

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1904.

Number 320.

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.

Says the Chicago Tribune: "Money talks, and Bryan talks, yet Parker's silence beats both of them in Indiana." Not Parker's. Belmont's.

Cleveland is fast forging to the front as the Democratic candidate. There is significance in the gentle pounding that such papers as the New York Times and Puck are giving Parker. There is significance in Watterson's reconciliation to Cleveland. There is significance in the Wisconsin movement for Wall as a Cleveland stalking horse. And above all, there is opportunity in the Republican split in Wisconsin, not to mention the Republican faction fighting in Illinois. To be able to argue that Wall street syndicates would carry New York for Cleveland and that through Republican dissensions Wisconsin and Illinois would drop into his lap, is to take spoils-hunting Democrats up into a pretty high hill. And spoils-hunting Democrats have never yet learned how to say, "Get thee behind me!"

No matter what university presidents may think about it, the real estate men of Chicago have no doubt of the influence of good government in raising site rents in any community where it prevails. In expectation of a new charter which will improve local government in Chicago, they are expressing their confidence that after the new charter is secured site values will so materially advance as to give investors a large extra profit. How strange it is that the business eye so quickly

perceives economic truths which the pedagogical brain seems incapable of grasping. If any such truth is more self evident than another, it is this truth which business men so readily perceive, that all public improvement tends to increase site values and nothing else; yet professors shy from it with a very great shyness.

The United States Supreme Court has decided the Turner deportation case (p. 73) against Mr. Turner, thereby holding that the President may, by executive process, constitutionally arrest and deport foreigners visiting this country whose opinions are not agreeable. It would be interesting now to know whether Congress might not also empower the President to arrest and exile native Americans whose opinions do not conform.

In a syndicate article on the importance of cultivating correct pronunciation of words, a well-known writer illustrates with this instance: "A young lawyer rises to address a jury. Among the twelve are several men of education. The lawyer states his case clearly enough; he grows eloquent; but he differs from all accepted standards in his pronunciation. The judge smiles behind his hand and the educated jurymen are prejudiced against the pleader on account of his blunders and fail to appreciate his argument." No exception can be taken to this illustration. It inculcates a good lesson, and almost without exception any "educated" jurors would be influenced precisely like these. The ordinary man of "education" is very likely to turn a deaf ear to any statement however clear, and to miss the point of the most cogent argument, if made with faulty spelling or uncouth pronunciation. But

why should literary culture be so deadening to the intellect?

An incident of a recent rent war in some of the tenement districts of New York city, enforces a very valuable lesson in a very interesting form. One of the rack-renting landlords who had a \$20 flat accepted a voluntary offer of \$21 from a prospective tenant. Before this tenant got possession an offer of \$23 was made by some one else. This also was accepted. But a third offer came before possession had been given to either the first or the second bidder; this offer was \$24, and the tenant moved in immediately. "I did not raise the rent," the landlord protested; "the tenants did." Now that is absolutely true, not only in this extremely obvious instance but in all instances. It is tenants seeking accommodation, not landlords having it to give, that raises rents. And tenants raise rents for one or the other of two reasons: because the building is improved, or equally advantageous locations are scarce. To know this fact and to appreciate it, is to understand much of the mysteries of social and industrial life.

For example: "Charities," the organ of the organized charities of New York, from whose columns we have taken the foregoing story, is in an engulfing quagmire of mystification regarding the site-rent war of which it tells. It has no better remedy to propose than an inquiry into "the desirability of urging upon builders the necessity of erecting houses with small apartments to rent for a moderate sum." Think of that! Think of urging builders to relieve the situation, when the increase of rent is due not to improved buildings but to scarcer opportunities for building in the needed locations. Think of urging builders to relieve

the situation when they are already anxious to do so, but cannot get needed sites on profitable terms. Think of urging builders to relieve the congestion when it is caused by exorbitant prices demanded by land monopolists for building sites. Think of urging landlords to do this when your own taxing authority exacts heavy tribute of builders for building, while it exempts land monopolists with lavish generosity. Tax these monopolists more and builders less, and appeals to builders need not be made. They would erect small apartment buildings as fast as needed, and competition among them would keep rents down to a moderate sum. Perhaps "Charities" has some such thought in mind, for it makes its suggestion regarding remedies only as a matter of "the greatest immediate need." There is in that phrase something like a hint of concealed knowledge, which makes one suspect that "Charities" is more knowing, perhaps, than it thinks wise to "let on" just now.

Steps were taken at the last meeting of the Chicago Federation of Labor to execute the mandate of the people on the referendum with reference to electing the Chicago school board. At this referendum (pp. 7, 19) the vote stood 57,121 against and 115,553 in favor of popular election of the board, a majority for the proposition of over 58,000 in a total vote of 172,000. A committee on the condition of the schools, appointed by the Federation, has now reported a recommendation that members of the board be elected at large; that they be elected at a special election called for the purpose, like that for the election of judges; and that candidates be nominated by petition only.

This recommendation is a wise one. As at present chosen, the school board, when not the playing of "business" interests that starve the schools by false economies for the benefit of monopolies, is part of the stock in trade of

spoilsmen in politics. It flip-flops alternately from "business" graft to political push and pull. The only remedy for the evil is the one proposed by the committee of the Federation of Labor. Elect the board, and all appointive influences are removed. Elect it on a ticket at large, and log rolling between representatives of wards and districts is eliminated. Elect it at a special election, and public attention is concentrated upon school questions. Nominate only by petition, and partisan boss-ship is reduced to the minimum.

Naturally enough, however, the beneficiaries of mismanagement, whether allied to the "business" graft faction or the political spoils faction, are opposed to any kind of popular election of the board, and they offer plausible objections. Yet an elective school board has proved so successful in St. Louis that President Eliot of Harvard declares his belief that the St. Louis school board is the best board of education in the United States. If an elective board can succeed so well in that city of "business" graft and political spoils, why not try the experiment in Chicago?

It is refreshing to see now and then in the public prints something about maintaining public order, which is democratic in spirit and thoughtful in presentation. Very seldom can the newspaper reader of the United States enjoy refreshment of that kind. To symbolize the American idea of order some scheme of bull dogs, bloodhounds, policemen, jails and gibbets would be necessary. In Canada there is a better spirit, of which the following extract from the Ottawa Journal is an excellent expression. It is none the less acceptable for its criticism of reactionary tendencies on this side of the line and even in our own raw city of Chicago:

The business of the law and those who enforce it is to assert and maintain the right of the individual and to prevent aggression upon the weak and simple by the strong and cunning. But the danger is that those who are intrusted with

the power of the people in enforcing the law may themselves become aggressors upon individual rights. Merely to call this high-handed conduct "maintaining order" does not make it any less disorderly. The czar is only "maintaining order" in Finland at this moment, but his process means the stamping out of civilization by sheer barbaric force. We of British blood have had to fight this cause out many a time against magistrates, lords and kings. Not only have we asserted the right of the individual as against the mere might of the ruler, but we have set up plain constitutional marks, in order that we might know at once when the sacred territory of individual right was being invaded. The right to think freely, to speak freely in private or in public, so long as common decency is maintained; the right to a speedy and open trial; the right to be held innocent until proven guilty; these and other boundary marks are unquestioned with us, as yet. The United States inherited the standards of British liberty, as we did. Their object in making themselves a nation was to "set the bounds of freedom broader yet." In the spirit shown by the examples just given and by others that might be given, they indicate themselves apostates to the faith. It is not for us to judge them or to plume ourselves upon superior virtue. It may be that we sin in other respects and have earned condemnation in our own special way. Or it may be that temptation has not come to us as strong or as insidious as that which assailed them. But we have a right to note our neighbors' errors if we do it with a sincere desire to avoid similar errors in our own conduct. For, be it noted, this plea of "maintaining order," however honest those may be who use it, may be a sheer illusion. Arbitrary power may be granted for the public good, but it is always in the long run used against the people and in the interest of those upon whom it is conferred. Those familiar with great cities make much of the difference between London and Chicago in the matter of police protection. In London the police are under iron discipline and must observe scrupulously the rights of every individual, from the lord mayor to Bill Sykes himself. And in London life and property are safer, and order is better maintained, than in any other great city on earth. On the other hand, Chicago gives its police great latitude. The club and the "sweat box" are theirs, to use at their discretion. And in Chicago crime and the police are partners. The law-abiding citizen who would keep his property and go about the streets unmolested must know and observe the terms of that partnership and go abroad only when and where it is safe to do so. Liberty is sacrificed to a too cowardly love of order, and order is sacrificed to the tyranny of those whom the people have been weak enough to clothe with arbitrary power.

Advocates of regulative laws for holding monopolies within bounds, must have experienced some degree of surprise when they learned that the rebate practices of railroads, supposed to have been completely suppressed, have been resumed in a new and baffling way. The fact has but recently transpired. It came out definitely at a hearing in Chicago before the Inter-State Commerce Commission. The trick is a new one. Large shippers build little railroads, mere switches, for the transportation of their own goods from their own factories to the railway line that serves them, and then receive, as cooperating railroads, a share of the freight charges on their goods, from factory to destination. As much as 20 per cent. of the entire freight charge is paid by railways to these little switch roads. Of course the arrangement is a mere cover for giving rebates to favored shippers. If the railway line agrees to a rebate for any factory, the switch connection is made and the rebate paid in the form of a division of receipts between cooperating roads. If the railway does not agree to give rebates to a competing concern, the switch connection is not made, and the competitor is forced to the wall by freight discrimination. The lesson of it all is that monopolies cannot be regulated. Their lawyers can drive a vestibuled train through all the restrictive laws that human wit can devise. The only way to reach them is at the source of their power—the legal privilege, whatever it may be, that makes them monopolies.

Extreme solicitude is manifested by the Chicago judge, Adams, (who writes the opinion of the Appellate Court in the injunction case coming before it from Judge Holdom's decision in a labor "picketing" case), lest labor unions may become monopolies. It is well for judges to be sensitive to monopoly tendencies, but it is unpleasantly significant when they appear to be peculiarly sensitive to the labor union monopoly, the weakest kind

of all, and a defensive kind at that. If Judge Adams is right in one part of his opinion, his court has planted itself against labor strikes whether peaceable or not. For he says:

Appellants' counsel admit the purpose of the strike was to bring about execution of certain labor contracts. It is unlawful to compel one to execute any contract. A contract executed under duress is voidable, and duress is present where a party is constrained to agree to or perform the act sought to be avoided.

