombardy have been put in charge of some of the farms to ascertain if it is possible to improve the state of the Campagna without undue injury to the interests of the landed proprietors."

The landlords have exercised their power to take everything hitherto, whether that everything was little or much. By the introduction of the Lombardy colo-

nists, it is no doubt confidently believed that conditions will be greatly improved, without having recourse to so harsh an expedient as interfering with the landlord's power to take everything, as heretofore! This may be "historical" sociology, but it certainly is not economic science.

Remember, Prof. Lanciani says that: "Since the days of the Empire the state and condition of the Campagna have only altered for the worse." If any advantage from any source whatever has arisen, then, the landlords have appropriated it—and more too. Which means, of course, that if any advantage arises from the introduction of the Lombardy colonists the landlords will not appropriate that! So thinks the learned professor.

Thus we perceive that "neither safe inference nor sound action can be built upon" the theory that rent tends increasingly to absorb the produce of human industry! Do we or do we not?

"The most interesting result of this campaign," Prof. Lanciani further observes, "has been the colonization of the once pestilential swamps of Ostia by a band of socialists, who have become models of thrift, order and propriety since the late King Humbert gave them the means of acquiring possession of the lands which they had rescued and drained with their own hands."

Now, at the risk of incurring the contempt of the "historical" economist, I confess that I deduce, from the Ricardian law of rent, that but for the intervention of King Humbert the landlords would have reaped the benefits of the improvements made by the peasants in this case, as in all others in that territory.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

OHIO.

Columbus, O., June 1.—I think I am able now to make you a fair statement regarding the principal happenings at the Democratic convention of last week, and about which the papers of Ohio are not yet through speculating.

To begin with, the reactionaries had a majority of the delegates. They are likely, too, to control the Ohio delegation at the national convention, al-

though this is not certain. Notwithstanding their majority in the State convention, however, they were so badly managed that the radicals under Mayor Johnson fairly beat them on two distinct and important contests.

One was the nomination of A. P. Sandles for secretary of state. Mr. Sandles is an out and out radical, who has always been with the Johnson faction, and who is likely to dominate the party organization against the interest of the reactionaries. He was nominated in a contest against a reactionary.

More significant even than this was the contest regarding the railroad ring. This ring had influenced the committee on resolutions to keep out of the platform the demands for 2-cent per-mile railroad fares, prohibition of railroad passes, and equitable taxation of railroads. It was plausibly argued that as no legislature was to be elected this year those questions ought to be ignored by the convention. Mayor Johnson did not think so, and making a test of one of the demands, that for reducing fares to two cents, he started a contest on the floor of the convention, and greatly to the chagrin of the reactionaries he won.

It is evident that if Mr. Johnson had made any fight at the primaries for delegates, he could have controlled the convention. But he had decided not to do this, and his friends now say that he does not regret that decision. They do not regard his temporary loss of control, which they look upon as more apparent than real, as a calamity at this time. On the contrary, they believe that the principles he is fighting for will soon stand out all the more clearly for this seeming eclipse.

The most sensational thing regarding Johnson's relation to the convention is the story, which is persistently published, that a break has occurred between him and his political lieutenant—Charles P. Salen. There is just enough truth in the reported facts to make the story plausible.

Salen is not Johnson's kind of politician. Whereas Johnson is frank in all he does and says, depending upon the essential honesty and common sense of the people in the long run, Salen is a politician of the machine type who believes in heelers and combinations rather than political principles for effectiveness in winning political battles, and who has not the patience to court present defeat for the sake of future victory. But Salen is a skillful manager, in whose personal probity and loyalty to the radical principles of democracy Johnson has had implicit confidence, notwithstanding his unwisdom at times as to methods. Many of Johnson's supporters have never shared his confidence in Salen, and when they found him lobbying here

last Winter with a Republican legislature to prevent the repeal of a Republican law making county offices fee offices instead of salaried offices, they were confirmed in their distrust; for Salen, as county clerk of Cuyahoga, is in receipt under the fee system of perhaps \$40,000 a year, and Johnson is known to be strongly opposed to that system.

It was easy, therefore, for Johnson's friends to believe that a breach had occurred when they found Salen at the convention last week opposing radical contests and in some cases apparently denying Johnson. And when Salen instead of Johnson was elected as one of the four delegates at large to the national convention, the newspaper men generally jumped to the conclusion that this meant war between the two, and they have ever since been spreading irritating gossip about the matter.

The main facts are very clear. Johnson was not a candidate for delegate-at-large to the national convention. He and Clarke, who had been the party candidate for U. S. Senator, had agreed weeks before that it would not be good policy for them to go upon the delegation at large, and both refused to be candidates. They did become candidates, however, for district delegates to the national convention and both were elected by the 21st district convention. Salen also was elected as a district delegate, by the convention of his own district, the 20th. It is true furthermore that Johnson opposed Salen's becoming a candidate for delegate at large, which Salen did not do publicly until the State convention met. But Johnson's opposition appears to have been only advisory, on grounds of wise policy, and was not improbably prompted by the fact that Salen had fallen under suspicion of having made a corrupt compromise with Bernard, the Cincinnati boss and McLean's lieutenant. In the face of this suspicion Salen's candidacy was certainly well calculated to bring both himself and Johnson under suspicion of making the kind of deals that Johnson is opposed to. But Johnson threw no arbitrary obstacles in Salen's way. He acted against him frankly as a fellow delegate and not arbitrarily as a boss. It is becoming better known that Johnson never does act as a boss. He controls his honest following by advice and argument; and as to the dishonest, he refuses, when convinced of their dishonesty, to cooperate with them either openly or secretly. What Johnson did regarding Salen's candidacy was simply to lay the matter candidly before the Cuyahoga delegation. Telling them of the situation, he advised them that they need not oppose Salen's candidacy on any such theory as that it was a personal affront to him, for both he and Clarke had been urged to become

candidates and had persistently refused. So far, therefore, as he was personally concerned, the field was open to Salen. But he also advised them that he thought Salen's candidacy bad policy. I am assured that Johnson could have carried the delegation unanimously for himself, but as between Salen and an outsider, a considerable majority were for Salen. The minority were still for following Johnson's advice; but, as I am informed, Johnson suggested that they vote in the convention with their colleagues in order to prevent ill-feeling in the delegation. He and Clarke, however, voted against Salen, in protest, as Johnson explained at the time, against what they regarded as Salen's doubtful policy. Johnson moreover nominated and supported Jephtha Gerrard, of Cincinnati, a radical of the Bigelow wing of the party in that city.

The belief among Johnson's friends that Salen had made a bargain with the reactionaries, through "Boss" Bernard of Cincinnati and "Boss" Ross of Columbus, to secure a place for himself as delegate at large in return for using his influence against seating radical delegations, especially those from Cincinnati and Columbus, made his candidacy and his attitude toward those delegations particularly exasperating to Johnson's radical friends. This belief, while natural enough under the circumstances, seems upon the surface to have been unfounded, for both the Bernard and the Ross delegations, except five of the latter, voted on the floor against Salen for delegate at large. It is probably true, nevertheless, that Salen did lend aid and comfort to the reactionary delegations from those cities when their seats were contested.

From Cincinnati the reactionary delegation's seats were contested by Bigelow's radical delegation, and from Columbus the contestants were led by John J. Lentz. The Cincinnati contest appears to have been weakly supported with evidence, although it is a moral certainty that the contestants had been cheated by a combination between Bernard and the Republican boss, Cox. In point of evidence the Columbus contestants' case was much stronger. Mayor Johnson became satisfied that they ought to be seated, and although it is well known that he and Lentz are not friendly, he accordingly supported them. The credentials committee gave the seats to the contestants and Johnson secured the entire Cuyahoga delegation in support of that action. This was done against Salen's urgent opposition. In the Cincinnati case the committee had reported adversely to Bigelow, and nothing could be done to reverse that report.

