

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1904.

Number 347.

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.

He must be either ignorant of history or blind to its tremendous parallels, who fails to see in the Russian conference of Zemstvos delegates, now in session at St. Petersburg, a repetition in Russia of the revolution of 1789 in France. The French States General and the Russian Zemstvos Delegates are ominously alike, and even the double of the weak and vacillating Louis XVI is in evidence. Apparently, Russia's war with Japan has precipitated the Russian revolution.

A professional pickpocket is reported to have gravely applied to an official of the National Horse Show Association for a monopoly franchise to pick pockets at the approaching show at New York. The official indignantly refused to consider the subject, though the pickpocket offered a large percentage of his gross receipts by way of compensation. Now, why was that horse show official indignant? Is he any better than a city council? And do not city councils grant just such pocket-picking franchises — sometimes without compensation unless to their members personally—to street car corporations to pick the pockets of passengers?

A movement in favor of W. L. Douglas, governor-elect of Massachusetts, for the next Democratic candidate for the Presidency, is reported to have been started in the East. The suggestion is a good one. Douglas has made a radical fight, and against great odds has won. But this is not the time for choosing candidates. The

work immediately before the Democratic party consists in making it democratic. Let all attention be concentrated on that work during the next three years, and a friendly rivalry among democratic Democrats for the Presidential nomination, will then strengthen the work that has gone before. The naming of names while that more important work is undone will justly raise suspicions. The next candidate of the Democratic party must be a man who demonstrates in some manner that he may be depended upon to put progressive democracy first and himself second.

The "safe and sane" organs of plutocratic Democracy are beginning another campaign of villification and perfidy to hold the Democratic party in the service of American plutocracy. No one need fear these dying convulsions. The fate of plutocratic Democracy was decided at the election this month. In that overwhelming plurality for Roosevelt the condemnation of an assistant Republican party was written. The Democratic party must be democratic henceforth or pass off the stage.

A single suggestion is worth offering in this connection. There is a vast difference between plutocratic Democrats who are gold standard men, and gold standard men who are democratic Democrats. With the aid of the latter, it is to be hoped that a militant Democracy, democratic in spirit and purpose, will be lined up against the plutocrats of all parties. But with the former, all party association is and must be at an end in the Democratic party.

An interesting Thanksgiving gift is that brand new city charter which certain financial inter-

ests duped the people into giving the city of Chicago at the recent election. When votes were wanted for the proposed amendment to the constitution the people were assured that the amendment would give the city a maturity charter in place of the infantile one which it had been wearing since childhood. But now it appears that the amendment makes possible nothing of the kind. Instead of getting a charter, Chicago is to be placed under the government of the State legislature. As New York has been governed from Albany, so Chicago is to be governed from Springfield. The constitution has been altered by this much-belauded gold-brick of an amendment, so as to enable the legislature to indulge in all the special legislation regarding Chicago that it wants to.

The only check is the referendum. No special act can be imposed by the legislature upon Chicago without the consent of the voters of the city. But that is a broken reed to lean upon. For when an act is once passed by the legislature and adopted by the voters of Chicago, the probability is that the legislature can amend that act at will without a referendum.

Men who voted like sheep for this amendment ought to have been put on their guard by the support it received from the corporations. Chicago corporations have no more public spirit than an ox has speed; and when they made their grand rush to put the charter amendment through, that in itself should have warned every voter.

Lawson's exposure of "Fierce Finance" in Everybody's for December goes a long way to redeem the promises he made in his introductory article last summer.

The time has passed when the people whom Lawson is exposing can evade his charges by silence or innuendo. His accusations are made circumstantially, with names and dates, and in a manner which carries conviction of their probable truthfulness. If they are not true, they can be easily refuted.

More important, however, than his exposure of individual turpitude, are Lawson's pictures of modern business ethics as they work themselves out in practice. They are the ethics of hell. The lesson to be learned from his exposures in this respect is that the grafters and boodlers whom good citizenship clubs usually pursue, are as sneak thieves to pirates in comparison with the captains of finance whom business men respect, society adores, colleges cringe to, churches idolize, and good citizenship clubs defer to. We have exemplifications of this moral rottenness everywhere. Whoever knows much about business environments and operations, knows that Lawson is telling the truth. Take Chicago or New York, for instance, and you find the respectable graft system at work in the most disheartening fashion. Boodlers may be thrown down, but "financial interests" thrive on boodle principles. The great grafters make the system, and the system becomes to young men of abilities, who would rather be honest than not if they dared— young business men and lawyers and preachers and politicians—as a harrow to a toad. The toad must move along with the harrow, if he can, or be torn by its teeth. And so the best budding abilities of the time are drawn into the service of this boodling system of "business."

THE SINGLE TAX MOVEMENT—ITS ORIGIN AND PROGRESS.

In its early days the single tax movement was spectacular. Centering about the first candidacy of Henry George for Mayor of New York, it threatened the supremacy of Tammany Hall, developed a heated controversy in the Roman Catholic church over the case of Father McGlynn, and stirred the stagnant pools of con-

ventional politics and self-satisfied piety to their depths.

Seldom has there been a more exciting local campaign in American politics than this unique campaign of 1886 in New York, which, in giving birth to the single tax movement, almost put George into the mayor's chair, and did eject McGlynn forever from his chancel and for a long time from his church. Great masses of adherents of a new third party only locally organized, marched and shouted and voted for "George! George! Henry-George!" With this refrain the streets of New York rang again and again. For many months, moreover, both before and after the election, the larger auditoriums of the city were overcrowded—sometimes three of the largest at once—with enthusiastic listeners to Henry George's doctrines, then without a distinctive name but now everywhere known as "the single tax."

The political elements of excitement were contributed chiefly by Henry George himself. They were strongly reinforced by religious emotions excited by George's doctrines and intensified by the expulsion of McGlynn from St. Stephen's (one of the most populous Roman Catholic parishes in the world) for supporting the agitation. Both McGlynn and George, by their personal magnetism and thrilling oratory, stimulated the enthusiasm of their followers, while the opposition were stirred to resistance by appeals from their leaders to rise up and "save society."

With the passing of this initial stage of the single tax movement, afterwards described by one of its most loyal supporters as its "howling dervish stage of emotional insanity," the movement itself has seemed to many to have receded. Even among its devoted adherents are those who still sigh for a return to that period of ebullient enthusiasm and phenomenal organization, as to a time when the single tax movement was at its best.

Yet its greatest strength was not then, it is now. Few and weak as are its organizations to-day, and subdued as is the enthusiasm of its present promoters over their less spectacular tasks, the magnitude and influence of the

single tax movement are vastly greater now than ever before.

I.

In one sense, this movement is not modern. The single tax question is at bottom the land question, and the land question is as old as the Gracchi. Even in our own new country it dates as far back as to the middle of the last century, when Duganne sang:

And the soil is teeming o'er all the earth,
And the earth has numberless lands;
Yet millions of hands want acres,
While millions of acres want hands.

Who hath ordained that a parchment scroll
Shall fence round miles of lands,
When millions of hands want acres,
And millions of acres want hands?

In no such connection, however, is the single tax movement usually thought of. It is regarded as having originated with Henry George, who was born in 1839 and died in 1897.

Nor is this idea much amiss. For George, though he did not discover the land question nor invent the single tax, did propose the single tax as the just and expedient method of solving the land question in harmony with the normal tendencies of civilization. It was he, also, who originated and led the political agitation for the gradual abolition of taxes on everything but land values, as the best way of socializing land values and individualizing labor values.

In that view of the matter the single tax movement derived its original impulse from George's pamphlet, "Our Land and Land Policy," published in California in 1871.

Between that time and 1879, when his "Progress and Poverty" appeared, a club was formed in San Francisco, which is accorded the distinction of having been the first single tax club in the world. George himself was a member, as was James G. Maguire, afterwards a judge in San Francisco and a member of Congress from California. Judge Maguire is now a prominent lawyer of the Pacific Coast, and still a recognized single tax leader of national fame and influence.

Outside of California the first distinctively single tax organization was "The Free Soil Society," which organized in New York in 1883, and of which Henry George

was a member. Although national in its scheme it never advanced much beyond the "paper" stage.

About the same time the "Land Restoration Society" was organized in Scotland with the aid of Mr. George on the occasion of one of his lecturing trips to that country. Other organizations sprang up here and there on both sides of the Atlantic in those early days of the movement, but the Scottish "Land Restoration Society" alone lived very long or made a record of much importance. It is still an influential body.

When the New York mayoralty campaign of 1886 got under way, an era of active and quite general organization set in. This counted for little, however, beyond the local sphere of influence of the New York movement.

The New York mayoralty campaign originated with the Central Labor Union of New York city, an organization which had grown out of a workingmen's mass meeting at Cooper Union four years earlier, called to indorse the "no rent" manifesto then just issued in Ireland.

Owing to tremendously intense excitement in New York labor circles in the Summer of 1886, over the vindictive prosecution in the criminal courts of a strike committee, the Central Labor Union determined upon independent political action and authorized a nominating convention of trade union delegates. At this convention, George was nominated for mayor upon a platform that would now be recognized as a single tax document, although "single tax" as a name was not yet thought of. George's candidacy had been called for by a petition bearing the names of 34,000 signers. It was subsequently indorsed by a citizens' mass meeting, and ratified by a meeting at Cooper Union larger than any previous one since the outbreak of the Civil War. After an exciting campaign, in which the two factions of the Democratic party united upon Abraham S. Hewitt, George polled 68,110 votes. This was 22,442 less than were counted for Mr. Hewitt, and 7,675 more than were credited to Theodore Roosevelt, now President, who was then the Republican candidate for mayor.

