

# The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1904.

Number 844.

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.

In referring last week (p. 464) to Thos. W. Lawson's unaccepted offer to contribute \$100,000 to the Democratic campaign fund if Patrick McCarren would publicly and explicitly deny that he is regularly employed as the trusted political agent of the Standard Oil "crowd," we inadvertently described Mr. McCarren as chairman of the executive committee of the Democratic national committee. This was a mistake. He is chairman of the executive committee of the Democratic State committee of New York.

The Presidential election, which will have been decided before another issue of this periodical appears, is of less importance in one sense than any national election since long before the Civil War.

One or the other of only two men can possibly be elected, and there is no reason for believing that it will make much difference which, so far as any public policy is immediately concerned. Parker's election would introduce less reckless dynamics into the public service, but that is all. The colonial policy would be practically unmolested, and robbery by "protection" would either go untouched and uncondemned or be slightly modified in percentage and in the personnel of the robbers. Nothing better could be expected from Parker than from Cleveland in his second term, and Cleveland's second term was pretty bad except from the plutocratic point of view.

Even such mild benefits as

might by any possibility be hoped for under Parker, are out of reach; for Parker cannot be elected, unless Lawson's story is verified by events and the Standard Oil "crowd" do buy up enough doubtful States to stultify in the Electoral College the overwhelming popular vote that apparently is certain to be cast against him. His election under these circumstances would not be particularly encouraging, even with reference to small things. But there is little possibility now of the success of the Standard Oil conspiracy if there has been one.

Whether there has been such a conspiracy the ordinary man, though a Solomon, can hardly guess. Such things are never concocted in the open, and Lawson's exposure may after all not be gospel through and through. Much of it may be only his guess. Of the sincerity of his contributions to *Everybody's Magazine* we have no manner of doubt. They ring true, even if they are flamboyantly literary in style and Barnumesque in exploitation, and even if there be purposes back of them other than the manifestly genuine purpose which Lawson professes. Nevertheless, Lawson cannot be personally cognizant of the facts he declares with reference to an arrangement between the Standard Oil "crowd" and some of Parker's managers. His facts must be well sprinkled with indistinguishable inferences. But there are many corroborative circumstances, not least among them being the distinguished consideration shown by the Parker management for such Standard Oil pets among trusts as the steel, the oil, the beef and the tobacco trusts. But neither have Roosevelt's managers been indifferent to the good will or the ill will of trusts. His managers are not fighting "single handed and

alone," as Bryan's were when the Standard Oil "crowd" turned on him. Roosevelt is backed by some of the giants of plutocracy. If there is any hope at all of Parker's election, it rests upon facts that are even at this late day in the campaign invisible to the naked eye.

But if in one sense there is little reason for democratic interest in this election, there is much reason in another sense. It seems to be marking time to the music of impending popular change in politics of great moment and magnitude. Readers of American history will remember that in the '20's, at that period known as "the era of good feeling," there was but one party, and that this party hatched factions which developed into parties. Somewhat similar were the conditions in the '50's, when new issues brought on new party alignments. They were significantly like that of the present time, when new issues are once more breaking up political crystallizations. The more overwhelming Parker's defeat may be, then (p. 465), in this period of lull in our political warfare, the more certainly and the sooner will the crash of battle it presages witness definite alignments; whether under new party banners or old ones, no one can predict and no one need care. The period is transitional. Under these circumstances, and as Parker cannot be elected, the more overwhelming his defeat the better for the future of genuine democracy. For it will tend either to give birth to a new democratic party, with the principle and the vigor to fight plutocracy; or, better yet, to make the present Democratic party really democratic through the drifting away from it, after the manner of the *Chicago Chronicle*, of its plutocratic elements, in hopelessness of ever again controlling it, and

the coming into it of masses of democrats from the temporarily triumphant party of plutocracy. How this defeat can be made most significant we have already suggested (p. 466), and we see no reason for modifying that suggestion.

There are Democratic candidates whose election in this campaign is of importance, of much importance in some instances, to the future of genuine democracy. First among these is Bryan. Although not a regularly nominated candidate for any office, his election to the United States Senate will result from the election of the fusion candidates—Democratic and People's party—to the Nebraska legislature. The good service Mr. Bryan could render to democratic Democracy, on the floor and in the committee rooms of the Senate, is incalculable; and no democratic Democrat of Nebraska should lose any opportunity to promote the success of the fusion ticket there.

Gov. Garvin's election is another of special importance. Although his candidacy is upon local questions, they are of a character to give national importance to the man and his campaign. Popular government is involved in it. Rhode Island is so organized that one town, for illustration, the town of West Greenwich, with a voting population of only 171, has the same voting strength in the Rhode Island legislature as the city of Providence with a voting population of 31,771. The Aldrich oligarchy is struggling to maintain this undemocratic system. Gov. Garvin is fighting to destroy it. In that connection Garvin advocates a constitutional referendum, under which a certain number of citizens might secure a popular vote at any election upon proposed constitutional amendments. Thus the constitution would be always under popular control. This reform should appeal to everyone everywhere who believes in popular government. It is especially distasteful to plutocrats.

In the neighboring State of Massachusetts the Democrats have nominated a man for governor whose campaign has proved his right to the confidence of democratic Democrats. We refer to W. L. Douglas, a man of national repute in business as a manufacturer of shoes. His letter of acceptance, from which we have published extracts (p. 477), indicates the strong democratic tendency of his opinions on public questions. In his speeches he has justified this estimate of his political character. The tariff issue is alive in Massachusetts, owing to protective interferences with normal trade between New England and Canada; and Mr. Douglas has advocated radical tariff reductions, radical in character as well as high in percentage, with more boldness than Democratic candidates have been accustomed to doing for years. He has in fact resorted without quibble to unmasked free trade arguments. If all Democratic candidates were as democratic as Mr. Douglas, the party would soon lose its bad name and be a congenial political home for all Jeffersonian democrats.

Robert Baker, of New York, has stirred up the dry rot of petty corruption in Congress, as only a thorough-going democrat could. By his public refusal of a railroad pass, he called general attention to the fact that this insidious form of petty corruption, and open sesame to all degrees of bribery from "entered apprentice" up to the self-perpetuating and all-dominant "33d," and from municipal buildings superintendents to President, is a prevalent, usually a cherished, perquisite of public office. Mr. Baker also did effective work in other respects in Congress. He was unique, as a thoroughly honest and independent man is certain to be in any body whose members, when not directly owned by corporations, are ridden by corporation-owned caucuses. Mr. Baker secured his renomination in spite of the opposition of his local party "boss," the Patrick McCarren whom Law-

son charges, without contradiction, with being the hired lobbyist of the Standard Oil trust. Should Baker be reelected from the Republican district in which he is now for the second time the Democratic candidate for Congress, it would be a distinct triumph for the policy of faithful public service and the principles of democratic Democracy.

Another candidate for Congress whose election is to be hoped for, and which seems to be assured, is John F. Shafroth, of Denver. Mr. Shafroth is the Congressman who startled the country by resigning his seat in the present Congress upon discovering that he had been fraudulently counted in. The simple honesty of this act, coupled with the marked ability with which Mr. Shafroth had served in Congress, should win him the support of every independent voter in his district.

In Illinois there are good democratic reasons for voting against the Democratic candidate for governor, regardless of his ability, regardless of his honesty, regardless of his democracy. The management of the convention that nominated him (p. 161-70) disgraced the party and discredited its nominee. Mr. Stringer might have been nominated had the convention been honestly managed, but there is no way in which the fraudulent and dangerous kind of politics that prevailed in that convention can be rebuked except by voting against him as its leading nominee. It is unfortunate for Mr. Stringer if he suffers for the rascality of the clique that nominated him; but the remedy was in his own hands. He could have denounced the fraud and declined to stand before the people as its chief representative and beneficiary.

In Chicago there is room for some choice on democratic grounds. Willis C. Stone, the Democratic candidate for Congress in the 3d district, is a democratic Democrat, a man of strong character, who measures fully up to

the ideal standard of Congressional statesmanship. William Preston Harrison, the Democratic candidate in the 8th Congressional district, will be opposed by many democratic Democrats, as well as by others, and for reasons that appeal to every sense of good citizenship. A brother of the Mayor, he was forced into the nomination by peculiar influences and by means but little if any better than those which controlled the State convention. His democracy, moreover, is known only by the brand, which is a poor recommendation. Quin O'Brien, the Democratic candidate in the 9th district, is of a different type. His democracy, like Dr. Stone's, is Jeffersonian; and, like Dr. Stone, he would make an ideal Congressman. No democratic Democrat who supports either of these men will waste his vote. In the 1st district, Martin B. Madden, Republican, entered into a combination with the Democratic "boss" to prevent the renomination of Congressman Emerich, an able Representative and high order of Democrat. The object was to pit a weak Democrat against the notorious Madden. This was done. But the anti-machine Republicans and anti-machine Democrats have nominated David S. Geer, a Republican, as an independent candidate, and Mr. Geer is under the circumstances worthy of every democratic vote. For the board of tax review the Democrats have nominated Joseph Donnersberger, who, though he would hardly rank as a thorough-going democrat in the radical sense, is a man peculiarly well fitted for this office. His qualifications and his reputation for probity are such that he may be depended upon to enforce the tax laws impartially as they exist. And that is what a taxing officer ought to do. Reforms in tax systems must be sought of the legislature; a strictly honest and intelligent administration is what is properly required of taxing officials. For this reason we have no hesitation in recommending Mr. Donnersberger's present candidacy to democratic Democrats. In the long list of

Chicago candidates are seven for the bench. One is F. A. Windes, whose experience in the court of which he is now a judicial member, and the high reputation he has achieved, are ample recommendations of fitness. In politics he is not only a party Democrat; he is a democrat. Among the Republican candidates are two, already on the bench, who have conspicuously demonstrated their judicial unfitness. One is Jesse Holdom and the other Axel Chytraus. Holdom especially has identified himself judicially with the spirit of plutocracy. Excellent successors for these two judges may be found in Joseph O'Donnell and Charles H. Mitchell. O'Donnell was elected a year and a half ago to a place on the bench recently created by a law which the Supreme Court has since held to be unconstitutional. Both he and Mr. Mitchell are in regular legal practice. The fact that both are Altgeld Democrats is an assurance of the democratic spirit in which they would administer justice; their undisputed professional standing is a guarantee of their judicial fidelity in other respects.

