The Public

Seventh Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1904. Number 342.

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.

Bryan's sturdy blows at imperialism, in his advocacy of Parker's election, appear at last to have had an effect upon Parker himself. His speech on the 15th upon welcoming a delegation of anti-imperialists to his home, would have been altogether inspiring but for his retention of the last of the Philippine-question "weasel words" which he had previously injected into his acceptance speech.

—

In his acceptance speech he undertook to modify his party's excellent platform declarations regarding Philippine independence. One of his modifying phrases limited the redemption of the proposed promise of independence to the Filipinos to some indefinite time or other when we of this country may conclude that they are "reasonably prepared" for it. His other modifications he has since explained away or dropped. But this one clings. So all the good things he said in his speech to his anti-imperialist visitors last week are sicklied o'er with the repetition of that fateful phrase.

—

It is to be regretted that Judge Parker did not adopt Bryan's anti-imperialist pace earlier in the campaign. He might in that case have avoided entangling himself in ambiguities which he now finds it difficult to repudiate; and the genuine democrats of the country might by this time have become prepared to accept the assurances of those close to him, and the indications of his anti-imperialist speech, that he is truly a man of democratic instincts.

Parker's old-man-of-the-sea is David B. Hill. Whether he is indebted to Hill or not for his political advancement, his relations with Hill have been close enough, and Hill's position of managership in his campaign has been such, that the average voter who knows and detests the kind of politics which Hill represents, naturally shrinks away from supporting Parker. Not content with discrediting his candidate in this general way, Hill has gone upon the stump to proclaim, as he did in West Virginia on the very day of Parker's anti-imperialist speech at Esopus, the old shibboleth of the slave oligarchy, that this is a "white man's government."

—

A "white man's government"? Yes. In the sense that the majority shall administer it, and the majority are white, it is a white man's government. But not in the sense in which Hill's phrase is used. It is not a government where white men may enslave black men. It is not a government where white citizens may disfranchise black citizens by class legislation reinforced with shotguns and tissue ballots. It is not a government where white criminals may with impunity burn black criminals at the stake. Yet all this barbarity is involved historically in the phrase "white man's government," and it is to that barbarous spirit that Hill appeals. Judge Parker's democracy would need to be better known to the genuine democrats of the country than it is, to carry him successfully through a campaign in which the man who is popularly believed to be closest to him, personally and politically, makes speeches of that undemocratic kind.

—

And now this same Hill is to be sent into Indiana, it is reported, to follow Bryan. The Republicans have thought of following Bryan there with Beveridge. They need not trouble themselves. If Hill cannot undo Bryan's work for Parker among the democratic-Democrats of Indiana, it is useless for the Republicans to try. Bryan has done the same marvelous campaigning in Indiana this year that he did in 1896 and 1900. He has made no pretenses of a personal or political liking for Parker. But he has shown that the Democratic platform is good as far as it goes, and that the political atmosphere which Parker would bring to Washington with reference to imperialism and militarism would be preferable to that which surrounds Roosevelt. On this line he has undoubtedly influenced many a reluctant democratic-Democrat. The effect that Hill might have upon such voters—Hill with his record for "peanut politics" and his "white man's government" speeches—may be imagined.

—

Almost dead as is the national campaign throughout the country, there is no deadness in the State campaign in Wisconsin. Lines are drawn in all directions, through churches and clubs, through business interests and political associations. This is the result of a real fight over a live issue. Gov. La Follette is attacking the monopoly interests of his State, and they know it. Accordingly every key they can touch, every wire they can pull, every influence they can exert is made to produce its effect. The State is fairly alive with political excitement. It is the same as in the national elections of four and eight years ago, when the monopolists rubbed their eyes to see in Bryan a foe to fear. La Follette represents in Wisconsin the same democratic sentiment in the Republican party which in the Democratic party has rallied under Johnson in Ohio and under Bryan

in the nation at large. And it is pleasing to see the democratic-Democrats of Wisconsin recognize democratic leadership though in the Republican party. There is a regular Democratic candidate against La Follette. But he can carry only the hide-bound party vote and divide the pluto-Democratic vote with the bolting Republican candidate. With clear vision and good sense, the democratic Democrats of Wisconsin are joining the democratic Republicans to reelect La Follette.

Thoughtful citizens, who believe that the judiciary should be free not only from taint but from distrust, were not a little concerned upon learning last week that Judge Grosscup, the Federal judge at Chicago, is a large owner of traction stock which depends for its value largely upon franchise privileges. However conscientious he may have been, Judge Grosscup's judicial conduct with reference to Chicago traction questions has seemed on the whole much more acceptable to traction interests than to the representatives of the public interests. A natural inclination in that direction might have been assumed, owing to class intimacies and a certain trend of legal training. But now it appears that Judge Grosscup has all along had financial as well as class interests running parallel with those of the Chicago traction company. He owns a large interest in the 50-year street-car franchise of Charleston, W. Va. Judge Grosscup thinks that this ownership does not disqualify him from sitting as a judge between the public interests of Chicago in her own streets and the claims of the Chicago traction companies. If he could be challenged, like local judges, he might learn that others do not share this opinion. He thinks himself qualified because the persons interested in the Chicago companies are not interested in his company. He is sure, moreover, that he has the stamina to pass fairly upon the rights of the Chicago companies, notwithstanding his interest in the same kind of privilege elsewhere. This confidence may very likely be well founded. There are men whose sense of justice is so keen and their devotion to it so faithful and impersonal that personal interests cannot sway them. Judge Grosscup may be such a man. We are not questioning it. Yet it would doubtless be more satisfactory to the people of Chicago, whose rights hang in the balance, if he had no large financial interests of a kind similar to those for which the Chicago traction companies contend before him.

The campaign in Illinois for a constitutional amendment allowing the legislature to enact a special charter for Chicago (p. 435), proceeds as if the demand for it were unanimous. This assumption has led the school board of Chicago into a gross abuse of power. Although it has refused the use of school buildings for discussions of taxation questions, on the ground that they are not educational questions, it has ordered the school teachers to join in a school campaign for the proposed charter amendment. But popular sentiment is not unanimous in favor of this amendment, and there are sufficient reasons for the opposition.

—

While the amendment would open the way for some excellent and much-needed reforms, the principal manifest motive for urging its adoption, is the sordid desire of a large body of acute but reputable tax-dodgers to shift their own legitimate burdens off upon the shoulders of posterity, which cannot yet speak for itself. Their influence is buttressed by the banking interests, which are ever alert for opportunities to increase the general stock of gilt-edge municipal securities, for such securities constitute part of their stock in trade. Those two interests easily draw to their support a miscellaneous aggregation of business men, politicians, professional men, club men, dainty reformers, etc., some of whom are quick to see which side their bread is buttered on, and nearly all of whom think of hell as a place where one is not on agreeable terms with the moneyed classes. The motives of these men are evident. But it is not improbable that there are other motives of which few of these men are cognizant.

—

Hints are abroad that this charter amendment might enable the traction interests to get a "tighter" grip upon the city's streets. Of the reasonableness of this fear we are unable to judge. We can, however, indicate the theory out of which it springs. Although no charter under the proposed amendment would be operative until adopted by local referendum, yet it is argued that amendments to the charter, after its adoption, could be made by the legislature without referendum. In support of this view the fact is cited that although the present charter law was adpted by referendum it has been frequently amended by simple act of the legislature. And so it is urged, and not without great force and plausibility of argument, that under the proposed charter amendment long term street car franchises might be granted without referendum, by way of amendment to the charter after its adoption by the referendum. If that theory is correct, a very acceptable charter might be presented to the voters of Chicago for its adoption, and when it had been adopted the first legislature with a pecuniary appetite might be invoked to give the traction grafters all they want. There seems to be enough plausibility to this point to admonish all municipal-ownership advocates to cast a negative vote on the proposed charter amendment at the election next month. It is quite true that the legislature might now do all that is thus feared. But the circumstances are different. The people of Chicago are on the alert with reference to the legislative power as it is; but if there were a readjustment, such as this charter would make, they might easily be caught off their guard. Since the proposed amendment does not affirmatively prevent legislation

in favor of privilege, as it does against reforms that strike at privilege, it had better be voted down.

There is all the more reason for this when certain speeches in support of the proposed amendment are considered. We allude to the speeches of which John S. Miller's, before the Bankers' Club on the 15th, was typical. Mr. Miller recognized, what is the fact, that this amendment is proposed in order to avoid the necessity for calling a constitutional convention; and his objection to a constitutional convention was that it would open the way "for the cranks, and lunatics and agitators." These handy terms are bankerese for all active objectors to high-grade graft. In view of speeches of the Miller type, it will be safest for citizens who have no axe of their own to grind, no special interest to serve, but who believe with some fervor in equitable public policies and are therefore "cranks" and "lunatics" in the estimation of the grafting interests miscalled "conservative," to vote against the charter amendment. Instead of constitutional patchwork, contrived in the interest of arrogant classes, let us have a constitutional convention, through which the people can be heard on the whole question of constitutional readjustment.

There is reason in the idea that the preferences of the legal profession in a community are a good guide in the selection of judges. But there is none in the notion that this preference is expressed by the vote of a lawyers' club. Yet a lawyers' club in Cook, the Chicago county of Illinois, with a membership of only 900, habitually assumes to speak for a bar of 5,000 members, on the question of judicial preferences. It has done this with reference to the choice of judges at the approaching election. The highest vote it casts for any candidate is 520—about 10 per cent. of the total membership of the county bar. This vote is entitled to its full value, as indicating the preference of a respectable club of respectable lawyers, including all of the more dangerous corporation-owned practitioners; but its exploitation as an indication of the preferences of the bar of the county is not quite ethical.