Although these circumstances do indicate the possibility of Salen's having made an arrangement with the reactionaries, the strong probabilities are

that it was less objectionable considerations that influenced him to oppose the Lentz and Bigelow contests, and that bad judgment prompted by personal ambition caused him to ignore Johnson's advice as to the place of delegate at large.

One thing is certain. Johnson's friends know that he would have tolerated no deal with the reactionaries. Four years ago he declared that clean and effective politics in the Democratic party of Ohio demanded the expulsion of McLean from power in the party, and the overthrow of his Cincinnati ring which operates in collusion with the Republican ring. He has not yet been able to accomplish this. McLean may even get the national committee-manship for which he is planning. But Johnson has not abandoned the effort to make his party in Ohio represent principle instead of spoils and plunder. It is freely stated that he declared here during the convention that he had countenanced no bargain with the ring and would rather lose everything than do so; and whoever knows him well enough to understand his faith in clean and candid political methods realizes that he would rather break with any of his supporters than to wink at corrupt bargains.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, June 2.

The bloodiest battle of the Russo-Japanese war (p. 118) and one of the fiercest of modern times was fought on the 26th from Kinchow to the crest of Nanshan hill, the strongest of the outer land-defenses of Port Arthur.

Upon their double landing near Kinchow three weeks ago (p. 87) the Japanese advanced upon Kinchow, beginning their attack on the 21st. After taking it on the 26th they proceeded along the Russian railway toward Port Arthur, 32 miles to the south, and upon reaching Nanshan hill the same day they became engaged in the fearful conflict which is reported as making this day's battle the fiercest of modern times. Nanshan hill commands the very narrow neck of land just south of Kinchow and is 1,100 feet high. The Russians had covered the top with heavy guns and guarded the slopes with trenches, entangling wires and explosive mines. They believed their position to be impregnable. Up these slopes the Jap-

anese charged again and again in the face of almost certain death. In the earlier rushes every man was shot down before reaching the first line of Russian trenches. It was not until late in the afternoon, after having fought since dawn, that the Japanese drove the Russians from the crest. They then followed the retreating Russian army southward to its second line of defenses, near Nanwanling, and after having fought steadily and bloodily for sixteen hours, they halted. The losses are not accurately reported, but are said to be, as the circumstances would indicate, of enormous proportions on both sides.

Three days later the Japanese were reported as attacking Dalny, the docks and piers of which the Russians themselves had already blown up (p. 103). On the 30th Chinese and Russian refugees from Dalny asserted that the Russians had completely withdrawn from the place, and that the Japanese had taken possession on the 29th. The Russians appear also to have abandoned without a battle their second line of defenses at Nanwanling.

A blockade of the Liaotung peninsula by the Japanese was reported at Washington on the 28th by the American minister at Tokio. The blockade includes the entire peninsula south of a straight line drawn from Pitsewo on the east coast to Pulientan on the west. This line crosses the Russian railway at a point a little south of Port Adams.

In connection with the British invasion of Thibet (p. 118), a fight of 11 hours occurred near Gyantse on the 26th, which resulted in the expulsion by the British of the Thibetans from the neighboring village of Palla, a walled town where the Thibetans had started to build works to outflank the British position at Gyantse. A British lieutenant and three Sepoys were killed and three officers and nine men were wounded. The Thibetans are reported to have suffered heavily. Thirty-seven were made prisoners.

The discord in the diplomatic relations of France and the Roman Catholic church (p. 118) was a sub-

ject of discussion in the French chamber of deputies on the 27th. The premier, Mr. Combes, and the foreign minister, Mr. Delcasse, described the attitude of the ministry toward the Vatican, Mr. Combes explaining the character of the Pope's letter at which the French government had taken offense. He said it was a letter complaining to certain Powers of the visit of the President of France to the King of Italy (p. 55) as an insult to the Holy See, and also of the refusal of France to concede to the Pope certain "untenable prerogatives." Explaining the consequent recall of the French minister, Mr. Combes proceeded:

This recall signifies that we cannot allow the Holy See to interpret the presence of our ambassador in Rome in a sense favorable to its claims or to make use of this presence to justify pretensions which we reject. It also means that we will not allow the Papacy to intermeddle in our international relations, and that we intend to have done once for all with the superannuated fiction of temporal power, which disappeared thirty-four years ago.

The position of the ministry was sustained in the chamber of deputies by a vote of 427 to 95.

Religious news in the United States relates principally to the action on the Cumberland overture (p. 121) by the Northern branch of the Presbyterian church, the general assembly of which is in session at Buffalo. After consideration of this overture for reunion the general assembly voted on the 27th overwhelmingly in favor of acceptance. The vote was on the question of adopting a committee report declaring that—

the churches shall be united under the name and style of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, possessing all the legal and corporate rights and powers which the separate churches now possess. The union shall be effected on the doctrinal basis of the confession of faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, as revised in 1903, and of its other doctrinal and ecclesiastical standards; and the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged as the inspired word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

This basis of reunion is to be submitted by both churches to their respective presbyteries, which are required to meet on or before April 30, 1905, to express approval or

disapproval; and reports of the presbyteral vote are to be submitted to the respective general assemblies at the meetings thereof in 1905, whereupon, in case of favorable results, the reunion becomes complete. Both the race question and the woman question are involved in this readjustment. The Cumberland church freely admits women to office, but discriminates against Negroes; the Northern branch makes no discrimination against Negroes, but does exclude women from ecclesiastical office. One of the dispatches says of the debate at Buffalo that—

Dr. Stevenson opposed the proposed union because of the difficulty in the way of administration, especially in regard to the boards of the church, and more particularly because the Cumberland Church has a good many women elders. The picture of a woman sitting as a commissioner in the general assembly caused a smile that ran into laughter and ended in applause.

In Methodism also the spirit of reunion is at work. At the conference of the Methodist Protestant church—the largest non-episcopal branch of the Methodist denomination in America—this body adopted a report on union, at one of its sessions in Washington on the 27th. The report provides that whenever the Methodist Episcopal Church shall appoint a commission to consider the question of union the president of the general conference of the Methodist Protestant Church is authorized to appoint a like commission to consider terms; and the president of the conference is given authority to call the conference together whenever any commission on union shall request it.

At the Methodist Episcopal general conference in session at Los Angeles (p. 73), the question of prohibited amusements (p. 106) was disposed of on the 27th. In the debate, lengthy and heated, the opponents of restriction argued that young people are kept out of the church by an unnecessarily severe restriction, which is not obeyed by many of their elders and cannot be generally enforced. The proposed amendment was voted down, 441 to 118, and theater-going, card-playing, dancing, etc., remain under the interdict of this church. Another important act by this conference

was the adoption on the 28th, by an almost unanimous vote, of an amendment to the constitution of the church, authorizing the selection of bishops without regard to nationality or race. On the 28th the conference adjourned.

In the political field the principal event of the week is the reassembling on the 31st of the Republican convention of Illinois (p. 119) after the recess necessitated by a long deadlock. The first ballot for gubernatorial candidate, after this recess, being the 59th ballot of the convention:

Yates	487
Lowden	396
Deneen	383
Hamlin	116
Warner	41
Sherman	50
Pierce	28

The subsequent changes are indicated by the following report of the last ballot on the 1st of June, the 66th of the convention:

Yates	474
Lowden	411
Deneen	384
Hamlin	119
Sherman	51
Warner	36
Pierce	28

Democratic conventions (p. 119) for choosing national delegates were held in Georgia, Michigan, Oklahoma and Nebraska on the 1st. The Georgia convention instructed for Parker by a vote of 166 to 157. That of Michigan refused to instruct for a candidate, a defeat for Hearst, but it did instruct the delegation to act as a unit. In Oklahoma the convention, controlled by the Bryan wing, overwhelmingly voted against instructions for Parker and made none for anyone else.