From that it follows that if workmen strike or threaten to strike, no matter how peaceful their conduct, and to avoid the strike their employer agrees to terms, his agreement cannot be enforced against him. They could not even collect an increase of wages raised by means of the "duress" of a peaceable strike, if the legal principle of duress applies to strikes. It is not too much to say that a judge who makes such a ruling—who holds that an agreement with an employer secured through the "duress" of a peaceable strike, is a voidable agreement—would be more appropriately employed as the acknowledged attorney of Mr. Parry's employers' union than as a public servant on the judicial bench. If he is sincere in his opinion, which is to be presumed, his judicial temperament must have been de-judicialized by plutocratic association. With this tendency becoming common in courts, it is high time that counter influences be brought to bear; and the labor organizations of Chicago are consequently fully justified in raising a labor union issue over the proposed reelection of Holdom, the judge whose "government by injunction" decision Judge Adams sustains, and who has become conspicuous as an anti-labor judge.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY PLATFORM.

I

When the "Chicago anarchists," so-called, were arrested, charged with conspiracy to murder the police with a bomb, the late James Redpath, then editor of the

North American Review, a man of wide and varied experience, chiefly as a journalist, also a man of broad sympathies and radical inclinations, predicted that the prisoners would be hanged, not for murder, but for writing artless English. "I could write the substance of everything they have written," he said, "and no one would think of prosecuting me for inciting murder; but they have written so artlessly that suspicion falls upon them instantly, and they will be convicted although they are probably as innocent of the murder as you or I."

Whether Mr. Redpath was right or not, he certainly may have been right, for there is even as much difference as he implied, with reference to the effect of the manner of stating things. This commonplace fact is strikingly illustrated by a comparison of the Socialist party's platform adopted at Chicago a few days ago (p. 89), with the platform of the same party adopted at Indianapolis three years ago.

The platform of three years ago emphasized what socialists call the "the class struggle," and it wholly ignored American ideals and traditions in its pronounced internationalism. It was written withal in a style and spirit well calculated to intensify every prejudice against socialism and really to attract none but "scientific" socialists of the most uncompromising type. And although it made some concessions to opportunist socialists by formulating a collection of "immediate demands," it did this so grudgingly as to repel all believers in them except thorough-going Socialist-party socialists.

Quite different is the platform of 1904. While it does not discard the "class struggle" idea, which it could hardly do without ceasing to be socialistic; and while it retains internationalism, as a great many besides socialists would have it do; yet, it lays its emphasis more discreetly than its predecessor did, and it presents its claims in a manner better calculated to attract the average American voter.

Its literary style is cordially inviting; its "immediate demands" are adopted rather in the spirit of fraternally offering a helping

hand than of tossing pennies to vagabond beggars; and through it all there runs a refreshing allusion to moral righteousness. This platform is endowed with the life of the time and the country. It differs from the other as a sympathetic man of flesh and blood differs from an articulated skeleton of papier mache, or, to recur to Redpath's remark, as skillful differs from artless writing.

II

It is necessary, however, to pass by the superficially attractive parts of the platform, and get down to its bones. As the platform seeks votes, it properly appeals to sentiment; but as it embodies a public policy its sentiment must be laid aside and its doctrines be uncovered. So we may disregard references in the platform to the "liberty and self-government in which this nation was born," to the reactionary tendencies that seem to prevail in our politics, to the sanctity of private property, to the importance of individualistic ideals and the democratization of society, to "moral harmony," to "right" and "power" as cause and effect, and to the "rightful" inheritance of the working class. Important as are these references for party purposes and as indicating a tendency away from the unmoral philosophy of "scientific" socialism, they are only verbal wrappings when the philosophy of the movement is under consideration. For purposes of such consideration the enwrapped ideas must be extracted.

These are five, and they do not differ essentially from the ideas of the discarded platform. They may be briefly enumerated as follows: (1) The possessing class oppresses the producing class by controlling all the sources of social revenue; (2) this condition being world-wide, the struggle between the possessing class and the producing class is also world-wide; (3) the class struggle springs out of the private ownership of the means of employment, of the tools of production; (4) it is irreconcilable; (5) the socialist programme (not a theory but the interpretation of the inevitable) contemplates that the tools of production shall be owned and administered in common.

III

The first thing that should impress an analytical student of this platform is its indefiniteness in the use of the term "class." Interpret the word as meaning interests, and the assertion of an irreconcilable conflict is correct. Interpret it as meaning persons, and the same assertion is mistaken.

It is certainly true that there are such things as interests in incomes unearned by the recipients. Slaveholders had these interests, landowners have them, and if socialists wish to add that machinery owners also have them, we shall not at this point raise denial. What we now assert is simply this, that all monopolists have interests in incomes that are not earned by the recipients.

If all monopolists were monopolists only, it would make no difference whether we used "class" in the sense of interests or of persons. For in that case monopoly interests and monopoly classes, on the one hand, and non-monopoly interests and non-monopoly classes, on the other, would coincide. In these circumstances we could speak interchangeably of a slave-owning "class" and of slavery "interests," of the land-owning "class" and of landed "interests," or, if you please, of the machinery-owning "class" and of machinery "interests." Both terms would in each instance refer with exactness to the same thing.

But that is not the case in fact. All monopolists are not monopolists merely. Most of them are also workers regularly performing productive and useful service. Neither are all workers only workers. Many of them have interests to some extent in monopolies.

Such being the true state of social affairs, it confuses thought to speak of these conflicting interests in terms of personal classes.

The interests are indeed conflicting, but the persons who profit by them do not fall into distinct personal classes—impoverished earners in one class and possessing idlers in the other. The Socialist party platform, therefore, is fundamentally in error when it alludes to the irreconcilable conflict of interests—monopoly interests versus producing interests—as a conflict between classes of persons. If there-

by obscures the natural line of demarcation between earnings and tribute, and refers the solution of the labor problem to the power of mere might regardless of every principle of right and every consideration of fairness.

IV

Similar confusion of thought appears in that part of the platform which attributes the class struggle to private ownership of the means of employment. It is as follows:

This class struggle is due to the private ownership of the means of employment, or the tools of production. Whenever and wherever man owned his own land and tools, and by them produced only the things which he used, economic independence was possible. But production, or the making of goods, has long ceased to be individual. The labor of scores, or even thousands, enters into almost every article produced. Production is now social or collective. Practically everything is made or done by many men—sometimes separated by seas or continents—working together for the same end.

Here the fundamental confusion lies in the inference that production has ceased to be individual and become "social or collective." The facts cited in support of this conclusion do not sustain it; for the change in production to what the platform calls "social or collective" is a change in degree only. It is not a change in essential character.

If present modes of production are "social and collective," as the platform asserts, production has always been "social and collective." If it ever was individual, as the platform concedes when it asserts a change, then it is individual still.

The mere fact that the labor of scores, or even thousands, enters into almost every article produced does not change production from individual to "social or collective." It is not more true now than aforesaid that "practically everything is made or done by many men sometimes separated by seas or continents, working together for the same end." This quotation from the platform is only a statement of the phenomenon long known to political economy as "division of labor." From the time that division of labor began—and one can hardly think of

a time so remote as when its advantages were not availed of, nor a people so primitive as to have neglected it,—“practically everything has been made and done by many men.” Farming, seafaring, mining, herding, building, merchandising, and so on, are very ancient specializations.

What this platform really describes is not a change from individual to collective production. It is an intensification (consequent upon greater and more extensive trade freedom) of division of labor. More individuals than formerly do now contribute to the production of most articles, perhaps of all; and cooperation through division of labor is therefore more minute and comprehensive. But the work is not more truly “social or collective” in the sense intended, which is that of being done by industrial society as a collectivity or unit.

Yet the assumption that work has become “social or collective” is necessary to justify the demand for collective ownership and administration of artificial tools. That demand cannot be set up fairly without making an assumption that those tools are produced collectively. And socialists believe, just as this platform states, that they are so produced.

But in fact, though “practically everything is made or done by many,” no one thing is made or done by all producers. Nothing is made by the collectivity. Each thing is made by groups of specialists. If, then, there is any virtue at all in doctrines of moral right or fairness, each member of each group owns, with the others, an undivided interest in the thing his group produces, until he trades it for what others produce, and then he owns that. The principle of individual production persists notwithstanding specialization of labor and regardless of its intensity.

Dropping the question of individual production and ownership, however, still one cannot fairly regard a labor product as belonging to the whole collectivity, merely because many men help to make it, not even if a just distribution were impossible (which it is not) between its individual makers. It

would at any rate belong to the producing group as against the rest of society.

And this would be so notwithstanding that men of different times as well as those of different places unite in its production; notwithstanding, that is to say, that we of this generation are largely indebted to the inventiveness of men of former generations for the potency of our productive powers. It is still the respective groups, and not the industrial collectivity, that bring forth and therefore fairly own each labor product.

Even upon the supposition that the collectivity justly inherits the products of the dead, it would inherit but little. What one generation gets from another in actual products is not very much. Its great inheritance is accumulations of knowledge. But knowledge is intangible and can be utilized only by individual acquisition.

The collectivity does not perpetuate accumulations of knowledge. Individuals do that by laboriously acquiring what they respectively need and then laboriously acquiring personal skill in its utilization. This double acquisition is not a social or collective but an individual function. The collectivity may or may not best maintain some of the means for transmitting knowledge, but the process of acquiring it is as individual as eating.

It is through mistaking for societal phenomena greater specialization in division of labor and wider and freer extensions in the domain of trade, that the Socialist platform reaches its conclusion that production has changed from individual to “social or collective.” Closer analysis and clearer thought would show that it is social in no other sense than is the lifting of a log by two men which one cannot move, or as the making of tents by a St. Paul with cloth other men had woven, or the catching of fish by a St. Peter with nets other men had knotted and boats other men had built. The difference is in extent and in intensity, not in character.