Some implications are made by the Record and Guide, the real estate review of New York, that the local tax department there is remiss in not assessing all property, unimproved as well as improved, at full value, as the law requires. If deserved, this is a good criticism. There is no fair reason for assessing unimproved lots lower in proportion to market value than those that are improved. It is often urged that the owners of unimproved lots get no income from them, and therefore should be treated more gently than improvers. But if these owners get no income from their vacant lots it is their own fault. The fact that a vacant lot has market value proves that it is in demand for improvement. If, then, it is not improved, the reason must be that the owner is holding out for higher prices. In other words, he is preventing the lots' yielding an income now, in order that he may some time in the future possibly reap a larger reward. This disposition should not be encouraged by tax discriminations. If either kind of owner is to be encouraged by tax officials, it should be the improver and not the forestaller. But after all this has been said, the embarrassments of the New York tax officials must be considered. For many years it has been the custom there to assess improved property at 50 to 60 or 70 per cent. of market value, and unimproved at from only 15 to 30. This custom is being reformed. Efforts apparently in good faith are being made to bring all assessments up to the level prescribed by the law—full market value. But it is evident that this cannot be done as quickly with property heretofore assessed exceedingly low as with that which has by custom been assessed relatively higher, without making trouble for the assessors; and their admirable report (p. 402) indicates a disposition to advance to the legal requirement as diligently as possible. No harm will be done by stimulating this disposition on the part of the taxing officials; but they have fairly earned exemption from severe criticism. It is gratifying to observe in the criticisms of the Record and Guide a judicious balance in this respect.

While the utmost sympathy is due to men who are denied employment for having passed the age limit, or, indeed, for any other cause, how is it possible to sympathize with the criticisms on employers for refusing to hire these men. This is a false scent. Employers don't refuse to hire men for the joy of making them miserable. They do it because other men can serve them better. The true reason for sympathizing with the unemployed is not that this employer and that, or all employers together, refuse to hire workers; but that the unemployed workers have no where else to go to earn a living. And why have they no where else to go? Is it in the nature of things that men should be workless when the demand for workers is as limitless as human wants. We have all gone far astray in assuming that so-called employers are the real employers of labor. They are only middlemen—workers themselves in some degree, and in some degree monopolists, it may be. The real employers of labor are the consumers of labor products. And in the nature of things who are these? They can be no other, in the nature of things, than some kind of plunderers who give no work for the work done for them, or else workers themselves. If consumers, the real employers of labor, are workers themselves to the same degree that they are consumers, then it is impossible to conceive how there should exist at one and the same time an unsatisfied demand for products and an over-supply of productive labor. In that case we must "give up" the riddle. But if the consumers are in any degree plun-

derers, then the riddle is comparatively easy. We have only to find out how the plundering is done and put a stop to it. With plundering stopped, workers would both make and meet demand for workers. Demand for workers might then exceed the supply, but the supply of workers could not exceed the demand for them while any Oliver Twist asking for "more" remained above ground.

THE MARRIAGE PROBLEM—SUCCESSIVE MARRIAGES.

Out of the conclusion that polygamous groupings and "free love" alliances lack the essentials of marriage by reason of their promiscuity (p. 437), questions naturally arise with reference to successive monogamous unions. If, for example, legitimate marriage cannot exist between one man and two or more women at the same time, how can it exist between one man and two or more women successively? Questions of this kind put upon trial the legitimacy of second marriages after death or divorce.

The issue here is in reality not the same as in questions of polygamy, polyandry, and "free love," even though it may at first seem to be so in principle. Polygamous and polyandric marriages are condemned (p. 438) because they are absolutely irreconcilable with the principle of marriage unity; but successive marriages are not necessarily irreconcilable with that principle. "Free love" is condemned (p. 439) because it ignores the essential principle of the love that makes marriage: but successive marriages may, each in its order, be cemented by essential marriage love. There is nothing of promiscuity in successive marriage relationships, if each be constituted by love abiding in its nature, and each ends before the next begins.

Obviously the crucial point regarding the legitimacy of a second marriage is whether or not the prior one still lives. If it does, then the second is subject to the objection of promiscuity. But if all prior marriages in a series of successive marriages are dead, the last one in the series must, so far as the question of plurality affects it, be as legitimate as the first.

And the life of a marriage cannot be perpetuated by making the marriage bond indissoluble. Since marriage itself and not marriage ceremonials constitutes the relationship, it is the vitality of the marriage itself and not the potency of the ceremonial bond that determines the life of a marital union.

This does not imply that marriage ceremonials are unimportant. What it implies is that their importance is to be kept within proper bounds. To give excessive importance to marriage ceremonials is to degrade marriage, not to conserve it. They must not be allowed to prevent a new marriage when the older one is dead.

I

The first consideration regarding successive marriages is the effect upon temporal marriage of bodily death. Does a marriage naturally die with the death of one of the parties to it?

On this question there is almost universal agreement.

In the sensuous view, according to which human life ends with the death of the physical body, the love that makes marriage must necessarily be regarded as ending with death. Reciprocal unifying love cannot possibly survive the existence of either of the two persons it unites. To the materialist, therefore, every marriage naturally dies with the bodily death of either party to it; from which it follows that successive marriages, separated by bodily death, are free from promiscuity.

In the spiritual view, the marriage love that constitutes a temporal marriage is abiding in its nature only for the period of bodily life. Though it may possibly be eternal in its character, not even the parties to it can know that it is so (p. 422); and at any rate, the material and the distinctly spiritual spheres of existence are so insulated from each other that personal relationships can be rationally created in the former only with reference to its own limitations. Accordingly, a temporal marriage is (as to temporal concerns) only for the life of the parties. So far, then, as it relates to what is temporal, it dissolves with the death of either party. Whether or not the same union revives in a further or continuing life, on some other level of human existence, has to do with that life and not with temporal life, with that level of existence and not with this. In the spiritual view, therefore, as well as in the sensuous, temporal marriage ends with bodily death. Successive marriages separated by death are consequently free from promiscuity.

On this point there is no confusion with reference to marriage ceremonials. The ceremonial contract being for life only, even idolatrous minds, which tend to regard as marriage itself the mere ceremonial proclaiming marriage, must acknowledge that marriage ends with life and that successive marriages are free from promiscuity if separated by death.

In every view of the question—the material, the spiritual and the ceremonial,—temporal marriage comes to an end when death intervenes; and subsequent marriages, being thus free from promiscuity, are, so far as objections to plurality have any bearing, entitled to be considered as legitimate.

II

There is no such unanimity over questions of successive marriages separated otherwise than by death. While all agree that the death of a party to a temporal marriage dissolves both the marriage itself and its ceremonial bonds, thereby justifying a succeeding marriage by the survivor, it is not so with reference to divorce. A strong if not the dominant opinion, opposes marriage by either party to a prior marriage during the lifetime of the other party, when divorce only, and not death, has intervened.

Yet the determining principle is really in each case the same.

The legitimacy of successive marriages when death intervenes, depends, in the last analysis, not upon the fact of the death of one of the parties to the prior marriage, but upon the death of that marriage itself. If, for instance, the marriage survived the death of a wife, the second marriage of the widower would be plural—as truly so as is polygamy, and as illegitimate. It is because the unifying love of temporal marriage may dissolve with bod-

ily death, that successive marriages are legitimate when death intervenes. This is the reason, at any rate, that appeals to all but mere ceremonialists. But it will hardly be denied that there are cases in which marriage love dissolves without the intervention of bodily death. In such cases why may not successive marriages be as legitimate as when death intervenes? The crucial fact with reference to successive marriages acknowledged to be legitimate, must not be forgotten. It is not the bodily death of one of the parties to the prior marriage; it is the death of the prior marriage itself.

To conclude, as we have already done (p. 405), that sexual unions unsanctified by the love that unifies character-building tendencies are not marriage, neither eternal nor temporal, is to concede that any temporal marriage from which that love departs, as we have concluded it may (p. 406), is desanctified. It thereby and thereupon ceases to be a marriage.

Questions of divorce law, therefore, have nothing to do with marriage itself. They cannot affect it one way or another. Divorce laws are as alien as a writ of replevin, to marriage itself. If the marriage continues, then it continues—divorce law or no divorce law. If it does not continue, then it does not; and there an end. So long as the unifying love that makes a marriage lives, divorce laws can no more dissolve that marriage than they can separate the children of the marriage into their original paternal and maternal elements. Whatever natural law holds together, man-made laws cannot put asunder. But, conversely, whatever natural law puts asunder, man-made laws cannot hold together. When the unifying love of a temporal marriage, though originally abiding in its nature, proves with the lapse of time to be ephemeral in fact and dies, or when a sexual relationship has begun and continued in the name of marriage and pursuant to marriage ceremonials but without the unifying love whereby marriage is essentially distinguished from concubinage, legal divorce is superfluous, so far as it concerns or can affect the question of marriage itself as distinguished from marriage ceremonials and their civil obligations. In such cases the ceremonial of divorce, like the ceremonial of marriage, is at most but a formal, though it may be a necessary, declaration of an existing fact.

The practical question regarding divorce laws is not whether they may attempt the impossible by assuming to dissolve living marriages, or the superfluous by assuming to terminate dead ones. It is whether they may with propriety annul the civil obligations of marriage ceremonials, thereby enabling parties to such ceremonials to enter into other marriage relationships without incurring the penalties of the civil law.

No question of ecclesiastical obligation is involved, unless it be contended that churches shall be allowed to rule the state in matters of marriage.

In so far as successive marriages are questions of church obligation, churches may assume toward them whatever attitude they please. They may refuse to ceremonialize marriages of persons divorced. They may expel them if they marry without their sanction. They may deny to the bodies of such persons funeral ceremonials, and burial within church enclosures. They may forbid marriage to part of their membership, as some communions do, or to all, as the Shakers have done. They may regulate the marriage relations of their members as they choose, within the limits allowed by legitimate civil regulation. For in all this there is no coercion. Those who respect church authority or fear church penalties, will conform to church requirements; those who do not will be free to follow the dictates of their own conscience. So long as the state is not called in to enforce the discipline of churches, no outsider has the right to condemn the attitude toward marriage of any church. Since none are coerced but those in voluntary membership, there is no invasion of rights.

Yet a suggestion may not be impertinent.

Even as matter of church obligation it will probably be conceded that the sole question with reference to a second marriage is whether the former marriage is dead. It is inconceivable that any religious system which approves of marriage would forbid a second marriage under circumstances in which the former marriage clearly did not subsist. This may be inferred from the fact that no church objects to successive marriages when death intervenes. True, in those cases death is supposed to terminate the marriage. But, after all, it is the termination of the marriage that really decides the matter. The death of the marriage is inferred from the death of either party. If the same thing were inferred from the fact of divorce, there would be no more objection on the part of churches to successive marriages when divorce intervenes than there is when death intervenes. All ecclesiastical objections to the marriage of divorced persons will be found upon analysis, we think, to spring from a belief that the original temporal marriage, which would not survive the death of one of the parties, does survive their divorce.