The Nebraska Democratic convention was most important of all. It met at Omaha on the 1st, and of the 1,065 delegates present 1,056 were devoted to Bryan, who was chosen to lead the delegation as first delegate at large. Mr. Bryan, as chairman of the committee on resolutions, reported the platform which the convention adopted, and with the authorship of which he is credited. As reported by the dispatches, the platform imposes the

unit rule and is otherwise as follows:

We, the Democrats of the State of Nebraska, in convention assembled, reaffirm our faith in democratic principles as those principles were set forth in the last national platform of the party, adopted at Kansas City in 1900.

Democracy means the rule of the people—a government resting upon the consent of the governed and administered according to the will and in the interest of the people.

With an increasing love for the principles of democracy and an increasing confidence in their final triumph, we look upon the present time as opportune for their earnest and courageous promulgation. With a chief executive who has disregarded constitutional limitations, stirred up antagonism between the races, employed all the powers of his office to secure a renomination, and purchased political support by turning the treasury department over to the financiers and putting the law department into the hands of the trusts—with such a chief executive and with Republican leaders openly and arrogantly in alliance with organized wealth the country imperatively needs a return of the government to positive and clearly defined democratic principles.

Democracy, as taught by Jefferson and exemplified by Jackson, is the hope of the Republic and offers the only relief from the plutocracy which now dominates the Republican party and through that party the country.

Democracy would oppose as inimical to the welfare of the people all private monopolies, and would exterminate them by the enforcement of the remedies suggested in the Kansas City platform. The failure of the present administration to enforce existing laws, or to suggest more effective laws, is conclusive proof that it lacks the desire, the intelligence, or the moral courage to attack the conscienceless combinations of capital that have flourished during recent years.

Democracy would relieve the country of the menace of militarism and imperialism by following the example set by this country in its dealing with Cuba, and giving the Filipinos an immediate promise of ultimate independence. The administration of a colonial system according to monarchical principles is repugnant to our theory of government and cannot be depended upon without the assertion of doctrines which, if carried out, will undermine free government in the United States.

Democracy would restore the tariff to revenue basis and administer it for revenue only, thus demolishing the legal bulwarks behind which the predatory trusts have found refuge. Protection for protection's sake is an ingenious device for the exploitation of the masses by the privileged classes; it has brought

great injustice to the consumers and has been the fruitful source of widespread political corruption.

Democracy would administer the treasury department in behalf of the public, not, as now, in the interest of Wall street; it would prevent the recoinage of legal tender silver dollars into limited legal tender subsidiary coin. It would secure to the people a volume of standard money sufficient to keep pace with the demand for money. It would favor paper money issued by the government without the intervention of national banks. It would resist the attempt to establish an asset currency and branch banks, and it would oppose the loaning of government money to favored banks—a scheme by which the people's money is employed to lay a foundation for a campaign fund and to bribe the financial interest to oppose any reduction of taxation. The present administration of the treasury department is progressively beneficial to the capitalistic class and progressively harmful to the producers of wealth.

Democracy would make taxation more equitable by collecting a part of the revenues from an income tax, secured by a constitutional amendment, and would bring the government nearer to the people by the popular election of United States senators and direct legislation.

Democracy would strictly regulate railroads, thus protecting farmers and merchants from excessive rates and discriminations.

Democracy would safeguard the interests of the wage earner and the artisan by providing for an eight hour day; by substituting arbitration for strikes and lockouts; and by restoring the right of trial by jury, now suspended through government by injunction.

Democracy would secure to surviving soldiers and sailors and their dependents generous pensions, not by an arbitrary executive order, but by legislation which a grateful people stand ready to enact.

Democracy would construct an Isthmian canal without a violation of treaty obligations and without exciting suspicion among our sister republics of Central and South America.

Democracy has nothing to gain from ambiguity and nothing to fear from the light. Democratic platforms should, therefore, set forth democratic principles, policies, and purposes with frankness, clearness, and definiteness. Those who champion the principles embodied in a truly democratic creed can appeal to the moral sense of the country, and trust for vindication to the awakened conscience of an intelligent and patriotic citizenship.

In addition to the platform the following resolution, offered by a delegate on the floor was unanimously adopted:

The Democracy of Nebraska heralds

to the democracy of the nation its steadfast respect for, confidence in, and loyalty to Nebraska's great champion of pure democratic principles, and bids him God speed in his splendid efforts to prevent the national organization from falling under the baneful control of the enemies of the real democracy.

Another pronouncement on the Presidential situation in the Democratic party (p. 8) was put forth by ex-President Cleveland on the 30th in the form of an interview in the Philadelphia North American. He reiterates his belief that Judge Parker will be the nominee, but implies that while favorable to Parker he does not yield his original judgment that Mr. Olney or Judge Gray might have proved the strongest candidate against Roosevelt.

Important court decisions are a notable feature of the week's news, the Supreme Court of the United States having contributed most of them. One of these, rendered on the 31st, sustains the oleomargarine law of Congress (vol. v, pp. 90, 148), which imposes a higher tax upon oleomargarine colored to look like butter than upon the uncolored product. Another decision, rendered the same day, invalidated a street car ordinance of Cleveland which reduced fares from 5 to 4 cents, holding that the 5-cent ordinance was an inviolable contract. The conviction of two Philippine editors, convicted of libel at Manila without jury trial, was sustained by the same court on the same day, Judge Harlan writing a dissenting opinion in which he said:

The guarantees for the protection of life, liberty and property embodied in the Constitution were for the benefit of all, of whatever race or nativity, either in the States composing the Union or in any territory, however acquired, over which and for the independence of which the United States may exercise the power conferred upon it by the Constitution. The conclusion reached by the Court is so obviously forbidden by the Constitution that I cannot regard the judgment of this Court otherwise than as an amendment to the Constitution by judicial action, when another mode of amendment is expressly provided for in that instrument.

In another Philippine case two convicts were released by the Supreme Court in a decision of the same date. They had been once acquitted, but upon appeal by the

prosecutor a new trial was ordered at which they were convicted. The Supreme Court holds that they were twice in jeopardy, contrary to the Constitution of the United States and at variance with the practice established by Congress for the government of the Philippines. Finally, this court made a decision, also on the 31st, refusing to review a decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the circuit including Chicago, and thereby reversing Judge Grosscup, one of the Federal judges of the Chicago circuit, who had granted an injunction against minority stockholders of the Union Traction Company, in the hands of receivers appointed by him, forbidding those stockholders to assert their rights in the State courts.

That decision was preceded only by a few days by the decision of Judges Grosscup and Jenkins, in the contest between his receivers of the Union Traction Company and the city of Chicago (vol. vi, p. 777). They hold (1) that as to such ordinances as were passed by the city council of Chicago prior to the counting of the vote at the charter election in 1875 (whereby Chicago acquired full power to grant local traction privileges), and accepted and acted upon by the railway companies, there exists, between the companies and the city a contract relation, terminable by neither party without the consent of the other, until the 99 years named in the legislative acts expires; but (2) that as to the streets occupied under ordinances passed after that date, the contract relation is to be looked for solely in the ordinances themselves. In substance this decision denies the contention of the city that the so-called 99-year act is ineffective to fix the term of any franchise at 99 years from its passage, but admits its contention that the act can apply only to some of the trunk lines. Both sides claim a practical victory, but the probability appears to be that the decision, as it stands, fatally cripples the traction monopolists.

NEWS NOTES.

—President Roosevelt delivered the Memorial Day oration at Gettysburg on the 30th.

—Robert M. McLane, mayor of Balti-

more, committed suicide on the 30th. His age was 36.

—A joint convention of British and American engineers began its session in Chicago on the 31st.

—The international tuberculosis congress was formally opened at Copenhagen on the 27th.

—United States Senator Quay, of Pennsylvania, died at his home in Beaver, Pa., on the 28th, at the age of 71.

—A Filipino leader of the name of Ricate was sent to Guam in exile by the American authorities at Manila on the 30th.

—During the military parade at Denver on Memorial Day the militia were frequently hissed along the line of march.

—Jane Addams, of Hull House fame, has been elected by the University of Wisconsin to receive the honorary degree of LL. D.

—At the tenth annual conference on international arbitration, held at Mohonk on the 1st, Judge Gray presided, and Gen. Horatio C. King and Congressman Robert Baker spoke.