Following that election the

United Labor party was organized permanently in the county of New York. It consisted of the supporters of George. Another historic organization of the movement was the Anti-Poverty Society, founded about the same time, with the unfrocked Father McGlynn as its president. For the purpose of making the political organization national, a national organizing committee also was formed. One of the earliest results in the way of more extended organization was the birth of the United Labor party as a State organization at a convention held at Syracuse, N. Y., in the summer of 1887. Outside of New York county this party never rose above the grade of a "paper" organization. In that county, however, and in Brooklyn, it was generally regarded as a political factor of no small importance.

At the Syracuse convention a conflict arose between socialists and non-socialists, resulting in the secession of the socialists, who thereupon organized what is now the Socialist Labor party.

The Syracuse convention adopted a single tax platform, and, greatly against his will, nominated Henry George for secretary of state, the highest office on the State ticket. A strenuous campaign of the State was made by George and McGlynn, supported by a small army of minor speakers, but without effect either in country or city. Although George's and McGlynn's meetings were large everywhere, and in New York city were phenomenal, the result was keenly disappointing. In New York city George received but little more than half of his vote of the previous year, and his total vote for the whole State was only 70,000—about 2,000 more than his vote of the previous year in the city alone. His vote in the city was about 37,000.

Yet the meetings in New York continued with unabated fervor, though in a few weeks with dwindling audiences. Within the walls of the meeting places public sentiment was still aflame, but only there. Outside there were but embers, and these were growing cold. The first stage of the single tax movement had come to an end.

II.

Apparently smaller and weaker, and to superficial observers, both

friend and foe, growing more so, the single tax movement was in reality becoming only less nebulous and therefore all the better fitted for the new kind of activities that lay before it.

These were first revealed by President Cleveland's tariff reform message to Congress in December, 1887. Seeing in the timid tariff reform policy of that message the thin end of the free trade wedge, of which the thick end is the single tax. Henry George rallied his followers to the support of Cleveland. Father McGlynn took a different course. Encouraging an independent political programme, he participated in the national campaign of the United Labor party in 1888, for which a popular vote of 2,668 was reported in New York and 140 in Illinois, a total for the United States of 2,808.

The single tax voters who followed George at this juncture supported Cleveland, not as a party Democrat, but as a pioneer, even if a timid one, of free trade. They solicited pledges for Cleveland for the express reason that his proposed tariff reform was a step in the direction of free trade and the single tax. More than 10,000 signatures to this petition were secured through the efforts chiefly of William T. Croasdale, who had the work in charge.

One incident illustrates the utter absence of enthusiasm, yet the determined purpose, which characterized the beginning of this new stage of the single tax movement. At one of the single tax meetings in support of Cleveland, an auditor arose toward the end and with unaffected seriousness said:

"Mr. Chairman: I move that this meeting adjourn with three cheers for Grover Cleveland."

The motion being seriously seconded, the chairman put the question to vote. In the same stolidly serious manner, the audience voted "aye." There were no "nay" votes, though the chairman called for them.

Announcing the vote accordingly as unanimous in the affirmative, the chairman was about to declare the meeting adjourned, when he was reminded of the result of the motion to cheer. He hesitated, in order to give some enthusiastic adherent of Mr. Cleveland an opportunity to lead the cheering. No

one offering to do so, he raised his own right arm and with a slight swinging motion of the wrist, but with no signs of enthusiasm, addressed the audience in moderate and monotonous speech, saying:

"Three cheers for Grover Cleveland. Hurrah!" He paused, and the audience solemnly repeated: "Hurrah!" Then the chairman again said "Hurrah!" and the audience again repeated it. A third time he said "Hurrah!" and waited for the repetition, which came as promptly and as stolidly as before. Finally, after the manner of the cheering New Yorker, the chairman added: "Tiger!" The audience repeated that also, and then dispersed to work and vote for Cleveland.

At the conclusion of the Presidential campaign of 1888, Mr. Croasdale continued his work for the purpose of permanently organizing the single tax movement, that name for it having meanwhile come spontaneously into use. Petitions similar to those of the campaign were prepared, the pledge being changed, however, so as to commit the signer, not to vote for Cleveland—this preliminary phase having gone by—but to demand from Congress an investigation of the single tax proposition. A petition with scores of thousands of signers was secured and presented formally to the lower House of Congress, where it has reposed since 1892, if it has not been destroyed.

Congress did nothing. No one supposed it would. But the petition had served its purpose of organizing the single tax movement in its second stage. This work was practically completed and its possibilities well-nigh exhausted under the management of Mr. Croasdale, who died before the presentation of the petition.

During those years, single tax clubs were formed in various parts of the United States. Some of them were large and some were small, but all were energetic. Notable among them was the Chicago Single Tax club, a survival from the previous stage of the movement, of which Warren Worth Bailey, now editor of the *Johnstown (Pa.) Daily Democrat*, was the principal promoter and for years the president. John Z. White, at present the leading lec-

turer of the Henry George Association, was the most distinguished debater of the club. In 1900 this club divided over the question of organizing a local single tax party. Its president now is Thomas Rhodus. The members who opposed that policy, since practically abandoned, left the club and organized the Henry George Association, of which Frederick H. Monroe has been president from the beginning.

Another notable organization of that period was the Manhattan Single Tax club of New York city, organized in 1888. It owns its own clubhouse and is now under the presidency of Benjamin Doblin, one of the young men converts of the memorable mayoralty campaign of 1886.

These and other local bodies, together with isolated single taxers throughout the country who had shown their interest and their activity in connection with the Congressional petition, made the nucleus of the national organization, which began with a conference at Cooper Union, New York, in the summer of 1890. Among the members of that conference were Tom L. Johnson, of Ohio, now mayor of Cleveland; Judge James G. Maguire, of California; Edward Osgood Brown, of Illinois, now an appellate judge in Chicago; William Lloyd Garrison, of Massachusetts, son of the Liberator; Mayor Hoch, of Adrian, Michigan; Robert Baker, now a Congressman from Brooklyn, and Henry George, then just returned from a lecture trip around the world. Three years later a similar conference was held at the Art Institute, Chicago, of which Father McGlynn as well as Henry George was a member. No others have been held, and the national organization of which these conferences were the representative gatherings has long since ceased to exist except upon paper.

III.

The single-tax movement is no longer an organized movement. It has entered upon a third and more effective stage in its progress. This does not mean that there are no live single tax organizations. On the contrary there are several, one of the younger ones being the Ohio Single Tax league, of which William Rad-

cliffe, of Youngstown, is president, and J. B. Vining, of Cleveland, is secretary. Another is the Land Values League of England, which has been taking advantage of the Chamberlain episode to make a radical free trade agitation. Some organized activity is reported from Germany, where a Land Reform league has been organized which held its 14th annual conference at Darmstadt in October, 1904; and Fairhope, an Alabama colony as nearly single tax in its methods as existing laws permit, has become widely known for its successful demonstrations under the management principally of E. B. Gaston and James Bellangee. There are various other single tax bodies. Some are survivals, while some are only recently organized; some are men's clubs and some are women's leagues; some are moribund and some are alert; and along with all the rest are literature-supplying committees modeled upon the plans of E. B. Swinney, of Brooklyn, who is conducting the principal one. But single tax organizations in the United States are at best only local in influence and character, even when national in form; and none can be said to be representative of the single tax movement even locally.

Not only in the United States, but throughout the English-speaking world, the single-tax idea has taken possession in greater or less degree of vast numbers of people who are not avowed single taxers at all, and therefore will not organize; while the avowed single taxers prefer as a rule to work through other organizations than such as bear the single-tax label. Distinctive single-tax organizations are therefore neither many nor representative. Yet the movement has made a strong impression upon public opinion.

In Glasgow, single-tax men have done their best work within and through the Liberal party. They have thus carried elections on the single-tax issue, and, followed by some 300 other British cities, have taken the lead in demanding of Parliament the right to adopt the single tax for local purposes.

In this connection a municipal conference of 124 local taxing bodies was held in London in the Fall

of 1902, the delegates having been officially authorized to represent their respective municipalities. With only one dissenting vote this conference by resolution declared its approval "of the principle of the taxation of land values for local purposes, as being just and equitable." Still more significant of the quiet but steady progress of the single-tax movement in Great Britain was the vote in Parliament in the Spring of 1903 on a bill allowing municipalities to adopt the single-tax principle for local revenue purposes. The bill was made a party measure by the Liberal members of the House of Commons, and being generally supported or not opposed by Conservatives, it was defeated by only 13 votes. That the public sentiment which made that result possible has not subsided, but is really gaining in mass and momentum is evident from the fact that in 1904 the same bill had a majority in the Commons of 67.

A like inference may be drawn from the impression made by the second conference of local taxing bodies held in the fall of 1904. Apropos of this conference the *Observer* and *Times*, an old and conservative paper of Accrington, in its issue of October 15, 1904, editorially declared that the movement is steadily gaining ground in Great Britain. Simply as one among many available illustrations of this progress, we extract the following from that editorial:

It is gratifying to see that the movement for the taxation of land values is becoming steadily strengthened and extended. One of its most hopeful features is the absence to a large extent of any political element. Not long ago the principle had few advocates outside advanced sections of the Liberal party. This is no longer so by any means. The question has gradually resolved itself into one of the relief of the rates. The great municipal authorities of the kingdom have almost for the sake of self-preservation been compelled to force it to the front, and to-day for practical purposes they are unanimous in advocating the reform. . . . A second conference of representatives of municipal and other rating authorities has just been held at the Westminster Palace hotel to push the movement a further stage towards realization. Over 200 rating authorities were represented, and all the speaking was unanimous, as the whole of the resolutions were passed without a dissentient

voice. The Lord Provost of Glasgow, who presided, struck the key-note both of the conference and the position involved in saying that the demand for the bringing of land values into the rating net was a determined one on the part of the municipal bodies, and was approached from an economic standpoint. . . . Mr. Charles Trevelyan, M. P., said at the conference he believed public opinion was nearly ripe for going in the direction of many of our colonies, and putting a large part of the rates entirely on the land, a movement which so far had been remarkably successful. We scarcely think public opinion here is so ripe. But it is ripening and the ever-increasing local and national burdens will hasten the process.