This belief, if it related to marriage itself, would admit of rational discussion. For if the unifying love which made the prior marriage did survive the divorce, a subsequent marriage would of course offend against the principle of monogamy. But if the belief in question relates only to the effect of marriage ceremonials, assuming them to be sacrosanct and their bonds indissoluble regardless of the death of the marriage they symbolize, is not this an irrational belief—irrational to the extent of idolatry?

Irrational as this possible idolatry may be, however, we must never forget that every man has a right to be even irrational and idolatrous, provided he does not impose his irrational notions and his idolatrous penalties upon others, against their will, by calling in the aid of the civil power. This right with its proviso applies as well to churches as to individuals. To paraphrase a famous saying of Daniel O'Connell's, "All the religious authority you please, within the churches; but no civil coercion at their dictation."

It is not with religious exactions unenforced by the civil law that public discussion of successive marriages with intervening

divorce has to do. The discussion raises a social and civil, not a religious question; and it is with reference to the social and civil phase of the subject that our inquiry is made. In harmony with the general theory already outlined, we shall encounter in that inquiry problems that may be summarized in these five questions:

(1) May society properly exact binding contracts of marriage, and assume for social and civil purposes that if there be no contract of marriage there is no marriage?

(2) If so, has society the right to regulate marriage contracts so far as to inhibit the making of a second marriage contract while a previous one subsists between either party and a third person?

(3) If society has this right, has it also the complementary right to annul marriage contracts?

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

(5) Is either party to an annulled marriage contract properly at liberty, while the other lives, and not only as matter of naked legal right but also with reference to the just censures of public opinion, to enter into a marriage contract with a third person?

The first two of these questions relate to the ceremonial of marriage in its civil and social, as distinguished from its ecclesiastical aspects; the other three have to do with questions of divorce. We shall discuss them in their order.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

NEW YORK.

New York, Oct. 18.—The political horoscope indicates but little change in the situation in this State. There is no excitement or enthusiasm anywhere. Even the Socialists and the People's Party seem to be in about the same condition as the two old parties, while the Wall street gamblers give evidence that they care not a whit how the election goes. Within a month of the election the sales of stocks are much heavier than they were for the corresponding period of last year, with a marked advance in values. A young Chicago Board of Trade operator who has been in New York for the past three or four years told me last week that his business for the past month or two had increased several times in volume from what it had been at any corresponding period of time since he had been operating here. This would indicate that the country is exceptionally prosperous and that the Republicans would easily win.

But the stock and grain markets are not a true barometer of the general prosperity of the country, nor even of that portion of it in proximity to the stock market center. An advertisement was inserted in the New York World of Sunday, October 9, for a stenographer and typist. Before noon on Tuesday, October 11, the firm inserting the advertisement had received eight hundred and fifty (850) answers from applicants for this position. The World is running a letter from this firm in large black type as an advertisement of its columns as an advertising medium. The following extract from the letter would indicate that conditions are worse than usual.

> We scarcely anticipated such wonderful amount of replies. We have advertised many times ere this, but have never been so deluged with applications, there being those from almost every point within a distance of fifty miles.

The senior member of the firm thought the number of applicants from one short advertisement so remarkable that the World deserved a testimonal, which he has sent unsolicited, according to the published statement of that journal. It does not seem to have occurred either to the World or to the firm that the condition of the unemployed had anything to do with the wonderful success of the advertisement.

In a three-column double-leaded editorial, "Not a Government by the People," the Times of yesterday seems to have given up hope of Parker's election. The wail of the editorial is that the trusts are not dividing their contributions. If Mr. Bryan were to use some of the language in the Commoner used in this editorial, conservative society would be shocked. Here are a few extracts:

> They [Republicans] have grown used to seeing the Presidency bought with the funds of corporations, to seeing the powers of the Government farmed out to the providers of campaign funds. That is why the public is indifferent, the voters unconcerned. . . . Where do these conditions lead? How long will they be continued? Where they lead, history tells us. . . . The common people of France overthrew their government, and cut off the head of their King when they could no longer bear the merciless exactions of the nobility and the clergy, at that time the privileged class of France. Our trusts and combinations lack patents of nobility, but in what other respects do they differ from the French nobles who lived in luxury and splendor upon tax monies squeezed out of the pockets of a starving peasantry? . . . So we are already come upon the time when special privilege creates that inequality of condition which, in the history of other countries, has been cured by revolution. It will be cured by revolution here, a peaceful revolution, through the use of the ballot, but nevertheless it may be a costly one. There is no possible concealment of the magnitude or the source of the great fortunes that have been accumulated in the country through government favor and privilege. The people know about them, the people are much given to discussing them. In the orderly course of natural law and evolution, the instruments by which great social and political changes are brought about begin their work automatically and in the ripeness of time. The people of the country are coming to understand what special privilege means. . . . Mr. Roosevelt may be elected President. . . . If there be no change in the Republican administration and legislative plan, . . . then the year 1908 may prove to be one of grave political importance, it may mark an epoch in the economic development of the country. If we would picture to ourselves what it is that impends, what may be the origin and nature of the coming change, and with what forces the regime of special privilege is to be brought to an end, we need go no farther back than to the campaigns of 1896 and of 1900.

Is this not a warning to the trusts that if they elect Roosevelt the radicals will take the Democratic saddle and in all probability elect their candidate in 1908? —and on a more radical platform than in 1896 or 1900?

Congressman Robert Baker has begun a cart-tail campaign in the Sixth Congressional district. If he has the physical strength to make the same kind of campaign he did two years ago he will not be long in arousing enthusiasm throughout his district. Several incidents have occurred since Baker's nomination to indicate that deliberate, although quiet, measures are taken to prevent him from getting the fullest opportunity to speak at the meetings controlled by the Brooklyn boss, P. H. McCarren.

Baker was nominated in spite of McCarren's domination in Brooklyn, because two of the largest districts are not controlled by the Brooklyn boss. Although it is pretty generally conceded here that McCarren has exceptionally close relations with the Standard Oil Co., he is also chairman of the Democratic State executive committee. Two of the three largest halls in Brooklyn are situated in Baker's district. A large meeting has already been held in each. At the first meeting Baker was completely ignored. At the other his name was not announced as one of the speakers until after he made a vigorous protest, and then not until the night preceding the meeting, although it had been advertised several days before, and the name of the candidate for State senator, a minor office as compared with Congressman, given a prominent place on the bills, although he makes no pretensions as a public speaker. He preceded Baker, reading his speech closely from manuscript, and not finishing until after 11 o'clock. Even at this late hour the chairman made no attempt to hold the audience for Baker, but deliberately

played his cards to drive the audience away without giving Baker a chance to address them. But although it was nearly midnight when Baker began speaking, he held the audience for forty minutes, scoring the Republicans for their subserviency to the trusts, and in denunciation of Rockefeller and Standard Oil methods of finance, although McCarren was on the platform with a number of his cronies. The audience greeted Baker's excoriation of Wall street methods of fleecing the public, with rapturous applause, while McCarren and his friends winced and covertly sneered. A few nights subsequent to this, at a district meeting where Baker was billed as the chief speaker, an ex-Congressman was introduced first and held the platform for an hour. Baker was billed to speak at two other meetings that same evening and requested the chairman to notify the speaker that he had these other engagements. It has always been the custom in Brooklyn for speakers to give way temporarily to candidates who have other appointments to fill. After repeating the request Baker left without addressing the meeting. However, he took pains to let both his friends and enemies know that the leaders had deliberately planned to squelch him.

Although not in favor with the Anti-Bryan Democrats who have control of the Brooklyn machine, Baker is popular with the rank and file Democrats who do the voting. They give evidence that they admire his fighting qualities wherever he addresses them. Even at a conservative business men's noonday meeting in New York, at 597 Broadway, one day last week, at which I was present, Baker was the only speaker that evoked enthusiasm, although his talk was along the most radical lines. He received quite an ovation from the audience at the conclusion, the reporters joining in the applause.

A few evenings ago I was passing through Baker's district on a trolley car. Just before I got off a couple of gentlemen, who by their dress and demeanor gave evidence of being successful business or professional men, took seats near me. One of them expressed himself very strongly in favor of Baker's course in Congress and said that he believed the people would return him, the other gentleman quietly assenting. Some of his friends are predicting that he will lead the ticket, notwithstanding the secret knifing that he will receive at the hands of McCarren's friends. Baker, himself, feels sanguine of victory if he had friends to make an aggressive and thorough campaign. To do this effectively he must not only conduct the cart-tail campaign, but the forty thousand voters in his district should receive his record both in and out of Congress. This alone will cost a thousand dollars. The circulation of his article in the September Arena, entitled "The Reign of Graft and Its Remedy," would be an effective campaign document.

Both the national committee and the Congressional committee have refused him aid. He will receive no aid from the local committee. Unless his radical friends throughout the country lend a helping hand he has a difficult task ahead of him. His reelection would be a victory for radical democracy everywhere.

D. S. LUTHER

BUFFALO.

Buffalo, N. Y., Oct. 18.—In my last letter (p. 278) I told of the "public opinion" ordinance which had been adopted by the Common Council of this city, referring to the fact that a resolution had been introduced in the Board of Aldermen providing that a question be submitted to the voters to advise whether school houses shall be opened for public meetings under proper regulations, and saying that the resolution had been referred to the school committee, and that the Common Council had adjourned over the month of August. Since then some progress has been made.

The Board of Aldermen met on the 5th of September. Mr. Stockton, of the Referendum League, was unable to persuade the committee on schools to meet and take action on the resolution prior to the meeting of the Board. He did, however, persuade the Board of Aldermen to discharge the committee and adopt the resolution. Approved by the Board of Councilmen on the 7th and signed by the Mayor on the 8th the ordinance came in force just within the required time for placing it on the ballot.

The next problem was to get the question upon the ballot. The City Clerk on the 3d of October, under the direction of the Corporation Counsel, sent a certified copy of the referendum ordinance and the resolution to the Commissioner of Elections, who is a county officer, with a request that he place the question on the ballot and inform him (the city clerk) whether or not he would do so. The Corporation Counsel and Mr. Stockton were preparing to make application to the Supreme Court for a peremptory writ of mandamus to compel the Commissioner of Elections to place the question on the ballot in case his answer was unfavorable. This proved unnecessary, however, for a reply was received from that officer saying the question would go upon the ballot.