—The 50th anniversary of the recognition of Kansas as a Territory of the United States was celebrated at Topeka on the 30th. The Secretary of War, Mr. Taft, delivered the oration.

—Prof James H. Dillard, of Tulane University, New Orleans, to whom the presidency of the Louisiana Industrial school at Ruston, was recently tendered (p. 41), has declined the appointment.

—A. N. Waterman, former justice of the Illinois Appellate Court, has been elected dean of the John Marshall law school, of Chicago, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late John N. Jewett.

—The Worcester (Mass.) Spy, established in 1770, by Isaiah Thomas, a patriot refugee from Boston, and which has never before missed an issue, suspended publication on the 31st. It was loaded down with debt.

—At the inter-State oratorical contest at Springfield, Ill., a young woman, Miss Mamie White, of Wheaton College, was the victor. She had won three preliminary contests as a condition of admission to this one.

In the contest of the Northern Illinois High School League at DeKalb, on the 27th, Edwin M. Miller, of Geneva, Ill., a grandson of a former Virginia slaveholder won the gold medal for oratory with an oration in eulogy of "William Lloyd Garrison."

—The consecration of King Peter of Serbia is to take place on the 15th (28th) of June at the Convent of Yatcha. He will not, however, be crowned, for the simple reason that there is no historical royal crown or insignia in Serbia, and the democratic ideas of the Serbs are al-

together opposed to the introduction of a modern one.

—A special dispatch from Cincinnati to the Cleveland Plain Dealer of the 26th announces that Herbert S. Bigelow, Tom L. Johnson's political co-worker and principal supporter in Cincinnati, and pastor of the Vine Street Congregational church, has withdrawn from active politics. He is quoted as saying:

I have concluded that, having tried for three years to assist in that way to the good of my fellow citizens, and as I have contributed really more in that direction than I could afford, it is best that I should desist from further efforts of that kind. I have always had mental reservations as to that kind of work, but they were overruled by the friendship between Mr. Johnson and myself. I told Mr. Johnson some days ago that I found myself getting in deeper and deeper, and that I had finally decided to abandon specific efforts in the political line.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE CHICAGO TRACTION QUESTION.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind. Rep.), May 29.—What, then, can the Union Traction Company do if the court's view is sustained? Should it essay the role of an obstructionist on such slight holdings as it has it would merely irritate the people without making any substantial gains for itself. And it is hardly conceivable that shrewd business men would give way to such folly. The sensible course, at any rate, is to resume negotiations with the idea of placating the public and of utilizing the ninety-nine-year fragment only in so far as it may be reasonably brought in for trading purposes. If the right spirit is shown there will be no unreasonableness on the part of the city.

Hearst's Chicago Examiner (Dem.), May 31.—Suppose we had believed what the corporation-ruler newspapers incessantly told us, that the ninety-nine-year act was an effective bar to municipal ownership. What would be the state of things now? Why, simply this, that the traction companies would have their twenty-year franchises, the community would be once more helplessly in their power, the old game of gauge and graft would go on, the stock-jobbers would reap their rewards, there would be no possible chance of relief in this generation and too late we should discover that the ninety-nine-year act was a mere bluff, a thing of straw, an old stuffed scarecrow and the traction companies had used it to frighten us into willingness to be bunceed.

TOM L. JOHNSON.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), May 30.—Tom Johnson himself may get knocked out sooner or later. In the hurly-burly of politics men come and go. But the ideas for which Tom Johnson stands will persist. They may for a time be obscured. They may for a season seem to be forgotten. But they cannot die. They are as immortal as truth, and, like truth, when crushed to earth, they will rise again. There has been a certain amount of reaction in Ohio. Of this it is Mr. Johnson's fate to be the victim to a greater or less extent. But the work Mr. Johnson has already done will live and in good time it will result in still greater achievements. Mr. Johnson, happily, can afford to wait till the pendulum swings back.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind. Rep.), June 1.—We may be quite sure that the promise of independence will appear in one party platform if, not in another, and that will keep recurring unless there is such complete satisfaction in the islands that the desire for independence shall pass wholly away.

DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM.

The Commoner (Dem.), May 27.—There is a well defined line between government

ownership when competition is impossible, and government ownership for the express purpose of destroying competition. Take the case of a city water plant. The argument in favor of the municipal ownership of such a plant is not that all competition between water companies is necessarily bad, but that competition is practically impossible. Following close behind the water and the lighting comes the street car service, and the same arguments that apply to water and lighting apply with almost as much force to the street car system. . . . If central heating plants grow in favor, as they seem likely to, the same principle will apply. . . . If we are to shun as socialist every cooperative effort of the government, we must abandon our public schools, for they are distinctly cooperative. . . . In paving streets the city indulges in cooperative effort, and in providing police protection the city engages in a cooperative work. . . . All government is cooperative in the sense that it is an economical method employed by the people to do for themselves by joint action what it would be more expensive for each one to do for himself. The question, however, which is doing most to make socialists is the trust question. . . . The Democratic party attacks the principal involved, and declares that a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. It favors legislation that will lay the ax at the root of the tree, and by making a private monopoly impossible, restore industrial independence, and by a revival of competition give protection to the consumer, and stimulus to the producer. The papers which defend the trust as an economic development are the best friends of socialism.

POLITICAL CROSS-EXAMINATION.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), May 31.—On July 6, 1900, the Chicago Chronicle said of Mr. Bryan that "his energy, his zeal, his sincerity, even by his most implacable foes. An honest man, whose honesty is recognized and admitted, is a power in himself, and Mr. Bryan is an honest man." To-day as in 1896, the Chronicle says that Mr. Bryan is a demagogue, an anarchist and a grafter. Did the Chronicle lie in 1896 and does it lie now, or did it lie in 1900? The conclusion is inevitable that it has lied. This being true, is it to be trusted?

CLEVELAND AND ALTGELD.

(Hastings, Neb.) Adams County Democrat (Dem.), May 27.—Mr. Cleveland's defense of his course during the 1894 Chicago railroad strike was very inopportune. During the strike period John P. Altgeld was governor of Illinois; two years ago Altgeld died. Mr. Cleveland had eight years during Mr. Altgeld's life time to make his defense. But he had no defense that was worthy the name while Altgeld lived. With the latter dead, Mr. Cleveland imagines that his perfidy is so far forgotten that he can malign the dead and clear his own skirts. But the people have not forgotten Mr. Cleveland's course in that strike was bad enough, and he only makes it worse by attacking the dead Altgeld, when he had such ample opportunity to speak while Altgeld lived and could have answered.

RAILROAD RETRENCHMENT.

Hearst's Chicago Examiner (Dem.), May 26.—The Pennsylvania Railroad company has decided to lay off 11,000 men. The New York Central has been similarly reducing its operating force, and the same things come from the big lines out here in the West. What is the reason for this tremendous retrenchment? The railroads answer that business has been shrinking, and there is no evidence of improvement of conditions in sight. . . . Why has the volume of business fallen off? Because people cannot afford to travel as much as formerly, in short, because, in spite of the talk of prosperity, the average man is poorer than he was. The railroads are themselves largely to blame for the condition. By their illegal rebate system and freight discrimination they have built up the monster combination that control the resources of the country. The necessity of paying dividends on millions of dollars' worth of watered stock, added to the greed that cannot fail to take advantage of monopoly, has increased the cost of everything a man must buy, so that the ordinary citizen, even though he

finds his income increased, also finds that he must get along with less. . . . If a man consumes a pound of meat a week less than he did formerly, the railroads must transport a pound of meat less from the packing houses to the market. When that man is multiplied by millions the total shrinkage must make a respectable hole in the railroads' freight schedules. Applying the same reasoning to the coal consumed, the clothing worn, and all the rest of the consumption in this country, it is no wonder the railroads find their business diminishing.

STOCK SPECULATION.