There will be at this election a good deal of referendum voting in Illinois. Some of it is local to Chicago; as the question of adopting voting machines, the advantage of which over the present antique system needs no explanation. Another question is that of amending the State constitution so as to enable the city to secure a distinctive charter. While this is local to Chicago in effect, it is to be voted on throughout the State. An affirmative vote will be equivalent to a negative vote on the question of holding a constitutional convention. The amendment is sought by certain financial interests in Chicago so as to obtain what they want without risking the anti-monopoly constitution which a convention might make. Three other questions are to be voted on under the public policy law (p. 457), namely: direct primaries, popular veto by referendum, and local option in meth-

ods of taxation. Every proposition is meritorious, and should be carried by an emphatic vote. To make this popular vote effective, the Referendum League is pledging legislative candidates to act in accordance with it if they are elected.

The following extract from a conspicuous editorial in the Cincinnati Times Star of the 28th, makes an astonishingly accurate statement of a natural economic law which is not generally understood—the law, namely, of the incidence or point of pressure of taxation:

It is an accepted law of economics that the value of the structure is fixed by the law that governs the value of commodities the supply of which can be increased at pleasure; that is, it is equal in the long run to the cost of production, or rather of reproduction. The rent of the house proper is normally equal to the interest on the capital expended plus an annual sum which, when capitalized, will be sufficient, after paying all necessary expenses, to replace the capital by the time the house is worn out. The laws which govern the incidence of taxes on houses, or on house rents, are, therefore, analogous to those which govern the incidence of taxes on capital or on competitive profits—it is shifted in varying degrees to the tenant. On the other hand, the value of the lot is fixed in agreement with the general principles of economic rent, according to which the price paid is measured by the superiority of situation, or more exactly, the value of a lot is determined by the general law of price which governs all those commodities which are not susceptible to an indefinite increase in their supply; that is, the incidence of the ground tax is on the owner. He has no means of shifting it; for if the tax were to be suddenly abolished, he would nevertheless be able to extort the same rent, since the ground rent is fixed solely by the demand of the occupiers. The tax on the land simply diminishes the owner's profits.

Accepting this elucidation as true—and it is really so all the way down to the dotting of the i's and the crossing of the t's—what moral inference would a sane mind naturally draw? Would it not be that taxes ought to be laid upon lot values, so that the rent which owners "extort" from this class of property, common property in its nature, should go to the public good instead of enriching land mo-

nopolists? But not so the Times-Star. It thinks, along with monopolists generally, that that would be immoral. Its own conception of the morality of the case is that taxes should fall on houses, so that landlords may shift them in varying degrees to tenants, thereby making tenants pay taxes which landlords themselves boast of paying, and making taxes collectable out of the value of earnings instead of the value of privilege. What explanation is there of this moral upside-downedness on the part of the Cincinnati paper? Isn't its inverted ethics due to the fact that the really immoral tax upon house values is the "going thing," whereas the tax on lot values is the "single tax" of which Tom L. Johnson is an advocate and which every plutocratic paper in Ohio is therefore sworn to attack whenever it rises above the economic or political horizon?

#### THE MARRIAGE PROBLEM—DIVORCE

Granting that society may properly exact binding contracts of marriage, and may inhibit the making of a second marriage contract while a previous one subsists between either party and a third person (p. 468), questions regarding divorce arise. The first relates to divorce simply as a decree of nullification, regardless of its bearings upon successive marriages. In considering this question, we are confronted with the third and fourth of the five queries heretofore (p. 454) reserved for examination, namely:

(3) If society has the right to exact binding and exclusive contracts of marriage, has it also the complementary right to annul marriage contracts?

(4) Assuming society to have this right of nullification, may the parties to the contract or declaration of a marriage which has come to an end through the dissolution of the unifying love that made it—may they themselves, or either of them, properly call upon society to annul the contract?

In harmony with what has preceded, conventional divorce must be correlative to conventional marriage. To think otherwise is difficult, if not impossible, without ignoring the essential differ-

ence between ceremonial marriage and natural marriage, between the symbol and the thing symbolized.

If there were no such thing as natural marriage back of the conventional, if it were the ceremony and that alone that constitutes marriage, then, indeed, divorce might not be regarded as a correlative of marriage. For in that case, marriage would be an arbitrary custom, not a natural principle; and arbitrary custom alone would consequently determine the legitimacy of divorce. It might even abolish marriage altogether. But the ceremonial theory is too paganistic, not to say materialistic, to demand attention in any discussion in which marriage is regarded as a vital ideality. The materialist may consider divorce as raising only questions of expediency. The pagan may regard it with superstitious horror. But he who is neither pagan nor materialist must bring it to the test of ideal principle.

Doing this, he sees that marriage does not consist in conventionality or contract or ceremonial, but that it consists in an ideal relationship, of which ceremonials are only the symbols or outward expressions. As to divorce, then, the primary consideration with him is not whether the ceremonial of marriage is an indissoluble contract, but whether the ideal relationship is indissoluble in its nature.

If he finds that marriage is in reality constituted not by ceremonials but only by marriage love, and that marriage love, although abiding in its nature, may nevertheless die, he realizes that the ideal relationship itself is not indissoluble. Thereupon he concludes that when the natural force of marriage love, which alone makes a marriage, is dissipated by natural law, the marriage itself is dissolved by natural law. With that principle to guide him, divorce ceremonials take their place in his mind by the side of marriage ceremonials. Reasoning that there ought to be some ceremonial of conventional marriage wherever there is a real marriage, he reasons in like manner that there ought to be some ceremonial of conventional divorce wherever there is a real divorce.

The correctness of that view cannot reasonably be disputed, on the basis of what has preceded in this discussion. Grant that natural marriage is ideal and not merely conventional, being created by marriage love and not by a ceremonial; grant that the ceremony of marriage is a useful conventionality publicly declaratory of natural marriage; grant that natural marriage may end in natural divorce because the marriage love that sustains it has died,—grant these propositions which we have already advanced with reference to marriage, and you must concede the propriety of conventional divorce. The ceremony of conventional divorce is to natural divorce what the ceremony of conventional marriage is to natural marriage—the declaration or symbol whereby society may be advised of the true relation of the parties as they themselves regard it.

By what means, then, if conventional marriage may be dissolved, shall the ceremony of conventional divorce be performed?

To remit it to church control would be grossly improper. Churches have no coercive function in the matter. They cannot prevent that natural divorce which results from death of marriage love, and they must not be permitted either to grant or deny conventional divorce. Their only function is that of spiritual influence. In so far as the parties may voluntarily submit to be ecclesiastically governed and the rights of society as a whole are not infringed, churches may either regulate or prohibit divorce. That is, they may freely appeal to the individual conscience. But here their function ends.

Nor should conventional divorce be left to the control of the parties themselves. While they alone can decide whether there is a real divorce or not, just as they alone could decide whether there was originally a real marriage or not, all this being in the nature of things, yet the ceremonial of conventional divorce affects civil rights in such manner as to entitle all concerned to their "day in court." These rights might be jeopardized if married persons were allowed to proclaim natural divorce at will, and without adju-

dication to assert conventional divorce.

Society, therefore, as well as the parties, being affected by the contract of marriage, must be consulted about its abrogation. Though only a symbol or conventionality in comparison with marriage itself, the marriage contract is more than a conventionality with reference to society. In that relationship it is a compact, defining personal and social obligations and duties from which neither of the parties, nor both together, may with justice be allowed to release themselves. They must appeal to organized society as the general guardian of civil rights.

Since it is conventional marriage and not ideal marriage to which conventional divorce applies, and conventional marriage derives its civil force and vitality from organized society, organized society may with propriety regulate the terms of conventional divorce. If it may not, then it is difficult to conceive of organized society as having any function at all. Like the churches, society is powerless to dissolve natural marriages. Only the parties can do that. If a natural marriage truly exist, nothing conventional can dissolve it; if it does not truly exist, nothing is necessary to dissolve it. But whether a natural marriage truly exists or not, conventional divorce does dissolve, and nothing else can dissolve, the marriage contract; and civil society, upon the application of either party to a marriage, with evidence that the natural marriage of the parties has probably ceased to exist, acting withal in the interest of social and civil rights, ought to consider the propriety of decreeing a dissolution.

If dissolution may be decreed, it does not necessarily follow that either of the parties thus conventionally divorced may with propriety, during the lifetime of the other, contract a succeeding conventional marriage with a third person. The right to prohibit a second conventional marriage while the prior one subsists (p. 470), might not unreasonably be regarded as implying that there is likewise a right to prohibit such marriages even when the prior one has been nullified. But

whether this prohibition would be defensible is not now to the point. The question immediately under consideration is not the propriety of second marriages after conventional divorce; it is the propriety of conventional divorce itself.

And what reasonable objection to conventional divorce can be advanced? Considered simply as a nullification, it does but cancel the civil obligations which conventional marriage imposes. And this only upon the best proof of the nature of the case admits of, that the conventional marriage is no longer truly symbolic of a natural marriage and has consequently become a lifeless pact. Conventional divorce does not affect the problem with reference to ecclesiastical authority, nor to conscience in any other respect. Even though the law permits marriage after divorce, it only permits, it does not compel it. The domain of conscience is not invaded.

The whole problem of conventional divorce, considered simply as nullification, resolves itself into a question of civil regulation for the protection of rights. The rights of each party to the marriage contract must be conserved. So must the rights of children. So, also, must the rights of society as a whole. This done, however, there is no good reason why the conventional marriage should not be dissolved, if the parties or either of them avow that their natural marriage no longer exists.

So far, indeed, from there being no reason why, in such circumstances, it should not be dissolved, there are imperative moral reasons why it should be dissolved. To enjoin submission to conventional marriage bonds, where there is no natural marriage, what is that but to sanction and encourage an adulterous relationship? The persons so enjoined, though nominally married, are they not really unmarried? If their intercourse is to be regarded as chaste, then chastity is only a thing of conventional ceremonies and not a principle of natural purity.