But without this confusion, socialism would lose its distinctiveness. To concede that production is not “social or collective” in an all-inclusive societal sense, would necessitate the abandon-

ment of the socialist contention that the artificial tools as well as the natural opportunities of industry should be socialized in ownership and administration. For, artificial tools, from least to greatest, are products; and if production is essentially individual, in contradistinction to societal, then all artificial tools are individual products. It is only by assuming that production is a societal process that the ownership of artificial tools can with fairness be assigned to society.

This assumption is not made for the purpose of forcing the conclusion. It is made in good faith, no doubt. Like the assumption—from the fact of an irreconcilable conflict of two classes of interests—that there is an irreconcilable conflict of personal classes, it results from a confusion of ideas.

V

It is upon such conclusions that the demands of the Socialist platform rest and by them that it must be interpreted.

The demand that all those things upon which “the people in common depend shall by the people in common be owned and administered,” is intended to include labor products as well as natural opportunities. But the platform is mistaken in assuming that the people depend upon those products in common in any other sense than that men who buy their dinners depend for them upon other workers, from farmer to cook and waiter, whom they pay when they settle their restaurant bills; and it is unsound economically and politically in demanding public ownership and administration of occupations that do not necessarily rest upon grants of legal power.

When this platform demands that the tools of employment shall belong to their “creators and users,” it is guilty of an incongruity. That tools should belong to their creators is a sensible proposition, but why to their users? To use a tool can not generate a moral property right in it. And as to ownership by the creators, no paternal government is necessary for that. Every artificial thing now produced in this country belongs to its creator, to the extent of

his creation, until he sells his share in it. That he is generally forced to sell his share in advance and for less than it is worth is true. That is because he is under some subtle coercion which puts him at a disadvantage relatively to the buyer. But private ownership of tools is not what coerces. It is private ownership of legal power over natural opportunities to produce tools. The ownership of machinery is in truth not essentially monopolistic. It is made so only by some arbitrary exercise of legal power, such as patents which forbid its duplication, or taxation and land monopoly which interfere with its production and use.

To demand, as the platform does, that "the making of goods for profit shall come to an end," is to deny one of the most natural of rights—the right to trade one's products without obstruction, upon terms mutually agreeable to buyer and seller. "Profit" is another vague term covering a multitude of loose thoughts. It includes both earned and unearned incomes. Many a worker gets his earnings in the name and form of "profits."

And how shall we interpret the demand that "all opportunities shall be open and equal to all men?" It does not mean this literally. That would be absurd beyond characterization. What it doubtless does mean is that not only natural opportunities for production but also certain artificial opportunities for production—business establishments with their machinery—shall be open and equal to all. But what justification is there for drawing the line of opportunity to use at a particular class of artificial implements? To draw it between the natural and the artificial is to distinguish a logical and natural difference; but the line that this platform draws distinguishes no such difference. It draws the line arbitrarily; and if it may do that so as to treat produced machinery as collective property, it may as well do it so as to treat all products as collective property. If society may rightfully appropriate some kinds of products it may rightfully appropriate every kind, and so put an end to all individual ownership of individual earnings.

Nor would the platform be deemed from these weaknesses by its miscellaneous minor demands, even if minor demands could redeem fundamental faults. Although it calls for public ownership of "the means of transportation, communication and exchange," it does not distinguish between such of these as are dependent upon grants of legal power and such as are not; and while it demands taxes on "land values," it does so in a manner that shows that the builders of the platform hadn't the faintest conception of the economic influence of such taxes nor of the vital importance of associating them with exemptions to production and trade. For the purpose of strengthening the Socialist vote all these demands may be advantageous. Some of them are good in themselves, and if the party could possibly succeed in the election—or come within telegraphic distance of succeeding,—they might make its pledge regarding them of value to voters. But none of them modify the faults of the essential parts of the platform. They only tend to confirm the conclusion that it proposes a policy thoughtlessly at variance with economic laws of production and distribution, and in equally thoughtless disregard of the moral law of mine, thine and ours.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

INDIA.

Anchor Line, S. S. Circassia, Red Sea, March 10, 1904.—What is the secret of a few office-holders controlling the destinies of 300,000,000 Indians? is a question that will never down. While some attribute it to the centralization of government, some to internal native revolution directed by the English, some to the peculiar introspective, retrogressive Hindu mind, some to the conflicting fanatical opinions as to the nature of God fomented and continually fanned into vigorous action by a people whose dominant religious tenet is "love"—while all these views undoubtedly represent some of the causes, I feel that far too little significance is attached to the land tenure systems of the country.

This failure of outsiders to find in the land tenure systems the cause of tolerance of an alien master may be due to the facts, first, that no general system prevails; secondly, that the systems are exceedingly complicated and

involved, and, thirdly, that attention is rarely bestowed thereon by tourists or even by British residents. The latter fact may again be explained by the temporary residence of all Englishmen in India, but perhaps more particularly by the fact that, generally speaking, India has not been thrown open to the rapacity and greed of land speculators. The dealing in land is not exalted to the high business standard it has attained in Europe and America; and the comparative absence of this species of power of levying tribute on the Indian people by exacting a yearly payment for the use of God's gifts, compels the enlistment of the brain and energies of the white man in real and competitive fields of industry.

I do not mean to say that the Englishman does not look for and get special privileges, opportunities or franchises; but I do mean to say that he does not secure such extensive rights in land in India as are encouraged at home. I speak, of course, generally. India is really a continent, as much so as Europe. There is a greater variety of dress, of language, of customs and of religion in the former than the latter. However, before the advent of the English the landlord system was hardly known. In the year 1765 the ruler of every state in India was the superior landlord of every acre of land. There was but one landlord, and he the ruler under whatever name. There was but one rent, and that went to him; but one occupant, and that the tenant; but one tenure, and that so long as he paid his rent to the government. The ruler received about 50 per cent. of the net product, or eight per cent. of the gross product, at first in kind, but later in money. And this is generally speaking the ruling rate to-day. Even under the laws of Manu, at the commencement of the Christian era the share of the ruler was one-sixth of the gross product. No other tax was necessary, and none other is known to have existed.

But in the year 1793 Lord Cornwallis, reared and educated in England, where the right of private property in land had for over 150 years been most exalted, for various reasons established the same species of "property" in the province of Bengal. The assigned reason for this departure was to save the government much trouble in the collection of its rents, and also more particularly to create a class of people, who, by receiving governmental grants whereby they might live without working (and others might work without living), would be more loyal to the government, and render it more stable.

In that year, 1793, he recognized the right and title of certain claimants called zemindars, who were mere official rent collectors theretofore. The land rental was fixed in perpetuity, never to be increased or diminished. The cultivator still gets the same produce,

but pays a higher rent; the government gets the same old rate, and the idle zemindar gets the difference. So extortionate have the zemindars become, and so reduced the cultivators, that the government has passed a law, as in Ireland, fixing the conditions for enhancement of rent or ejection of the tenant. Railroads, telegraphs, irrigation wells and canals, sanitary provisions, public police, fire and military protection, have all intervened; but the rent remains the same—i. e., to the zemindars, but not to the occupant.

The rental received by these Bengal landlords, over and above the state rental, is said to amount annually to the sum of \$40,000,000, which, capitalized at four per cent., would represent a wealth of the valuation of \$1,000,000,000. This right, then, of collecting rent in Bengal is equivalent in its productive capacity to \$1,000,000,000 worth of property; and the statistics of Bengal show it to possess, either in its total sum or its average, a much greater wealth than many other provinces with temporary settlement tenures.

Yet Bengal is no more prosperous or better to do. The land is no more productive, though its value represents great wealth, while the land value in the other provinces represents none. Or, to state it otherwise, in the former case the landlords possess great wealth, while in the latter the government retains this wealth. In a republic this would mean the people retain this landlord wealth. And, now, instead of these landlords being a source of strength to the government, they are a thorn in its side. They claim exemption from all kinds of taxation, irrespective of the nature of local or general improvements. Even an income tax, paid willingly by others, is resisted by them as a violation of their permanent settlement rights, so called, whereby their annual rental to the state was fixed in perpetuity.

Not only did the English make a serious mistake in granting valuable permanent rights in land at insignificant temporary prices, for the benefit of a few, and at the expense of the many, in Bengal and certain other provinces, but they have failed to appreciate the glorious inherited opportunity to adopt the Henry George idea of the single tax. The English tendency seems to be to extend the tenures, which are partly from year to year, partly for ten years and partly for 30 years, renewable forever, so long as the rent as fixed by the government at the expiration of each agreed period is paid.

England's policy also tends towards a diminishing of returns from the land, and an increased indirect taxation in the form of import and internal revenue duties. During the time of Akbar, the great Mogul, in the year 1582, the following maxim is believed to have ex-

pressed the ruling idea of the revenue system maintained under him:

There shall be left for every man who cultivates his land as much as he requires for his own support till the next crop be reaped, and that of his family and for seed. This much shall be left to him. What remains is land tax, and shall go to the treasury.

Accordingly, a land tax was collected which far exceeded the land tax now generally collected, sometimes even double the present tax. How easy it would have been upon the advent of the English to declare a tax of so much as is necessary for economical administration of the government, the balance to belong to the cultivator.

Instead of this direct and equitable method, the British government, like all governments, seeks popularity from its ignorant subjects by reducing the known direct tax and imposing continually increasing, uncertain, unfeeling, less known, and, therefore, less irritative indirect taxes. Instead of her policy tending towards equal opportunity, and, therefore, progress and "love," it tends toward unequal opportunity, special privilege, aristocracy, and unbridled authority and power.

Credible authority places the land revenue at one time far in excess of all present sources of income, including gross income of railroads, irrigation, telegraphs, post, opium, salt, etc. That is, if the same tax were paid to-day, all might ride on trains, send telegrams and letters, and transport freight, free of charge. In the boast of a diminishing land tax or rental is concealed the confession of ignorance that property and speculation in land arise in an increasingly menacing proportion as the state rental is diminished and the land relieved and exempted. Compared with other industries or avenues of trade or profit, the greatest speculation and property is created in land where it is least taxed.