This advance in the single tax movement, which now affects both parties in Great Britain, has been secured in that country by working in politics primarily through the Liberal party—that one of the two great parties having the democratic trend. This sensible policy is not peculiar to Great Britain. As British single taxers have worked through the Liberal party, so their Australasian brethren have worked through the Free-Trade party of Australia and the Liberal party of New Zealand. The single-tax leader of Australia, Max Hirsch, stands in the Free-Trade party second only to the party leader, Mr. Reid; and George Fowlds, the single-tax leader in New Zealand, is a Liberal member of Parliament. Both in Australia and in New Zealand much has been done in the way of making the single tax the accepted method of local taxation. It is mandatory in some parts of Australia. In New Zealand it is voluntary, yet more than 50 municipalities there have adopted it and cling to it. Among these is one of the large cities, Christchurch, besides several farming districts.

Although the administration of the German colony of Kiaochou, China, has not been influenced through political parties, since it is not governed locally by parties, it has been influenced in its fiscal adjustments by an adaptation of the same policy of promoting the single tax movement as that which is proving so satisfactory in Great Britain and Australia. One of the members of the body which formulated the fiscal and land tenure systems now prevailing in Kiaochou was a single tax man, who proposed the method to

his colleagues as an economic device for discouraging anticipated land monopoly. His proposals were welcomed, and a crude but unmistakable single tax system has consequently been in operation in Kiaochou for more than five years, with the most gratifying results.

Even in the German Empire itself a considerable advance in the application to cities of the single-tax principle was reported in the summer of 1904. In several German cities, according to that report, taxes have been imposed on the values of building lots, with the express double purpose of depressing land values and stimulating building operations—a typical double object of the single tax movement.

Outside of political bodies, similar tendencies in the direction of the single tax movement are observable in too many places to permit of detailed description here or even of enumeration of results. As a single instance, merely for illustration, we quote the following special resolution of the executive committee of the Provincial Mining Association of British Columbia, the association of practical mining operators of a Canadian Province that has already made some legislative progress in the direction of the single tax:

In the opinion of this association, natural resources of the Province, and not industry, should bear the chief burden of taxation. The enormous areas of valuable land now held under a taxation which is practically insignificant should be made to pay its proper share of the burden, and thus relieve industry. The association therefore respectfully recommends to the government the advisability of inquiring into and adopting the Australasian or some other equitable and uniform system of taxation on land, including mining lands, that will tend to increase the revenue, foster the settlement of the lands of the Province, and encourage the development of its great mineral and other resources.

In view of the vast areas of land held in this Province, it is believed that the revenues from such a system of taxation will more than meet the annual deficit of the Province, and will enable it to materially relieve the mining industry.

It is evident, even from this cursory survey, that the single tax movement has made great practical progress within the past two decades,—greater, perhaps, than

movements which have made a greater noise.

Much the same kind of progress as in Europe, and by similar methods, has been made in the United States, since the so-called "howling dervish" stage of the movement; although progress in or toward practical applications of the single tax principle are not yet so far advanced.

On the Pacific coast the single-tax leader, ex-Judge James G. Maguire, has served several terms in Congress with acknowledged ability and unquestioned fidelity. While there he introduced a single tax bill as a substitute for the proposed income tax. Upon coming to a vote on the 31st of January, 1894, it received six votes—Congressman James G. Maguire, Tom L. Johnson, Jerry Simpson, John De Witt Warner, M. D. Harter and Charles Tracy. All were pronounced single tax men except Harter, who was a real estate tax man, and Tracy, who merely took this method of recording his opposition to the income tax.

Maguire was the Democratic candidate for governor of California in 1898, and though bitterly opposed and running in a Republican State, was defeated by only a small plurality—about 20,000. Franklin K. Lane, also a single taxer, was defeated for governor of California in 1902 by only 2,553 votes.

Other prominent and influential public men in the West are pronounced single taxers, including James W. Bucklin, whose work in the legislature and before the people of Colorado is familiar.

In the East, Gov. Garvin of Rhode Island, who has long been closely identified with the movement, has been twice elected governor as a Democratic candidate, and was defeated in 1904 by less than 600 votes in a State which gave the Republican candidate for President a plurality of 15,000. The names of William Lloyd Garrison, Congressman Baker and Tom L. Johnson need only be mentioned to arouse thoughts of the single tax. Johnson is without dispute the single tax leader in the United States, and through his activities and the methods of his political adversaries, the single tax principle is permeating public sentiment to a

degree and with a rapidity that distinctive single tax organizations could not possibly accomplish. One of his most efficient coadjutors is Robert C. Wright, the auditor of Cuyahoga county, Ohio, whose administration as a fiscal officer has been as straight in the direction of the single tax principle as existing law allows, and as far under the law as possible in the face of corporate opposition. Mr. Wright was reelected in 1904 as a Democrat by a plurality of 2,500 in a county which at the same time gave a Republican plurality for President of 34,000.

The particular political reform which the single tax movement presents is known as "local option" or "home rule" in taxation. This has been the political advance courier of the movement in Great Britain as it is in the United States. Its aim is to secure to localities the right to establish their own methods of taxation, so that any locality may adopt the single tax, without waiting for action by the State if the voters of that locality desire to adopt it.

This line of single tax policy was formulated immediately after the Presidential election of 1888. Its author was Thomas G. Shearman. Work upon it began immediately in New York, and the legislature of that State has at nearly every session had the measure before it. Although it has defeated the measure every time, the affirmative vote has always been large. It was in connection with this phase of the movement that New York city was empowered by the legislature to distinguish land values from improvement values in tax assessments and to publish the results—a reform which has revealed the amazing fact that hardly one-fourth of the immense real estate value of New York city is improvement value, about three-fourths of it being the value of sites alone.

This question of "local option" or "home rule" in taxation is the one on which Senator Bucklin was beaten in 1902. Submitted simply as a public policy question for an advisory vote in Illinois at the Fall elections of 1904, it polled 469,749 votes, to 134,487, a majority of 335,262.

This also is the New Zealand and the Australian system, and

it is this right of local application of the single tax principle that the municipalities of Great Britain, with Glasgow at the head, are demanding so urgently of Parliament.

As the single tax movement is essentially reformatory rather than revolutionary, a progressive directing force in or influence upon existing social life rather than a protest and revolt, it does not appeal to segregative impulses. This is the reason that its distinctive organizations are few and small out of all proportion to the real magnitude and effectiveness of the movement.

For the same reason its newspaper organs also are few. But just as the leaders of the movement are acceptable leaders in general civic affairs, and all the more so because they are not hampered by the requirements and discipline of distinctive single tax organizations, so is its newspaper press all the more influential because not a collection of mere organs.

If one were asked what single tax papers there are, he would probably name the Single Tax Review, the Courier (organ of Fairhope colony, Ala.), the Standard, of Daphne, Ala.; Economy, of Solon, Ia.; Rockland Opinion of Rockland, Me.; Goodhue County News, of Red Wing, Minn.; Why, of Cedar Rapids, Ia.; the Single Tax, of Glasgow, and the Volksstimme, of Berlin. He might also name The Public, but The Public is not a single tax organ; it is simply a general review which approves the single tax principle. Notwithstanding this dearth in newspaper organs, the single tax movement is not weak in its newspaper support. No other radical movement where English speech prevails is so well served by friendly newspapers.

Distinguishing papers by their sympathies and underlying editorial policy, and not by their character as organs, a long catalogue of single tax papers could be named. This list would include the London Speaker, the London New Age, the London Daily News, and the Liverpool Financial Reformer, in Great Britain; the Star, of San Francisco; the daily Coles County Democrat, of Jefferson City, Mo.; the daily Re-

press; his next to authorize a call for an imperial conference at St. Petersburg, November 19th, of representatives of the Zemstvos. This in itself is tantamount in Russia to revolution. "Zemstvo" is the name of the provincial legislatures of the Russian Empire in Europe. Though the word legislature fairly describes these bodies, they are not really legislatures in the American sense. They simply administer the local economical affairs of their respective districts and provinces, but are elected by popular vote—the electors being the landed proprietors, the peasants of the country and the householders of cities. From latest data (1897) it would appear that there are Zemstvos in 361 districts of 34 provinces of European Russia, with an aggregate electorate of 40,172 landowners, 48,091 city householders, and 196,773 peasants. Apparently these electors are themselves elected. The membership of Zemstvos aggregates 13,196, of which about 35 per cent. belong to the nobility, 15 per cent. to the merchant class, and 38 per cent. to the peasantry. The remainder are probably of the mechanic class. The plan of a St. Petersburg conference of representatives of these bodies, called for the 19th as stated above, was bitterly opposed by the reactionary elements of Russia, represented especially by the head of the Greek church, Mr. Pobyedonostseff, who is on the Czar's Committee of Ministers (the Russian cabinet) as Procurator-General of the Holy Synod. Their first effort was to postpone the conference until January. In this they failed. But they did succeed in inducing the Czar to withdraw all indications of official approval of the conference. Its being permitted to meet at all, however, is evidence of a great advance. Prince Sviatopolk Mirsky guaranteed the meeting immunity from police interference.