It is a sad mistake to suppose that strict divorce laws are conservative of marriage sanctity. When organized society assumes to hold together what nature has put asunder, for any other purpose or to any greater extent than to protect the civil rights involved,

as when by rigid divorce laws forcing an appearance of marriage where there is none, it aims to make marriage sacred, it thereby thwarts its own purpose. Difficult divorce makes easy virtue. In so far as marriage comes to be commonly regarded as institutional bondage, just so far does respect for the sacredness of natural marriage give way on the one hand to idolatrous regard for its conventional symbols, on the other to contempt for those symbols, and on both to indifference or obtuseness toward the sacred thing itself.

It is not by urging rigid enforcement of the marriage tie upon organized society, that churches can hope to emphasize either the sacredness of marriage or the inviolability of its symbolism. There was much wisdom in this rebuke of a clergyman, reported by the Akron Times-Democrat of October 10 as having been offered recently by an Ohio Judge, A. R. Webber of Akron: "You take a great responsibility when you grant divorces to almost anyone who happens to ask for them," said the clergyman. "The courts in many cases do not investigate thoroughly and divorces are often granted where they are undeserved by the persons asking for them." He was a divine of considerable importance and had been a minister for many years. The judge mentioned this fact to him and asked: "How many marriages have you performed in the years that you have been a minister?" The minister was proud of his marrying record, and named a great number. "In how many of the cases," continued the judge, "have you carefully questioned the candidates for matrimony, and determined whether they were suited to each other?" "None," was the reply. "How many candidates for matrimony who have presented themselves to you have you refused to marry for some good reason?" asked the judge. "None," was the reply. "You see, then," said the judge, "that the courts are not really in fault, and that they are simply trying to patch up the blunders that have been made by the ministers."

We should not advocate impertinence by clergymen asked to perform marriage ceremonies. The parties must be pre-

sumed to know better than anyone else, even a clergyman, whether their marriage is natural and genuine. But it is not impertinent to seek assurances that they are making the conventional declaration with a reasonable consciousness of the great natural relationship to which it certifies and which it symbolizes; certainly there is reasonable propriety in the attitude of clergymen who do place the importance of marriage love as a prerequisite to the marriage ceremonial above the sanctity of the ceremonial as a bar to divorce where the marriage love is dead. The Rev. Samuel H. Bishop, an Episcopal clergyman, has declared, for instance, that years ago he resolved, come what might, he would marry no couple who were unknown to him personally, and concerning whom he had not some assurance that the prospective union was founded on genuine love. "Not that I designed," he explains, "to put a couple through a detailed examination as to the nature and quality of their love, which would of course be absurd; but I have required some kind of assurance, valid to me personally, that the proposed marriage was not de convenience, de richesse, or de anything else but love."

The tendency of this policy is truly to emphasize the importance of conventional marriage, thereby encouraging sexual propriety, and to exalt the sacredness of natural marriage, thereby conserving sexual purity. But rigid divorce laws rigidly enforced, can have only the opposite effect. Not alone do they foster between persons only nominally married a relationship essentially adulterous, thereby degrading marriage itself; they also discredit conventional marriage by encouraging illicit natural marriages and concubinal alliances.

Simply in the interest of a wise conventionality and marital morality, therefore, divorce laws should make no attempt to perpetuate matrimonial bonds. The solicitude of society, with reference both to the sanctity of marriage itself and the solemnity of the marriage ceremonial, should be confined to protecting the civil rights concerned.

Natural marriage being in any instance dead, the conventional should in that instance be severed.

When the fundamental fact of a dead natural marriage reasonably appears, society can have no other rational duty in the matter, besides conserving all civil rights, than to nullify the conventional marriage by conventional divorce.

But, after all, this conclusion does not probe the core of the divorce controversy. For it is not so much to conventional divorce, considered merely as marital separation, that objection is really made. It is made because conventional divorce permits, and is usually followed by, conventional marriages between third persons and one or both of the persons divorced. The objection to divorce is only a form of statement. What in truth is hateful to the objectors is conventional marriages after conventional divorces. Yet, as the propriety of such marriages, though distinctly a problem itself, can be questioned only with reference to divorce, the propriety of conventional divorce considered simply as nullification, needed first to be understood.

Conceding that society may annul conventional marriages, may this nullification properly be of such a character as to permit the divorced parties to enter into other marriage contracts? This question, which is at the heart of the divorce problem, comes next in order and is the final one in our discussion.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Nov. 3.

As the Presidential campaign (pp. 39, 53, 58, 72, 89, 99, 105-19-36-70-82, 204-14-15-27-29-33-47-64-79-95, 310-29-41-56-75-93, 408-24-39-56-72) draws to a close, there is more activity by party managers and campaign speakers, but hardly any greater indication of popular interest than heretofore.

Judge Parker's speeches have been notably more frequent and in some respects more vigorous and pointed. He responded sharply on the 28th at Esopus to Gov. Wright's criticism (p. 474) of his Philippine revelations, and was replied to in turn on the same question by Secretary Taft at Buf-

falo on the 29th. On the 31st Judge Parker began an active speaking campaign in New York city and vicinity with a speech in Madison Square garden to an audience that filled the auditorium after large crowds had been turned away. Here he directly charged the Republican campaign management with extorting funds from the great trusts. He spoke in Jersey City and Newark on the 1st. The burden of these speeches as reported in the press dispatches may be stated as follows:

After calling attention to the rise of trusts and the demands of capital and labor, he declared the other chief issues which divide the Republican and Democratic parties are these: Administrative extravagance must be checked. There must be equal opportunity for all and special privileges for none. This shall remain "a government of laws, not of men." There must be a reform of the tariff. This nation will no more hold another people in perpetual bondage than it will tolerate the enslaving of individuals by its citizens. Overwhelming in importance as are these issues, above them tower the questions: Shall the partnership between the Republican leaders and the trusts continue with profit to both and hurt to the country? Shall the trust contributions of millions to the campaign fund secure the right to continue the wrongful taking of many millions a year from the people?

In two speeches in New York on the 2nd, Judge Parker pressed hard the charge against Mr. Cortelyou, the Republican campaign manager, of extorting contributions from the trusts. Following is the indictment in Judge Parker's own language:

A new department of the government was created—the Department of Commerce. To that department was intrusted inquisitorial power over the great corporations. Its head, the Secretary of Commerce, was made a cabinet officer. But lest honest business interests should suffer, lest unscrupulous competitors should take unfair advantage, it was provided that the results of the department's investigations into the affairs of any corporation should be confidential. They were and are to be placed in the first instance at the disposition of the President, and in his discretion only are they to be made public and become the common knowledge of the people. Extraordinary powers, these, and marking an extraordinary faith of a people in its elected chief executive. And how has this administration responded to this trust? It placed at the head of this new department as the first secretary of the Department of Commerce of the United States the pri-

vate secretary of the President. What the department's researches were we know not. Of the results attained by such researches we are not informed. When, however, the present campaign opened the Secretary of Commerce resigned his office, and at the request and as the personal representative of the President became the chairman of the Republican national committee, to bring about, if it might be so, the election of his patron to the Presidency. And lest any should err, it was at the time of his resignation authoritatively announced that at the termination of the campaign he would be summoned again to fill another cabinet office. I leave it to you to say whether or not, in your estimation, the vicious circle is complete.

Judge Parker has coupled these charges with broader ones of the same character, in phrases of which this extract from his last New York speech is typical:

What have we, then, before us in this election? We, the plain people of the United States, stand ranged upon one side. Upon the other, as I view it, stand the forces which make for evil to the United States. There we find the exaggerated tariff aggrandizing the few, and the trusts grinding the many; there the extravagance that is their bedfellow; there the insolent disregard of the rights of the weak, and there the greed of empire. Behind them stand, not those citizens of the United States who are the true republicans, but those few who have for their own purposes seized upon the power of the people and who rely on the traditions of the Republican party, and the delusions created by their astuteness, for the perpetuation in their hands of the powers which they have misused.

Managers of both parties are claiming a victory, but the Democratic claims are not regarded very seriously. The most hopeful predicts 277 electoral votes for Parker, a majority of 38. But to make this total the following Northern States, are included: New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Washington, Utah and Idaho. The loss of New York would wholly spoil the calculation. Even with New York, the loss of New Jersey, Indiana and Wisconsin would spoil it, while the loss of any two of these would make the result dangerously close. The New York Herald of the 29th, which supports Parker, gave Roosevelt 257 electoral votes, and placed 60 more in the doubtful column, thus making it possible for Roosevelt to receive 317. The Brooklyn Eagle, on a

postal card canvass, estimates a Parker plurality in Greater New York of 182,022. This result would doubtless place the State in the Parker column. Estimates attributed to Democratic national managers with exceptional opportunities for observation, but divulged only confidentially, concede Parker's overwhelming defeat by popular vote, a defeat to be compared only with that of Horace Greely in 1872, but allow for his actual defeat by only 20 or 30 electoral votes.

In some quarters the Democrats are claiming Colorado for Parker. This seems to be based upon the proclamation of the Federated Unions of Colorado Miners, issued on the 1st. Because President Roosevelt refused to secure the citizenship rights of workmen in Colorado against the outrages of the local authorities (pp. 372, 434) during the miners' strike, the Federation asks all union men to vote against Roosevelt as an enemy of Constitutional government. It advises them to make their own choice of Parker, Watson or Debs, so only that they vote against Roosevelt.