The (Chicago) Bear (market letter), May 24.—I am a bear fundamentally. In saying this I do not mean that stocks never should be bought, or that they will not have another great advance some time. Stocks have a normal value. If we can ascertain what it is in a given case, then let's buy, of course, when the price falls below it, and sell when the price soars above it. What I mean by saying that I am a bear fundamentally is that I can see fundamental reasons for the normal values of stocks on an average to decline rather than advance; my estimate of the normal value of most stocks is many points lower than that of the bulls. I fear declines more than I do advances; I can sleep better on a short account than on a long one.

ROCKEFELLER'S MONEY.

Springfield (Mass.) Republican (Ind.), May 13 (weekly ed.).—John D. Rockefeller has been telling his son's Sunday school class in New York how he got his money—part of it. This is one of the evils of this particular great fortune, that it is forever being dragged into church, clothed in white raiment and a halo, and made to solemnize on its own beautitudes. The secret of the Rockefeller fortune, according to its owner, is an early training in business, beginning at the age of 10 or so, and a habit of never letting money on hand burn holes in the pocket. Such a habit is an indispensable condition precedent to getting rich, but it would explain only a part, and that a small part, of the Rockefeller fortune. Saving and industry together would not explain. The full story will never be told by Mr. Rockefeller. That has been left to others for relation out of church.

THE BLACK MAN AT HOME.

(East London, Cape Colony, So. Af.) Izwi Labantu (Kafir-Sesutho), Apr. 19.—Judge Kotzee's sentence on the Basuto convicted at East London Circuit Court of a monstrous outrage on two females, one of whom was a European, has been most interesting to us as revealing the savage racial spirit manifested by the South African Press. The "Cape Times" has astonished one of its own countrymen by the malicious vindictive and purely racial spirit in which it deals with the case. All the recent professions of equal rights and equal justice are proved to be hollow in this paper and the "Cape Argus," the old enemy of the colored people. The "Cape Times" says: "It seems to us that the infliction of the death penalty in all cases of outrage by natives upon white women might well be the rule instead of the exception." Nothing it will be noticed is said of outrages on black women. It may be that the "Cape Times" is ignorant that this particular crime is as repulsive to the black people as the whites. . . . White man, you have got to govern this country for the good of its inhabitants without distinction of race or color. Do not flatter yourselves the man of Africa, white and black, who love justice are going to be cowed by lynching mobs. We approve of Judge Kotzee's decision only that it be as strictly carried out with all. We disapprove of it as a remedy for crimes which are manufactured wholesale in our cantens and brothels and sum up generally. . . . The Negro question is nothing to the great question of social and political corruption which involves the question of democracy versus plutocracy—in a word the human question of right versus wrong.

HERBERT SPENCER.

The (London) New Age (Rad.), April 21.—Spencer had a passion for generalization. This, by-the-by, is also the opinion one forms of him after perusing Henry George's book. Grant Allen says that almost everything he said was a generaliza-

tion. If you remarked it was a fine day, Spencer would answer: "Yes, anti-cyclonic conditions like those of yesterday seldom break up without warning of the advent of a depression from westward." If you observed that Mrs. Jones was a pretty woman, Spencer would reply: "Her father was a West Highlander, and her mother an Irishwoman; and intermarriage between Highlanders and Irish almost always produce physically handsome, but intellectually inferior children."

MISCELLANY

THE FILIPINO'S SONG OF FAITH.

For The Public.

All bathed in sunshine glistening,
One summer afternoon,
The fair young world lay listening
To echoes all atune,
Of song the stars together sang,
In greeting earth's first dawn.
Oh, sweet, though faint, those echoes rang,
Adown the cycles gone.

And yet those strains of joy and hope
A mockery seemed to one
Who slowly climbed the rocky slope,
Facing the western sun.
'Twas Esau, tolling wearily,
Returning from the chase;
His eyes, uplifted drearly,
Beheld his brother's face.

And in that hour of dark despair,
Esau, the hunter bold,
Tempted beyond his strength to bear,
For food his birthright sold,
Then, through the long regretful years,
With toil and sorrow fraught,
In vain, though "carefully, with tears,"
"Place of repentance sought."

Now, crowned with sunshine glistening,
Columbia stands to-day,
And all the hushed world, listening,
Awaits what she may say.
No more the heavenly echoes ring,
Adown the ages gone;
Instead, the song the tempters sing
Proclaims a golden dawn.

False prophets they, and false their song,
As e'er the sirens sang,
For never right was born of wrong,
Nor truth from treachery sprang.
They do not tempt a desperate need,
As Esau's was, of old;
They seek to rouse a nation's greed,
Its thirst for power and gold.

For promises of blood-stained gold,
And power that's yoked with shame,
Was e'er such glorious birthright sold
As that they fear to name?
Still, crowned with sunshine glistening,
Columbia stands, sublime,
With patient scorn stands, listening,
And bides her own good time.

L. L.

IDEALS OR COLONIES?

To be a world power we have warped the Constitution. The Constitution can go to ballyhack but we must keep the Philippines.

To be a world power we have made the flag of the free a symbol of conquest. That, we were told, was unavoidable, we must keep the Philippines.

To be a world power we have forgot-

ten the declaration of independence. Men are not born to be free, and unalienable rights are exploded myths. We could not both hold those beliefs and keep the Philippines, and we must keep the Philippines.

And now they tell us we must discard our ideals. We can't keep our ideals and keep the Philippines, and we must keep the Philippines.

We will be eternally damned if we do.

That is not profanity, but statement of fact.

What is this precious possession that we must give up for it all that has made America great and glorious and godlike among nations?

They say truly no doubt that a colonial government is the only method of ruling a colony. But is it really worth while to sacrifice our institutions and our ideals for the sake of having an assortment of colonies?

But if we chose to keep our ideals and turn the islands loose, what would become of them?

Don't know. Suppose we let God worry about that.

Set this down. The American people will never with knowledge and intent part from their ideals.

—Goodhue Co. (Minn.) News.

THE REDEMPTION OF POLITICS.

In the dictionaries the politician, like the statesman, is a man versed in the science of government. In common usage, however, he is the man who seeks the place of the statesman, without the statesman's qualifications. The aim of the statesman is to promote great public policies. The politician aims to further that policy which will most surely promote him. With the statesman, principle always will be first. The politician cares nothing for principle. He will pipe any tune to which the people will dance.

It may be useless to try to redeem the word "politician." Perhaps we shall have to let it stand for the name of the man who exalts a self-seeking policy above right principles, who regards place and power, not as the possible incidents of a life of public service, but as ends to be sought and won at all hazard to public good or to private honor.

It is the solemn duty of the young men of to-day to enter politics, but not to become politicians. America needs men in public life who, like Cromwell's soldiers, put some conscience into their politics; men who have an understanding of public questions; who see how much human misery is caused by the

practice of false theories of political economy, and who, for the sake of humanity, will throw themselves into the work of instructing the public mind and improving government.

Give us an army of men determined to seize and use the political tools which lie at hand to put an end to the wrongs which breed poverty in the sight of plenty and cause the slums of misery and degradation to mock the triumph of civilization—give us an army of such men, and we will write the history of another French revolution, a revolution which shall not be written in blood nor so soon forgotten in dreams of empire. By arguments and votes we will storm the strongholds of economic ignorance and political greed.

This will be the character of the crusades of the Twentieth century. The church can call men to no holier mission.

HERBERT S. BIGELOW.

THE DEPORTATION OF AN OPINION.

There are various phases of the case of John Turner, the English anarchist, that merit consideration, now that his expulsion from the territory of the United States has been finally decreed. The decision of the United States Supreme Court cannot be successfully attacked by anyone, from a constitutional point of view; and it is not in the least our purpose to deny the power of Congress to enact such laws regarding immigration as the one under which Turner has been obliged to leave the country. The case, however, is evidently the first one of the sort in our history, and it deserves to be studied, notwithstanding that Turner personally is not a man whose intellectual weight or character would arouse widespread sympathy in his favor.