The problem now is to get the people to vote on the proposition. This question was adopted for the purpose of starting the referendum movement without the corporate opposition which would be met if a question more vital were submitted. The disadvantage lies in the fact that, owing to the character of the question and the shortness of the time before election, the vote may be light. This would give the opposition newspapers a string to harp on about the referendum always being a failure. The Referendum League is doing all in its power to arouse interest in the question. The two morning papers are favorable and give us a good deal of space, and several high school teachers are trying to get their pupils to work at the polls. The Superintendent of Education is in favor of the adoption of the plan.

The League is also questioning candidates for the State legislature as to their stand on the referendum generally, and has prepared literature to send out in opposition to State Senator George A. Davis, who "held up" the referendum bills in the Cities Committee of the Senate last winter and who is now seeking reelection. The normal Republican majority in his district is 2,200, which the League hopes to reduce.

ALBERT H. JACKSON.

AUSTRALASIA (p. 407).

Corowa, N. S. W., Sept. 15.—An important question in connection with land tenures is coming up for settlement in New Zealand. About 1,735,000 acres are held by nearly 9,000 tenants on lease; 1,565,000 acres being at a rent of four per cent. of the capital value, without revaluation, for 999 years, and the balance subject to periodical revaluation. There is a movement to allow these tenants to purchase the freehold. This is strongly opposed by a party which also desires to prevent any more crown land being sold. Mr. Seddon, the permier, who is an opportunist, has parried the matter so far, and has now shelved it by appointing a royal commission to inquire into the whole question of land tenure.

In New South Wales we have a perpetual leasing system, also, the land being let at a rent of one and one-fourth per cent. of the capital value for the first five years, and afterwards at two and one-half per cent., subject to revaluations. There is a similar proposal here, that the tenants should be allowed to buy the freehold, but the number of leaseholders is not yet large. The chief argument used in favor of the proposal is that tenants cannot borrow money on the security of their land. To read the Conservative papers, anyone would think a farmer could not be happy unles his land were mortgaged.

In this state the Reform party has organized a ministry, with Joseph Caruthers as premier and James Ashton, a true democrat, as minister of lands.

The Labor party has made a further gain in Queensland. There were three parties in the State parliament until the Labor party and another formed a coalition ministry. But the House was then almost equally divided, so that neither side could command a majority. An election was held in August, when the parties were returned as follows:

Ministerialist (coalition)	19
Labor (coalition)	34
Opposition	14
Independent	2

In the previous parliament the Labor

party consisted of 24 members. This party is strongly in favor of State socialism.

In West Australia the State premier (Labor) has promised to introduce a bill for taxation of land values.

The South Australian State treasurer proposes to increase the land value tax from one halfpenny to three farthings in the pound. [From about one cent to one and one half cents of tax, to each five dollars of value; or, from about two to three mills tax per dollar of value—an increase from two-tenths of one per cent. to three-tenths of one per cent. —Ed.]

The accounts in The Public of Chief Justice Marshall, (Vol. iii, p. 677) and the way the American Constitution was "Hamiltonized" have led me to watch the proceedings of our Federal High Court. So far the decisions have been few and comparatively unimportant, though some may become valuable as precedents. They seen to be all in the right direction, upholding the rights of the States. Too much power was given the Federal government by the constitution act, so it is very undersirable that more should be added judicially. Fortunately the Chief Justice, Sir Samuel Griffith, besides being a very able lawyer, is a democrat.

The High Court may have to decide a very important point regarding arbitration legislation. Any ordinary person reading the constitution act would think a federal arbitration act could only become operative if an industrial dispute extended beyond the limits of a State. But there seems to be some doubt of this, and the Labor party has assumed that the federal act will over-ride all State acts. If the federal arbitration bill ever becomes law, the High Court will eventually have to decide as to its scope.

The bill was taken up by the Reid ministry where the Watson government had left it. The Labor party took no further interest in it, saying that with preference to unionists cut-out, it was useless. It has been passed by the House, and sent to the Senate, where there may be more trouble over it, as the Labor party is strong there. Mr. Watson, the leader of the opposition and Labor party, has given notice that he will move a no-confidence motion against the Reid ministry.

ERNEST BRAY.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Oct. 20.

Although there has been no general dissipation of the apathy which envelopes the Presidential campaign (p. 439), public meetings in some places and under some circumstances have been attended by large crowds and have apparently awakened some interest.

—

This is notably true of Bryan's campaigning in Indiana. As reported on the 18th by Raymond, the Chicago Tribune's correspondent, whose statements are usually trustworthy,—

Bryan is saving thousands of votes in Indiana, but he is not making any. He has been in the State since the middle of the week and has had extraordinary receptions everywhere. His crowds have been the only ones of any magnitude during this campaign. He is doing the work for which he was brought to Indiana, and doing it well. That is to say, Bryan has stopped the landslide against Parker among the old silver Democrats. He will, in all probability, hold the Democratic vote about to the normal figures, and has put an end to the intended slump to Watson.

—

Bryan's appeal to his followers is briefly indicated by the same correspondent, who says:

He has argued with the people with his usual cleverness that while he is still a silver man, while he disagrees radically with Parker's gold telegram, and while he does not like the influences which surround Parker in New York, still Parker stands for some things in the Democratic platform which Bryan stands for. Bryan is making the issue that he loves Parker not more, but Roosevelt less, and this issue is taking with the old Bryan free silver Democrats. He is keeping them in the party.

Referring to Roosevelt, Bryan is reported in a press dispatch of the 13th from Fort Wayne as declaring in his speceh there that he is—

not willing to risk new questions if we have a warlike spirit in the White House. A man who loves war and has military enthusiasm, when brought to decide between peaceful and warlike means, may choose the more violent and involve us in a great war.

—

The burden of Bryan's speeches is opposition to militarism and imperialism. On the latter issue he was criticized by Senator Beveridge for his speeches against the Republican Philippine policy. Mr. Beveridge called him inconsistent because the Philippine islands were acquired through a treaty which Bryan himself had favored. It was the same accusation that has been frequently made against Bryan, of using his influence to secure the ratification of the peace treaty by the Senate. He noticed it on the 17th at several places in Indiana by saying:

If Senator Beveridge had been honest he would have told you that when I advocated the ratification of the treaty I also insisted that we should immediately promise independence to the Filipinos, and I insisted that the Bacon resolution should be passed. It was defeated by the vote of the Vice President. That resolution promised independence to the Philippines on the same terms that it was promised to the people of Cuba.

Judge Parker made an important anti-imperialist speech at Esopus on the 15th. It was in the form of an address of welcome to an anti-imperialist committee headed by Col. Codman. While reiterating in this speceh the statement of his letter of acceptance, that the Filipinos ought to be assured of independence "as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it," Judge Parker severely criticized the statement of Secretary Taft that—

a promise to give ultimate independence will be construed by the more violent element, disposed to agitation, to be a promise to grant independence in the near future and during the present generation. The success of the experiment we are making in the Philippines depends on having the Filipinos understand that we are there for their benefit, but that we expect to stay there indefinitely in working out the good we propose to do them.

In the course of his speech Judge Parker, commenting upon this, said:

Here we have the issue clearly defined. The Republican party stands for the subjugation of defenseless foreign peoples. Democracy stands for freedom. We relieved Spain of this thorn in her flesh, the Philippines, to plunge into our own. We paid, and are paying, enormously for the privilege of performing this operation. Spain had been trying to conquer the islands since the early decades of the sixteenth century. She had never quite succeeded. That is not surprising. Every true American would despise a man who would not fight to the last gasp for the land of his fireside and the birthplace of his babes. . . . Our duty to the Filipinos demands a promise of independence. But if it did not our own inter-

est demands that we be relieved of the Filipinos just as soon as they are reasonably prepared for self-government. A colony-holding nation is ever subject to expensive wars with other nations and with its colonies. This necessitates strong garrisons and powerful navies and draws heavily upon the treasury. . . . It is alike certain that but two classes of our people can hope to be benefited by our holding the Philippines—the class which is always hunting for special government privileges and the class which seeks to make of office-holding a means of livelihood. . . . Aside from the duty we owe the Philippines in preparation for the enjoyment of the blessed privileges we posses, we should guard carefully against the danger to ourselves of an imperialistic policy. History teaches that from republicanism to imperialism the movement is gradual and unperceived of the people. Its ominous progress, when discovered, leaves open but two courses—submission or resort to violence. . . . That our people may never be compelled to choose between these fearful alternatives should be our prayer. But we should work as well as pray. And our work should be to guard the foundation on which our government rests. Its basis is that of declared ideas—ideas that are stronger than battle ships and armies, ideas which for more than a century have stimulated our development and which have given promise that our "world mission" shall be not to seize the territory of distant peoples and rule them with a scepter of iron, but to establish truth, honor, justice and peace among the nations. . . . We must choose whether within our borders the basis of government shall continue to be this idealism, or a materialism which is the sure percursor of dissolution; for no nation can endure upon a basis of materialism, however splendid. Prudence requires that that choice be made in time. The time is now.

After making a canvass of the State of New York, and finding that Roosevelt will probably have a plurality of 150,000 outside of the city, the New York Herald, which has been urgently supporting Parker, made the following double-leaded editorial announcement on the 18th:

In three weeks from to-day the people will have to decide who will be their choice, Mr. Roosevelt or Judge Parker. To speak frankly, there does not appear to be room for much uncertainty as to their probable decision. It seems almost a foregone conclusion that Mr. Roosevelt will be elected, not, perhaps, because the people have confidence in him and in his conception of the Presidential functions, but because the country is prosperous and thus the necessity for a change is not very pressing.

There will be referendum voting in Illinois at the coming election as well as voting for candidates. In the State at large five questions are to be submitted, and in Cook County one more. The Cook County referendum is on refunding certain county bonds so as to make them payable in annual installments during 20 years. Of the others, three are under the "public policy" law, one relates to making the Torrens land title law mandatory, and the other authorizes a special charter for Chicago.

The "public policy" questions are (p. 377) as follows:

Question No. 1. Shall the State legislature amend the primary election law so as to provide for party primaries at which the voter will vote under the Australian ballot directly for the candidate whom he wishes nominated by his party, instead of voting for delegates to convention or caucus; the primaries, throughout the entire district affected by the offices for which nominations are to be made, to be held by all the parties conjointly at the same time and polling places. This law not to prevent the nomination of candidates by petition as now provided.