Further light on the miners' troubles in Colorado (p. 372) alluded to above has been shed by two members of the Colorado militia, one of them a commissioned officer. The officer, Major Francis J. Ellison, has sworn to the following affidavit, made public at Denver on the 29th:

State of Colorado, City and County of Denver—Francis J. Ellison, being first duly sworn, upon his oath deposes and says: That on the 12th day of December, 1903, at the request of Adjutant General Sherman M. Bell, I went to the Cripple Creek district on special military duty, and from that time have been continuously in the service of the State, both in the Cripple Creek district and in the Trinidad district. When General Bell first sent me to Victor I offered him certain evidence in regard to the perpetrators of the Vindicator explosion, which he has failed to follow up, but which would have led to the arrest and conviction of the men who are responsible for the placing of that infernal machine. At about the 20th of January, 1904, by order of the adjutant of Teller County military district, and under special direction of Major T. E. McClelland and General F. M. Reardon, who was the Governor's confidential adviser regarding the conditions in that district, a series of street fights were

commenced between men of Victor and soldiers of the National Guard on duty there. Each fight was planned by General Reardon or Major McClelland and carried out under their actual direction. Major McClelland's instructions were literally to knock them down, knock their teeth down their throats, bend in their faces, kick in their ribs and do everything except kill them. These fights continued more or less frequently up to the 22d of March. About the middle of February General Reardon called me into Major McClelland's office and asked me if I had a man in whom I could place absolute confidence. I called in Sergeant J. A. Chase, Troop C, First Cavalry, N. G. C., and, in the presence of Sergeant Chase, he stated to me that, owing to the refusal of the Mine Owners' Association to furnish the necessary money to meet the payroll of the troops, it had become necessary to take some steps to force them to put up the cash, and he desired me to take Sergeant Chase and hold up or shoot the men coming off shift at the Vindicator mine at 2 o'clock in the morning. I told General Reardon that I was under the impression that most of these men caught the electric car that stopped at the shaft house so that such a plan would be impracticable. He then said to me that the same end could be reached if I would take the sergeant and fire fifty or sixty shots into the Vindicator shaft house at some time during the night. Owing to circumstances making it impossible for Sergeant Chase to accompany me, I took Sergeant Gordon Walter of the same troop and organization, and that same night did at about 12:30 o'clock fire repeatedly into the Vindicator and Lillie shaft house. Something like sixty shots were fired from our revolvers at this time. Afterwards we mounted our horses and rode into Victor and into the Military Club, reporting in person to General Reardon and Major McClelland. The next day General Reardon directed me to take Sergeant Walter and look over the ground in the rear of the Findlay mine with a view of repeating the performance there, but before the plan could be carried out General Reardon countermanded the order, stating his reason to be that the mine owners had promised to put up the necessary money the next day, which, as a matter of fact, they did. General Reardon, in giving me directions regarding the shooting up of the Vindicator shaft house, stated that Governor Peabody, General Bell, he himself, and I were the only ones who knew anything about the plan.

Maj. Ellison's affidavit is corroborated by the affidavits of Sergeants Chase and Walters, whom he mentions.

More generally than at any previous elections is the popular mandate in some of its forms to

figure in the elections of next Tuesday. The questioning of candidates is especially widespread and embraces an unusual variety of subjects. In Michigan the securing of direct nominations is the dominant issue among the farmers. The Democratic party declared for the system but the Republican State convention refused, whereupon the Granges of the State, which number about 800, with some 60,000 members, have proceeded to question candidates for the legislature. This is expected to result in the pledging of a sufficient number of Republican nominees to insure the enactment of the law, thus reversing the Republican convention. The letter to candidates sent out by the Grange legislative committee of five members in each Michigan county, was as follows:

Hon. \_\_\_\_\_, 1904.  
Candidate for State Legislature, \_\_\_\_\_.

Dear Sir: We understand that you have announced yourself as a candidate to represent our district. This is a worthy ambition, but the citizens claim the right to know in advance how you stand on a certain important measure affecting our interests. To ascertain this the accompanying interrogations are propounded to all candidates in this district for this office on all tickets. This is a general circular conducted under the auspices of the Grange, but the entire public here is interested in getting this information and your position upon this question will be made public. We expect positive and direct reply. An evasive answer or failure to reply within a reasonable time—say no later than October 15,—will be taken to mean that you are opposed to the passage of this measure. Upon the character your reply will largely depend our attitude toward you. Your attitude will be made known that voters may govern their voting accordingly.

The letter enclosed for reply was as follows:

Grange Legislative Committee.  
Mr. \_\_\_\_\_, Chairman Grange Legislative Committee,  
Dear Sir: Replying to the letter of your Legislative Committee dated \_\_\_\_\_, 1904, I desire to say that, if elected, my influence and vote upon the following questions will be as indicated in my answer to each interrogation, as follows:

Are you in favor of Direct Nominations for governor, Lieutenant governor and members of the legislature?

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_.

If elected, will you work and vote for same?

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_.

The foregoing questioning of candidates for a direct nominations system would indicate that the Michigan farmers consider it to be the dominant State issue this year. The organized wage-earners, on the other hand, have declared that the establishment of the initiative and referendum is the dominant State question. Two years ago the State Federation of Labor instructed its legislative committee to question candidates as to the submission of a constitutional amendment for the initiative and referendum, but it disobeyed the instructions. At the next annual convention, which was held during September of last year, steps were taken to prevent a repetition of this disobedience. It was provided that the questioning should be by the secretary of the Michigan Direct Legislation League, Mr. G. R. Weikert, whose integrity is beyond dispute. The secretary-treasurer of the State Federation of Labor was instructed to issue to the secretary of the Direct Legislation League letters to each union in the State, urging that steps be taken to carry out the request of the State Federation of Labor to question candidates as to the referendum and initiative. A vigorous campaign has been conducted. The questions include one as to the enactment by the incoming legislature of rules of procedure for a system whereby no bill except an urgency measure, shall become operative until ninety days after the adjournment of the legislative session; and pending that, if five per cent of the registered voters unite in a request for the submission of any measure, the legislature before adjournment shall provide that the measure shall not become operative at the expiration of ninety days after adjournment, but shall be submitted to referendum vote at the next ensuing general election. This plan of the Michigan Federation of Labor for the immediate establishment of a people's veto is proposed because it can be adopted by a majority vote in each house, whereas the submission of a constitutional amendment requires a two-thirds vote. There is the additional reason that the rule of procedure will

become immediately effective instead of two years hence.

To add effectiveness to the non-partisan movement in Michigan the following "Mutual Agreement Among Voters" is being circulated for signatures:

In order to prevent the granting of special privileges and the enactment of legislation repulsive to and against the will of a majority of the people, as well as to insure the enactment of legislation desired by a majority of the people, we, the undersigned, hereby agree not to vote for any candidate for legislative office who failed to pledge himself, if elected, to vote for and abide by the following demands:

First. A rule of procedure, for the legislative body of which he is a member, by means of which any enactment challenged by five per cent of the voters shall be submitted to the referendum.

Second. The submission of a constitutional amendment providing for the initiative and referendum at 5 per cent.

In Delaware the Initiative and Referendum league of the State, of which Mr. Francis I. duPont is chairman, is questioning candidates as follows:

The American system of government is founded on the principle that the people are the sovereign power. Such is the fundamental doctrine and we ask you, Sir, the following question: Do you recognize this fundamental principle of free government? If so, do you promise the electors who may vote for you that if elected you will vote to submit to a referendum vote of the people of Delaware the question of whether they desire more efficient means of instructing their representatives through an advisory referendum and an advisory initiative, the details of which being those we herewith submit? To this question we would like a clear-cut "Yes" or "No." Please do not delay answering, for the question is not a difficult one and a refusal to answer will be equal to saying that you do not intend to let the people say if they want to come nearer to governing themselves. This will of course be very unpopular.

The advisory system is being worked for because of the unusually serious obstructions that exist for a direct amendment to the Delaware constitution.

In Pennsylvania the Granges and the trade unions are exceedingly strong. There are more than 500 Grange organizations in



the 67 counties of the State. These Granges are federated in a State Grange, which, at its annual convention last December, instructed its legislative committee to prepare questions to candidates and distribute them to the legislative committees in the several counties. This was done during the latter part of the winter in order that candidates for nomination at the primaries should be made to declare themselves, for the contest in many of the districts is decided at the primaries. The questions by the Pennsylvania Granges are as follows:

**National Issues.**—Our manufacturers of many lines of goods are selling their products cheaper in foreign markets than at home. Will you, if elected, assist in passing legislation which will enable American citizens to buy American products as cheap at home as they are sold for abroad? Will you, if elected to Congress, use your influence to secure the establishment of postal savings banks? The people living in the rural districts are very anxious to have legislation permitting the Post Office department to carry larger parcels than four pounds, the present limit, and also at a reasonable charge. Will you, if elected, favor the establishment of a parcels post.

**State Issues.**—Will you, if elected, favor legislation giving to Trolley companies the right to carry freight in Pennsylvania? This organization is in favor of good roads, but we believe that all classes of property should bear an equitable share in building and maintaining them. To equitably effect this we ask that a tax of at least one mill should be placed on all personal and corporate property for road purposes and that this money should be applied locally in proportion to the road mileage to reduce road taxes. Will you, if elected, support such legislation? The bill of rights in our State constitution declares that the people are the sovereign power and have the right to amend the constitution at will. The organized farmers and organized wage earners of the State are demanding the submission of a constitutional amendment for more power in the people through the extension of the people's veto (the optional referendum) and the adoption of a direct initiative (in addition to the indirect system which now exists), the details of both to accord with the inclosed specifications. If elected, will you vote to submit to the people this proposed amendment? Bear in mind that we are not asking for your opinion of the proposed system, but whether you will recognize the right of the sovereign power to have the question come before it for discussion and a

vote. Should you refuse to promise to let the people decide this question for themselves it will be an open repudiation of the fundamental principles of free government and will be so stated to the voters in your district. Will you, if elected, favor a law whereby all license taxes, personal property taxes, and the tax on county and municipal loans shall remain in the counties and municipalities? As you are aware these taxes now all go to the State. As its treasury is overflowing while many counties and municipalities are suffering from excessive taxation we insist that the State relinquish these taxes and by so doing local taxation will be relieved of over \$3,000,000.

Such are the State and national issues for which the Pennsylvania farmers are working. The Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, however, is limiting its efforts to the overthrow of machine rule by questioning candidates as to the submission of a constitutional amendment for the initiative and referendum, and as to the enactment of a law expressly authorizing common councils, village and county boards to order an advisory referendum vote?

In other States the trade unions are actively pushing the questioning of candidates as to the establishment of the initiative and referendum in State affairs. Last year the American Federation of Labor at its annual convention adopted the following resolution, No. 270, which commands the State Federations of Labor to work for the system:

Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor believes that:

(1) The voters of each State ought to have the power to submit constitutional amendments by petition to the referendum.

(2) That the right of the people to change their constitution and laws by petition and vote, is a clear, unquestionable and vital right, which must be attained before any reform of present conditions is possible.

(3) That the present monopoly of the law-making business by the legislatures of the various States is the source of all the forms of monopoly that oppress labor and rob the public.

Therefore the State branch of the American Federation of Labor in each State is hereby instructed to petition the legislature for a change in the constitution, providing for the submission to the people of constitutional amendments on petition of voters.