But I started to show the importance of the land tenure systems as an explanation of continued British supremacy. Briefly stated, I believe that the communal system of holding property is one of the main secrets of English retention of power. Not only did the Brits find that the intermediate landlord was the exception to the rule, but also that by far the greater part of the land of India was held and occupied by communities organized as villages. These villages have their own government, make their own regulations, work the land conjointly, and constitute, in short, communal entities with which the rulers have at all times dealt as units. The larger part of the land of India is still held by villages which pay their rent to the government in a lump sum. The details are left to the village, which is the unit of assessment, rather than each particular lot or field.

The English found these local governing bodies large helps in administering

general affairs, and have, consequently, not disturbed them in their local affairs. And, as these represent the larger part of the affairs with which an ignorant population are conversant, we may say that in great part England preserves the local self-governments as she found them.

Many Englishmen maintain that they have been successful with their dependencies in proportion as they have permitted them to continue without interference; in other words, as England keeps her hands off, her colony prospers, and English rule is successful. It certainly seems to be the fact in the case of Australia and Canada. It was certainly so in the case of the lost flower of her colonies, the United States. It is so in a lesser degree on the continent of India. I am firm in the belief that her taking of these local villages as units in occupation, taxation, tenure and government, and her maintenance of Mohammedan and Hindoo laws and customs as she found them, is the very condition of England's continuing in India. But thereby she minimizes her influence as a civilizing, Christianizing power, and again proves that the "white man's burden" is to "stay on the black man's back."

JOHN A. ZANGERLE.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, May 19.

Reports of the week from the seat of the Russo-Japanese war (p. 87) indicate no change in the course of the conflict. The Russians are still retreating before the Japanese advance.

On the 12th it was reported that the Russians had blown up the docks and piers of their city of Dalny, a few miles northeast of Port Arthur, and these reports have since been confirmed, with the additional information that the whole city has been destroyed. Dalny is the old Manchurian city of Talienwan. It was rebuilt as well as renamed, 1899-1901, by express orders of the Czar, at a cost of \$20,000,000, with a view to making it the commercial center of the Russians on the Asiatic coast. Its bay, one of the finest deep water harbors on the Pacific, is free from ice in winter, and ships drawing thirty feet of water can enter at low tide without difficulty, and without the aid of pilots could sail or steam alongside the docks, where their cargoes could be loaded into railroad cars and run direct

for 6,000 miles to St. Petersburg. The Russian explanation of their reasons for destroying Dalny is cabled from St. Petersburg, where it is said to have been due to the probability that a force attempting to hold the place could be separated from Port Arthur and captured, thus inflicting further loss of prestige. The destruction is conceded in St. Petersburg to be complete, the breakwater and the buildings as well as the piers and docks having been blown up.

Although Port Arthur is still in the possession of a Russian force, it is cut off from the Russian main body. The declaration of the Russian viceroy, made public last week (p. 87), was on the 12th reported officially from Tokio to be untrue, and from St. Petersburg on the 13th there came an acknowledgment that railroad and telegraph communication with the place had been cut off again.

The most important war news of the week, however, is that of the 18th relating to the reappearance of what is supposed to be the third army of the Japanese (p. 87) which had not been heard of since it left the eastern coast of Corea. This news comes from St. Petersburg. It is to the effect that a Japanese army, believed to be the army which first landed in Corea and from which nothing has been heard since it pushed into the interior last March, has appeared about thirty miles northeast of Mukden, and that Gen. Kouropatkin's armies are retreating all along the line. Mukden, the Russian headquarters, is considered the strategic center of southern Manchuria. It lies in the mountains on the main railroad, about 100 miles north of Newchwang, and all roads converge upon it. The appearance of a Japanese army above Mukden, with two below it, is supposed to imply an enveloping movement threatening the destruction of the Russian army in Manchuria. On the 18th Gen. Kouropatkin was reported from St. Petersburg, upon the authority of the general staff, as making preparations to fall back upon Harbin, some 700 miles north of Port Arthur, and about 400 north of Mukden. But the Japanese claimed on the 19th, as per dis-

patches from Tokio, that these preparations are too late.

On the 17th the evacuation of Newchwang (p. 87) by the Russians was completed, Gen. Kandratoitch, who had been in command of the place, having left that night with his last regiment. Dispatches of the 18th, however, from St. Petersburg, tell of the reoccupation of the place by a Russian force.

The British expedition into Tibet (p. 87), is meeting a degree of opposition too great to be overcome with a small force. The Tibetans, armed with European weapons, are keeping up a bombardment of the British camp at Gyantse, and the proclamation and preaching of a "holy war" against the British is now reported. One of the later reports tells also of 2,000 warriors marching toward Gyantse to join the band bombarding the British camp at that point. In consequence of this stubborn resistance the British ministry have announced their intention of invading Tibet in full force. The announcement was made in the Commons on the 12th by Mr. Brodrick, Indian secretary, who stated that the ministry had decided that recent events in Tibet made it inevitable that the British mission must advance to Lhasa, the capital, unless the Tibetans consented to negotiate at Gyantse before a given date. The Chinese Amban, he said, has been notified to that effect. At the same time, he added, the ministry does not intend to depart from its policy regarding Tibet as previously announced.

The motive for this British invasion is explained in a dispatch of the 14th to the Chicago Record-Herald from London as follows:

Tibet is nominally a suzerainty of China, two of whose representatives called Ambans reside at Lhasa, the capital. In 1890, with the tacit consent of China, the Indian government arranged a commercial treaty with the Tibetan authorities. The terms of this compact not proving satisfactory to the people at Calcutta, another arrangement was desired, and the Grand Llama assenting, representatives of both governments met, in the spring of 1893, and perfected another convention. Under this arrangement Yatung, a town in the Chumbi Valley, on the Indian-Tibet frontier, was opened for trade, with an official

from Calcutta and a Chinese official stationed there. By the terms of the treaty all articles, except munitions of war, drugs and intoxicants, were to pass free of duty for the first five years, and the import of tea from China was prohibited for the same period. The latter clause was intended to protect the Indian market for the consumption of Indian and Ceylon tea. Affairs moved along amicably until 1902, when rumors reached Calcutta and London of Russian intrigues with respect to Tibet. It had been known that two years previously the Czar had made advances to the Grand Llama, and had sent him presents as "the lord and guardian of the Buddhist faith," a title generally conceded to the Chinese emperor. It later became known, however, that Russia and China had entered into a secret pact affecting Tibet, some of the stipulations being that in the event of any trouble arising in Tibet, Russia, "in order to protect her frontiers," should have the right to dispatch troops to that country after notifying China. This agreement, if carried out, would have made of Tibet a Russian province, but protests by Great Britain resulted in a denial being made that such a treaty was in existence. The negotiations opened the eyes of British officials, however, who at once decided to checkmate the designs of the Czar. There must be interference at once to preserve the domain of the Dalai Lama within the sphere of British influence, and with this purpose in view complaints were made officially to the Lhasa authorities that Tibetan compacts with the Indian government had been grossly disregarded, that the Tibetans had violated the English frontier, and that trade obligations had been systematically violated. The Indian government further demanded a conference at Khamba Jong to have matters righted at once. The Tibetans agreed, but when the appointed time came did not send suitable envoys. In fact, the English representatives reached Khamba Jong in July of last year. This place is about thirty miles on the Tibetan side of the frontier. The mission remained there until November, with no satisfactory developments, and the Indian government then decided that an advance should be made to Gyantse, which is about 150 miles from Lhasa. The mission was instructed further to occupy the Chumbi Valley, a wedge of Tibetan territory projecting between Bhutan and Sikkim, as a measure of military precaution. Colonel Younghusband, with large re-enforcements, started for Lhasa in November and crossed the Jalep Pass on December 15, 1903.

An official report of the recent ambushing of American troops in the Philippines (p. 88) was received at Washington by cable from Manila on the 12th, as follows:

While on a reconnaissance to locate Datto Ali, who had been sending in

threatening messages and trying to stir up trouble, a detachment of Company F, Seventeenth Infantry, consisting of thirty-nine enlisted men, was attacked by Moros near Lake Liguasan, Mindango, on the 8th inst. First Lieutenant Harry A. Woodruff, Second Lieutenant Joseph H. Hall and fifteen enlisted men were killed, and five enlisted men wounded. The names of the killed and wounded will be reported by cable later. General Wood has ordered troops to proceed and recover bodies and arms of our killed and to punish the offenders. No further details have been received.

In American politics a triangular contest in the Republican convention of Illinois is the most notable event of the week. This contest is between three candidates for the gubernatorial nomination, representing respectively the national administration, the State administration, and the "anti-machine" Republicans. The candidate of the national administration is Frank O. Lowden, whom the "anti-machine" faction associate with the party machine, of which Congressman Lorimer is understood to be the manager. Gov. Yates is the candidate for renomination of the State administration faction. The "anti-machine" candidate is Charles S. Deneen. A deadlock over these three candidates has held the convention in session since the 13th. Following is the first ballot:

Yates	507	2-3
Deneen	386	2-3
Lowden	354	2-3
Hamlin	121	
Warner	45	
Sherman	87	

On the 47th ballot, the last of the day on the 18th, the vote stood as follows:

Yates	482
Lowden	403
Deneen	432
Hamlin	111
Warner	38
Pierce	33
Sherman	2
Necessary to a choice	752

Republican conventions elsewhere, bearing especially upon the Presidential candidacy, have been held in nine States since our last report (pp. 40, 53, 72, 73, 88). New Hampshire and Arkansas instructed for Roosevelt on the 17th; and on the 18th Idaho, Michigan, North Carolina, North Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa in-

structed for Roosevelt, while Ohio made no instructions.