The conference of the Zemstvos met, therefore, on the 19th at St. Petersburg, but in a private house instead of the public building in which its deliberations were to have been conducted. The American dispatches explain that official sanctions were withdrawn because the delegates refused to

limit their deliberations to specified subjects.

At the first session of the Zemstvos delegates, on the 19th, and 20th, they endorsed the first seven of the following ten sections of a memorial on the subject of Russian government:

Preamble of proposals on the question of general conditions preventing the normal course and development of our social life, submitted to a private conference of zemstvo workers, Nov. 19 and Nov. 20, in St. Petersburg.

Section 1. The abnormal system of government prevailing among us, and especially noticeable since the '80's, is due to complete estrangement of government and people, and the absence of the mutual confidence so necessary to national life.

Sec. 2. These relations between the government and the people originate from apprehension of development of popular initiative and persistent efforts to exclude the people from participation in internal government. With this object the government endeavored to extend centralized administration to all branches of local government, and impose a tutelage in every branch of national life, admitting cooperation with the people solely for the purpose of bringing popular institutions into harmony with the views of the government.

Sec. 3. The bureaucratic system of causing estrangement of the supreme power and the people creates a field for a wide scope of administrative arbitrariness and personal caprice. Such a condition deprives the nation of the necessary assurances that the rights of each and all will be protected, and undermines confidence in the government.

Sec. 4. The normal current and evolution of state and nation is possibly only under the condition of close living and union and the cooperation of the imperial power with the people.

Sec. 5. In order to exclude the possibility of the display of administrative arbitrariness and to guarantee personal rights, it is necessary to establish and consistently apply a principle by which no one will be subjected to punishment or to the restriction of rights without the decision of independent legal authorities.

Sec. 6. For the unrestricted expression of public opinion and the free exposition and satisfaction of popular needs, it is essential to guarantee freedom of conscience and speech and of the press, and also freedom of meeting and association.

Sec. 7. Self-reliance is the chief condition of the proper and successful development of the political and economic life of the country. A considerable majority of the population of Russia belonging to the peasant class, it is neces-

sary, first of all, to place the latter in a position favorable for development of self-reliance and energy, and this is attainable only by a radical alteration of the present unequitable and humiliating condition of the peasants. For this purpose it is necessary (a) to equalize the civil and political rights of peasants with the other classes; (b) release rural self-government from administration tutelage; (c) safeguard peasants to proper courts of justice.

Sec. 8. Zemstvo institutions, in which local and popular life is mostly concentrated, must be placed in conditions in which they may successfully carry out their duties. For this purpose it is necessary that the zemstvo representation be based on a no-class basis, and all the forces of the local population be admitted to share in zemstvo work; that zemstvo institutions be brought into closer touch with the people by the creation of a small zemstvo and unite upon a basis guaranteeing absolute independence, and that zemstvo institutions be assured the necessary permanency and independence essential to their proper development and activity and mutual cooperation of governmental with popular institutions.

Sec. 9. But for the creation and maintenance of close and healthy communion, a unison of the imperial authority with the people upon the basis above pointed out, and in order to assure the correct development of life, state and nation, it is unquestionably necessary for national representation in the form of a specially elective body to participate in legislation.

Sec. 10. This conference, considering itself an informal gathering of which the members express personal views, considers that settlement of the question on the basis which form the relationship of government and popular representation in the life of the country should be submitted to representatives of the nation chosen under the conditions above indicated as essential for freedom in elections.

On the 21st the ninth section was significantly strengthened. By a vote of 105 to 3 the latter half of that section was amended to read as follows:

In order to secure the proper development of the life of the State and the people, it is imperatively necessary that there be regular participation of national representatives, sitting as an especially elected body, to make laws, regulate the revenue and expenditure, and control the legality of the actions of the administration.

This memorial of the Zemstvos Delegates was completed on the 22d, after having been altered in form so as to express "the hope

that it is the wish of the Czar to summon a national assembly." It was to be presented to the Minister of the Interior, Prince Sviatopolk-Mirsky on the 23d, by a delegation composed of Presidents Shipoff, Petrunkevitch, Prince Lyoff, Count Heider and Rodzian-sky, the most prominent participants in the meeting.

A communication from Finland was received on the 21st by the Zemstvos conference. It was signed by 26 prominent Finlanders and is in these terms:

The undersigned, citizens of Finland, interested in the evolution of social and intellectual life of Russia, send their sincere and cordial salutations to the zemstvo representatives assembled in St. Petersburg to study the general circumstances which prevent regular development of Russian life. Now that the government has just proclaimed confidence in the people, the development of their moral, intellectual and social forces is henceforth opened to the powerful, generous Russian genius. We wish you complete success in your work of peace and concord, and hope it will redound to the glory and happiness of your country.

The local excitement over the conference is reported by St. Petersburg dispatches to be intense. "Nothing else," says an Associated Press dispatch of the 21st, "is talked of. Liberals from all parts of the Empire are flocking hither, including many from Poland and Finland. The hotel lobbies are crowded, almost resembling convention times in American cities. The permission granted by Prince Sviatopolk-Mirsky was for an assembly of 300. The situation altogether is unparalleled. Nothing approaching such a gathering has ever before been permitted in Russia. As evidence of the remarkable state of affairs it is sufficient to mention that one of the most prominent speakers yesterday was M. Petrunkevitch, of Tyer, who spent 24 years in exile and who had only been allowed at the capital since Prince Sviatopolk-Mirsky's advent. Sympathetic demonstrations are reported in various parts of Russia." Speaking of the future of the memorial, an unnamed member of the Zemstvos Delegates conference, described as one of the most prominent, was reported by the Associated Press on the 22d as saying:

The general opinion of my colleagues

is the reverse of optimistic. Therefore it is a mistake to raise hopes that are doomed probably to disappointment, but hope exists. Probably there will be the usual attempt to temporize. We may not get all, but we should get something. The Emperor is kind-hearted and sincerely desirous of helping the people if he becomes convinced where the interests of the people and government lie, but he is surrounded by influences. The court and the imperial family are opposed to anything like a suggestion of a constitution. Of only one thing we are certain—Interior Minister Sviatopolk-Mirsky will present the memorial to the Emperor. How far or whether he will indorse it at all is not yet known, but he will place it before his majesty if it costs him his position in the ministry. No matter what the immediate result, however, we have gained a remarkable victory. We have put into concrete form our opinion that the present system in the end must spell ruin or revolution. The Emperor knows the character of the men whose names are attached to the memorial. They represent the best blood and thought of the Empire. We are not revolutionaries. We do not believe the people are prepared for a republic. We support the monarchical idea, but we believe it must be a constitutional monarchy, and that the Emperor must choose between the moderate programme we offer or eventual revolution. If there is no result now, we will continue the work of agitation and education. There will be a larger and a stronger meeting next year. If the meeting is forbidden in St. Petersburg, then it will take place in Moscow, Kieff, or in an open field, if necessary. The movement will gather headway as time elapses. We have risked our liberties, and we shall not retreat. The law which makes agitation for a change in the form of government punishable with penal servitude is still in force. We are all amenable, but so long as Prince Sviatopolk-Mirsky is minister we know we are safe. If he falls we take our chances, although we feel sure the government would not dare to reverse the policy of liberalism which has received such an impetus since Von Plehve's death. The moment is propitious for concessions. The government is in a difficult position and needs the support and sympathy of the people. I believe something at least will be granted. A free press would be the greatest step short of calling a national assembly. If only the A B C's of the programme are conceded the rest of the alphabet will inevitably be drawn in their wake.

NEWS NOTES.

—Col. W. C. P. Breckinridge, Congressman from Kentucky from 1884 to 1893, died at Lexington, Ky., on the 19th.

—Ex-Judge Alton B. Parker, late Democratic candidate for President,

has opened a law office in New York city in the suite occupied by William F. Sheehan.

—The annual memorial meeting of Chicago, in memory of Robert G. Ingersoll, is to be held at 40 Randolph street, on the 27th at 8 o'clock in the evening. The admission fee, 25 cents, is for the benefit of the Ingersoll Memorial Association, and the oration is to be by ex-Senator William E. Mason on "Liberty."

—The bronze statue of Frederick the Great of Prussia, presented to the American people by the Emperor of Germany (p. 344), was unveiled at Washington on the 19th by Baroness Speck von Sternberg, wife of the German ambassador to the United States. President Roosevelt made the address of acceptance.

—At the session of the American Federation of Labor at San Francisco, on the 22d, two resolutions presented and supported by socialists, namely, abolition of the militia, as it now exists in the United States, and the substitution of the Swiss system, and old-age pensions for workmen, were overwhelmingly defeated.

—Thomas A. Moran, one of the leading members of the Chicago bar, and formerly an appellate judge, died suddenly in New York city on the 18th at the age of 65. Although not an active advocate of single tax doctrines, Judge Moran was a believer in and at times a spokesman for single tax principles, especially in their fiscal aspects.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States (p. 458) for the four months ending October 31, 1904, as given by the statistical sheet of the Department of Commerce and Labor for October, were as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold and S for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M.....	\$71,499,929	\$35,162,159	\$36,337,770 exp.
G.....	18,446,164	28,555,047	10,108,883 im p.
S.....	19,247,319	7,588,766	11,658,553 exp.
	\$99,193,503	\$71,553,972	\$27,639,531 exp.

—The Jefferson club, of Chicago, was incorporated on the 22d, with the following board of directors: Clarence S. Darrow, Judge E. F. Dunne, J. R. Gregg, H. R. Eagle and William Prentiss. Its declared purposes are "To oppose government banks of issue; to oppose monopolies; to oppose a large standing army and the spread of militarism; to oppose political connections with foreign countries; to oppose expansion of territory, excepting contiguous territory, which may be carved up into States; to promote free commerce, free speech, and friendliness among nations; to develop and spread the principles of Jefferson."