In Pennsylvania and Michigan, as already stated, this instruction is

being obeyed. Newspaper reports show that the same course is being pursued in New Jersey and Minnesota, and probably in many other States. In Colorado two years ago the unions declared the initiative and referendum to be the dominant issue and candidates were questioned, resulting in an almost unanimous vote in the lower house of the legislature; but as half the senators held over the reform did not get the necessary two-thirds vote. This year most of the hold-over senators are pledged, and the ones who are up for election are being questioned most vigorously.

The executive council of the American Federation of Labor has issued an address and questions to candidates for Congress, also to the legislatures with a view to affecting the Federal Senate. The measures declared for are the abolition of government by injunction, immediate establishment of a national referendum system through rules of procedure and statutes, and an eight-hour day in government contract work. To secure a majority vote in the Senate as well as in the House, the candidates for the several legislatures are asked to promise that, if elected, they will vote to instruct the senators of their several States.

The National Direct Legislation League and the People's Sovereignty League have circulated for signatures by some one in each locality and sent up to the candidate at his meeting the following questions:

Dear Sir: As a means for curbing the power of the inter-State trusts, what is your attitude toward the establishment of more power in the people through a right to a direct vote on national issues? If elected, will you vote for the establishment of such a system by voting for the advisory initiative and advisory referendum as proposed by the organized farmers of Pennsylvania and the organized wage-earners of the country?

The Referendum League of Illinois, which is responsible for the three questions of public policy to be voted for in this State (p. 475), has sent the following letter to every legislative candidate:

We are receiving inquiries as to which legislative candidates may be relied

upon to obey the will of the people as shown by the vote on questions of public policy. We therefore respectfully request a statement from you defining your position in this matter, and, as no doubt you are very busy with your campaign, we submit the form below for your signature. We trust you will give this immediate attention and that we may hear from you by return mail.

The pledge solicited of the candidate is in these terms:

If elected, I will work and vote for such legislation as may be necessary to put into effect the will of the people as expressed by the voters on propositions or questions of public policy submitted to them.

A condition bordering on riot is reported from Toledo, over the attempt of the city council to grant a 25-year franchise to the Toledo Railways and Light Co. Such a measure was passed something more than a year ago. It was vetoed by the late Mayor Jones, and when the council was about to pass it over the veto (vol. vi., p. 393) a menacing crowd forced that body to allow the veto to stand. Once more the traction-extension party secured an ordinance, which the present mayor, Mr. Finch, vetoed. Then a third was passed, on the 31st, by a vote of 13 to 3. It was this action by the council that has caused the popular disturbances noted above. As reported by the press dispatches—

an immense crowd surrounded the council chamber when the objectionable ordinance was passed. There were cries of "thief," "robber," "boodler," etc. Bottles of vile smelling drugs were emptied upon the floor, and when it was evident that the councilmen were to be attacked a squad of forty police was sent for. The demonstration alarmed the offending councilmen, who dared not leave the chamber without police protection. One or two took the risk, and they were followed, threatened, and even stoned by the infuriated crowd. At midnight the chamber was cleared, and the councilmen were escorted to their homes by the police. It is reported that the wives of several of the councilmen were called up and notified that their husbands would be assassinated if they dared vote for the franchise ordinance. On the following day these scenes resulted in popular expressions of approval of the course adopted by the citizens in resentment of the act of the councilmen. Throughout the day the thirteen councilmen who voted in favor of the objectionable ordinance were severely criticised and the opinion was expressed that if they did

not rescind the ordinance under public pressure serious trouble would ensue.

The same dispatches describe the controversy as follows:

The trouble was on account of a bitter fight over the extension of the franchise of the Toledo Railways & Light company, which operates all the street car lines of the city, and which is a portion of the Everett-Moore syndicate's holdings. None of the franchises expires for several years, but the company has a large amount of bonds to sell, and the election of the last city council was accomplished largely with this subject as an issue. An ordinance was drawn by which universal transfers and six tickets for a quarter were made the chief points at issue. At once an independent party sprang into existence and grew to large proportions. Eleven members of the council were accused of having been bought outright to vote for the franchise extension. Two wavered and three opposed it. It required thirteen votes to pass the ordinance over Mayor Finch's veto, which was assured. Then a new ordinance was drafted, in which the interurban lines entering the city were not granted good privileges, they thought, but seven tickets for a quarter was the slogan. At the end of ten years the fare was to be at the rate of eight tickets for a quarter. The street railway company intimated that it would not accept such an ordinance. Nevertheless, the council by a vote of 13 to 3 passed it, despite the protest of the Mayor and a "petition in boots" several thousand strong, which surrounded the council chamber. As soon as the election is over a supreme effort will be made to rescind this ordinance and pass the original seven for a quarter. Bloodshed is freely threatened.

Reports of the week from St. Louis describe the second and third experiments in aerial navigation, with the Baldwin airship, the Arrow (p. 476), as entirely successful. On the 31st the operator, A. Roy Knabenshue, began his voyage at 3:37 in the afternoon and completed it at 4:05. The vessel was under complete control, reaching an altitude of 2,000 feet and responding to every movement of her helm. On the 1st she made her third voyage and with success equal to her second. Upon alighting Mr. Knabenshue said:

There was not one instant to-day that the airship was not under my control. A breeze was blowing from the southwest, but my airship proceeded to breast it whenever I so directed with the rudder. I decided to go to the lower side of the grounds and return, which I did. Then I tried several maneuvers and the

airship responded every time. It is like a thing of life to me. Never once did it hesitate or prove obstinate. I feel confident after to-day's flight that all question as to the dirigibility of the Baldwin airship has been dispelled.

The vessel escaped on the 2d, with no one on board, and its whereabouts are now unknown.

An arbitration treaty between the United States and France, supposed to be similar to that between the latter and Great Britain of a year ago (vol. vi., p. 457), was signed at Washington on the 1st by Secretary Hay for the United States and Ambassador Jusserand for France. It will not be made public until after it has been submitted to the Senate.

The danger of war between Great Britain and Russia over the North Sea episode of last week (p. 476) seems to have passed. Reporting officially, as appears from his dispatches given out at St. Petersburg on the 28th, the Russian admiral, Rojestvensky, explained the occurrence as follows:

The North sea incident was caused by two torpedo boats advancing to attack without lights under cover of darkness against the vessel leading the detachment. When the detachment turned on its searchlights and opened fire the presence of several small steamboats resembling steam fishing boats was discovered. The detachment endeavored to spare these and ceased firing as soon as the torpedo boats were out of sight.

Having met several hundred fishing boats, the squadron showed them every consideration except when they were in company with foreign torpedo boats, of which one disappeared, while the other, according to the fishers' own evidence, remained among them until morning. They supposed it was a Russian and were indignant because it did not aid the victims; but it was foreign, and remained until morning, seeking the other torpedo boat, its consort, either to repair damage or through fear of betraying itself to those who were not its accomplices. If there were also on the spot fishermen imprudently dragged into the enterprise I beg in the name of the whole squadron to express my sincere regret to the unfortunate victims of circumstances, under which no warship, even in time of deep peace, could have acted otherwise.

On the same day the two countries had recourse for settlement of the affair to the method provided by articles 9 to 14 of the convention of The Hague, Russia agreeing to abide by the decision of such a tri-

bunal as that provided for in these articles and to punish the officers guilty of the attack on the British fishing fleet when the tribunal shall decide upon the degree of their guilt. In publicly announcing this settlement in a speech at Southampton the British premier, Mr. Balfour, said:

The Russian Admiral has a theory of the rights and duties of a belligerent fleet as against neutrals which makes the high seas a place of public danger. Suppose some dark night a liner fell in with the second Pacific fleet, and approached within the magic distance. According to the Russian admiral's theory he would be justified in sinking it. The position is one impossible for neutrals to tolerate. A fleet animated by that policy would be a fleet that would have to be eliminated out of existence.

The Russian fleet sailed from Vigo on the 2d, leaving behind four officers to testify at the arbitration inquiry.

Regarding the progress of the Russian-Japanese war (pp. 458, 476), Japanese official reports of the 1st are to the effect that Port Arthur has been under continuous bombardment since the 24th. Some progress appears to have been made, but the place still holds out.

From Mukden (pp. 458, 476) nothing is reported but skirmishes and rumors. Another big battle at the Shahke river is expected.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—General parliamentary elections for the Dominion of Canada are in progress on the 3d.

—President Roosevelt's thanksgiving proclamation sets Thursday, November 24, as Thanksgiving day.

—Ex-Gov. George K. Nash, of Ohio, died suddenly of heart disease at Columbus on the 28th. His age was 62.

—Charles Boese, a Florentine, was reported from Rome on the 29th as having invented a process of sculpture by photography.

—Owing to a strike of hoisting engineers against a reduction of 5.55 per cent. in their wages, most of the coal mines in Illinois were shut down on the 1st.

—When asked her age upon registering to vote for school officers in Toledo, each woman applicant replied "twenty-one plus," and her registration was made. This seems to have been general over the State, and in Cincinnati the election

board has reprimanded officials for making such registrations.

—The subway of Manhattan borough, New York, was opened to the public on the 27th. The formal opening exercises were held at the city hall in the afternoon. The first train for the public left the city hall at seven in the evening.

—Official announcement was made on the 2d that the International Typographical Union has by its referendum voted to establish an eight-hour day, beginning January 1, 1906, and has ordered an assessment for that purpose.

—By the aid of two spirit mediums, one in London and one in New York, Prof. James Hyslop, of Columbia University, declared on the 30th that a message was recently instantaneously transmitted from one on to the other without wire or electricity. Formal report of the event is to be made to the Psychical Research society.

—One of the exhibits at the St. Louis exposition which deserves more than passing notice is a collection of maps showing the development of the knowledge of the Louisiana Territory, from the map of Juan de la Cosa, pilot of Columbus, up to the year 1812. Over one hundred of these are shown in chronological order in the Liberal Arts building. They are lent to the State of Louisiana by William Beer, librarian of the Howard Memorial library, New Orleans.