The instructions of Republican State and Territorial conventions on the Presidential question up to date are as follows:

Roosevelt—	Delegates.
Arkansas	18
Delaware	6
Florida	10
Georgia	26
Idaho	6
Indiana	30
Iowa	26
Kentucky	26
Louisiana	18
Michigan	28
Maine	12
Montana	6
Nevada	6
New Hampshire	8
Nebraska	16
North Carolina	24
North Dakota	8
Oregon	8
Rhode Island	8
Utah	6
Virginia	24
Vermont	8
West Virginia	14
Wisconsin	4
Arizona	6
New Mexico	6
Oklahoma	6
Indian Territory	6
Wisconsin	26
Total	396

Uninstructed—	Delegates.
Alabama	22
Maryland	16
New Jersey	24
Ohio	46
Total	108

In Wisconsin, on the 18th, there was a bitter faction fight in the Republican convention between Gov. La Follette and his anti-trust followers on the one hand and the Payne-Babcock faction on the other, which resulted in a split. The La Follette faction secured control of the convention and the Payne-Babcock faction bolted and organized another convention.

A notable feature of the Iowa convention was the rejection of the reciprocity tariff programme of Gov. Cummins, known as "the Iowa idea" (vol. vi, p. 664). The convention refused to declare for tariff revision when necessary, and adopted a clause declaring that the Republicans of Iowa—

believe it unwise to seek markets abroad by sacrificing any part of the home market, and equally unwise to legislate in a manner to provoke American industries into making war upon one another.

It added a demand "for reciprocity in non-competitive products only."

Democratic conventions have been held since our last report (p.

88) in six States and Territories. In Indiana on the 12th the convention instructed for Parker as against Hearst by 954 to 582. In the District of Columbia on the same day there was a bolt, the bolting convention instructing for Hearst and the regulars making no instructions. On the 17th Montana refused to make instructions, and Wisconsin instructed for Edward C. Wall, "a favorite son," as against Hearst, by 304 to 226. The California convention defeated the Hearst candidate for temporary chairman on the 16th by 367 to 345; but on the 17th it instructed for Hearst by 365 to 346. South Carolina refused instructions, voting down a resolution for Parker.

The situation with reference to instructions for Democratic candidates is now as follows:

Hearst—	Delegates.
New Mexico	6
South Dakota	8
Nevada	6
Massachusetts	6
Iowa	26
Washington	10
California	20
Total	82

Parker—	Delegates.
New York	78
Connecticut	14
Indiana	30
Total	122

Olney—	Delegates.
Massachusetts	26

Wall—	Delegates.
Wisconsin	26

Uninstructed—	Delegates.
Pennsylvania	68
Oregon	8
Kansas	20
Rhode Island	8
West Virginia	14
New Hampshire	8
Montana	6
South Carolina	18

Contests—	Delegates.
New Jersey	24
District of Columbia	6
Total	30

Two court decisions of general importance and interest have been rendered this week. On the 16th the Supreme Court of the United States sustained the proceedings of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor (p. 73) for the deportation of John Turner as an "anarchist." On the 12th the Appellate Court of Cook county, Illinois, sustained the action of Judge Holdom (pp. 170, 567, 752) of Chicago, in punishing twenty-three labor union men for acting as strike "pickets" in violation of an injunction he had issued. The

matter related to a strike of the brass workers union against the Kellogg Switchboard & Supply Co., of Chicago.

The central labor body of Chicago, the Chicago Federation of Labor, has begun a movement to realize the referendum demand of the people for an elective school board (pp. 7, 19). Its special committee on schools made the following report to it on the 15th:

Your special committee on schools respectfully reports that in accordance with instructions the accompanying statement on the public school situation was prepared by the committee and copies sent to all affiliated locals. Your committee recommends that the following provisions be endorsed as essentials in any bill providing for an elected Board of Education for Chicago to be enacted by the legislature in compliance with the vote of 117,617 in favor to 57,792 against, or more than two to one in favor of an elective Board of Education:

1. Nomination to be by petition only.
2. Election at large.
3. Special election held for the purpose of electing a Board of Education.

Your committee further recommends that the report be received as progress and that the committee be authorized and directed to bring the facts concerning the needs of the public schools to the attention of the affiliated local unions and other organizations interested in the welfare of the schools and to urge the passage of a bill providing for an elected board of education. The Committee takes pleasure in reporting that it has secured a list of speakers competent to present this matter who will gladly visit the local unions for the purpose, and the committee recommends that the Chicago Federation of Labor invite the co-operation of the local unions in securing to these speakers opportunity to place the matter before their members. This report was adopted by the Federation and its proposed agitation among the local labor organizations is to begin at once.

NEWS NOTES.

—The 52d annual meeting of the Western Unitarian conference met in Chicago on the 17th.

—The 35th international convention of the Young Men's Christian associations of North America, in session at Buffalo, closed on the 14th.

—Miss Clara Barton resigned the presidency of the American Red Cross society on the 14th, and Mrs. John A. Logan, the vice-president, becomes acting president.

—Through a navy department order President Roosevelt on the 16th prohib-

ited members of enlisted bands from taking the places of civilian musicians on strike or locked out.

—Ranking higher in her studies than any of her schoolmates, Florence Davis, a colored girl, has won the honor of being valedictorian of the graduating class this year in the South Division high school of Chicago.

—The Radical Democracy, of Brooklyn, New York, has tendered a complimentary banquet to Congressman Baker, in recognition of the excellent service he has rendered in Congress. The date set for the banquet is May 26th and the place 364 Fulton street, Brooklyn. Gov. Garvin, of Rhode Island, is to be one of the speakers.

—At the General Conference of the Methodist church, in session at Los Angeles (p. 73), the committee on the state of the church reported on the 16th by a vote of 58 to 40 against any alteration of the church rule prohibiting dancing, card-playing, theater-going, etc. The dispute over this rule will come now before the body of the Conference upon a minority report.

—Messrs. Hornblower, Nicoll and Joline, the committee appointed by Cord Meyer, chairman of the Democratic State committee, to investigate the eligibility of James T. Woodward (p. 82), Harry Payne Whitney, and Isidor Straus, national bank directors, as candidates for electors for New York on the Democratic national ticket, decided on the 17th to recommend that these three names be dropped from the ticket.

—When Judge Theron Stevens appeared in Telluride county, Colo., to open the May term of court, he found the county in control of the militia (p. 55), whereupon he at once adjourned court for the term, after putting a statement on record in which he said that it appeared that—

the Executive and the militia and a portion of the people of this county are willing that this court should be opened, and that such business as meets the approval of the military commander and a portion of the people of the county, may be executed; but that such portion of the orders of this court or the decrees of this court as do not meet with the approval of the militia and the people of this county may not be executed. Under such circumstances, the court would not be in a position to enforce its lawful orders, or what it conceives to be its lawful orders. Such being the case, it would simply be a farce to attempt to enforce the civil laws in this county.

PRESS OPINIONS.

EXCLUSION OF ALIENS.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), May 17.—The Supreme Court has handed down a decision in the Turner case upholding the constitutionality of the anarchist exclusion law. In its opinion the court holds that it is an inherent power of government to exclude aliens from its territory. The constitutional guarantees, it virtually holds, do not apply to aliens. . . . If Congress had excluded immigrants holding certain religious beliefs, in the reasoning of the court such an act would be valid, despite the constitutional provision that is designed to restrain Congress from en-

acting any law denying the freedom of worship. . . . In other words, while Congress has no authority to make it a crime to believe in the Buddhist religion, it is within its power to exclude aliens that believe in that religion. Turner is excluded because of his "disbelief" in organized government. If Congress had so enacted, he might have been excluded on account of the color of his hair. . . . The decision of the court makes the exclusion law none the less detestable. A law that excludes immigrants because they may "disbelieve" in the accepted theories of government is entirely foreign to the spirit of American institutions. It is a striking commentary upon the reactionary tendencies that are undermining the foundations of the republic that no European government, with the possible exception of Russia, excludes foreigners because of their beliefs or disbeliefs in governmental theories. The United States stands alone among the civilized nations in undertaking to penalize men's thoughts.

THE CHICAGO REFERENDUM.

The "Little Ballot" has had another far-reaching effect. It has taught the citizens that franchises or no franchise, the "wheels will continue to go round."

Chicago Examiner (Dem.), May 18.—A conference between the representatives of the Union Traction Company and the leading exponents of municipal ownership, at which the immediate acquisition of that company's lines by the city is being discussed, has marked significance. It is notable, first, because it shows the advance toward a real solution of the traction problem, as a result of the "Little Ballot," when over 120,000 voters declared for immediate municipal ownership. So far as the traction representatives are concerned, arrogance has given place to reasonableness. They no longer assume the role of dictators. This is one of the primary effects of the "Little Ballot." It may lead, through wise counsels, to a satisfactory recognition by the corporations that their day in the public streets is nearly over. Businessprudence should suggest an amicable settlement with the city.

POLITICAL SUCCESS.

Seattle Mail and Herald (Dem.), May 14.—The other kind of political success is that of the man who enters political life without the hope or desire for office or financial benefit, but as a citizen to protect the liberty of citizens and their sacred institutions. He does not want office. He does not want to get at the public funds. He does not look for the preferment of his personal friends. He stands for principle and labors for the education of the great mass of his fellow citizens up to a standard of public spirit and conscience that shall enable them to guard themselves against those who would debauch the spirit of liberty and betray its honor. It so happens that citizens of this kind, men who take this side of political life, are seldom ever given the responsibilities of public office. But theirs is a higher duty, a graver responsibility. . . . These are the citizens who cannot be "fixed," who refuse to be dealt with by others as chattels, who refuse to be traded against judgment and conscience for unworthy or incapable men. It is their duty to instill in the public mind ideals of government and public policy that are above the commercial idea of government.

THE OPEN SHOP.

The (N. Y.) Worker (Soc.), May 15.—There is really no such thing, anywhere in the world, as an "open shop." Every shop, every mine, every factory is closed to the unemployed workman unless the capitalist owner gives him permission to enter and go to work. . . . Socialists want an open shop—but a very different sort of "open shop" from that which the capitalist class advocates. Socialism would make all the shops open to all who want to work by mak-

ing the shops the common property of the workers. . . . Now the door is closed to men who want to work, and those who are allowed to work can do so only on condition that they make profit for the useless capitalist, because the factories, land, mines, mills, machinery, railroads and other means of production are privately owned.

THE YELLOW PERIL.