What gives importance to the case is the fact that, broadly speaking, our government has deported not so much a man as an opinion that happened to be embodied in a man. This particular opinion, of course, subjects our traditional freedom of speech and thought to its severest test, because the opinion wars with government itself. Turner, however, claimed that he was not an "active" anarchist, and the Supreme Court, in discussing this point, could go no farther than to intimate that certain of his public discussions of the "universal strike" and of the hanging of the Chicago anarchists in 1887 warranted the conclusion "either that he contemplated the ultimate realization of his ideal by the use of force, or that his

speeches were an incitement to that end." Nowhere does it appear that he actually taught assassination of rulers; his nearest approximation to the doctrine of force was in the "universal strike," which he advocated; and that meant the utterly visionary suspension of work by all the workers of Christendom at the same time in order to compel, by the usual strike method, the inauguration of the ideal of government which he favored. That Turner denounced the hanging of Spies at Chicago as "a legal murder" must be considered in connection with the fact that many respectable and law-abiding citizens in America have held the same view; and that Gov. Altgeld, of Illinois, in pardoning the anarchists who were left unchanged, made a severe criticism of the trial at which they were condemned. Much as we disagree with Turner's opinions and repudiate any championship of his cause, it is necessary to point out these facts in order to comprehend the true bearings of his case.

Conceding, however, for the sake of avoiding controversy on points of fact, that Turner's teaching contained the germs of incitement to others of less self-control to use force in attaining the ideals of theoretical anarchy, the curious situation in which the United States is left by the affair remains to be considered. The situation is this, that if Turner were an American citizen, he would not be molested. Unless his public utterances were an actual incitement to disorder, he would enjoy the same liberty of movement and freedom of speech that the rest of us enjoy. He would not be arrested, were he an American citizen, for advocating a universal strike, nor for denouncing the hanging of Spies and Parsons, nor even for speaking in his usual vein from the same platform with John Most. Emma Goldman wanders about this country at will; and frequently delivers public addresses. Turner, who evidently is much less of a "red" than the Goldman woman, is deported. Thus the absurdity arises of tolerating in American citizens what we will not allow to persons coming from abroad. We permit a freedom of speech to ourselves which, exercised by a foreigner, leads to his expulsion from the land. Turner's opinions are obnoxious; but is it not a futile and absurd proceeding to drive him out of the country while our own citizens can with impunity deliver the same speeches that Turner delivers? The logical outcome of the case would be to deport all others in America who agree with this Englishman. But that cannot be done because of the protection af-

forded American citizens by their Constitution.

The futility of the act of expulsion need not be emphasized, yet who can believe that Turner's departure has increased by an iota the security of our institutions and our government, or has rendered the lives of our officials a particle more secure? Our home brood of anarchists are still with us, and it needs no great discernment to see that their bitterness against government has not been lessened by the recent performance. Anarchy has been advertised; Turner, in the eyes of his sympathizers, has been martyred. In the opinion of the discontented, the embittered, the brooding class of society, the government by this act is more likely to be regarded as a tyrant. And it is from that class of our own citizenship that ugly and disturbing crimes against authority are the most likely to spring.

Congress may enact laws expelling aliens of the Turner type and the government may enforce them; but it is the deliberate judgment of not a few of our best citizens that they fail to accomplish what is expected of them. The history of mankind demonstrates that attacks on opinions, or states of mind, through the coercion of law, are almost invariably an error on the part of governments. True, a government has the power of self-preservation. But is it not also true that there is a right and a wrong time to exercise that power? The socialists of Germany are hostile to monarchy, and there is talk in that country of disfranchising all socialists in order to save monarchical government. Disfranchisement, however, would prove a mistake, because the act would inflame the situation and render peace less secure. These anarchists, whether "active" or "passive," may well be treated with a method calculated to enhance their importance and dignify their menaces as little as possible. They are exceedingly few in number; government as an institution can afford to ignore them utterly; and as for the personal safety of kings and presidents, there is no possible way to insure it except by the constant watchfulness of personal guards.

Much as we dislike to say it, the deportation of Turner is also, in a sense, a break with our past, especially with the tradition of free speech and free thought which have been our pride for generations. Despise this man himself as we may, his expulsion because of his opinions marks a precedent which not a few of us dislike to see established. It apparently marks the beginning of an effort to combat erroneous and pernicious

ideas with other weapons than those of reason and the truth. There can be no permanent victory over human error and fallacious conceptions save by the arts of peaceful persuasion and the general dissemination of truthful information and culture. Deportation, even of an anarchist, smacks too much of a system that has always characterized despotisms rather than free republics whose chief security has rested in the affections of the people.—Editorial in Springfield (Mass.) Republican of May 20.

THE YOUTH OF A CAUSE.

Speech of Louis F. Post at Northwestern University Settlement, Chicago, May 14, 1904, on the occasion of a celebration of the twenty-fifth year of Henry George's "Progress and Poverty."

In the life of a man, a quarter of a century is a long lapse of time. Look back over the past 25 years of your own lives and note how revolutionary the change has been. Some of you have passed from infancy to manhood or womanhood, some from youth to maturity, some from middle life to old age. And between these extremes there are experiences so varied and numerous as to make a glance back over your memories seem like the vision of a vista into some by-gone age. Twenty-five years mark the passage of what is indeed a long, long time in the life of a man.

Even so is it in the life of the man whose work we celebrate to-night. Twenty-five years ago Henry George was setting the type for his then unpublished manuscript of "Progress and Poverty." Outside of California his existence was unknown. In California itself his name was not familiar beyond the suburbs of San Francisco, and was hardly familiar there; while the book upon which he had spent so much labor lived only in his own sublime faith and in the fond hopes of his personal friends. But the passage of these 25 years has left a record of great changes regarding this then obscure man and his then famous book, a record of changes great enough to make the period verily seem like an age.

The book is now a familiar volume and a living force in English literature. By translations it has forged its way into the literature of every other civilized tongue. The man's name has grown into a household word throughout his own country and almost so wherever our language is spoken. He himself, passing from a vigorous manhood through the struggles of a nobly strenuous life to the achievement of the highest of all earthly rewards—popular recognition as a leader of advancing thought in behalf

of human brotherhood—has gone on beyond our ken across the horizon of death. All in 25 years! The time is even shorter, for from that 25 years no less than seven must be deducted for the turf to strengthen upon his grave, for the pathway toward it to harden under the tread of the pilgrims who visit this mound in Greenwood which marks the resting place of his body.

In the life of Henry George as in all our lives, a quarter of a century, with its many events and their wondrous contrasts, with its little beginnings and their amazing climaxes, with its hills of expectation and its valleys of experience, with its sowings and its reapings, is a long lapse of time.

But that which is an age to the individual may be but the youth of a cause; and the greater and more enduring the cause, the longer the period of its youth.

Religion, the greatest and most enduring of all causes, began with the consciousness of the race; but it is not yet out of its youth. Philosophy, the handmaiden of religion, is as old as history; yet it, too, is still in its youth. Science, destined to be as enduring for time as religion for eternity, is not out of its swaddling clothes. Except in the realm of physics, and only on the outer margins of that realm, it babbles like a babe.

In minor causes—sub-causes would perhaps be the better word—this same rule of development holds good. To the causes that are superficial, a few years are as an age. They blossom, bloom and die, like garden flowers. But those that approximate the fundamental, as does the cause to which "Progress and Poverty" gave the impulse, years are as days. Some causes that have sprung up within the past 25 years have already gone. With some that are flourishing in the full flower of maturity, the brevity of their youth is prophetic of their early disintegration. But still in its youth with this close of its twenty-fifth year, our cause is wholesome in spirit, normal in development, sturdy in its youthful strength, and enduring in its possibilities.

From its very nature this cause must be slow of growth. It is farther from the surface and nearer to the core of sound social philosophy, than any of the causes with which it might be compared. In considering problems the human mind naturally proceeds from surface to center, from without inward, from that which seems nearest to that which seems remote, from that which is most obvious to that which at first blush is less so. Normal advance in thought, is, therefore, not from the

fundamental principles of "Progress and Poverty" to those of anarchism and then to those of socialism, and so on, but the reverse. It is from the money question, most superficial of all the substantial economic questions, to socialism, and thence through anarchism to the dominant principle of the book we are celebrating.