—The Manhattan Single Tax club, 224 East Sixty-second street, New York, of which Rabbi Stern, formerly of Cumberland, Md., is now general secretary, is preparing to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the publication of "Progress and Poverty," with a banquet at which each participant is to be presented with a silver memorial medal designed by Henry George's son, Richard F. George, the sculptor. Only enough of these medals are to be struck to supply the diners at the banquet, and to meet such special demand as may be made prior to December 1.

—At Lancaster, S. C., two weeks ago, according to the Charleston News and Courier, the circuit court adjourned upon being informed of the death of Isom C. Clinton, bishop of the African Methodist church. The motion to adjourn was made by R. E. Allison, the oldest member of the Lancaster bar, and was seconded by Maj. Wylie, also of the Lancaster bar, and by Solicitor Henry, all native South Carolinians. Judge Watts granted the motion, and in ordering the adjournment of the court expressed his high appreciation of the character and services of the Bishop.

#### PRESS OPINIONS.

BRYAN IN THE CAMPAIGN.

Dubuque Telegraph (Dem.), Nov. 1.—"Bryan says a victory for Parker will be a victory for Bryan's ideals. Let it go at that. But wouldn't the defeat of Parker be pretty convenient for Bryan as a real business proposition?"—[Sioux City Journal.]

It probably would. But his first consideration is principle, not a "business proposition." Which explains why some Republicans esteem him a fool.

(East Aurora) What's the Use (Ind.), Nov. —The morning of November 9 will see the figure of William Jennings Bryan looming large on the political horizon of these United States. Election day will clear the air. In the dawning of the morning of the day after, the Eastern and Northern Democratic politicians will have it borne in on them that there are such things as Democratic sentiments and a Democratic conscience to reckon with at the polls.

TILLMAN AND PARKER.

The (Chicago) Broad Ax (Negro), Oct. 29.—The Broad Ax is for Judge Alton B. Parker for President of the United States first, last and all the time, and it simply shied off in the middle of the road a few weeks ago, in order to tear the hide off of Ben Tillman.

HUMAN LIFE AND RAILROAD DOLLARS.

Chicago Examiner (Dem.), Sept. 27.—The train bearing J. P. Morgan, his grace the Archbishop of Canterbury and other members of the Archiepiscopal party, tore into a locomotive Friday morning, threw it off the track and did the occupants of the train no further damage than to shake their dignity. That there was no loss of life in Mr. Morgan's party is due to the solid construction of the private car they occupied. The car is strongly made. It is said to have a steel floor. It is not possible to "telescope" it. A car is "telescoped" when it is torn to pieces by the impact of a car in the rear or when it is split by striking a heavier car ahead. The greatest railroad horrors come from telescoping cars. They can be so constructed as to be unbreakable. Private cars are so made. Let the railroad companies construct their public coaches and Pullmans after the manner of a private car, and the railway horrors in America will be reduced in number and in death lists.

#### MISCELLANY

##### THE PROSTITUTES.

She had sold her soul for bread:  
Her soul for her body's life;  
But the life she had bought was a living death,  
So she buried its shame by a plunge beneath;  
And a moment's drowning strife:  
And Heaven shall judge the dead.  
He had sold his soul for bread:  
His soul for his stomach's lust;  
And the life he had bought was pampered and gay,  
So he scribbled the world's ideals away;  
A journalist traitor to trust:  
And Heaven shall judge what he said.  
—"Suspriosae Coqitationories" (Kegan Paul & Co., London).

##### THE ELDER ADAMS ON THE CORRUPTION OF HIS TIME.

An extract from one of the many letters that passed between John Adams and his wife, Abigail, during his absences from home in the Revolutionary period. This letter is dated from Philadelphia, October 8, 1776.

The spirit of venality you mention is the most dreadful and alarming enemy America has to oppose.  
It is as rapacious and insatiable as the grave. This predominant avarice will ruin America, if she is ever ruined. If God Almighty does not interfere by His grace to control this universal

idolatry to the mammon of unrighteousness, we shall be given to the chastisement of His judgment. I am ashamed of the age we live in.

#### THEN AND NOW.

For The Public.

A letter of Daniel Webster's written when he was secretary of state in 1841 to Thomas Ewing, then secretary of the treasury, in reference to the part to be taken by Federal officeholders in State and other elections, has been revived. Mr. Webster wrote in this old-fashioned strain:

The President is of opinion that it is a great abuse to bring the patronage of the general government into conflict with the freedom of elections, and that this abuse ought to be corrected wherever it may have been permitted to exist, and to be prevented for the future.

He therefore directs that information be given to all officers and agents in your department of the public service, that partisan interference in popular elections, whether of State officers or officers of this government, and for whomsoever, or against whomsoever it may be exercised, or the payment of any contribution or assessment on salaries, or official compensation for party or election purposes, will be regarded by him as a cause for removal.

We have passed that point of scrupulosity. Now, when there is a State or national election depending on the vote of a State, it is no uncommon thing to see cabinet officers leaving their duties to race up and down the country, make speeches of an extremely partisan character, and direct the distribution of moneys assessed upon and collected from clerks in the departments, so as to make it most effective in carrying the election. Webster would stand aghast were he to revisit the glimpses of the moon, and see how an administration is perpetuated.

#### A READER.

##### GLASGOW.

Frederick Upham Adams, in the Brooklyn Eagle, May 1, 1904.

It is a mystery to me how the Scot has had thrust on him a reputation for predominant traits of hard-headed conservatism. In any country where he is of the majority he is the most radical of human beings. Once he has figured to his own satisfaction that there is a material or financial advantage in introducing a new system, he bends every energy to the overthrow of conflicting institutions, no matter how old or venerated.

These "conservative and hard-headed Scotch" migrated to New Zealand. They proceeded to exterminate or convert the natives and long since have finished that task. They invented and installed an experimental system of gov-

ernment which has astounded the world by its audacity. They put into actual operation a combination of the socialism of Karl Marx and opposed to it the individualism of Henry George. Others quarreled over theories; they tested them on a gigantic scale.

While I am writing this paper, news comes from England that the House of Commons has passed to a third reading a bill which proposes to tax out of existence "the unearned increment on land." To those who are familiar with the "single-tax" theory to which Henry George devoted his life and talents this phrase has an ominous sound. Its enforcement would sound the death knell of land speculation and in all probability put an end to the landlordism on which is based the aristocracy of Great Britain. The House of Lords will probably defeat the bill, but it promises to become the weapon which will hammer to fragments the institution which is responsible for the permanence and sharp alignment of the two great classes, the rich and the poor of the United Kingdom.

And who was responsible for the agitation which has made it possible to force so revolutionary a measure through the ruling legislative body in Great Britain? The "conservative and hard-headed Scotch." For a generation the famous John F. Ferguson, of Glasgow, has been agitating for this and for other radical reforms. At its inception his crusade was laughed at, but Balle Ferguson paused not to listen to sneers. He was a man of wealth and of tireless energy. He wrote pamphlets on land reform and on temperance. He carried a Bible in one pocket, a copy of "Progress and Poverty" in the other. He called conventions, made speeches and converts, and recently had the satisfaction of attending a national convention with accredited delegates from the great cities of the Kingdom. The Scotch people are practically unanimous for this drastic reform, and in the bill now before Parliament the provisions for Scotland are far more radical, and are, in fact, retroactive.

This may be a new view of the Scottish character, but it is fortified by more proof than that just cried. It offers an explanation of the indisputable fact that Glasgow is the pioneer of municipal public ownership, not only in Great Britain, but in the modern civilized world.

Strange that the choicest title  
Come down from tribe and clan  
Is not the *bold*—or *strenuous*—,  
But just the *gentle*—man.  
—The Whim.

#### A SUCCESSFUL LIFE.

Life—is it unsatisfactory? Are the days monotonous and commonplace? Is there no real buoyancy and joy in living? Are we but drifting with the current, weary of the voyage, yet dreading the end? What, then, is the remedy? It is in a more abundant life. If life is a burden, it is because we have not enough of it. Life is a miserable thing only as it is narrow. The higher the aims, the broader the sympathies—the more abundant the life, the greater the joy of it.

Pity the lives that are imprisoned in small thoughts. The slave of appetite with his deepening wretchedness; the unhappy woman who sells her soul for finery; he who plays at the fatal game and will not see the impending ruin, nor hear the cries of his hungry children; worshippers of Mammon, made ugly and hateful by the struggle for wealth they cannot use; the aspirants for social supremacy, embittered by jealousy and compromised by a thousand hypocrisies; the people who nurse their injuries; who delight in retaliation; who feed on gossip; who brood over their poverty; who flaunt their wealth; the countless souls who spend their days working for what they do not need and bemoaning what they cannot help—what a multitude of miseries they make for themselves, and how vapid the taste, how bitter the dregs of such existence!

Then afe men wise to put an end to their lives? Can suicide save them? No, it is not less, but more life that they need. Let them feel humanity's sorrows, and forget their own. Let them look at the stars, and not at their neighbors' faults. Let them turn from the babble of the crowd to the music of the sea. Let them honor the soul within and the God above.

Let a man touch the hem of Truth's garments; let him hearken to the pathos of human history; let him waken to the wondrous visions; let him discover himself to be a part of all that is, into whose soul surges the struggle of the universe, whose interests are as high as heaven and as wide as the world.

What trial can ruffle the spirit of such a man? What sorrow can overwhelm him? What danger daunt him? He will smile in misfortune's face. He will forgive his enemies. The sordid finger of the world will not touch him. He will dwell in the secret place of the Most High, and abide in the shadow of the Almighty.

The successful man, the man who makes the best use of his opportuni-

ties, is he who grows most in the direction of this larger life. If a man's soul shrivels with age, if his interests contract and his horizon narrows, he is a failure, though he may totter to the grave weighted with the prizes of earth. He who starts out with ideals, and ends with pessimism, makes a botch of life. He may have grown rich, but he has also grown small. A man's success is sometimes like the ascent of a pyramid, the higher it gets the smaller it becomes. Exclusiveness is one of the signs of a bad society. A man starts at the bottom. The smell of the earth is upon him. Sweat is on his face. He is one of a multitude. The circle of his friendship is wide and genuine. But he succeeds. He climbs to some high place. Thereupon he shuns his old companions; he denies his poor relations. The impulse of the heart is no longer in his hand-shake. There is less of the spirit of brotherhood in him. This is a miserable success. The man goes into moral bankruptcy to make a fortune.