PRESS OPINIONS.

FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY. Elizabeth (N. J.) Evening Times (Dem.), Nov. 15.—It is no longer for the Democratic party to attempt to play to the fortunes of both of the widely separated elements in

this country, although the Republican party, thanks to the popularity of President Roosevelt, has succeeded in doing so.

Colusa (Cal.) Sun (Dem.), Nov. 12.—We do not like the word "plutocracy" so freely used by Mr. Bryan. We do not like to have to come under his leadership; but where are we to turn? We do not like anything akin to socialism; but are we to give up all the wealth coming out of the development of the country to a few men? Thinking men should read the statement of Mr. Bryan and they will see that the issues of the future are big with danger. Whether we like it or not, we have got to see that William Jennings Bryan is going to be the leader of the common people for the next four years. The South, always desiring to be conservative, will have to join in with him. Many exceedingly conservative men throughout the North will feel compelled to join in with him. The present is a time for deep thought. Read Bryan as a foundation for it.

THE "STRAIGHT" TICKET.

Detroit Free Press (Dem.), Nov. 15.—It is an inevitable inference therefore that the present method of making a straight party ticket by placing the cross mark in the circle at the head of the column prevents an exactly fair expression of public feeling as to all candidates and a fair expression of this feeling is the aim of all election laws in these days. The obvious remedy is to abolish the circle at the head of the ticket and thus compel the voter to place the requisite mark in front of the name of every candidate for whom he desires to vote. That this is practical was proved at the primary election. It is the method followed in Rhode Island and Massachusetts. It is the only method that not only permits but compels the voter to use his intelligence and exercise his discrimination in selecting men for preference.

SIGNIFICANCE OF INCREASE OF THIRD PARTY VOTES.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Nov. 16.—The meaning of this ought to be obvious. Democrats did not vote the Socialist or the Prohibition ticket where there was a democratic Democrat in the field. It was only where plutocratic control was manifest and where a Democratic vote was in effect a vote for plutocracy that we discover great jumps in the Socialist and the Prohibition votes; and these increases must be credited, not to a growth of Socialist or Prohibition sentiment among Democrats, but to a desire among democratic Democrats to rebuke the arrogant plutocracy which had cunningly seized the reins of Democratic power and was subverting the great Democratic organization to the service of an oligarchy of privilege.

JOHNSON OF MINNESOTA.

Green Bay (Wis.) Advocate (Dem.), Nov. 17.—Governor-elect Johnson, of Minnesota, in an interview Saturday, among other things said: "The Democratic party cannot identify itself with those who enjoy the benefits of special privileges to the disadvantage of the people and hope to win. The Democracy cannot be the party of trusts and at the same time be the party of the people. It must be the party of the people to achieve success. Its issues must be the trusts, the tariff and the special privileges that foster the trusts. The success our party achieved in this State in electing its candidate for governor is due to the fact that we took up the people's cause while the Republican State managers flouted the people and stood with the corporations." These words from Governor Johnson are in accord with the messages which other Democratic leaders have been giving to the party since its crushing defeat last Tuesday. With one accord such men as Bryan, Folk and Johnson have declared that the defeat was due to the fact that the party

failed to stand by its principles and that defeat can be turned to victory by the party returning to its principles.

TARIFF REVISION.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Nov. 23.—The burning question. Manifestly it is revision of the tariff. The people will not be content with a "stand pat" policy. They demand justly that something be done in the direction of correcting the inequalities of the present tariff. It is iniquitous and an abomination. It has undue protection and favoritism for certain classes, at the expense of consumers, who are composed of all classes. . . . The Republican party must modify it or see its own majority and influence in the country materially modified at the next election. The people of this great free country have no intention of submitting indefinitely to the oppression of the money power, the manufacturing power, or any other power representing solely special interests and privileges.

MISCELLANY

HOW DID YOU DIE?

Did you tackle that trouble that came your way

With a resolute heart and cheerful?
Or hide your face from the light of day
With a craven soul and fearful?

O, a trouble's a ton, or a trouble's an ounce,

Or a trouble's what you make it.
And it isn't the fact that you're hurt that counts,

But only, how did you take it?

You're beaten to earth? Well, well, what's that?

Come up with a smiling face.
It's nothing against you to fall down flat,
But to lie there, that's disgrace.

The harder you're thrown, why the higher you bounce;

Be proud of your blackened eye!
It isn't the fact that you're licked that counts;

It's how did you fight?—and why?

And though you be done to death, what then?

If you battled the best you could;
If you played your part in the world of men,

Why, the Crittle will call it good.

Death comes with a crawl, or comes with a pounce,

And whether he's slow or spry,
It isn't the fact that you're dead that counts,

But only, how did you die?

EDMUND VANCE COOK.

THE GAME OF PHILANTHROPY.

This is a long game, usually taking a lifetime. As many players can enter as want to. The idea is to begin as young as possible, and beg, borrow or steal enough to get a start. Then get a lot of widows, orphans and suckers together and stack the cards. Also have the tariff raised. By and by when money enough has been raised, the player calls, "Philanthropy, Philanthropy," and then everybody knows that he has arrived at the goal.—Life.

A DRAFT OF A LETTER TO BE ADDRESSED TO THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE.

I pray your honorable body to grant my request to become a citizen of this Republic of the United States of America.

I have never done anything unworthy. I believe in a government for the People, by the People.

I gave more than life for the country when in time of peril I gave my son for one of its defenders.

As the dying slave implored his master to let him die free, so I pray you to allow me to become a citizen of this Republic, with the same power and privilege you would grant to a man born in Germany or Ireland.

REBECCA BUFFUM SPRING.

Born in Providence, R. I., in 1811. Now living and paying taxes in her own home, 504 Soto St., Los Angeles, Cal., on this Sun, 12th, 1904.

"IF THE LEGISLATURE BELIEVES."

For The Public.

In denying a Brooklyn child the right to attend school, the New York court of appeals is reported to have decided that "if the legislature believed" vaccination to be a preventive of smallpox, it could compel the child to be vaccinated before admitting him to school.

"If the legislature believed" is richly suggestive. Courts have been supposed to be for the purpose of protecting the citizen in his rights when the legislature's "belief" was erroneous, or worse.

This may have been a superfluous safeguard, for we all know the unparalleled erudition and unimpeachable integrity of the average legislature, so much so that to say a man "belongs to the legislature" stamps him at once in the mind as—well, you know the impression it conveys to your mind.

We ought, therefore, to be prepared to accept the legislature's dictum upon all matters of pathology, ethnology, physics, diet, finance and fashion. "If the legislature believed" that cutting off children's thumbs would prevent their going lame, then children with thumbs could not attend school.

It were folly to file any objections, for "if the legislature believes" in its own infallibility, why should any court dispute it? A Missouri legislature "believed" that all baking powders were deleterious except trust baking powder. When this belief was sufficiently strong in a legislator, it commanded \$1,000 in the open market. A Colorado legislature was elected to believe in an eight-

hour law. It changed its belief after election. No quotations given out. A Pennsylvania legislature "believed" that the cities of the State should be owned by the same gang which owned itself and delivered them over in midnight session, with the governor sitting up to sign the bill and the harpies waiting to file their claims of proprietorship before the ink was blotted. And so on, ad infinitum, ad nauseam, ad absurdum. Also add the price per legislator.

But the court says, or implies, that it makes no difference whether the Act be right or wrong, "if the legislature believes." The colonies rebelled against the Stamp Act, "not because of the weight of the tax, but the weight of the preamble." So, in this case, it isn't so much the importance of the individual case, as the weight of such a precedent.

Yet, even in this case, it must be remembered that no one knows what vaccination is, except that it is the injection of a disease into the blood. The germ of the disease is not known, nor is the germ of the disease it is intended to prevent! The practice is pure empiricism, and is so acknowledged; and after a century of trial, there is still the gravest doubt and the fiercest dispute of authorities as to whether it is beneficial or injurious.

To use the public school as a club to compel a parent to allow his child to have disease (even "benevolent" disease) pumped into his veins, is, to say the least, questionable. But when the citizen questions it, he is told by the court that it is all right "if the legislature believes."

Then what in the name of sense is the court for? If its administration of right or wrong, of enforcement or violation of rights, of legality or illegality, of equity or inequity, rests solely upon what the legislature believes, why not abolish the court?

EDMUND VANCE COOKE.

THE TRIUMPH OF DEMOCRACY.

At the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, Ohio, Nov. 20, 1904, the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow, discussed the text:

"He that is devoid of wisdom despiseth his neighbor; but a man of understanding holdeth his peace. Where no counsel is, the people fall; but in the multitude of counselors there is safety."

This is good doctrine for both church and state. The strength of a church, the safety of a state depend upon the extent to which the people enter into their management.

Who says that our experiment in democracy is not a success? If the end and aim of government is to develop men, then democracy is ordained of God.

The true American is he who is always delighted with the election returns. Every election will go precisely to suit him. Let the people discuss and determine. Their responsibility in government is their opportunity to grow. Their government is a mirror which they hold up before their own faces. In this republic they have what they want, and no American will complain of that. Their decisions may not please the prophets, but they represent the people and mark their progress.

We hear much these days about the wickedness of the politicians. They are not worse than other men. If they seem so it is because they have greater temptations.