Probably most of the disciples of Henry George have gone sympathetically through those several phases of thought, but so quickly as to be unconscious of the process. Others may have been dimly conscious of one or another of the logical steps. But there is at least one man who has not only been conscious of every stage in the process; he has actually lived in every stage, and loved its thought. I refer to our chairman, George A. Schilling, whose work on the taxation report of the Illinois Bureau of Labor is one of the most useful contributions to our cause; and I am going to tell his experience at some length, because it is more exactly typical of the logical processes leading up to the single tax philosophy than any other I know.

When Mr. Schilling first realized the injustice of poverty, he drew the most obvious inference. Poverty consists, he thought, in lack of money; for if you have enough money, you are not poor. Therefore—such was his conclusion—therefore, what we need is more money. So he became a greenbacker, and for a period sympathetically lived the thought-life of the greenbacker.

But after awhile he saw that the problem went deeper down than any supply of money could reach to. It was not money, but the products of labor, that men really needed, and the reason they failed to get these was because government leaves men to shift for themselves, and the powerful capitalist is therefore free to despoil the weak laborer. Mr. Schilling accordingly demanded that government take over all the instruments of production, and establish a governmental industrial regime. He became a socialist, and for another period lived sympathetically the thought-life of socialism.

This phase of his experience also, in due time, passed its period of youth and decrepit old age, and Mr. Schilling began to realize that the solution of the social problem lay beyond the reach of socialism. He was awakened to that realization by an experience at a socialist meeting, where the leader carried things with a high hand, making an exhibition of that autocracy which is inseparable from centralized power. "It is bad enough," thought Schilling, "to

have that man rule our little socialist body with a rod of iron, but I can secede from that body, and I can't secede from society. Suppose his power were to extend to the whole community, and thereby to the regulation of the individual rights of those composing it!" Mr. Schilling had thus seen in minor drama a picture of the man-on-horseback, who would come with socialism as certainly as ice comes with the northern winter. So he swung clear over to the other extreme, and became an anarchist. Much centralized power means tyranny, and government means centralized power; he would abolish government altogether. Society no longer seemed to him as a unit of individuals in combination. It now appeared as a mass of individuals in aggregation. He would have no government, no coercive laws, no power, no opportunity for the man-on-horseback.

This was an advance, but Schilling had not yet reached the central truth. He had seen society as an all inclusive solidarity, and rejected the notion. He now saw society as a loose aggregation of individuals, and he embraced the thought. But he did not see that there is a measure of truth in the idea of social solidarity, as well as a measure of truth in the idea of pure individualism, and that these two ideas, instead of being discordant, are harmonious. What he had overlooked was the fact that in respect of certain classes of things society is a unit which must have coercive powers of regulation, and that in certain other classes of things it is merely aggregative and should have no coercive power whatever. He had not yet seen that the truth lies in that middle ground, between socialism and anarchism, which requires that government functions be confined to common affairs, and that government be securely fenced off from meddling in individual affairs. This central truth he learned through an accident.

One day while attending strictly to his own business, thinking perhaps as he walked, of the wickedness of the government idea, he stepped upon a slippery banana peel which some unsocial individual had dropped upon the sidewalk. In an instant he lay flat upon the hard cement. His head had struck it as he fell, and he saw a whole milky way of the most dazzling stars. In the midst of these stars, moreover, he discerned just the slightest twinkle of a brilliant truth, which he forthwith began to make his own. "By jimini," he exclaimed to himself; "there ought to be government enough and coercive law enough at least to make folks stop

throwing slippery banana peels on the sidewalk!"

With that little vision of the central social truth, Schilling began to grasp the truth itself. He learned that there is a natural sphere for society as a solidarity, and a natural sphere for the individual as an individual, and that neither must be allowed to invade the sphere of the other. As he pondered upon this newly discovered truth, the path of the single tax philosophy opened before him, and he followed it until he had seen in full completeness the graceful outlines of the single tax cat.

I have ventured to tell this so fully, I repeat, not for the humor there is in the climax, but because Schilling's experience seems to dramatize what I regard as the logical progress of thought, and as possibly the actual progress of social reform, from existing social evils to their radical remedy.

The symbol of the single tax movement, which I have said that Schilling saw, namely, the single tax cat, might be usefully explained right here. It came into vogue some 15 years ago as the result of a story told by James G. Maguire, then a judge of the Superior Court of San Francisco, afterwards a member of Congress from California, and later the Democratic candidate for Governor of California. Judge Maguire told the story in the course of a speech at the Academy of Music, New York City, in 1887, to illustrate the character of the difficulties in the way of understanding the single tax philosophy, and the effect of overcoming them. Let me recall what he said:

"I was one day walking along Kearney street, in San Francisco, when I noticed a crowd around the show window of a store, looking at something inside. I took a glance myself, and saw only a very poor picture of a very uninteresting landscape. But as I was turning away my eye caught the words underneath the picture: 'Do you see the cat?' I looked again and more closely, but saw no cat in the picture. Then I spoke to the crowd:

"Gentlemen," I said, "I see no cat in that picture. Is there a cat there?"

"Some one in the crowd replied:

"Naw, there ain't no cat there. Here's a crank who says he sees a cat, but nobody else can see it."

"Then the crank spoke up:

"I tell you there is a cat there, too. It's all cat. What you fellows take for a landscape is just nothing more than the outlines of a cat. And you needn't call a man a crank either, because he can see more with his eyes than you can."

"Well," the Judge continued, "I looked very closely at the picture, and then I said to the man they called a crank:

"Really, sir, I cannot make out a cat. I can see nothing but a poor picture of a landscape."

"Why, Judge," he exclaimed, "just look at that bird in the air. That's the cat's ear."

"I looked, but was obliged to say:

"I am sorry to be so stupid, but I can't make a cat's ear of that bird. It is a poor bird, but not a cat's ear."

"Well, then," the crank urged, "look at that twig twirled around in a circle. That's the cat's eye."

"But I couldn't make an eye of it."

"Oh, then," said the crank, a little impatiently, "look at those sprouts at the foot of the tree, and the grass. They make the cat's claws."

"After another deliberate examination, I reported that they did look a little like a claw, but I couldn't connect them with a cat."

"Once more the crank came back at me. 'Don't you see that limb off there? and that other limb under it? and that white space between? Well, that white space is the cat's tail.'

"I looked again, and was just on the point of replying that there was no cat there, so far as I could see, when suddenly the whole cat burst upon me. There it was, sure enough, just as the crank had said; and the only reason that the rest of us couldn't see it was that we hadn't got the right point of view. But now that I saw it, I could see nothing else in the picture. The landscape had disappeared and a cat had taken its place. And, do you know, I was never afterward able, upon looking at that picture, to see anything in it but the cat!"

From this story, as told by Judge Maguire, has come the slang of the single tax agitation. To "see the cat" is to understand the single tax.

In beginning that story Judge Maguire asked: "Did you ever hear Henry George's cat story?" This was an allusion to a paragraph of "Progress and Poverty," pages 292-93 in the Library Edition of George's works, which had really suggested to Maguire the narration of an actual occurrence as a picturesque adaptation of George's concealed picture illustration. What George had written was this:

As land is necessary to the exertion of labor in the production of wealth, to command the land which is necessary to labor, is to command all the fruits of labor save enough to enable labor to exist. . . . So simple and so clear is this truth that to fully see it once is always to recognize it. There are pictures which, though looked at again and again, present only a con-

fused labyrinth of lines or scroll-work—a landscape, trees, or something of the kind—until once attention is called to the fact that these things make up a face or a figure. This relation once recognized is always afterward clear. It is so in this case. In the light of this truth all social facts group themselves in an orderly relation, and the most diverse phenomena are seen to spring from one great principle.