Question No. 2. Shall the State legislature pass a law enabling the voters of any county, city, village or township, by majority vote, to veto any undesirable action of their respective law-making bodies (except emergency measures) whenever five per cent. of the voters petition to have such action referred to popular vote. This law to apply only to such localities as may adopt the same.

Question No. 3. Shall the State legislature submit to the voters of the State of Illinois at the next following State election an amendment to the State Constitution, which will enable the voters of any county, city, village or township of the State of Illinois to adopt such system of assessing and levying taxes as the voters of any such county, city, village or township may determine.

The Chicago charter question (p. 435) is in the form of a proposed amendment to the constitution of the State, providing for the addition of the following section to Article IV. of that instrument:

Section 34. The General Assembly shall have power, subject to the conditions and limitations hereinafter contained, to pass any law (local, special or general) providing a scheme or charter of local municipal government for the territory now or hereafter embraced within the limits of the city of Chicago. The law or laws so passed may provide for consolidating (in whole or in part) in the municipal government of the city of Chicago, the powers now vested in the city, board of education, township, park or other local governments and authorities having jurisdiction confined to or within said territory, or any part thereof, and for the assumption by the city of Chicago of the debts and liabilities (in whole or in part) of the governments or corporate authorities whose functions within its territory shall be vested in said city of Chicago, and may authorize said city, in the event of its becoming liable for the indebtedness of two or more of the existing municipal corporations lying wholly within said city of Chicago, to become indebted to an amount (including its existing indebtedness and the indebtedness of all municipal corporations lying wholly within the limits of said city, and said city's proportionate share of the indebtedness of said county and sanitary district, which share shall be determined in such manner as the General Assembly shall prescribe) in the aggregate not exceeding five per centum of the full value of the taxable property within its limits, as ascertained by the last assessment either for State or municipal purposes previous to the incurring of such indebtedness (but no new bonded indebtedness, other than for refunding purposes, shall be incurred until the proposition therefor shall be consented to by a majority of the legal voters of said city voting on the question at any election, general, municipal or special); and may provide for the assessment of property and the levy and collection of taxes within said city for corporate purposes in accordance with the principles of equity and uniformity prescribed by this Constitution; and may abolish all offices, the functions of which shall be otherwise provided for; and may provide for the annexation of territory, to or disconnection of territory from said city of Chicago by the consent of a majority of the legal voters (voting on the question at any election, general, municipal or special) of the said city and of a majority of the voters of such territory voting on the question at any election, general, municipal or special; and in case the General Assembly shall create municipal courts in the city of Chicago it may abolish the offices of justices of the peace, police magistrates and constables in and for the territory within said city, and may limit the jurisdiction of justices of the peace in the territory of said county of Cook outside of said city to that territory, and in such case the jurisdiction and practice of said municipal courts shall be such as the General Assembly shall prescribe; and the General Assembly may pass all laws which it may deem requisite to effectually provide a complete system of local municipal

government in and for the city of Chicago.

No law based upon this amendment to the Constitution, affecting the municipal government of the city of hicago, shall take effect until such law shall be consented to by a majority of the legal voters of said city voting on the question at any election, municipal, general or special; and no local or special law based upon this amendment affecting specially any part of the city of Chicago shall take effect until consented to by a majority of the legal voters of such part of said city voting on the question at any election, general, municipal or special. Nothing in this section contained shall be construed to repeal, amend or affect Section four (4) of Article XI. of the Constitution of this State.

—

Relative to the charter amendment, just quoted, the Chicago Board of Education, at its meeting on the 12th, at the solicitation of the Civic Federation, with which the amendment originated, has directed a general distribution through the public school pupils of the literature prepared in support of the amendment by the committee which is agitating for its adoption. Upon learning of this, the Federation of Labor, on the 15th instructed its legislative committee to apply to the Board of Education to direct a similar distribution on like conditions of its literature in support of the three "public policy" questions quoted above. This committee was authorized, in the event of its request being refused, to institute legal proceedings to prevent distribution of any election literature through the schools.

—

Parliamentary elections in Italy are reported as approaching, at which a determined stand is to be made by conservatives against what the dispatches catalogue indiscriminately as "socialists, republicans, and anarchists," (vol. iii. pp. 92, 121, 136, 187, 427, 713, 729; iv. pp. 172, 202, 524, 745; vol. 394). The Italian parliament is divided into two houses, a senate and a chamber of deputies. The senate is composed of the princes of the royal house who are of age, and an unlimited number of members above 40 years old and with certain other qualifications, who are named by the king for life. Members of the chamber of deputies are elected by all citizens 21 years of age and having certain additional qualifications. Radicalism of various types, including socialism, is strongly represented in the present parliament.

—

The great battle in the Russian-Japanese war, which we reported last week (p. 442) as having been brought on by the Russians taking the aggressive and moving southward from Mukden was still being fiercely fought as late as the 19th. On the 14th the tide of battle was reported as having turned in favor of the Japanese, and the Russian lines as shattered. On the 15th a Japanese victory was reported as complete. But the news of the 16th described the Russians as having rallied for a last stand on the banks of the Shakhe river, about ten miles south of Mukden. By the 17th they had resumed the offensive and retaken some lost ground, according to Mukden reports; but according to Tokio reports of the 18th, in the morning, all the Russian attacks had been repulsed. It now appears that this long and bloody battle ended on the 19th with the repulse of the Russian movement and a gain to the Japanese of about 15 miles of ground northward. The armies face each other at the Shakhe river, ten miles south of Mukden. The number of men engaged in the battle just ended is reported as 500,000; the estimated number of killed as 15,000, and of wounded as 40,000—a total of 55,000 casualties. It began on the 9th and ended on the 19th, the fighting meanwhile being incessant.

NEWS NOTES.

—King George of Saxony died at Pillnitz on the 15th, at the age of 72.

—Thomas E. Watson is to be the only speaker at a People's party mass meeting at the Grand Central Palace, New York City, on the 24th, at 8 p. m.

—Alonzo B. Cornell, Republican governor of New York 1880-83, and son of Ezra Cornell, the founder of Cornell university, died at Ithaca on the 15th at the age of 72.

—Philip Weinseimer, former president of the Building Trades Alliance, was found guilty on the 18th at New York City, on the charge of extorting $2,700 from George J. Essig for calling off a strike. He is to be sentenced on the 28th.

—A meeting of the Socialist Party at Chicago on the 17th packed the Auditoriun to listen to Debs and Hanford, the party candidates respectively for President and Vice-President of the United States. J. B. Smiley presided. An admission fee was charged and paid.

—A 75-cent dinner is to be tendered Alfred J. Boulton, People's party candidate for Governor of New York at the Labor Lyceum, at Willoughby and Myrtle avenues, Brooklyn, on the 30th at 7 p. m., at which Judge Samuel Seabury is to preside. The arrangements are in charge of Edwin Hammond, 357 Fulton St., Brooklyn.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States (p. 411) for the three months ending September 30, 1904, as given by the statistical sheet of the Department of Commerce and Labor for September, were as follow (M standing for merchandise, G for gold and S for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M	$311,838,627	$242,767,712	$69,070,915 exp.
G	14,590,515	20,927,824	6,337,309 imp.
S	12,762,221	5,897,603	6,804,618 exp.
	$339,191,363	$269,593,139	$69,598,224 exp.

—Stephen Dudley Field, nephew of the Atlantic cable inventor, has recorded successfully the Morse alphabet on paper tape by means of wireless telegrphy. The experiment was carried out on the 16th, in the presence of a few friends of Mr. Field at his electrical laboratory in Stockbridge, Mass., with the aid of Mr. Field's invention of what he calls an amplifier. It is an electrically delicate mchine of wire coils and magnets so adjusted as to record all variations in the electric current which passes through it. It occupies less than half a cubic foot of space, and Mr. Field says it is nothing but a mechanical microscope for electricity.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE POLITICAL CALM.

(Minneapolis) Farm, Stock and Home (agr'l), Oct. 15.—Now we are enjoying the political calm that precedes the inevitable storm. And the coming storm will be violent and epoch-making, for the present dissatisfied, faction-riven partisans, and the great army of "political orphans" as well will then be aligned on one side or the other of the momentous question of whether this is to be a government of the man or the dollar, whether it is to be a democracy or a plutocracy. There will be no dearth of "issues" then, and it is dead certain that neither of the contending sides will be "safe and sane" in the estimation of the other. Radicalism will be in the saddle, and may it be radicalism safely tempered with sane conservatism, is the wish of all lovers of the truly republican form of government.

BRYAN'S CAMPAIGNING.

Chicago, Daily News (Ind.), Oct. 19.—Mr. Bryan certainly draws crowds like a live one.

Nashville Daily News (Dem.), Oct. 13.—Bryan by his loyal and manly course at St. Louis did himself everlasting credit and set an example to his followers which is worth thousands of votes for the party. In not bolting the convention, he forever silenced the critics who charged him with a "rule or ruin" policy, bitterly disappointed the Republicans, and intrenched himself more firmly in the confidence and respect of the people than ever before.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Oct. 18.—Mr. Bryan may not save Indiana. But

if it shall be saved the work unquestionably will be his. Not even in 1896 was he more splendid in his thrilling oratory than he has been during this triumphal tour of Indiana, and the people are testifying their loyalty to him and their devotion to the cause he represents by spontaneous outpourings that are at once a marvel to the anti-Bryan Democrats and a source of fear and wonder to the upholders of standpattery.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), Oct. 13.—The New York World wants the Democratic national committee to take Mr. Bryan off the stump. The World has it figured out that he, Watson and Hearst are working in secret arrangement to defeat Parker that they may the easier secure control of the party organization. The World in effect charges Mr. Bryan with hypocrisy. That is a serious charge. But it lacks the necessary element of truth if it is to hold. Mr. Bryan has made it clear that he is supporting Judge Parker merely on the issue of imperialism. Hundreds of thousands of other Democrats are supporting Mr. Parker for the same reason. But for his stand, and the party's, on the question of imperialism, Watson's vote would be larger than Parker's. Mr. Bryan is sincere; there is no denying the fact that he did not relish Parker's nomination; but he is great enough and broad enough to consider principle as paramount to men. It is absurd to say that Bryan has an understanding with Hearst. Bryan did not support Hearst at St. Louis. That he believes in the same things Hearst believes in—except in the measure that Hearst believes in imperialism and a big navy—and in the things which Watson advocates, cannot and need not be gainsaid. Mr. Bryan is supporting Parker sincerely and will vote for Parker merely because Parker is right on the issue of imperialism. The World, in publishing editorials of the kind commented upon here, will do more to hurt Parker than any other newspaper has it within its power to do.