In the city of Cleveland, the street car companies have been making a long fight for new franchises. To help them in this, one Ohio legislature abolished spring elections. If they could elect councilmen while popular interest was fixed on a presidential election, they had hope of success. What is the result? The council stands 16 to 16 and the deciding vote is with the chairman, an anti-railroad man. The people won a scratch victory, and they did it by scratching. Nearly half of the people of Cleveland scratched their ballots—a most remarkable and gratifying evidence of the increasing intelligence and independence of our American citizenship.

But tremble for those councilmen. A vote or two is all the companies need. And franchises worth millions are at stake. Is it not time we required a referendum vote on all such franchises and saved our councilmen from such fearful temptations?

If one of these councilmen succumbs, we brand him as a boodler. We seem to forget that if there is corruption at the City Hall, it is because there is something rotten in the Chamber of Commerce. Political corruption is but the barometer of commercial morals.

Instead of complaining of our self-aggrandizing politicians, we might with better grace repent of our neglect of public duty. By their politicians you may know them.

A gentleman was complaining bitterly of the condition of the public schools in Cincinnati. What he said about them was but the mild truth. But this same gentleman confessed to a friend that he had not gone to the polls in four years.

This clashing of opinions and rubbing of elbows which we call democracy—what a glorious thing it is! It teaches us respect for the opinions of our neighbors. It teaches us social

grace, that subordination to social aims which is the necessary condition of brotherhood. To become large enough and loving enough to live in a society of equals, and co-operate for good ends, and take defeat good-naturedly, and keep one's faith in the republic, and fight on—this is the making of an American citizen—the triumph of free government.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE SUBWAY ON NEW YORK RENTS.

William Barclay Parsons has been telling of the reforms that will be worked by the subway, and, though he is a practical, hustling personality, he is something of a rainbow-winged optimist. That, however, is no discredit, for optimism is one of the qualities which smooths the rough way for achievement.

The man who looks on the bright side of life and finds comfort and inspiration in the picture; who serenely views the future with hopeful spirit and sees behind its veil the fulfillment of dreams and the maturity of benefits still in their infancy—that man is happy, indeed, whether his life be devoted to abstruse, technical things or belongs to the humble middle million whose names are writ in sand.

Sometimes the optimist overshoots the mark. This is no fault, either. The higher the mark, the higher the accomplishment. However, one exception immediately occurs. The subway furnishes an example of a high mark hit while concentrating on a low target. Mr. Parsons is an expert in this sort of marksmanship, and if what he says seems highly hopeful, you must remember that he speaks not only as an optimist, but as a distinguished expert.

Mr. Parsons believes the subway will have a great moral effect, tending to wipe out the densely populated centers by "offering homes further removed from the city, but equally accessible and reasonable."

That, indeed, would be so, if Mr. Parsons alone had the shaping of the thing. But, alas, he hasn't.

The real estate man is the person who must be considered in working out this sort of sociological problem. If you can go from city hall to Harlem in 15 minutes for a nickel, you must pay the real estate man for that privilege.

The subway has already sent up prices out of proportion to its present and promised benefits. If a rent-paying New Yorker moves far away from the crowded section to an "equally accessible" one, he will undoubtedly find

the rent much higher, for here light and sunshine are salable things that command good prices.

It seems that the poor and those of moderate means are those who really suffer by the subway, which otherwise may be considered a blessing.

Does it seem just to tack five or ten dollars on a man's rent because he lives "within a short distance of the subway"?

Or are we all in such a hurry that ten minutes saved each day is worth ten dollars a month?

No, indeed! There are thousands and thousands of us who will be content to lose ten minutes and save ten dollars.

It would be interesting to know what Mr. Parsons thinks of this phase of the actual present. It is no dream, as a great army of tenants can bear witness. The tone of the city is not only uplifted, but rents are so much so that this item of living is causing grave concern.

That the subway tavern has had its first throbbing "rough house" may not be exactly relevant here, but the thought occurs, if a man can become fighting drunk in the "Bishop's tavern," or any other subterranean rum shop along the line, why should not some provision be made for housing him underground while he is helpless or irresponsible? A series of bachelor hotels would meet this emergency.

And, having hotels underground, why not moderate rent flats and the like? Probably we could live cheaper there, and not only be "a short distance from the subway," but actually in it.—N. Y. Evening Telegram, of November 2, 1904.

CHRISTIANS AND CHRISTIANITY.

Extracts from a sermon preached in the church of the Advent (Episcopal), Birmingham, Ala., Nov. 13, 1904, by Rev. Quincy Ewing, Text, 2 Cor. vii.

When we consider the tremendous effect upon the world of 19 centuries ago brought about in three brief years by the one sublime Christ-life—a life begun in a manger, schooled at a carpenter's bench, and ended on a cross—it is impossible not to conclude that the world of to-day is as bad as it is, because the millions who have called themselves followers of Jesus Christ have not been followers of His in any true sense; have not been followers of His in the sense that they have actually striven against what was hateful to Him, and actually striven for what He held dear.

Aye, the men and women of the ages gone have been willing to do anything for Jesus Christ—willing to shout for Him, and pray to Him, and wrangle

about creeds for Him, and burn heretics and witches, and murder infidels, for Him, and carve rich altars, and build great buildings in His honor; they have been willing to do anything to prove that they were saved by Him—anything, except to work with Him for the world's moral regeneration; anything, except to take Him seriously as a moral leader; anything, except to consecrate their lives, humbly, honestly, heroically, to the service of those Divine-human ideals of everlasting righteousness, without which there would never have been any Christ, or any need for one!

Can any student of history fail to know that the Christianity of this world for 19 centuries has been mostly make-believe? At one time, hundreds of ecclesiastics meeting in solemn assembly from many lands, from across seas and deserts, to shake their fists in one another's faces over some abstruse point of questionable metaphysics; at another time and place, hundreds of "those having authority" parading to the tune of "Onward Christian Soldiers," clad in queer sorts of head-gear and gorgeous robes, with multitudes looking on awe-struck, or else as at some curious show; thousands of lights blazing on thousands of altars; thousands of masses and prayers paid for and mumbled, the earth over, to get human souls out of purgatory; thousands of priests in their confession-boxes, forgiving sins; thousands of preachers in their pulpits, explaining the difference between faith that is saving and faith that isn't saving, or shouting down one mode of applying the water of baptism, and shouting up another; iniquity black and rampant everywhere!—and one man in a thousand, one woman in a thousand, if so many, in any generation, really striving to do the *work* that Jesus Christ wants done; the work that He, Himself, did do, frowned on by every make-believe religionist of His time!

No wonder the Ten Commandments, delivered first to a horde of semi-barbarians, are still mocked at and trampled down in the world's most civilized centers! No wonder men with clubs in their hands must be stationed at our street corners to enforce them; and stone and steel structures erected at great cost in all our towns and cities to shut up their violators—in spite of the police and the patrol wagons!

Jesus Christ claimed to be the world's Redeemer and the world's Savior. He hasn't saved it or redeemed it. And yet His claim was a good one as He made it. It was a claim He had the right to make; for, unless this tragic and iniquitous world is redeemable and

saveable by the truths and principles He taught and lived, it is not redeemable or saveable by any principles or truths man's brain can think or man's heart can feel. He never expected to save men or redeem them by fiat—by any mere thing He did, or could do, independently of what should be done by them. The world isn't saved and isn't redeemed by Christ, because it has declined to accept Him as Redeemer and Savior in the only way He can be accepted; because in their aims and ambitions and deeds the vast number of His disciples have refused to be His fellow-workers; because through all the generations of the so-called Christian centuries, the supreme energy of so-called Christian disciples has been devoted to ends and aims which have had no more bearing upon any moral ideal that can be associated with the life and teaching of Jesus Christ, than upon the topography of the moon!

And what is true of the past generations is true of our own. We are most of us just merely make-believe disciples of Jesus Christ. We are most of us just merely playing at Christianity,—ten, a hundred, a thousand times more interested in aims, ambitions, plans, things, destined to vanish and die, so far as we are concerned, when the dirt falls on our coffins, than we are in the service and the glorification and the triumph of those eternal principles of right, justice, truth, taught and lived by Jesus Christ,—destined to abide while God abides, and to fix our status in this universe while the universe lasts.

If we want something easy in religion, we can have it—but not fellowship with the Man of Nazareth. There is nothing easier than to play at Christianity; nothing easier than to be a make-believe Christian in this day and generation.

There is nothing harder than to take Jesus Christ seriously; nothing harder than to be His disciple in sincerity and truth and deed. The churches, to-day, are partially dead, and are getting rapidly deader, because make-believe Christianity is approaching the evening of its long day and playing out. The world is getting tired of it, and its representatives, themselves, must tire of it ere long. Fiction must at last give way to fact, sham be routed by reality, in religion, though sham and fiction go with ease, and fact and reality with hardness. The latent heroism of the human soul must awake—and sooner perhaps than some of us expect—and assert itself in demanding a real religion to meet life's real needs, and

solve its real problems. Let it not be supposed that any old-fashioned revival can put new life and warmth in our cold churches. They will be warmed and made more alive on one condition, and one only—that the Christ professed and preached about and prayed to, become the Christ worked with, for the defeat of what is iniquitous to-day and forever; for the triumph of what is righteous to-day and forever!

A CHINESE VIEW OF WOMANHOOD.

A speech made by his excellency, Mr. Wong Kai-Kah, vice commissioner general from China to the Louisiana Purchase exhibition, at the banquet of the National Paint, Oil and Varnish association, served in the Southern hotel, St. Louis, October 15, 1903, as a finale to the association's sixteenth annual convention, reprinted from the report of the proceedings of the convention.