This is not the success of which we speak. It is not success at all. More often it is failure. The successful man is he who lives most; whose heart throbs with the most generous impulses; whose life abounds most with human sympathies; whose thoughts are ever widening; who sees more good and takes more joy in life with each passing year.

It is not how much we have, but how much enjoyment we get out of what we have, that measures our success. It is not enjoyment in the superficial sense, but the deepening satisfaction and the growing peace which come with wider thoughts and higher aims.

HERBERT S. BIGELOW.

### UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL.

Printed from the Original MS.

Dear John: I had a dream the other night. It was all about this new fangled discovery. I didn't take any stock in it at first, and it made the inventor mad.

"Darn ye," he says, "I'll show ye. I cannot only graft the spirit of a live dead man onto a dead live man, but I can make ye own up that I can do it. Now, if ye dare!"

Well, Theodore was in his usual state of coma regardin' the meat trust and the coal trust, and I says, says I, to the inventor:

"Look here! Graft the spirit of Andrew Jackson onto Theodore Roosevelt, and if it makes any difference I give in, and you can have a patent, too."

"Well," says he, "It's partly electrical and partly psychological; but go to the cabinet meetin' to-morrow and you'll see it's done."

"All right!" says I; and then I wakened up mighty bright, for with Old Hickory in as president I knew there'd be somethin' movin'; but I didn't know rightly what, and the inventor was so confident I felt he had backin'.

So next mornin' I went up to the cabinet meeting, and there, sure enough, was Andrew Jackson sittin' at the table, but the cabinet was struck dumb. They were standin' around in little groups, as if goin' to talk, but not a word did they say. A man 'd open his mouth to speak, and then keep it open.

"Hello, Andy!" said I. "Ain't science great? I never expected to see you president again. It's a wonderful change."

"Pooh, Sam!" says he, "the great change is in you. What's the matter with you, man? Hain't ye got no backbone? They tell me that these trusts and grafters have ye bound hand an' foot, and ye don't try any more to get loose."

"It's constitutional limitations, Andy," said I, "and vested rights; and—"

"Oh, git out!" says he. "It's grand larceny, and what you want is an administration that will administer. Cattle only five cents, and meat eighteen cents a pound; coal worth three dollars, and sold at seven; a little figgerin' and a big boot is what you want, Sammy. Your courts ain't worth a cuss against a rich rascal, Sam, but you keep your eye open and you'll see 'em hunt their holes, even as it is."

"Well, Andy," says I, "what help can I give you?"

"I shan't want much help," says he. "I'd like to have a cabinet with some sand in its craw. Use this new graft, Sam, on this cabinet. Give me the spirit of John P. Altgeld for my attorney general, and—let's see—John A. Rawlins, Grant's old chief of staff, for secretary of war, and I think that'll make a workin' team to begin with. The remainder of them wood-horses may go out under the shed." He nodded toward the honorable cabinet. "Bye, bye, Sammy! Come in to-morrow!"

The people had heard of the change; and as I went down the capitol steps a boy was singin' an old campaign song of Jackson's time:

Old General Jackson, he don't care a peg;  
He is straight up and down like a dog's hind leg.

"I'd know I was a dreamin'," said I. "If it wasn't that I distinctly remember wakenin' up."

UNCLE SAM.

### TOM JOHNSON'S FIGHT. THE TRACTION STRUGGLE IN CLEVELAND.

George E. Hooker, in the Chicago Daily News of October 11, 1904.

Cleveland's progressive movement has much to its credit. There is, for example, the splendid "group plan," a \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 scheme—already in part under way—for erecting on the lake front about a central mall five or more monumental buildings.

The water department, superintended by Prof. E. W. Bemis, has been placed on a merit basis, and the metering of the service has been carried out with unexampled rapidity since 1901. About one-half the total number of services, including those of all the large users, have been metered, and the bills of domestic users of meters have fallen 25 per cent. At the same time the pumpage, instead of increasing at the precedent rate of one-third every three years, has decreased seven per cent. during the last three years, thus obviating expensive extensions of plant. Despite certain political demonstrations against the metering plan, the public seems well satisfied with it.

A new water tunnel to a four-mile crib was opened last spring for supplying the whole city and the day of filtering and boiling water in Cleveland is claimed to be over. A system of main intercepting sewers to discharge ten miles down the lake, where purification can be undertaken, has also been entered upon and is expected to be completed in five years at a cost of \$10,000,000.

The school administration is progressive, the parks have been much popularized of late, the care of the streets has been conspicuously improved and a boys' farm of nearly 300 acres has been made an adjunct of the recently established juvenile court.

The street car question, however, overshadows all others in continued popular interest. Mayor Johnson demands three-cent fares, with universal transfers. The operating company declares these terms financially impossible, while at the same time exerting every power to prevent any new company from putting them into practice, either on the existing lines or on a duplicate system.

Cleveland's recent traction history has been stormy indeed. Until seven or eight years ago the companies had matters pretty much their own way. Their grants—for approximately 200 miles of single track—were obtained

at different periods from about 1860, and usually for 20 or 25 years. Beginning in the late '70's renewals were secured at different times, to expire at varying dates from September of this year to 1914. The "Big Consolidated" and the "Little Consolidated"—Mark Hanna having long been the controlling figure in the latter—were combined a year or two ago into the Cleveland Electric Railway company, which now operates all the mileage of the city and several suburban lines.

In 1897 a vigorous effort was made to secure a general renewal of existing street car franchises and, despite popular agitation, a renewal ordinance at one time passed its second reading in the council. It was finally halted, however, and matters rested. The advent of Tom Johnson as mayor in 1901 brought the question again to the front. He challenged the companies with his low fare demands. They were anxious for a renewal grant, but they declined it on his terms and chose to wait.

The mayor thereupon took the aggressive. He determined upon the Detroit plan, by which, under Mayor Pingree, a new company built a duplicate system, ever since operated with eight tickets for a quarter.

For years, however, the Ohio legislature, dominated by traction interests, had been hedging up the way against such a move. The statutes rendered it exceedingly easy to grant "extensions" of existing lines or renewals of existing rights to an existing company, but exceedingly difficult to confer a valid grant upon a new company. Mayor Johnson produced a three-cent company ready to enter the field, and a grant was made to it for an extensive new system. This grant was speedily invalidated in the courts on technical grounds.

A different line of tactics was then chosen: It was decided to confer a franchise upon a new company for a single short line, the technical requirements for which could more easily be met, and then to grant to this company, as fast as they should fall in, the lines of the old company, with due provision for paying the latter for the value of the plants. A grant was accordingly made nearly a year ago to a new company for a new line three miles long in the outskirts, on the basis of three-cent fares and a universal transfer for this and all other lines subsequently operated by the company, and with a provision for city purchase at any time. The old company, however, got an injunction

stopping construction when the line was half finished, and the matter is still in court.

A few months ago a grant was made to this three-cent company for two lines of the old company—one expiring September 20 of this year and the other in April of next year—equitable payment for the existing plant being required. But the execution of this grant was likewise promptly enjoined by a United States judge at the instance of the old company.

Moreover, this injunction was obtained on a basis wholly unforeseen by the public. It was secured on the absolutely novel claim that the existing grants of the operating company—expiring, according to their terms, at different periods from 1904 to 1914—are, through various implications, effectually extended until the latter date. The claim is a complete surprise to the people of Cleveland.

Looked at broadly, the obstructive tactics thus far successfully used by the Cleveland traction interests to defy and defeat the city, are a significant comment upon the general policy of intrenching great public service corporations in the municipal body politic, where, when once established they can pursue the plan of "tiring out the people."

The general admission, too, that in the case of Cleveland these interests are virtually backed by the State legislature—working through its discreditable code revisions—not to say by the State courts and the State board of elections, emphasizes again the dependence of municipal reform upon State reform.

It is impossible to suppose that the municipalities of Ohio will permanently submit to have charters thrust upon them without being consulted, to have "separate city elections" abolished by a high-handed political maneuver in the interest of local monopolies and to have their will effectually nullified by outside machinery as to the administration of these monopolies. Mayor Johnson's struggle for home rule in respect to the traction question is of far-reaching import. It is clearly the principal item in Cleveland's progressive movement.

"You say he has a visionary and impractical nature?"

"Yes," answered the girl who is employed in the post office; "he is one of those people who write 'Rush' on an envelope instead of putting on a special delivery stamp."—Washington Star.

#### THE PEOPLE ARE NOT FOOLS.

A portion of a speech delivered by Gov. L. F. C. Garvin in East Providence, R. I., Friday evening, October 28, 1904.

It has been long manifest that the active Republican leaders of Rhode Island have an utter contempt for the intelligence of the voters, both as a whole and in sections. They treat this constituency as non compos mentis.

Acting upon this low estimate of public intelligence, the State House machine has engaged in such petty tricks that to call them "peanut politics" is to magnify and ennoble them an hundred fold. It is needless to recall the numerous indignities thrust at the Governor as president of the Senate; but scarcely less foolish have been the continued attempts to throttle the minority. It must be borne in mind all the time that the majority, both in the Senate and House, who do those ridiculous things are merely the marionettes made to dance by the party managers who put them there.

Last year and this, although the Democrats have almost as many members of the House as the dominant party, the most important committees, against all precedent and public safety, have been made up of Republicans. Only by the most strenuous efforts have the Democrats of the House, both last year and this, been able to shame the Republican speaker into giving them any representation. In the Senate the committee on finance and the committee on corporations (often called the "boodle committee") are partisan in character. The cities of Providence, Newport and Central Falls, although ably represented in the Senate, have no place on any important committee, because, forsooth, those constituencies preferred to elect Democrats. This proscription of opponents is supposed by the machine to make votes for its party!

Analogous to their action in shutting Democrats off of leading committees is the scheme, in vogue now or three years, of refusing to report from committees the bills and resolutions introduced by Democrats. The object the Machine has in view apparently, is to prevent discussion, and thereby keep the public from knowing the merits of the measures, and at the same time prevent members of the majority from going on record directly upon such propositions, for instance, as the giving of the veto power to the Governor.