DEMOCRATIC REORGANIZATION.

Wetmore's (St. Louis) Weekly (Ind.), Oct. 12.—Mr. Eltweed Pomeroy contributes the following: "I have a friend in Providence who says he will vote for Parker, and the man is an ardent radical. 'Why?' I asked. 'Oh, I don't like Roosevelt,' he replied, 'and Parker has behaved in a dignified way.' 'But,' I retorted, 'you must have a better reason; we don't choose Presidents because of likes.' 'Yes,' he answered, 'I have a better reason. Garvin is our governor in Rhode Island. He is a Democrat, the only Democratic governor in the North, a splendid man and a radical. Parker will be beaten so badly that after the election the Democratic party will be groggy, the corporation men will see that it is no use, that the Democratic rank and file cannot be used for their purposes, and they will let go their grip on the organization. I want to be inside that organization to aid in controlling it so as to make it a genuine democratic organization.' His reason is a legitimate and good one. Of course it only applies to one already inside the party, and of some importance in the councils."

A NUISANCE TO WHOM?

Chicago Chronicle (Rep.), Oct. 19.—The referendum law is a nuisance. It has been so ever since it was enacted and will be more and more so until it is repealed. It turns voting into a farce, and if it is not got out of the way it will increase the number of stay-at-homes until elections will bring out nobody but cranks. The law should be wiped off the statute book as soon as possible.

NATIONALITY.

(London) India, Aug. 26.—As regards language, Belgium is bi-lingual, the Swiss are divided between three languages, French-speaking Louisiana finds no difficulty in taking her place among the States of the American Union, and England was a nation while French was still the language of the courts of law, and before the speech of the eastern midlands had supplanted the other dialects. Conversely, unity of language does not make the United States and England one nation. It is the same with race and religion. All the nations of modern Europe are of mixed blood. The diversity of sects in England and America is notorious. In Germany, besides the division of the Christians into Protestants and Catholics, there are great numbers, especially among the workmen of the towns, who do not profess Christianity. In France, the type of an intense nationality, there are three established religions—Catholic, Protestant and Jewish—and those who stand outside these Churches are now strong enough to threaten the severance of their connection with the state. As to unity of life, that probably exists much more in India than Indians believe. There are certainly many common features which strike the foreign observer. Of course, unity in race, religion and language strengthen nationality; but a common fatherland, a common government, common hopes and fears and sufferings are still more important. A great effort for the public good is the most important of all.

MISCELLANY

"THESE THINGS SHALL BE."

Hymn sung to the tune of "Duke Street," by the Handel and Haydn society at the great Peace Congress, meeting in Symphony hall, Boston, on Sunday evening, October 2, 1904.

These things shall be!—A loftier race
Than e'er the world hath known shall rise,
With flame of freedom in their souls
And light of knowledge in their eyes.

They shall be gentle, brave and strong,
Not to spill human blood, but dare
All that may plant man's lordship firm
On earth and fire and sea and air.

Nation with nation, land with land,
Unarmed shall live as comrades free;
In every heart and brain shall throb
The pulse of one fraternity.

New arts shall bloom, of loftier mold,
And mightier music thrill the skies;
And every life shall be a song,
When all the earth is paradise.

There shall be no more sin nor shame,
And wrath and wrng shall fettered lie;
For man shall be at one with God
In bonds of firm necessity.
—John Addington Symonds.

LET US CHANGE OUR ENVIRONMENT.

"Edgarton," said Prof. Jenks, thoughtfully, "you view things too narrowly, too much in detail, and your hasty generalizations, therefore, are of small value. We are all creatures of our environments and in the fierce competition of modern business life it is, after all, the fittest who survive."

"Devil a doubt of it," agreed the colonel, heartily. "But the fittest for what? For honorable and helpful, generous, manly living, or for selfishness, greed and heartlessness? The fittest may be the worst—it depends on the environment, which may be better suited to the survival of snakes than of birds."

"What would you do about it?" growled the professor.

"As an individual with a proper regard for the interests of No. One," kindly explained Col. Edgarton, "I seek to harmonize myself with the environment, avoid being a 'shine' and reach for all I can get this side of the penitentiary's wall. I'm a hard-headed, sober-minded business man and endeavor always to arrive with both feet. But if you ask me as a patriot and a citizen—and this Rhine wine surely does kindle a warm fire under the boiler of one's nobler self—I should say the environment that gives us Morgans and Schwabs and Rockefellers as its fittest product is a snide environment and ought to be changed."

"And how," inquired Prof. Jenks, "would you accomplish that?"

"It's easy," answered Edgarton. "Just elect Roosevelt and leave it to him, or Parker if you prefer the judge."—Arthur McEwen, in Chicago American.

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

Portions of an editorial in The Manchester (Eng.) Guardian, of October 5, 1904.

The American Presidential election, which is now about a month ahead, seems likely to figure in history as the quietest of modern times. The old idea of a Presidential election was a national agitation, disorganizing public and commercial life for nine or ten months. This has passed away for the present, although in subsequent years it may return. There cannot forever be an absence of hotly-contested issues in an election partly deciding the political fate of 80,000,000 persons for four years. New issues have long been rising, slowly but surely, on the United States horizon. The decision of the Democrats to put up a conservative candidate in the person of Judge Parker has temporarily shelved these issues. The "letter" which Mr. Parker issued just a week ago in reply to the lengthy and slashing "letter" of President Roosevelt dissipated the last hopes of any who expected a contest of principles between the two candidates. . . .

One has only to cast one's mind back to the last two elections and recall the almost religious devotion inspired by the campaigns of Mr. Bryan to feel how far the present election must be from exhausting the political interest of Amer-

icans. Mr. Bryan was doubtless a wrong-headed leader in many respects, but the extraordinary tide of emotion which enabled him to bid for victory in 1896 was not an unreal tide, because for the moment it spent itself in channels which led to nowhere. The forces to which he appealed were not reasoned convictions about bimetallism, but keenly felt social discontent and dim, yet glorious apprehensions of social hope In the last eight years an unparalleled industrial prosperity has taken, perhaps, the cruelest edge off the discontent, but has not removed it. The increment of prosperity has been very unequally shared between the masses and the few. The latter have not only skimmed unprecedented wealth; they have massed it in aggregates which render it at once more conspicuous in men's eyes and more tyrannously influential over their lives and liberties. The virgin soil of the new world, which has given the clearest arena for the victories of wealth, has also made its supremacy appear more nakedly than elsewhere. The personal habits of the rich and the not-rich classes further promote an antagonism. Luxury of that wanton and soulless kind whose display is the most irritating of all because of its dog-in-the-manger appearance to all who could use the wealth better, has nowhere gone further than among some rich Americans, and the ubiquitous American reporter is always there to herald its vanities from one end of the country to the other. On the other hand, the American middle and working classes are on a higher average plane of education than perhaps any other. Not merely have they the intelligence to assert themselves; they have developed on a very wide scale the habit of conceiving and following new ideals of justice and humanitarianism. The conflict between such opposite forces is certain to come, and the crudities so manifest in the composition of each will not deaden its shock, but complicate it. In the present election scarcely a breath of it can be heard or felt. Nevertheless there are some recognitions of its lurking menace. Such is the cautious and honeyed, although meaningless, lip-homage lavished by both parties upon labor unions.

A GREAT INDIAN.

Chief Joseph, of the Nez Perces, died Sept. 21, 1904, on the Colville Reservation in the State of Washington. The following estimate of his abilities and character is taken from an article which appeared in the Chicago Chronicle of Oct. 9.

With the passing of Chief Joseph there ended the life of one of mankind's most honorable and worthy members. He was a man whose life's motto seemed to be, "Never wrong a friend; never forget the good that comes from true friendship." In Indian life, and in the life of the heroic, no man would provide a better example than Joseph. His resolve made in early life never to be a slave of another was lived up to until death claimed him. While others of the Nez Perces succumbed and became residents of the reservation set aside for them, Joseph and perhaps 125 of his followers continued to live in the tents of their ancestors, hunted and fished and came and went. It was beside his tepee that he died. He had a nice home, but seldom slept in it. In the forests and in his camp the habit of Joseph was to wear the blankets of his ancestors. This rule he broke only when he went to see the white father in Washington, and he did it much as a token of respect to the great men in the east whose guest he expected to become. As a rule he could not sleep in a house.

Every inch a leader and strong man, Joseph was always admired by strong men. It was the strength of Gen. Nelson A. Miles that largely led him to admire Gen. Miles. In turn, Miles, who is a strong man, always expressed a liking for Joseph. Once when a reporter called to interview Joseph he sat silent, as was his custom when confronted by strangers, until a picture of Gen. Miles was produced. Then he brightened and talked. As an outcome of the Indian wars of 1877, when he first came into contact with the fighting ability of Gen. O. O. Howard and Gen. Miles, he formed this judgment of the two generals, a judgment that he often expressed: "Miles is a fighter and Howard a Bible warrior." It was Gen. Miles who headed him off and outgeneraled him after the 1,500-mile chase following the battle with Gen. Howard's troops.

It is interesting to note that Chief Joseph was a teetotaler all his life. He would not even drink a mild wine. Only once in a great while would he smoke a cigar or a pipe. He never drank tea or coffee. Water was his drink and he said that was good enough for any man. He regretted that his people abused intoxicating liquors and always preached temperance to them.

The Nez Perces were noted for the beauty of their women and the valor of their men. When white men first went into the Rocky mountains the tribe was powerful and populous and its people inhabited the valleys of the Snake, the Salmon and the Clearwater, westward from the Bitter Root mountains. Their men were brave, their women were virtuous and their country had no superior in all the famed valleys of the region. They were superior in many respects to most of the other tribes that roved through the northwestern country or made their homes among the mountains. Confident in their prowess and proud of their distinction, they were the undisputed masters of their realm.