Ladies and Gentlemen: In appearing before you this evening I cannot but feel some diffidence. It is an acknowledged fact that no foreigner has ever spoken before an American audience with any degree of self-confidence, because you are a nation of born orators. In our country we do not speak. We write. An orator's excellence is measured, not by the amount of water he drinks at a speech, but by the amount of paper he spoils. For the last 20 years I have concentrated my energies in manufacturing waste paper, and to be transported suddenly to this country, and to try to drink water, you will appreciate the difficult task I have encountered.

The other day Mr. Mellier and Mr. Green kindly asked me to attend the banquet. I accepted with gladness. Then they said I must say something. So I asked them: "What shall I say?" They said any subject would do. Now, you will see this is a large order; although it is nothing to them because they are accustomed to handle large orders, but it puzzled me sorely. However, I made up my mind to boycott business, that I would not touch on that subject, and with your permission I will not do it. There are two reasons; first, I am not a business man myself; I know nothing about business, and to display my ignorance before the talented assemblage of the best American business men would simply create more laughter on your part; secondly, you have had so many business meetings that you would like another subject, a sort of a change. However, I could not make up my mind as to my subject. But, in coming here to-night, after getting into the room, I found my subject. It came by inspiration. The subject I am going to take up will be:

"The Ladies of America." (Applause.) That you will agree with me is the sweetest subject mankind can think of. And in looking over this assemblage of the representative type of American womanhood, in looking at this bed of roses, smiling as they do, that beautiful, exquisite flower, the most beautiful and exquisite God has ever perfected for the enjoyment of mankind—inspiration will come to the dullest. I want to tell you what a foreigner thinks of the American women.

It is education that has made American women. The American women have made America—because good mothers bring up good children; good children grow into good citizens; and good citizens will, by their united efforts, contribute to the grand success of this glorious republic. But education has made men and women more than that. It is due to the American women that the world comes to appreciate the true beauty, the ideal beauty over which the old and modern artists raved in vain, and which the sculptors have given up in despair, after wasting tons of material. What is true beauty? It is not only in the beauty of eye, in the gracefulness of form, in personal adornments, but it is in intellectual beauty, the beauty that is the outcome of education. That is what American women have shown the world. Beauty without mind is inanimate; but American women, by their education, have reached that high standard of beauty, that high ideal; and, more than that, the American women have lifted themselves up to that sphere which men, in their conceit and arrogance, always claimed as their own. (Applause.) The American women, by their education, have entered into all walks of life, not only in business but in politics. And, if a foreigner's judgment is of any account, I think they make as good if not better politicians, than men. (Applause.) But education goes beyond that, even. It has enlarged their minds; it has inculcated altruistic ideas; they are not content with enjoying the liberty and freedom they have now, but they want the sisters of all the world to enjoy the same liberty and freedom. In their eyes the eastern women, especially the Chinese women, are like many a flower that is "born to blush unseen and waste its sweetness on the desert air." No doubt, to a certain extent, they are right. But permit me to say, as a representative of the Celestial kingdom, that, while our women do not, it is true, show their beauty in society or in public gatherings, nor do they permit their sweetness to pervade the

atmosphere of banqueting hall or ball-room, what little beauty and sweetness they have they lavish unstintingly on their husbands, their fathers, their brothers and their children. The home is the paradise of the Chinese women (applause), and children their stepladders to fame.

Now I want to tell you something about the education of Chinese women. As girls they are educated, that is, those who can afford it, the middle and upper classes. They teach them first to sew, and to read the Chinese characters, to write, to play on instruments of music, to educate their voices by singing and then to embroider; then they take the books our sages wrote about women, and the lives of famous women.

Our sage laid down three golden rules for the guidance of women; first, they must obey their fathers, before their marriage. Now, that rule is carried out faithfully. Very seldom, if ever—and I may say I never did hear—of an instance of a disobedient daughter. So that rule stands, and is workable. The second rule: When the girl is married she must obey her husband. (Applause.) Well, gentlemen, I am sorry you have wasted your energy. My wife not feeling well and not being present here, I can speak with more freedom. The second rule was never carried out. (Laughter.) We give a great deal of credit to our sage as a moralist, as a scholar, but when we read of the second rule, we thought he was a very poor student of human nature. And history does not tell us whether that rule was framed within the sacred precincts of his home, or his club; nor does history say that the rule was framed with the consent or even knowledge of Mrs. Sage. We fathers take very little trouble about that rule. We try to instill it into the minds of our daughters, but do not take the trouble to see the rule carried out. That is the business of the husband. Now, it is human nature that, before the sweet joys of a honeymoon are on the wane, the struggle for supremacy in the household is entered upon and settled; and we may safely say, contrary to the aphorism of Napoleon, the victory as a rule perches on the banner of the weaker sex.

As to the third rule, when the husband dies the widow must obey the first child. That is only figuratively speaking. It is not asked that a mother should obey the child, but it means that the mother should acknowledge the child as the master of the house.

Any of you who have traveled in China, and have been to the interior,

will have noticed stone arches here and there, countless. Some are finely polished, with beautiful carvings and inscriptions; some but rough, plain stone, with simple inscriptions. These are the arches dedicated by distinguished Chinese to their mothers. It is through their sons that Chinese mothers get fame, because the conditions of life exclude women from public life. It is very touching to read these inscriptions by the dutiful sons who consecrated them to their mothers. And these arches are always held in reverence. Even during our internecine wars the rebels and imperial soldiers always leave these arches intact. Very few arches are dedicated to fathers, because we believe men have all the chances of making themselves distinguished. Even when the arches crumble, the stories of the virtuous life of women will always be remembered by Chinese, because one generation tells another of the deeds and virtues of women of the preceding generations. All this is what made China last so long. So we owe to our women, too, as you to yours, the long continuance of our empire.

While I am speaking on that I ought to correct an erroneous impression of the world in general about Chinese binding their feet; that is, the world thinks Chinese mothers are devoid of natural instinct in making their little girls suffer the cruelties of having their feet bound. But that is not so. Our mothers have as much love for their children as any other race; but the foot-binding is a fashion. How that fashion started nobody, not even a Chinese scholar, was able to explain clearly. Some say it was due to an empress of a former dynasty. She was a very beautiful woman, but she had a club foot, and to hide the deformity she squeezed her other foot to the same size, and that started the fashion. It was ever after followed, up to the present. That empress lived about 1,500 years ago. The present dynasty is Manchu. The Manchu women have large feet; the Chinese have small—not only as a fashion, but as a sign of gentility, showing that she has to do no work. And the mothers, in their anxiety to see their daughters well matched and well married off, are obliged to resort to having the feet of the daughters squeezed to an unnatural size, because there is a larger demand for small-footed women, and that demand must be supplied. The mothers themselves have small feet, and they suffered as much when the process was being operated upon them. So it stands to reason that they knew the pain and suffer-

ing of having small feet. Still they feel obliged to practice the same cruelty upon their daughters, because they want them to be well married, into higher families.

On the incoming of the present dynasty, one of our best emperors, who reigned about 200 years ago, issued an edict abolishing the binding of feet. Do you know what that edict cost? A rebellion in China. All the women instigated their husbands to rebel. And the emperor saw his mistake. After that edict was out for three months he had to recall it.

But of late the fashion is changing. We have now another edict from the empress dowager, issued last year, exhorting the gentry to tell the people to stop the practice. That edict has a good influence. Also, the intercourse with foreigners has an influence that is being felt by all the people in the different parts. Of course it takes some time to get the people in the interior to come to the same opinion. But the Chinese, once they are on the move, never stop; and I think our women move as fast as our men; and it would not surprise me if in ten, fifteen or twenty years at the longest the fashion of foot-binding will be dropped entirely. Our women will at that time begin to import Paris gowns, and take to tight-lacing (applause), because their life would be dull without a fashion; and fashion is a tyrant, more tyrannical than the most despotic monarch. Fashion decides—from which there is no appeal.

As I said, education makes American women, and I think you will agree with me that no country can advance without having their women educated. China can be no exception to the rule. Last year I had the honor to serve as secretary under the prince sent by our emperor to congratulate King Edward VII. at the coronation; and in going through the different countries the prince was especially impressed with the advanced state of the English and American women. On his return home he submitted to the throne a memorial drawing up a plan of educating the Chinese women, and that plan was under serious consideration. Two or three schools have been started already, and the rest will follow. I do not think it will be very long before all Chinese women will be educated in a practical manner—not the little education they are receiving now; and the time is coming when all the women of the world will be educated. Then the American women will have their desire to have universal sisterhood and that time will arrive before universal brotherhood, be-

cause women are less selfish than men; they are more sympathetic; the feeling of self-interest appeals less strongly to them, and that day of universal sisterhood will come, and when it does come all the stones in the world will be requisitioned to build a monument to do honor to and to perpetuate the fame of American women. (Applause.)

Make things, do things, be things; and don't fuss and scramble.

A. T. P.

BOOKS

MASS AND CLASS.

Mr. W. J. Ghent, author of "Benevolent Feudalism," explains his reason for the title he gives his new book (Mass and Class; a Survey of Social Divisions. New York: The Macmillan Company), lest he may be suspected of having plagiarized from Mallock's *Classes and Masses*. The explanation is needless. Mr. Ghent's title is expressive and appropriate, and that is enough. His social philosophy, somewhat satirically put forth in his previous book, is here presented in the form of serious exposition; and one of its principal features is its judicial defense of the socialistic notion of class-consciousness—the theory that men act together as a mass in classes, according to economic class-interests. This theory, which is the antithesis of the theory that the general tendency of social progress is on the whole in accordance with moral ideals of universal application, is the corner stone of modern socialism.