The (N. Y.) Nation (Ind.), May 12.—Naturally, the startling apparition of Japan as a first-class military power causes consternation among the prophets. The Spectator mutters dolorously of the Yellow Peril, which it consents more kindly to call "a very serious and momentous change in the balance of power in Asia." We, for our part, believing that the balance of power in Asia is essentially temporary and vicious, and that the greatest of the continents should learn to govern itself, have welcomed the emergence of Japan from medievalism and would also welcome the rehabilitation of China. There can be no peril to the world at large simply because the yellow races are learning to fight for their undoubted rights. Peril to certain forms of commercial exploitation, peril to the notion that the yellow races have practically no rights, there is; we grant that freely. As for dread that China under Japan's guidance will overrun the world, we have Professor Ladd's testimony—he knows the Japanese well—and we have common sense to tell us that this prospect is the most unsubstantial of bogeys.

WM. J. BRYAN.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), May 13.—Mr. Bryan has got the Republican press in a perfect frenzy by refusing to stay dead.

MISCELLANY

PER ASPERA AD ASTRA.

Here's to the man who kicks.
Not the man with a grouch
playing the anvil chorus,
finding everything wrong
and grumbling his days away;
not the misanthrope
with black spots before his eyes;
but the indefatigable kicker,
with good red blood in his veins
and a healthy contempt for shams
and a high regard for real things,
with faith in his fellow man,
faith in our common humanity
and faith that God rules his world.

One of the right sort of kickers
glances back on the past,
not to sigh for the good old days;
but to trace the slow road up hill,
and discern the long upward track
to the loftier heights of the future.
He studies our present affairs,
not to gloom over untoward things
as matter for pessimism;
but to pick out clews of progress
to higher and better conditions.
The dust cloud of passing events
is not to him mere confusion,
but a sign of a struggling host
moving, though slowly, forward.
But most of the time
he is not studying history,
nor pondering facts;
but there in the thick of the throng,
tossing and turning and wrestling,
he too is struggling forward;
blindly, perhaps, half seeing
which way the path sunward lies;
pushing on as best he can,

and at every glance of the sun
through the eddying dust,
throwing himself toward the light.

Often down flat in the dust—
never mind, grits his teeth,
up and at it again.
Often finds after his agony
he has simply swung round a circle
to the place he has started from—
Never mind; try it again;
there's a way forward somewhere.
Sometimes finds that his comrade
with whom he linked arms to make way,
was all the time dragging him backward—
Never mind, so it has been
and so it will always be;
one must get somehow forward,
or smother where the dust settles.

Defeat cannot daunt him;
disloyalty cannot dishearten;
sneers cannot discourage;
doubts cannot give him dismay—
Blinded and choking with dust,
he has to go forward.

Do you know what that dust cloud is?
'Tis the pillar of cloud by day
that leads to the promised land.
And the red flames that glow,
the revolutions, the strikes—
even the riots and wars—
are the pillar of fire by night,
guiding to that far country
flowing with milk and honey.

Moses and Joshua,
Phillips and Garrison,
Jefferson, Washington, Adams,
old Possawatomie Brown,
Abe Lincoln and Henry George,
and all their great company,
once shuffled along in the dust—
not knowing whither they fared—
but they had to go forward.
—Goodhue Co. (Minn.) News.

ORGANIZATION.

The arrogant capitalist refused to confer with the representatives of the workmen.

"Why do you refuse to meet us as man to man?" asked the representatives.

"I do not believe in organization," replied the capitalist.

"But you belong to an organization that is fighting labor unions."

"Quite true, but we have organized to protect property, while you have organized only for the protection of human life."

Moral: There's nothing cheaper than human life.—Will M. Maupin, in The Commoner.

THE FILIPINOS WILL NOT "TAKE UP THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN."

From an article on "Hawaii and the Philippines," written by Sixto Lopez and Thomas T. Patterson for the Springfield Republican, and published in the Weekly Republican of May 6, 1904.

The charge is that "the Filipinos will not work." The sentence is not complete; it should read: "The Fili-

pinos will not work for foreigners." That is to say, they will not work for the vampire and the wolf whose sole intent is to amass wealth by the labor of others.

This is a fact of which every Filipino ought to be proud, for it places the Filipinos in marked contrast with all the peoples of the East, excepting Japan where a similar condition is found.

In India and China and in other eastern countries the "white man's burden" consists in making colossal fortunes out of the inadequately paid labor of the brown man.

But the Filipinos and the Japanese will not "take up the white man's burden;" they prefer to let the white man carry it himself, and hence his complaint.

The Hawaiian, the Indian and even the shrewd Chinaman are deceived by the professions of those who declare that "it is all for the brown man's benefit." But the Filipino knows that unless this "philanthropy" promises to yield 50 or 100 per cent. profit it will never be put into practice.

The Filipino, in short, will not slave for the benefit of foreigners any more than will the American or the Englishman or Mr. Kipling; nor will he barter his substance for rum, and so the white man finds when he takes rum to the Philippines he has to drink it himself!

That is what is now taking place in the once temperate city of Manila. Rum—using the word in its generic sense—is the only kind of trade that "follows the flag," and those who carry the flag have to drink the trade!

WE WILL RAISE THE WINDOW YET.

For The Public.

"That bee who's supposed to be busy,
Has bumped his poor head till he's dizzy.
Just trying to pass through a clear pane
of glass.
He may be a model of virtue (Alas!)
But he's not very clever, now, is he?"

One summer day as I lay half dozing near my window, suddenly from the open door on the opposite side of the room came a buzzing sound, and, like a rifle shot, came a "ping" against the window. It was a laden bee, his legs yellow with pollen, his little pouch filled with nectar culled from the fields. The sudden contact with my window stunned him and he fell to the sill. He was up again in a moment on the window, bumping and complaining in his buzzing bee language at being detained from his duties at the hive. He rose and dropped and bumped and fell, still

buzzing his complaints angrily. I arose and went to the window to release him; he stung me.

I quietly raised the lower sash, when he dropped again; the way was clear and away he flew to the hive. While binding ointment on the sting, I thought of the similarity of that bee to the people who earn bread by toil.

To them, as to the bee, it is clear that butting and buzzing is the only remedy. The bee could not, and the people will not, reason. If one attempts to point out a better way, they scorn him.

In conversation with a laborer a short time ago, I suggested that the land question was the paramount issue.

"The land question be damned!" said he, scornfully. "We don't want land; we want work!"

The bee stung me. The laborer scorned me. I was powerless to raise the window for the poor laborer.

(I here give notice that we will raise the window.) I turned away with a deeper stab than the bee had given me. Land is the source of wealth, labor the means of producing it. Land monopolists will not labor productively. Those who do labor produce necessities and luxuries for the landlord, carefully saving the crusts for themselves.

The laborer while forc'd to be busy,
Has bumped his poor head till he's dizzy,
Just trying to pass through economy's glass.

He may be a model of virtue (Alas!)
But he's not very clever, now, is he?

L. E. HUGGINS.

Omaha, Neb.

WITHOUT AND WITHIN.

O thou that, with surpassing glory crowned,
Look'st from thy sole dominion like the
God
Of this new world, at whose sight all the
stars
Hide their diminished heads, to thee I call,
But with no friendly voice, and add thy
name,
O Sun, to tell thee how I hate thy beams,
That bring to my remembrance from what
state
I fell, how glorious once above thy sphere,
Till pride and worse ambition threw me
down,
Warring in heaven against heaven's
matchless King.
—Satan's Address to the Sun—Paradise
Lost.

The science which treats of the structure, functions and diseases of the eye, ophthalmology, teaches that according to the power of the crystalline lens are objects discernible. The pupil admits light to the lens, which brings the rays to a focus and forms an image upon the retina, where the light, falling upon delicate structures called rods and cones, causes them to stimulate the fibers of the optic nerve to trans-

mit visual impressions to the brain. Careless speech often conveys the impression that the scope of vision is according to the power of the eye to "reach" an object.

The eye is poetically referred to as the window of the soul. Beautiful as is such sentiment, we may learn from the science of correspondences that Truth alone can illuminate the understanding, which is the receptacle of wisdom. For even as is man's discernment and receptivity of Truth, so is his spiritual environment. Truth is the fluorescent light which fills the mind with all the colors of the sky-arch as it appears in graceful majesty outlined by the sun and rain.

Truth to the understanding is as the light of the sun to the natural world. Truth and love are inseparable; indeed, they are as one. Deprived of the sun's heat and light the earth would hold no form of life; this we know; and the spiritual nature of man, excluding Truth, or its essence, Love, is dwarfed and withered. This is not mere analogy, but finds expression in the daily life of man. As from an eminence we may better view the beauties of the landscape, so may we see the flood of falsities which once more covers the earth, if we are receptive to Truth. Of this, Lucretius, one of the greatest of the Roman poets, said:

It is a pleasure to stand upon the shore,
and see ships tossed upon the sea; a pleasure to stand in the window of a castle, and see the battle, and the adventures thereof below; but no pleasure is comparable to the standing upon the vantage ground of Truth, and to see the errors, and wanderings, and mists, and tempests, in the vale below.

Looking into a ship's binnacle we see the trembling needle of the compass obeying the magnetic forces of the earth; looking upon mankind we may also see how unerringly he obeys the dominant forces of his spiritual nature, for as is his interior, so will his outward expressions conform. As man turns away from God the powers of evil are exalted and the natural world is filled with sorrow, crime and degradation.

Discoursing upon Truth, Lord Bacon observed:

Doth any man doubt, that if there were taken out of men's minds vain opinions, flattering hopes, false valuations, imaginations as one would, and the like, but it would leave the minds of a number of men poor, shrunken things, full of melancholy and indisposition, and unpleasing to themselves? . . . It will be acknowledged, even by those that practice it not, that clear and round dealing is the honor of man's nature, and that mixture of falsehood is like alloy in coin of gold and sil-

ver, which may make the metal work the better, but it embaseth it. For these windings and crooked courses are the goings of the serpent, which goeth baseely upon the belly, and not upon the feet. There is no vice that doth so cover a man with shame as to be found false and peridious.