Of this people Joseph was a worthy chieftain; strong, alert, intelligent, albeit haughty and disdainful at times, he was the idol of the younger element of his people and their acknowledged leader. When he led his people out of the valley that had been their home for generations, it was not to give battle to the whites, but to find a new home for his tribe, which believed that it had been treacherously dealt with by the agents of the Federal government and wrongfully deprived of the valley to which it was so strongly attached by tradition and association. The battles that occurred in this march, which has become historically famous, were not of Joseph's seeking; he had not crossed the mountains to fight the whites, but when it became necessary he and his warriors fought as Indians never fought before and never have since.

Men who had participated in the civil war and later in the wars with the Indians and in the middle west and south have given their testimony that the battle of the Big Hole was the most hotly contested field that they ever fought upon. These veterans say that they never saw such cool and determined fighting maintained so long at short range by any Indians as was carried on by these unseasoned warriors under Joseph.

And when Joseph's fight in the Big Hole was ended he took up his march down the valley, encumbered with his wounded and his women and children, heading for the British possessions, where he hoped he might find a home for his people and receive that just treatment that he felt had been denied him in this country. The history of that march is even more remarkable than the story of the battle. From a military viewpoint, this retreat is remarkable, as its course all the way lay through an enemy's country, and it was accomplished with less annoyance to the people of the State than would have resulted from a similar march by a hostile white foe. As long as he could, Joseph paid for the horses and provisions that he secured. When he could no longer do this, he took his supplies as any commander would have done. But no brutality marked the course of the Nez Perces in retreat.

When at last Joseph surrendered to Gen. Miles it was because of the suf-

fering among the women and children of his tribe, who, deprived of proper food and exposed to the chill of winter, were sick and dying. His surrender was complete; when he yielded it was with the promise that he would fight no more, and this promise he faithfully observed. In his later days, Joseph was not a disturber; he remembered his promise and he kept it; he kept it, indeed, better than many a paroled white would have done; it was lived up to in spirit as well as in letter; not only did he refrain from any attempt to make trouble himself, but his counsels were always for peace. He realized the hopelessness of a struggle with the whites and he adopted the course that seemed to him wisest.

Not all the Nez Perces engaged in the campaign with Joseph. A portion of the tribe, who were known as the "non-treaty Nez Perces," were the ones who followed Joseph, Looking Glass and White Bird on their march out of the Wallowa valley into the Bitter Root. These Indians believed truly that they had been wronged by the government agents, their chief grievance being against Gen. Howard, toward whom Joseph cherished an Indian's hatred to the day of his death.

It was the old story of a treaty obtained by questionable methods; by promises made only to be broken and by pledges given that were not intended for fulfillment. Joseph and his associates always averred that they had not been consulted in the framing of the treaty which ceded to the government the valley to which they were so strongly attached, the beautiful basin of the Wallowa, which had been the home and hunting ground of their tribe for so long. When they discovered that their rights to this land had been signed away, unknown to them, they resented the deceit and resolved that they would not submit.

But, whatever the opinion held as to the justice of the course of Joseph and as to the righteousness of his cause, there can be but one opinion regarding the man himself, whose life went out last week on his reservation home—he was the whitest Indian that ever lived.

THE REIGN OF GRAFT.

A portion of an article entitled: "The Reign of Graft and the Remedy," written for the September Arena, by Hon. Robert Baker, member of congress from the Sixth New York district.

Society should give more thought to the underlying cause of graft than to finding new obstacles to its continuance or new penalties for those who practice it. It may be well to first ask whether its prevalence is generally recognized. To assume that it is confined to the dealings of contractors with department officials is to overlook its larger and more profitable field of operation.

Before citing some of the more flagrant instances it would be well to first ask: What is graft? In the last analysis it is the obtaining of something for nothing—through collusion.

A hint of the extent to which graft has even permeated the commercial world is indicated in the case of a buyer for a large Washington department store, who, last winter, exhibited to her friends a magnificent array of "presents" received from business houses from whom she regularly bought goods for her employers. They were all of considerable pecuniary value, while she frankly said that the donors all understood she could buy wherever she pleased. It is immaterial whether the "presents" were bribes or blackmail; either the donors or her employers were "grafted." And yet she would have waxed indignant if anyone had suggested either alternative.

A few years ago we heard much of how the wholesale dry goods merchants in New York were harried by the police when they occupied the sidewalks with their packing cases, unless they submitted to "blackmail." It certainly was blackmail for the police to collect this tribute, but those who were admittedly occupying public property without paying the city for the privilege were the real grafters; they merely divided with the police the value of monopolizing the city's streets.

There is no more reason why cases of boots and shoes, dry goods, hardware, machinery; why furniture, fruits and vegetables should be allowed for hours to occupy sidewalks to the obstruction of pedestrians, than that he who sells meals should have his restaurant on the sidewalk, or that the barber, doctor or lawyer should have their offices there. The virtuous indignation of these merchants was not due to a high conception of civic duty—against some one obtaining something for nothing, against graft per se—but was due to their no longer being permitted to retain all the value of the privileges they were preempting.

At the very time when these merchants were crying out against police blackmail, and were giving more or less open countenance to the movement to overthrow the city government, one of the wealthiest dry goods merchants made strenuous efforts to privately induce the one member of the administration who was standing like adamant in opposition to colossal schemes of public spoliation to withdraw his opposition to a piece of wholesale graft—the abatement of the assessment for the Elm street widening. Had this high city official yielded to these blandishments this millionaire and his fellow property owners along that thoroughfare would have "grafted" the city to the extent of some $2,000,000, probably ten times the amount that the police had obtained from the merchants who monopolized the city's sidewalks during all the years that they had bribed the police for that privilege.

In denouncing "graft" let us maintain some sense of proportion. Let our demand for punishment "fit the crime." While expressing hostility to the methods shown to have existed in the contracting department of the post office, and venting our indignation on the petty contractors and bureau chiefs, who have defrauded the people of some hundreds of thousands of dollars, let us reserve some of our condemnation for those greater criminals who through collusion with higher officials and party chiefs have taken from the treasury millions every year in excessive mail transportation payments. The graft to the railroads in the $39,000,000 appropriated for inland railroad mail transportation is many times the total of the pickings of bureau chiefs and petty contractors. Some $6,000,000 are also appropriated for rental of mail cars at a cost equal to the original cost of the car, many being over 20 years old and in the opinion of the railway mail clerks a constant menace to their lives.

What is it but graft, when Congressmen and Senators accept (where they do not solicit) passes and telegraph-franks—some not only asking for themselves, but constantly applying for them for friends? Their conduct is different only in degree from that of the purchasing-agent of a department who divides with the contractor the increased price charged for his goods—each uses his official position to get something for nothing. The Congressman may try to delude himself with the idea that the railroad-pass or telegraph-frank is given him as a "courtesy," but we may be sure that the railroad or telegraph company fully realizes its subtle influence even where it is not openly issued as a bribe. It must be remembered that it is not only in affirmative legislation that a legislator can render a great service to railroads and other special-privilege corporations; the statu quo is frequently as serviceable to them as legislation openly in their interest. When the ablest Judge of the Supreme

Court of the State of New York (William J. Gaynor) describes favoritism in railroad freight rates "as the greatest crime of our day and generation," and says that "more wrong has been done by it than by all the crimes defined by our statutes," and that "it has crushed and beggared thousands all over the land," it can be readily seen that the most effective service a legislator can render to these criminal corporations is to quietly put to sleep what the companies are pleased to call "hostile" legislation; to put off all consideration by the Judiciary Committee; by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads—always so liberal in its appropriations for railway mail-transportation; by the Committee on the District of Columbia, where the two great railway systems having depots there were aided out of the joint treasuries of the District and of the United States to an amount variously estimated at from $4,000,000 to $7,000,000 during the Fifty-seventh Congress; by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, where bills to extend the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission so that they could enforce their decrees, instead of, as now, having them set at naught by the railroads, are quietly slumbering; or by the Public Lands Committee, which ought to have something to say, but doesn't, as to whether the transcontinental roads are living up to their agreements entered into as a part consideration, at least, for the hundreds of millions of acres and scores of millions of dollars in money that they bribed and cajoled former Congresses into granting them; or even by the Labor Committee, which for five months fooled with an eight-hour bill, and then referred it to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to report on, on the ground that it had not the time itself to investigate the subject;—hostile legislation in the vocabulary of the railroads being any measure to lessen extortionate tolls; to prevent freight rebates and discriminations; to compel compliance with the decisions of the courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission; to enforce the law for automatic safety appliances; or any other law drawn primarily in the interest of the public or of railroad employes.

A jurist of international reputation—Justice Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court—has recently pointed out another and an extremely insidious form of bribery. In speaking of a lawmaking lawyer's temptation which has come with the development of these enormous special-privilege corporations, he says:

> These interests are colossal in size, alluring by the magnitude of their achievements, tempting not merely by the money they possess and with which they can reward, but more by the influence they can exert in favor of the individual lawmaker in the furtherance of his personal advancement.
>
> No one can be blind to the fact that these mighty corporations are holding out most tempting inducements to lawmakers to regard in their lawmaking those interests rather than the nation.
>
> There may be no written agreement. There may be in fact no agreement at all, and yet when the lawmaker understands that that power exists which may make for his advancement or otherwise, that it will be exerted according to the pliancy with which he yields to its solicitations, it lifts the corporation into a position of constant danger to republican institutions.

For years the business interests of New York have besought Congress to make more adequate provision for its constantly increasing postal business, but no appropriation for a building was made. I learned during the recent session that the money could have been had at almost any session during the past ten years only for the opposition of the New York Central railroad. So general was this view that no attempt to gloss over the real cause was made even when correspondents of New York papers were present at informal gatherings endeavoring to secure an appropriation—although it was tacitly understood that they would not be so indiscreet as to put the blame for the delay where it belonged. The New York Central, having direct representation in the Senate, could block any proposition not in conformity with what it was pleased to consider its interest. Having finally come to terms with its great rival, the Pennsylvania, and those two corporations having agreed between themselves as to what they would permit to be done in the matter, it goes without saying that every difficulty was removed, every obstacle overcome; cabinet officers quickly approved, and the appropriations were duly made. The New York merchants who cried in vain so long for improved postal facilities will no doubt refrain from applying the term "hold-up" to the whole proceeding. We in the East have too great a reverence for great wealth to do anything more than complain, being equally careful with the correspondents not to say anything rude of those who have for so long prevented action, even if the result is to buttress private ownership of interstate highways by tying up the Post Office Department to the New York Central with a fifty-year lease. The records will, I think, be searched in vain during all this period for evidence that even one member has openly charged any railroad with being the real obstructionist. Of course no one would suggest that failure to do this was in any way related to the question of railroad passes. . . .