By taking human history or experience in detail merely, and pushing aside all the details that indicate idealistic devotion, a plausible case may be made for self-interest as the mainspring of individual success and social advance. So, also, may this self-interest be made plausibly to appear at its best as class interest, if only the predatory classes of history be considered. But much more is needed than anything yet put forth in socialistic literature, including Mr. Ghent's very interesting and judicial *Mass and Class*, to demonstrate that the economic class-conscious theory of social development has a scientific basis.

That there is such a thing in human nature as class-conscious idealism—recognition of class ideals instinctively—no one disputes. In the face of nationality in peoples, denominationalism in religion, alma materism in education, and so on, the fact would be too great and obtrusive to be denied if anyone cared to deny it. But that there is such a thing as class-conscious self-interest—instinctive recognition of interdependent individual interests—is not so clear.

There are, indeed, things that resemble it. The most impressive instance is

to be found in the apparently conscious solidarity of the so-called propertied classes. Socialists call this "capitalistic class consciousness," and infer from it that the capitalist class may be fought with and overcome by awakening in the working class a similar class consciousness. But capitalistic class consciousness depends upon mental apprehensions of a kind that are entirely alien to the working class as such. John Randolph of Roanoke put the whole thing into a sentence when he said that nothing is more limid than a million dollars, except two millions. In other words, the so-called capitalistic class consciousness is nothing but a panic produced by individual fears of loss of individual accumulations. It is a social disease. Threaten the safety of vested interests, and you frighten every unintelligent investor, little as well as big. They become like a flock of sheep running after the bell wether. This is not because they are concerned for the interrelated interests of their class. It is because each is concerned for his own board,—and directly so and not through any sensitive class nerve. They are not one whit more capitalistically class conscious than are the non-capitalistic mob that flock after them in order to get or to keep backsheesh.

To call the panicky fears of capitalists class consciousness, and infer from it that the working class can be awakened to consciousness of their economic interests as a whole, regardless of more obvious and immediate interests as individuals, is to build on a quicksand. Such workmen as are governed by motives of self-interest naturally strive to get into the capitalist class, not to destroy it. Their individual selfishness always has and always will (so far as socialist literature brings to light anything to the contrary) blind them to the fact that an injury to one of their class is the concern of all of that class. They are incapable of merging individual selfishness into a class selfishness.

This is characteristic, not of workmen especially, but of the quality of selfishness. Selfishness is the most individualistic of all psychologic forces. Workingmen are not peculiar; it is only that they are men before they are workers. As men they are swayed by their personal, and not their class, interests, and in the long run by universal, rather than by class ideals, if by ideals at all. When class interests seem to sway them it is really class ideals, and not class interests.

Socialists themselves are living exemplifications of the error of their theory of class consciousness. They are devoted not to their own self-interest, nor to that of any class whose benefits they can hope to share, but to a social ideal which cannot be realized by anybody until long after they have gone into the oblivion which their materialistic philosophy also teaches.

Mr. Ghent thinks, along with the "scientific" cult of socialists, that morals are generated by economic class interest. Yet he demonstrates no more at best than that economic class interests check and temporarily modify moral ideals. But that is nothing. No one disputes the bad influences of selfishness upon ideals. Does not every man in his own individual life check and modify the development of his own moral character by giving way to economic temptations? Showing that classes and nations and races also give way to economic temptations falls very far short of demonstrating that moral force is generated by economic conditions.

There are indications in his book that Mr. Ghent does recognize, even if vaguely, that moral ideals are modified to human apprehension, rather than generated, by economic conditions. Referring in a note at page 24 to the American agitation for the Cuban war, which he attributes to "an awakened sense of justice and humanity," he adds this explanation: "It happened that there was no adverse economic motive prevalent at the time sufficiently strong to obstruct the exercise of this altruistic motive." There is a similar indication at page 108, in a comparison of the British agitation to abolish West Indian slavery with that for the amelioration of factory conditions in England. Shaftesbury is quoted as complaining that the non-conformist religionists, who had been the mainstay of the anti-slavery movement in the West Indies, were not troubled about white slavery at home, and Mr. Ghent observes: "It did not conflict with their economic interests." This is no more than saying that men incline to morality unless overcome by economic temptation. It is in direct conflict with the theory that morality itself originates in the self-interest of dominant classes.

Obscuration of moral principles, distortion of moral ideals, retardment of moral progress, are indeed explained by economic temptation, whether individual, class, national or racial; but moral principle cannot be so accounted for. No social philosophy that rests upon individual, class, national or racial self-interest can long survive its academic infancy. The real social conflict is not between classes, nor yet nations nor races. Like the analogous conflict in the individual, it is between two psychologic forces—selfishness on one side and perceptions of ideal justice on the other. Selfishness makes for evil and tends to social destruction; ideal justice makes for good and tends to social upbuilding. Not through selfish class consciousness, but through moral perception and devotion to moral principle, is real social progress to be achieved and made secure. Class interests and associations may in greater or less degree obscure moral perception

and put moral courage to the test; but the clearer the perception and the stronger the courage, the more are class lines disregarded and all class-conscious selfishness abhorred.

No one who has read Mr. Ghent's *Benevolent Feudalism* and liked it, will turn from *Mass and Class* with disappointment. The lighter touches of the former book are of course lacking, but there is no retrogression. The book is direct, simple, clear, strong, honest and judicial. Whatever may be said of its philosophy, its motives and method are above criticism. The American reader who would get a glimpse of socialism from a sympathetic but not unbalanced American pen, can hardly find at the present time a better volume for his purpose.

PERIODICALS.

The *Delineator*, published by The Butterick Publishing Co., New York, is a good example of the steady advance of fashion periodicals to a high level of literary and artistic merit. The only criticism we have to offer to its excellent December number is that its illustrations are worth better presswork.

Reviewing Edward Atkinson's book, *Facts and Figures, the Nation of November 10* says: "Incidentally Mr. Atkinson brings out a fact that is little known—that the proportion of persons employed in great factories is diminishing. . . . The tendency is encouraging, and we may share Mr. Atkinson's hope that the small craftsman, being of some intelligence and independence, may be induced to attend to the evidence which proves how they are hampered by the present tariff." J. H. D.

If all the people in America who send and receive telegrams could be induced to read Mr. Lusk's article on the Australian Telegraph System in the November number of the *North American Review*, it would seem that it might be an easy matter to convert a majority to the adoption of a similar system of

A Special Holiday Offer

During the month of December a year's subscription to *The Public* and the choice of Louis F. Post's *Ethics of Democracy* or a copy of *Risocialism*, by Oliver R. Townbridge, will be included FREE with the new Library Edition of the Works of Henry George, all express charges prepaid, at the regular price of \$17.50 on installments, \$2 with the order and \$2 monthly, or for \$15 cash when books are delivered. Sent to different addresses if desired.

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

SIX RACY AND SPICY

10 cts. each

"Spells and Things from the Straight Edge," done into dainty Booklets.

50c for the six

The Church of Divine Satisfaction; The Honorable Charles Rockingham Ducketts; The Ghost of Murdered Love; The Silly Old Dragon; The Highest of all Arts; The Philosophy of Toys.
STRAIGHT EDGE PRESS, 1 Abington St., New York.



"GRAFT."
Will the Modern Hercules Conquer?

government management over here, in connection with our postal service. The contrast is too glaring to escape action, if people only knew about it. The article, with its simple statement of facts, is overwhelmingly convincing. J. H. D.

Edward A. Ross, who lost his position as professor of sociology in Stanford University, and now occupies a similar position in the University of Nebraska, begins a series of articles in the New York Independent of November 10. The present article is entitled the Value Rank of the American people. "It is quite possible," says the author, "that in 1860, before the Great Killing and the Great Dilution, the human stuff here was some carats finer than it is to-day." He attributes much debasing of the electorate and an aggravation of the strife between labor and capital to the flood of immigration, which he calls the Great Dilution. "Free land," he says, "is gone, and the fact that nowadays the hegira of the ambitious is all to the man-sifted town instead of to the spacious prolific frontier may be fateful for the American element in our population." J. H. D.

Mr. William Morton Payne has a most interesting article in the October issue of the International Quarterly on the Letters of H. H. Taine, two volumes of which have appeared both in English and in French. Mr. Payne calls our attention, among other traits, to the independence of Taine as a young professor. The atmosphere of the official educational establishment and the suspicious watchfulness of his superiors finally forced him, as Mr. Payne says, "to let go his moorings and cast himself adrift." A sentence about Taine's attitude to-

wards the verdicts of universal suffrage is worth quoting. "He accepted," says Mr. Payne, "the verdict of universal suffrage as binding, however, blind and corrupt its exercise, providing it determined the form of government only, and did not seek to trench upon those personal rights which he strongly maintained to exist anterior to society." J. H. D.

NOTICE TO READERS.

If you have been reading The Public on trial, this notice may interest you. Your regular subscription for three or six months or a year, if sent in before January 1, 1905, will begin at once and continue until three or six months or a year, as the case may be, after January 1, 1905. Thus \$2 will give you the paper from receipt of your subscription until January 1, 1906; \$1 will give it to you from receipt of subscription until July 1, 1905; and 50 cents will give it to you from receipt of subscription until April 1, 1905. The same offer is open to all persons not already on the regular subscription list of The Public.

The Public

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

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

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

ATTORNEYS.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 404; Corland, Rooms 1011-1012,
NEW YORK.

CONTRACTORS.

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

PUBLICATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

FREE AMERICA.—By Bolton Hall. In paper; 220 pages, 25 cents.

All of above sent to any address in the United States, for \$21 on monthly installments of \$2. Deliveries in Canada and Mexico will be made without additional charge other than for customs duties, and to other foreign countries without additional charge other than for customs duties and expressage.

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

THE PUBLIC

WILL BE SENT ON TRIAL for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of four weeks for
10 CENTS.