The great essayist, whose pen has so enriched the pages of English literature, saw clearly, despite his own moral failures, the golden light. His was a pitiable figure sitting upon the reef of reprobation where he had been cast by the swirling waters of the maelstrom of politics. The brilliant chancellor, grasping for a bauble, fell, as did Lucifer; and with the Prince of Darkness, cried out in the anguish of his soul:

Me miserable! which way shall I fly,
Infinite wrath, and infinite despair?
Which way I fly is hell; myself am hell;
And in the lowest deep a lower deep
Still threatening to devour me opens wide,
To which the hell I suffer seems a heaven.

From the ark of Truth how seems the deluge of falsities which enfolds the world to-day? Nations, semi-barbaric, with all the enginery of war engaged in destroying as many human beings as possible, for that really is the science of warfare. And why? To obtain supremacy in the possession of a patch of land! The conflict of the ages. The English empire, drenched with blood, quiescent, in these her decaying hours. Germany, with her great dominion as one military camp, ready to butcher and plunder, from her own borders to the helpless tribes on Africa's tropic shores. France, a republic in name, a monarchy at heart, trembling with every storm that proceeds from political and social unrest. Australia and Italy, mere puppets in the world game of politics. Far to the east the Mongolian giant slumbers, while European chancelleries haggle over the time and manner of his dismemberment.

And America, what of her?

History records the days of regal grandeur and colossal works of art, when Babylon and Nineveh were the pride of the earth, when Thebes with her hundred gates was one of the most renowned and splendid cities of the world; the days when the temples and glittering minarets of the mighty Memphis were in their prime; the days when the towers upon the lofty walls of Carthage afforded shelter for thousands of elephants and horses, and its navigable waters floated the armies and merchandise of all nations, while her magnificent temples were lined with burnished gold, and adorned with statues of the same precious metal,

and the symbolic objects of the people's worship were incrustated with gems of priceless value. Not only has the glory of these palatial cities departed, but even their tombs are lost to the research of mankind.

The patriot Kossuth had before him the mirage of this departed greatness when he bade farewell to the American people. After alluding to the wealth, grandeur and power of these nations of antiquity, whose ships overshadowed the seas, and whose multitudes of human beings peopled the earth; when "Tyre exchanged its purple for the silk of Serique, (and when) Cashmere's filmy shawls, * * * the pearls of Hevila, the diamonds of Golconda, the gorgeous carpets of Lydia, the gold of Ophir and Saba, the aromatic spices and jewels of Ceylon, and the pearls and perfumes of Arabia, the myrrh, silver, gold dust and Ivory of Africa, as well as the amber of the Baltic, and the tin of Thule" were among the articles of commerce. Reciting this chapter and observing that though all the glory of the Anglo-Saxon race is nothing more than the reproduction of "the grandeur of those ancient nations," one who listened to the noble champion of a people's freedom has told of the sad and plaintive cadence of the patriot's voice as he said that

Unless the divine law was paramount, and obedience to it the rule of life, your power is vain, your freedom is vain, your industry, your wealth, your prosperity, are vain; all this will not save you from sharing the mournful fate of these old nations, not less powerful than you, not less free, not less prosperous than you, and still fallen, as you, yourself, will fall, all vanished, as you will vanish, like a bubble, thrown up from the deep. There is only the law of God, there are only the duties of Christianity which can secure your future, by securing at the same time humanity. As long as the fragile wisdom of political exigencies overrules the will of God, there is no freedom on earth, and the future of no nation sure.

The heroic spirit that uttered such a warning, majestic and sublime, yet fraught with such solemn import to the American people, has been forgotten, and our ship of state has at the helm one who enunciates as a doctrine for the achievement of national greatness, to "speak softly, but carry a big stick." With dark waters and thick clouds of the skies round about him, the emancipator of a race could say: "With malice toward none, but charity for all." Consider the descent from such a lofty plane of thought to the meaningless dictum of an exponent of latter day ideals who advised the American people to "stand pat." These

are but types—the flight of the cherubim; the vapor of Gehenna.

When death removes from earthly activities any that have in the larger affairs of men contributed to the sum total of human progress and happiness, the world pays its tribute. Personality may not be considered only by those who by close association have enjoyed the rare and beautiful expressions of the soul. To speak of moral failures of men, though they have passed, is dealing with example, for even as noble lives leave their imprint, so, too, do the untoward, those whose lives have exerted a baneful influence.

Returned to the dust from whence it came, was a form that was but recently active in the affairs of the nation. Endowed with a brilliant mind, polished, educated thoroughly in worldly wisdom, by his supervision and direction there was builded a new fleet of ships designed for the destruction of human life and property. From affairs of government to the domain of finance in private life—millions of money were amassed by practices recognized by society as legal and legitimate, but in truth entirely void of "that clear and round dealing which is the honor of man's nature," and symbolized by the windings and crooked courses of the serpent of which the sage has written. Splendid powers stultified. Spending immorally gotten gains in the pleasures of natural senses. No return to God and man for the talents entrusted. Mausoleum magnificent will mark a tomb—the tomb of a wasted life. How compare it for a moment with the nobility of a soul that went into new light while pleading with humanity for justice for the people of two republics being crushed by an empire?

The framers of our declaration of guiding principles, who embodied in the nation's organic law the essence of spiritual law, saw as all men may see when the understanding is not veiled. In the present period, reached by a gradual closing of the understanding to the admission of Truth, the American people are as those represented in the allegory of the Tower of Babel. Here was an attempt, by natural agencies, to penetrate the arcana of heaven, and there followed a confusion of tongues. In this modern confusion of tongues the Tower of Babel has risen, parapet upon parapet of greed and selfishness. Only briefly may be outlined the larger outward expressions of evil in our national life.

The Church, closed to the Living God, has become as a lamp without oil. Evangelistic movements, widespread,

missionaries in legion, endeavor to awaken men. How futile. The pygmies bound Gulliver, but man's efforts to raise his fellow by other means than God's plan in its operation in temporal affairs, are but piling Pelion on Ossa. Thus have come the cults grotesque, organizations fantastic. While there have been broader lines noted in what is termed an "institutional" branch in many denominations, there has been inculcated the belief that in the fostering of the militant spirit in youth patriotism rises; and the embryonic man is organized into "boys' brigades," instructed in the science of armed conflict—seeking the love of the Creator with a gun. Yet this is not all. In no time in our national life have the powers of evil been so exalted. A witty writer recently said that if the people in the rural districts of our republic knew of what was common practice among officials of the government and the immorality of their representatives in Congress, a revolution would be imminent. From the capital to all the centers of population flows the same turbid tide. No fiercer than the wolf of the steppes pursuing a lone traveler, are the hordes that rob the masses of the people, and this in the name of good government and party politics. Modern commercial life has developed a type of piracy never dreamed of in those days when "low lying, rakish craft sailed the Spanish main." "Captains of industry," in the name of business, exploit their fellow beings with a shamelessness and cool effrontery that shock the sensibilities, but this depravity is a natural sequence.

The melancholy record of the increase of the insane is verified by all the large States in our union making increased provision for those so pitifully afflicted, and the moral insanity of the nation furnishes a sad corollary. Houses of detention, reformatories and jails are filled with the vicious, the depraved and all the flotsam and jetsam from this deluge of evil. This superficial age brings to view the standard to which literature, music and the drama have fallen—flippant and frothy creations from pens that seek notoriety and a bank check; the spirit of Mozart forgotten in the infantile amusement of the rag time; the stage once trod by Booth and Cushman, occupied by the comedian gross, the burlesque bizarre.

Among the idle and parasitical class there are recurrent periods of mental activity. Often an evidence of this is given when the grand ladies decide to

do something for "charity." It is then that the "vulgar" class is regaled with descriptions of diamonds magnificent, of pearls superb, of the velvet's sheeny folds, of priceless laces old and rare. The gaping crowd do not see under the gaudy tinsel flaunted in imitation of the corrupt and licentious court of Versailles, its deeper significance. Admiration and representation in this form is but a glorification of the evil itself.

Is it not a horrid phantasm that presents itself in a survey of our social structure? With all the achievements of science, with all the blessings that could come from sources inexhaustible, we see a marvelous dislocation; we see thousands eager and anxious to take a part in the world's activity; we see our fellow beings denied this privilege; we see thousands pressed down to a level of hopeless and despairing helplessness and suffering for the very necessities of life. And why is it? We have turned away from Love and Truth and Justice. We have denied God.

When will these waters subside? When may the dove of divine peace find a resting place for her feet? When may we see the glory of the Creator in the affairs of men?

The divine economy includes and enfolds every living creature. The spiritual abode of man is not a place beyond the stars, a shadowy, vapory somewhere. Heaven is a state or condition of the soul. Heaven is within and not without. God's kingdom on earth has form and expression in man's obedience to the harmony of divine law. Clothed for a brief span in natural form, mankind has been provided with every element essential for his material needs, and by the reign of Justice everyone may participate in the divine bounty. How may society obey the great mandate and the rule of life? Restore to society that which has been wrested from it—the right of use of the earth. Parchments giving title to private ownership of what is a natural birthright of all, are but a monstrous mockery and overruling of God's will. Conceived in wickedness, the private appropriation of the great storehouse of man has brought forth its awful punishments through all time.

The American people, by establishing an economic system which comprehended the abolition of every form of taxation until land values alone furnished an ever-increasing fund for the administration of government, would take the first step in the lighting of a beacon whose rays of liberty and jus-

tice would illuminate the world. That would be the first upward look at God. The benign influence of thus observing God's law would, in the social advance, lift other nations to the same plane of moral greatness, to follow the lead of the western world in the crusade of righteousness. Then will these turbid waters subside. Then will the dove find a rest for her feet. Mankind will see more clearly as each generation comes and goes, until Love reigns supreme in his nature, and he can turn to his Creator and say in truth and understanding: "It is well with my soul."

JAMES A. WARREN.

THE NEW STENOGRAPHER.

I have a new stenographer—she came to work to-day.

She told me that she wrote the latest system.

Two hundred words a minute seemed to her, she said, like play.

And word for word at that—she never missed 'em!

I gave her some dictation—a letter to a man—

And this, as I remember it, was how the letter ran:

"Dear Sir: I have your favor, and in reply would state

That I accept the offer in yours of recent date.