We are celebrating the twenty-fifth year of the book from which that quotation is made. Let us hope that before the year closes it will have been celebrated wherever the single-tax idea has taken root.

In this celebration we commemorate the first 25 years of the youth of a great and growing and enduring cause. We do not point to vast numbers of professed believers. A man must have an intelligent comprehension of our principles before he dares admit that he is one of us, for he knows that he must be ready to give a reason for the faith that is in him. The mere sentimentalist does not join us, or if he does he soon quits. To excuse himself he usually says that he has gone farther; which invariably means not that he has pushed on but that he has backed out. It is easier to be vague than to be specific.

But enduring strength lies in definiteness and not in nebulosity. So we are encouraged by the backsliding of those whose vagueness proves that nebulosity has superior charms for them. Yet, if our perfect converts are few, the advances our cause has made more or less imperfectly among the classes who are described in bulk as "the average man," testify to the invincible truth that vitalizes it.

We have fewer newspaper organs than some kindred causes, but no other cause at all radical exerts so much influence as ours through the regular newspaper press. One daily Johnstown Democrat (and there are several such dailies), one weekly San Francisco Star (and there are several such weeklies), none of them single-tax organs but all of them single-tax exemplars in journalism, is worth more than a whole newspaper directory of mere organs.

So also while we have few clubs; while we seldom nominate candidates through political parties of our own, refusing to play at politics with parties of the political-toy order, yet the influence of our cause is felt in greater or less degree in most clubs, in all civic associations, in the politics of both the great political parties, and in influential public office. A Gov. Garvin, a Congressman Baker or a Mayor Johnson is worth more to a cause in the development period of its youth than any possible influence to be had from isolating

the cause from the common thought and the common interests of the time, even if these are superficial. We envy no cause the more than dubious advantage of being wrapped in the insulating folds of some lilliputian third party.

In this youth of our cause, during this period of 25 years, so brief in the life of any cause that is fundamental in character and enduring in its possibilities—even in this brief period, he who looks with an intelligent eye may easily see that the cause which originated in "Progress and Poverty" has made normal progress. It resembles not the pith of the multitudinous elder stalk, which withers in the very season of its birth, but the strong heart of the giant oak, which endures and serves while successive generations of men pass away.

THE UNIVERSAL TARGET.

Speak kindly to the millionaire;
Perhaps he does his best.
Don't try to drive him to despair
With rude, unfeeling jest.
Don't laugh at portraits which display
His face with comic leer,
And when he gives his wealth away
Don't take it with a sneer.

Speak kindly to the millionaire,
He has a right to live
And feel the sun and breathe the air
And keep his coin or give.
You may be rich yourself, you see,
Before your life is through;
Speak kindly, and remember he
Is human, just like you.

—Washington Star.

BOOKS

STORY OF A BOOM TOWN.

If boom towns and the general phenomena they exhibit are characteristic features of American life, and who would dispute it, then Herbert Quick has written one of the few truly American novels. The title suggests the spirit of the story—"Aladdin & Co., a Romance of Yankee Magic" (New York: Henry Holt & Company. Price, \$1.50); and the reader quickly discovers that the author has studied not only the subject of boom towns, which holds his story together, but also the varieties of human nature which the boom craze develops. His opportunities for such study at first hand have been excellent, as may be supposed when it is known that Herbert Quick is none other than J. Herbert Quick, of Sioux City, that boomiest of boom towns in its day, of which Mr. Quick was an early inhabitant and where he has served as mayor.

There is an abundance of food for serious thought in Mr. Quick's novel, but he never once presents it in a didactic manner. He leaves his readers to draw the impressive moral of the story, as the thoughtful ones among them might were they to experience

what Mr. Quick's characters experienced. Some of those characters evidently did infer the moral, but Mr. Quick does not say so. From first page to last he never forgets that he is writing no treatise to instruct, nor any sermon to admonish, but a wholesome story to entertain. And he has succeeded in his purpose. There is not a heavy page in the book. The narrative flows like a stream.

It is not without a love plot, but this is subordinate to the main line of the story. Love experiences are pretty much the same everywhere, and it is not this universal experience that Mr. Quick aims to portray, except as an indispensable part of human life in boom towns as elsewhere. The boom town is his theme; and so his story is concerned principally with business exploitation and exploiters, land speculation and speculators, commercial journalism and journalists, and gum-shoe politics. There are touches, too, of high finance, which bring the boom town of the story into interesting and faithfully pictured relations with the railroad monarchs and bond syndicates of New York and their confederates of Chicago.

The fundamental conceit of the story, which comes to the surface here and there as the narration proceeds, furnishes ample opportunity for delicate bits of satire, and Mr. Quick takes frequent advantage of it. The principal characters, schoolmates in their boyhood, amuse themselves by speaking of their boom venture as if it were the realization of their boyhood dreams of romantic piracy. This conceit is cleverly sustained throughout. For example, and these are only two of many, the chapter in which the supposititious narrator enters into partnership with his old school chum for booming the village of Lattimore, is entitled: "I Go Aboard and We Unfurl the Jolly Roger," and that in which the inevitable crash is foreseen with its army of confiding and ruined investors, is described as "Relating to the Disposition of the Captives."

One of the strong minor characters in Mr. Quick's book is Gen. Lattimore, a level-headed survivor of the civil war, who belonged to "a sort of ancient and exclusive caste" in the town—and how familiar that caste is everywhere!—"which prided themselves on having become rich by the only dignified and purely automatic mode, that of sitting heroically still and allowing their lands to rise in value." Gen. Lattimore was a "knocker." He predicted the inevitable crash from the start. On one occasion this was what he said:

"You don't seem to see it, but you are straining every nerve merely to shift people from many places to one and then to exploit them. You wind your coils about an inert mass, you set the dynamo of your

power of organization at work, and the inert mass becomes a great magnet. People come flying to it from the four quarters of the earth, and the first-comers levy tribute upon them, as the price of standing room on the magnet. . . . Not only that, but people begin forestalling the standing room so as to make it scarcer. They gamble on the power of the magnet, and the length of time it will draw. They buy to-day and sell to-morrow; or cast up what they imagine they might sell for, and call the increase profit. Then comes the time when the magnet ceases to draw, or the forestallers, having in their greed grasped more than they can keep, offer too much for the falling market, and all at once the thing stops, and the dervish-dance ends in coma, in cold forms and still hands, in misery and extinction."

But an admonition like that could have no effect upon the boomers in the hey-day of "the most prosperous times" the town had ever seen. They talked lightly of the wise old general, and one of them cynically spoke of him in confidence to another as playing "in the role of Cassandra," and so the financial dervish-dance ended in the coma of hard times.

PAMPHLETS.

Commemorative exercises, especially those in celebration of the birthday of the "Father of His Country," the more especially if under the auspices of a Union League Club, are not well calculated to make interesting reading in pamphlet form. An exception is the report of the exercises in commemoration of the birthday of Washington held under the auspices of the Union League Club of Chicago, February 22, 1904. This is an exception because it contains two interesting and instructive speeches. One is the speech of Mr. Edith Root, formerly secretary of war, in which at length and with much moral stress he argues regarding the Panama question that the sovereignty of little nations which you can conquer is a limited sovereignty if they possess something you want. The other is a delightfully refreshing speech to school children by Mrs. Marjorie Foster Washburne. It is exactly the kind of speech that school children would welcome, because while appealing directly to the youthful mind, it is absolutely free from childishness. In the elemental simplicity of its moral tone, Mrs. Washburne's speech is in wholesome contrast with the sophisticated subtlety of Mr. Root's.

PERIODICALS.

The New York Independent, of May 19, reads Capt. Mahan a lesson on modesty and the captain's recent defense of battleships in the Sun. "With modern ships," says the writer, "he has had no practical

Campaign Subscriptions

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

FIFTY CENTS

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

THE HIGHEST OF ALL ARTS Some suggestions about teaching the art of industrial co-operation in the public schools. Daintily bound, 10 cents. **STRAIGHT EDGE, 1 Seventh Avenue, New York.**