A like belittling of public opinion is shown in the buying up of all open data of Infantry and Music halls, not for the purpose of using them, but, as in the 1892 campaign, in order to prevent the presentation of Democratic issues by

distinguished national speakers. By a wise foresight the chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee was enabled, long before the campaign began, to hire Music hall for the evenings of November 4 and 7; but for the open dates of the ablest Democratic orators no large auditorium in the city of Providence is available.

The leaders of the Republican party, after making a solemn pledge to have no more law making after election by a defunct legislature, are now a third time since that promise was made, about to defy public sentiment by holding such a session one week after a new legislature shall have been elected.

The State Machine, after refusing to consider amendments to the constitution conferring the veto power and equal suffrage in cities, has proposed an amendment to be read at the polls on November 8, dividing the cities and large towns into voting districts for the election of members of the House. Instead of yielding to the public demand that the people of the State be protected by reforming the State Senate, the Machine insults the voters by offering an amendment which will so gerrymander the large municipalities as to put an end to an opposition party of any kind in the State.

The State Machine, not content with its assumption that the electors are such fools that they will not see through the silly tricks above enumerated, acts upon the premise that every class of citizens in the State is made up of the densely ignorant. Among other things it tries to obscure the real issues by appealing to religious prejudice of some kind. It is to be expected, therefore, that this year, as last, some attempt to delude and deceive the voters in that line will be sprung somewhere a few days before election.

Again, this year still more than last, police commissions and license commissions are to be made use of by the State Machine to intimidate liquor dealers into a combined support of Republican candidates. As a means to this end threats are made as to what will be done to them after election if the Democrats are not defeated.

And so it has been year in and year out, that the active Republican leaders have manifested their supreme contempt for those whose support and votes they seek, unaware of the ridicule and dislike they have won from the common people. No one enjoys being looked upon and treated as though he were a fool.

But it may be said the policy so long followed must have seemed to be suc-

cessful or it would not have been continued. Certainly success has followed, but for other causes. The lavish and unscrupulous expenditure of money for both legitimate and corrupt purposes; the assistance of nearly all the State and municipal office holders; the support of most of the newspapers, and finally the mere momentum of long possession of political power, these have been the efficient agencies of the Republican Machine.

Added to these has been the poverty of the Democratic party. Unable to secure funds to build up a State organization and carry on annual campaigns, its members have not succeeded in substituting individual work and enthusiasm for the ordinary pecuniary methods.

Finally, a corrupt machine has controlled the Republican party, because no considerable number of influential citizens have been sufficiently interested and independent to rebuke it in an effectual manner.

The Democratic party, with all its faults, has always shown a respect for public opinion. In all its attempts at legislation it has appealed to the intelligence of the voters of the State. It refuses to arouse prejudice; it invites discussion of its measures; it has no desire to intimidate. All that it needs, in order to effect great and lasting reforms in this State is the open and cordial support of the good citizens who are dissatisfied with boss rule and its base methods.

#### THE BARGAIN OF ESAU.

Government by the people  
—next after home and religion—  
is the most austere obligation  
now resting on you.  
First is to keep your family;  
next—after God's dues are met,  
and a part of those dues if you will—  
is to keep up the state.  
Not merely to vote,  
but to know whom you're voting for,  
and to have some reason why.

If it's worth giving one's whole life,  
It's worth giving such small fraction  
of life as this study requires.  
It interferes with your business?  
It your business—  
in its due place  
the most important you have.  
What is there more important  
than saving the country?

And saving the country consists—  
not in dressing in hardware  
and making yourself a target  
for some one to take a pot shot at—  
but in doing this simple duty  
of taking your share in the government,  
this government by the people.

Come, if they all  
paid as little attention  
as you who read these lines,  
where would self-government end?  
Brethren, the bargain of Esau  
doomed him to age-long infamy,  
selling his birthright  
for a mess of miserable pottage.

But Esau at least was hungry,  
and got his hunger appeasal.  
You let your birthright rot.  
—Goodhue Co. News, of Red Wing, Minn.

Congressman Robert Baker, the man who wouldn't take a pass from the B. & O., was on the official train [at the opening of the New York subway road]. A Republican fellow passenger regarded him for some time with a malevolent glare, and then, touching him on the shoulder, said in icy accents: "Mr. Baker, did you pay for this ride?"

Of course everybody on that train was riding free. Baker gave a melodramatic start and hissed:

"Detected!"—New York Times, of October 28.

## BOOKS

### THE BOOK OF LORDS.

Mr. Watson, in his story of France, speaking of the splendid enthusiasm with which the friends of liberty everywhere greeted the fall of the Bastille, breaks out with the exclamation: "Cold, cold are the ashes of all this noble enthusiasm now." One cannot but be reminded of this in reading Morrison Davidson's "Book of Lords," written with a noble enthusiasm some 15 years ago, at a time when there was a hopeful agitation in England against the upper chamber of parliament. A great meeting was held in St. James' hall, which unanimously adopted this resolution—that the "House of Peers in Parliament is useless and dangerous, and ought to be abolished." If Davidson were writing now of this meeting, he might exclaim: "Cold, cold are the ashes of all this noble enthusiasm now."

The fact is that reaction is on top today. Enthusiasm for the abolition of shams and the overthrow of oppression is smouldering in the background. We have criticism, and cynicism, and a half-despairing discontent—but there is nowhere a buoyant enthusiasm thrilling the hearts of all lovers of freedom with a common fire. Socialism shows more signs than anything else, but even socialism, with its rapidly-growing protest, seems to many thoughtful reformers rather a sure manifestation of the social unrest than a clear-cut ideal that needs no defense. One does not feel in the air a pervasive, buoyant, bracing atmosphere of enthusiasm for liberty, equality and fraternity. And yet there are perhaps indications that the reactionary spirit is pausing at the top, and may soon decline.

It is a good time to read again such books as this little work by Davidson, with its scathing denunciation of so manifest an absurdity as hereditary legislators. Its spirit is catching, and will help to engender gall against other manifest absurdities.

"The Book of Lords" is a sequel to the author's well-known arraignment of royalty in the "New Book of Kings."

## The Public

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

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

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

### CONTRACTORS.

GEORGE H. ATKINSON,  
CONTRACTOR.

Telephone, Electric Light, Trolley Roads built  
Trolley and Municipal complete and  
Work. financed.  
66 Liberty Street, New York.

**A BANQUET** will be given in honor of the Rev. H. S. Bigelow on November 21st, at Kinsley's. For further information, Miss Nellie Carlin, 1202 Ashland Block, Tel. Central 927—or Dr. Anna M. Lund, 1014 Masonic Temple, Tel. Central 3691, Automatic 7691. Speakers and programme will be announced later.

### PERIODICALS.

The Reader Magazine (The Bobbe-Merrill Co., Indianapolis) offers in the November number a story by John T. McCutcheon, the cartoonist, and a few dashes of the pen by Zangwill.

Myra Kelly's "A Passport to Paradise," in the November McClure, another of her inimitable stories of school life on the East side in New York, is as humorous as anything she has yet done, but the contrasts of pathos are stronger than heretofore and the lessons more pointed.

The question of masculine and feminine employment has never been so well considered in print, nor so wittily expressed, as by Marion Foster Washburne in the North American Review for October. Gov. Garvin, of Rhode Island, also contributes to this number, his paper being on the subject of good city government.

"What the Dog is Built to Do," is an interesting contribution by Dr. Woods Hutchinson, to the Open Court for October. "When man appears upon the threshold of history," writes Dr. Hutchinson, "the dog is at his heels." A popular paper explaining how scientists have learned that the dog, so long man's companion, was domesticated from the wild would be a welcome supplement to this valuable speculation as to the purpose for which dogs were constructed.

### Parker's Old-Man-of-the-Sea.

Those who know his style are well aware that he neither spares facts nor minces words. What he said of kings, is paralleled here by what he says of earls and dukes. "The English aristocracy," he says, "is to-day what it has ever been—a predatory band. They are not permitted to murder, burn and rob as in the good old times of Sottim the Merciless and Falco Without Bowels. But they levy tribute on the whole people of these islands with merciless rigor. What they call 'rent' is simply a private tax laid on the industry of the nation by a small gang of peers and other inheritors of the spoils of the conquest. 'Rent' is brigandage reduced to a system."

Davidson shows in this book, as in his others, a wonderful acquaintance with the shady side of English history, and no one can read him without seeing the shallowness of our ordinary histories. He divides his inquiry into four epochs: First, from William the Conqueror to the close of the War of the Roses (1066-1485); second, to William the Third and the Glorious Revolution, the hypocrisy of which he shows more clearly than any other writer (1485-1688); third, to the Reform Bill (1688-1832); fourth, to recent times (1832-1884). In each epoch he shows by concrete illustrations the selfishness and rapacity that have dominated, from precedent to precedent, the policy of England's noble peers. It is safe to say that a more unsparing and righteously indignant arraignment cannot be found in print. "In one respect," thus he takes leave of his victims, "the aristocracy paint themselves in their true colors. The coats-of-arms on which they pride

themselves are hideously symbolic of their innate character. Wolves, tigers, panthers, lions, hawks, vultures, eagles, snakes, adders, vipers; swords, spears, daggers, arrows; griffins, ghouls, demons—everything horrible in nature and in the realm of imagination—grace the escutcheons of our old nobility."

The book contains only about 100 pages. It is published by F. R. Henderson, Paternoster Square, London.

J. H. DILLARD.

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

—Mass and Class; a survey of Social Divisions. By W. J. Ghent. New York. The Macmillan Company. Price, \$1.25 net. To be reviewed.

—The History of Civilization, which includes a History of Life and also a History of Ideas. With more than 650 illustrations. By Julian Laughlin, a member of the St. Louis Bar. Published by the author, 417 Pine street, St. Louis, Mo. Price, \$5. To be reviewed.

### PAMPHLETS.

David Overmeyer's oration, now in pamphlet form, delivered at the Louisiana Purchase exposition at St. Louis on Kansas Day, September 30, is a gem of blended eloquence and sense. No better oratorical representative of Kansas for that occasion could have been found than this Topeka lawyer, who is known the State over as a radical democrat.

Clarence S. Darrow's "The Open Shop" (Chicago: The Hammersmark Publishing Company, 151 Wabash avenue. Price 10 cents), is as its title implies, a discussion of the much-mooted labor issue of "open shop" or "closed shop." Mr. Darrow makes a plea for the closed shop while the "war of classes" shall continue.