I wish to say, however, that under no condition

Can I afford to think of your free lance proposition.

I shall begin to-morrow to turn the matter out;

The copy will be ready by August 10th, about.

Material of this nature should not be rushed unduly.

Thanking you for your favor, I am, yours, very truly."

She took it down in shorthand with apparent ease and grace;

She didn't call me back all in a flurry.

Thought I: "At last I have a girl worth keeping 'round the place;"

Then said: "Now write it out—you needn't hurry."

The typewriter she tackled—now and then she struck a key,

And after thirty minutes this is what she handed me:

"Dear sir, I have the Feever, and in a Plie I Sit

And I except the Offer as you Have reasoned it..

I wish to see however That under any condition

can I for to Think of a free lunch Preposishun?

I Shall be in tomorrow To., turn the mother out,

The cap will be red and Will costt, \$10, about.

Mateertul of this nation should not rust N. Dooley,

Thinking you have the Feever I am Yours very Truely."

—Milwaukee Sentinel.

A lady in San Francisco engaged a Chinese cook. When the Celestial came,

she asked him his name. "My name," said the Chinaman, smiling. "Is Wang Hang Ho." "Oh, I can't remember all that," said the lady. "I will call you John." John smiled all over and asked: "What your namee?" "My name is Mrs. Melville Landon." "Me no memble all that," said John. "Chinaman he no savey Mrs. Membul Landon. I call you Tommy."—Watchman.

Quoth Tommy: "Why's the Winter wind Called 'rude' I'd like to know."

"Perhaps," said little Bess, "It is Because it whistles so."

—Philadelphia Ledger.

BOOKS

THE ANCIENT LOWLY.

Few realize until their attention is called to the fact, how superficial are the written histories of nations. These histories tell almost nothing of the thoughts, doings and life of the great majority of the peoples about which they are written. Historians have almost invariably been aristocratic in sympathy, with eyes fixed on kings, princes, lords, rulers, and the rich. When an exception comes, like the great Mommsen, who recently passed away, he can only constantly regret that predecessors have told so little of the democratic movements in that ancient past which he tried to make clear to us. And Dr. Drumann came to the point at once when he said: "One searches in vain for satisfactory intelligence regarding the producing class." In other words, the histories and records have ignored those who in all ages have been most worth knowing—the men who have really kept the world going, the true workers, the producers. In all the distant past they were despised—made of no account by the rulers and soldiers for whom they labored. And the historians simply followed the same trend.

Why was it so? Why did the masses lie dumb? Most students of history and sociology will doubtless reply that it was necessarily and best so—that the people needed the domination and guidance and protection and thought of their ruling class. Certain glimpses we get disprove this. The people showed that at times they could act for themselves. Why did they not steadily claim and enforce their rights? Was it the mere incubus of custom and conservatism? Was it unhappy disunion when any impulse to freedom came? Was it the united, unscrupulous force of the men in power?

No closer answer can even now be found when we look at the modern world. We see almost the same condition to-day. Why do the masses of England permit themselves to be dominated by a comparatively small class of landlords? Why is Ireland landless, with land enough for millions more? Why do the peasants of Sicily go on

living on nothing? Why is all Europe overcrowded, overtaxed, overworked, for the splendid few who pass their time, as the old Roman nobles did, between the social seasons of the cities and the baths? Why do the workmen of America permit conditions to continue by which the wealth they produce centers in Wall street and Fifth avenue? These questions are as hard to answer to-day as it is to account for the subservency of the ancient lowly, about whom we know so little.

Perhaps a fuller study of the history of the working classes in ancient times would help to solve the problem, or would at least teach some useful lessons. For the people have had a history as well as the princes. To tell this history, so far as it can be delved out of ancient records and inscriptions, has been the task of the author of a book which deserves wide reading and earnest study ("The Ancient Lowly, a History of the Ancient Working People," by C. Osborne Ward. Purdy Publishing company, Chicago, \$2.50).

If the book should have no other effect than to instruct and influence the writers of ancient history for schools, it would serve a most useful purpose. The histories of Greece and Rome that are studied in the schools almost invariably belittle, or misinterpret, or ignore, the episodes that were evident struggles of the masses of producers against their oppressors.

The great struggle of Spartacus, for example, could hardly be dealt with in the usual superficial fashion by anyone who had read the chapter on his magnificent uprising as told in this book. Here we are able to see what gave strength to his movement, and made it far more than the outburst of a group of bold gladiators. We can see that, like the rash conspiracy of Catiline and the close-following collapse of the government with the almost necessary dictatorship of Caesar, it was the fruit of the failure to heed the warnings and reforms of the Gracchi. Spartacus became the champion of the oppressed working classes and labor unions of Italy, and but for the jealousies that followed the successes of the revolutionists, the subsequent course of Roman history might have been quite different.

Mr. Ward's task was one of great difficulty, and he has deserved the sincere thanks of all readers who recognize the struggle for freedom and for equal rights as the supreme problem of the historian. His book attempts to cover the period from the earliest times to the adoption of Christianity by Constantine. He has spared no pains to find out all the facts from all available sources that would throw light on these early centuries, and this is the chief value of the work. His reasonings may not be always acceptable, and his conclusions may be at times forced. He seems not to have sufficient faith in the ethics of real

democracy. But he has told a great number of most valuable facts, which he has been careful to back up by foot-note references.

The book is interesting from the sheer force of its facts. The writer is by no means a gifted narrator. He repeats himself, and does not always tell things in order. Sometimes he is guilty of an inversion that seems like ignorance; as when, speaking of the gladiatorial games, he says: "Commodus upheld them, Domitian extended them"—as if he did not know that Domitian lived a hundred years before Commodus. But the style is in the main earnest, plain and satisfactory.

Whatever fault may be found with the book, however this or that critic may object to the author's opinions, no one can deny the value and importance of the work. It deserves better proof-reading and better printing and binding. The foot-notes are here and there hardly legible. But the main body of the text is in fairly clear type, and no one should complain at paying the price for these 650 pages as they are.

J. H. DILLARD.

THE GERMAN STRUGGLE FOR LIBERTY.

Poultney Bigelow, school-boy chum of the Emperor of Germany through an accident of association, but radical democrat by deliberate choice, tells in the third volume of his "History of the German Struggle for Liberty" (New York and London: Harper & Bros. Price, \$2.25 net) of the stirrings of democracy in the womb of the German nation during those pregnant years from Waterloo to '48.

To read this volume is to understand, without further explanation, why the Emperor and Mr. Bigelow are not the chums they were when there were two lives between the one and his crown, and the other had not yet begun to write democratic history. Yet there is nothing of obtrusive partisanship about Mr. Bigelow's work. The book fully justifies his description of its contents when in the preface he writes: "We are not here to apologize for democracy, much less to glorify monarchy. We have in view nothing more ambitious than to explain, as well as we can, how a most loyal, monarchical, thrifty and peaceful people could in the short time of which this volume treats become so infuriated as to assist in shaking the foundations of nearly every European throne, of driving the late Emperor William to seek refuge in a foreign country, and of compelling the ruling Hohenzollern to take off his hat to the Berlin mob."

The author's apology for telling much of this story in biographical form will be cordially accepted by every reader of the book; for, instead of a lifeless chronicle of the automatic movements of official marionettes, it thus

becomes a vital narrative of the daily doings of real folks—a story of the heartbeats of a people. Conspicuous among these biographies is that of Friedrich Ludwig Jahn—"Turnvater Jahn," or, "as we might say, the tourney father,"—whose work and martyrdom Mr. Bigelow credits with giving impulse to the German sentiment that precipitated the revolution of 1848.

Fritz Reuter, Carl Sand, Kossuth, Mazzini, Strauss, Robert Blum, Lasalle and Heinrich Simon, are among the other characters whose life story enters into the great struggle that Mr. Bigelow describes. It is to be regretted that Mr. Bigelow could not have done the same justice to the much maligned memory of Thomas Paine that he has done to these Germans; but, unhappily, in a gratuitous mention of this American patriot he adopts the estimate of the enemies of democracy. His references to Henry George are conceived in a better spirit.

One of the most interesting episodes the author narrates is the free trade revolution of 1818—over a quarter of a century before Cobden's triumph in England—which freed the Prussian states from the exasperating commercial tariffs that separated their people; and Americans will be especially interested in the explanation of German migration to the United States from what is, to them, as a rule, the novel viewpoint of emigration. Most of our appreciation of this subject is from the viewpoint of immigration.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—"The Foundation of all Reform. A Guide to Health, Wealth and Freedom. A popular treatise on the diet question. By Otto Carque. Chicago: Kosmos Publishing Co., 765 N. Clark St.; London: L. N. Towler & Co., 7 Imperial Arcade, Ludgate Circus. This little book is a plea for fruit diet, and is scientific in method.

—"The Guide to Immortality; or the Child's First Lesson in Spiritual Science." By Dr. Georjean Miller. Girard, Kan., Press of Appeal to Reason.

PAMPHLETS.

Dr. Edwin Taylor Shelly, of Atchison, a leading old-school physician of north-eastern Kansas, who gratuitously distributes to his obstetric patients a sensible little pamphlet of "Suggestions for the Expectant Mother," takes occasion therein to criticize the common notion that birthmarks are caused by nervous shocks to mothers. There is no connection whatever, he writes, "between the nervous system of the mother and that of her unborn child, and the mother can therefore transmit no nervous shock to the child."

In anticipation of the return to hard times, and especially as a reply to the criticism that it is due to trades unionism, the Chicago Federation of Labor has issued a symposium (price, 10 cents) on "The Cause of Industrial Panics." This pamphlet, prepared under the supervision of a committee composed of T. P. Quinn, R. G. Wall and C. V. Peterson, contains portraits of Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, and Mr. G. Schardt, president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, and its contributors are Samuel Gompers, James Duncan, Henry D. Lloyd, Frank K. Foster, Sir Charles Dilke, Ernest H. Crosby, Lawson Purdy, Lyman J. Gage, E. W. Bemis, Kler Hardy, Louis F. Post, George Francis Train, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, John Burns, Eugene V. Debs, Lucien Saniel,