What is it but graft when a United States Senator, the head of an express company, not only uses his position to protect his own and allied companies from legislative "attacks," insuring them in the continuation of their extremely valuable privileges, but secures to the railroads from whom these valuable privileges are derived extortionate prices for transporting the mails?

What was it but graft when Huntington, Hopkins, Stanford and Crocker organized a construction company to build the Pacific railroads, paying themselves out of the treasury of the railroads enormous sums for work at inflated prices, under which they got possession of most of its bonds and stocks?

What was it but graft when big financiers forced the United States government to accept in full settlement but a part of the large debt the Union Pacific owed?

What is it but graft when the controlling forces of a railroad system organize an express or dispatch company to which valuable privileges are granted on far lower terms than it could, or would, obtain if the grantee company were not in effect themselves?

What is it but graft when the directors of a railroad company organize an industrial company, locate it along the line of their road, then accord it lower freight rates than are charged to competitors in the same business?

What is it but graft when the directors of a railroad have special cars placed at their disposal whenever they desire them for social or business purposes?

What is it but graft when the President of the United States accepts the "courtesy" of special railroad trains, or cars, for vote-hunting trips or for social visits?

What was it but graft when old and almost useless ships were foisted on the navy department at the outbreak of the Spanish war?

What is it but graft when the anthracite coal roads form a pool, not only to limit production but to fix the price of transportation at from three to four times what would earn a reasonable dividend on the actual capital invested? Occasionally these highway robbers fall out

among themselves as to a division of the booty; and we find the general coal sales agent of the Philadelphia & Reading (the Goliath of the coal trust) testifying under oath before the Interstate Commerce Commission as to what happened if the Reading cut its regular price, "that they denied it if they did,"—not even, it seems, maintaining that honor which is supposed to exist among thieves—i. e., thieves without the pale of the law.

What is it but graft when the Big Four who compose the beef trust get special freight rates which enable them to drive competitors out of business?

What is it but graft when heads of departments, chiefs and deputy chiefs of bureaus in Washington use public carriages for pleasure and to maintain their social "prestige"?

What was it but graft when those who purchased United States bonds during the Civil war in depreciated currency, years later "induced" Congress to make them redeemable in gold?

What was it but graft when the employer of a recent law partner of a President entered into a secret deal with the head of the government to issue bonds to his syndicate at from eight to twelve per cent. less than they were worth?

What is it but graft when this same leader in haute finance organizes the United States Steel Corporation and invites a confiding public to purchase "securities," three-quarters, if not four-fifths of which represent nothing but water? How many thousands of ignorant but innocent investors, relying upon the "high character," "deserved reputation," "commanding influence," "great ability," "financial stability" and "unblemished business honor" of these men have been ruined by having these securities foisted upon them? All the graft of the Machens and Beavers who have been in government employ for a score of years, including even the "star-route" frauds, looks puny and insignificant beside the colossal sums squeezed out of the people through the floating and manipulation of Steel-Corporation stock, to say nothing of the scores of millions wrung from the people in inflated prices charged for its products because it was "protected" by a tariff of from $7.84 a ton and upwards on its manufactures.

What was it but graft when the Western Union Telegraph Company supplied poolrooms with racing news in defiance of law, charging some five million dollars for the service which perhaps cost them a tenth of that sum? When burglars are caught with the goods on them they are not permitted to go their way because they insist that hereafter they will be law-abiding. But then among that profession there are no multi-millionaire "philanthropists."

What is it but graft when the special-privilege corporations of New York City—this same Western Union, the telephone, the gas and electric, the surface and elevated railroad companies—refuse to pay even the totally inadequate and ridiculously low rate of taxation levied against them, so that according to a recent issue of the New York World they owe the city some nineteen millions of dollars for arrears of taxes?

I was recently told of an incident that occurred in the home city of The Arena A Boston firm, a regular shipper to the extent of several hundred packages a week by the Adams Express Company, had been paying forty cents a package. A friend in another business happening to drop in and seeing a pile of packages ready for shipment asked: "How much apiece do you pay on them?" On being told, he said: "What! I don't know anything about your business, but I'll take a contract right now to ship them for you by the same company for thirty-five cents." To test the matter, his name was pasted over that of the actual shipper and he proceeded to the express office, asking for a quotation for several hundred packages a week. On their quoting a rate of twenty-eight cents he said: "I guess I'll send them by mail. The only reason I wanted to ship them by your company was to get an individual receipt for each package." He was then offered a twenty-three-cent rate. It is needless to say that the real shippers were astounded when the rate at which the company were prepared to carry their packages was reported to them. But in view of the tremendous difference in the charges for sending packages by "parcels-post" abroad—which rates are frequently less than one-half what Americans have to pay for the privilege of having a government function exploited for private benefit—it is not surprising that the express "ring" is able to shunt all investigation of the subject and to kill off all bills for an American parcels-post. The railroads and express companies have too many direct and indirect representatives in the House and the Senate to permit any legislation of that nature even being considered in committee, let alone reported to and acted upon on the floor of Congress; the "graft" is too big.

What is it but graft when the school-book-trust is able to force its books into the schools and keep other books out? . . . .

Let us have an end to the idea that he who corrupts the public officials (directly or indirectly) and thus secures a valuable special privilege, thereby obtaining millions, has "made" his money by business acumen, enterprise and foresight, while the few hundreds secured by petty swindlers through collusion with corrupt contractors have secured theirs by "graft." Whoever obtains something for nothing, whether it takes the form of "water" in an interstate railroad or a trolley line, in a telegraph or telephone company, in an electric-light or gas company; whether it is an unloading of the "securities" of a steel-trust, the milking of the public through a tariff on sugar, woolens, steel, salt or borax; whether it is in the form of a Standard Oil monopoly, or a monopoly of copper; whether it takes the form of forestalling population (either with or without advance information of what is projected), and thereby reaping an enormous harvest in "unearned increment,"—all are "grafting" upon the body-politic.

Those who deny freedom for others deserve it not themselves, and under a just God cannot long retain it.—Abraham Lincoln.

I speak not of forcible annexation, for that cannot be thought of. That, by our code of morals, would be criminal aggression.—President McKinley, April 11, 1898.

Wealth is indeed accumulated labor, but one man usually performeth labor and another the accumulating;—and this by the wise is called the Division of Labor.—Economic Nuggets.

BOOKS

THE COST OF SOMETHING FOR NOTHING.

If every young man who is now entering college would study this little book by John P. Altgeld (Chicago: Hammersmark Publishing Co.), and could be made to feel its truth, the next generation would show a great change. It touches the very spot of modern sins in business. For what is the basis of monopolies, watered stocks, and the various forms of business speculations and gamblings if not the desire of getting something for nothing? The fever is not a new one, but it seems to have become heightened by modern opportunities and lack of opportunities.

And the trouble is that we do not look upon the desire as criminal and destructive both towards ourselves and

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.

THE DEMOCRATIC PACE-MAKER.

towards others. We do not see and do not care that it violates what Gov. Altgeld calls "the eternal law of equivalents, the universal law of balances." This law has been proclaimed by the philosophers and prophets of all ages, but we do not yet believe it. Nineteen centuries ago the greatest of moral philosophers, the ex-slave Epictetus, said: "Nothing is to be had for nothing," but we do not believe it. We do not believe in the truth of the title of this wise little book, that there is a Cost of Something for Nothing.

The cost is often remote and abstract. It touches intangible results, like character, and comes frequently no nearer home than public injury, which is too vague to impress us. If there is one thing in which our congregations need moral instruction it is this, and it might be suggested that preachers the country over would do well to devote a special Sunday, as is sometimes done for other causes, to preaching on this subject—the sin of desiring to get something for nothing and the ultimate cost of this desire.

Meantime, let us be thankful for this little volume—the parting words of one of the greatest and most widely misunderstood men of our day. "At this time," says Mr. Darrow in a prefatory note, "when every one is intent on getting something for nothing, these words of a statesman and philosopher should not pass unheeded."

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—"The Supremacy of Jesus." By Joseph Henry Crooker. Boston: American Unitarian Association. Price, 80 cents net. To be reviewed.

PAMPHLETS.

Rev. Dr. R. A. Holland, the eloquent St. Louis preacher, has issued in pamphlet form, through the Young Churchman company, Milwaukee, his views in opposition to the use of the Revised Version of the Bible. The pamphlet is entitled Which Bible, and the author argues most forcibly in favor of retaining the King James translation. "Every word of it," he says, "has the supreme literary value of the supreme classic of the modern world. Its very errors and archaisms make a part of its historic and literary integrity." This may be true, and yet we may value, as being the best of commentaries, if for no other reason, the more modern translations, such as the Twentieth Century New Testament, at which Dr. Holland casts a sneer. The Twentieth Century New Testament—not the Twentieth Century Bible, as Dr. Holland mistakenly announces it—has had a deservedly large sale. It is a work of genuine merit and clears up many difficult passages, notably in the Epistles.—J. H. D.

PERIODICALS.

In the October number of the Ladies' Home Journal Mr. Mabie speaks, with more vehemence than is to be expected from his courtly pen, against the evil of yellow journalism. The trouble is that yellow journalism has not been defined. If two or three daily newspapers in the whole country be excepted, there is not one which is not guilty, in one way or another, of what is commonly called sensationalism. It has come to be a sort of fad to cry "yellow" at any paper that does not please the conventional opinions of commonplace readers. It is not so much the yellow that displeases as the editorial page. Rev. Sam Jones says: "Folks are not usually mad at what they are mad at."

J. H. D.

With reference to Mr. Bishop's letter in the Evening Post, which has been already noticed in The Public (p. 386), one further remark is suggested: "I am puzzled," said Mr. Bishop, "to understand the change that comes over men who are put upon the apex of official position." In solving the puzzle it is only necessary to consider the distinction between man as man, and man as official. Some men are great as men; other men are big only because of the place they occupy. If the man is greater than the position, then, of course, he is not changed by the position—certainly not as to matters of conviction. If the position is greater than the man, then, of course, any change may be expected in him that may suit the circumstances.

J. H. D.