

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1904.

Number 336.

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.

Mayor Harrison loses sight, whether willfully or not, of the real issue with reference to his campaign pledges on the Chicago traction (p. 342) issue.

The question is not whether he believes in compromising with the traction companies, nor whether he has always proclaimed that belief; but whether he is under campaign pledges to withhold his official approval from any extension ordinance until it has been approved by referendum vote.

That he is under such pledges, is proved beyond possibility of dispute by the record. His platform so pledged him, his speeches so pledged him, and he so pledged himself over his own signature. But for those pledges he would have failed to attract the votes without which his narrow plurality would have faded away and he would have been defeated. Those pledges constitute his contract with the citizens who elected him.

He is at perfect liberty to urge acceptance of the proposed compromise ordinance if he wishes to. No one can justly condemn him for that. But he is not at liberty to give legal vitality to this or any other ordinance extending franchises, until that ordinance has been approved by referendum vote. To that he is pledged, and by that pledge he is bound.

Mayor Harrison and his friends should understand that he cannot evade his pledges with impunity. They should understand, moreover, that he cannot justify

evasion by billingsgate attacks upon men who possess the public confidence in such eminent degree, both as citizens and judges, as do Judge Tuley and Judge Dunne. These accomplished jurists and public-spirited citizens are notable for greater faculties than the "lung" power with which alone Mayor Harrison spitefully credits Judge Dunne, and their opinions are accepted at a much higher value than "wind," which is the delicate tribute the Mayor pays to Judge Tuley's.

Perhaps it may not be amiss to remark that the criticism of Judges Tuley and Dunne, by the Mayor and the newspapers and traction interests that support him, because these judges have stepped down from the bench to warn the people of Chicago of approaching danger, is extremely callow. Justice never suffers from judges who openly take the whole people into their confidence on public questions. The thing in judges from which justice suffers is not frank expressions of opinion on the platform as in the case of Judge Dunne, or through the press as in the case of Judge Tuley; the thing in judges from which justice suffers is their private hobnobbing with representatives of powerful interests in the seclusion of plutocratic clubs. It ill becomes men and newspapers that are indifferent to the latter practice to go into spasms of virtuous protest over the former refreshing variation.

Only one reply to Judge Tuley's criticisms of the proposed ordinance has been made—only one that is dignified and thoughtful. It comes from Edwin Burritt Smith, the principal counsel for the city administration in connection with the traction litigation. In temper and tone this reply is all that Mayor Harrison's replies

are not. Much better would it have been for the Mayor and the settlement he has become so anxious to consummate before the people can be heard from on referendum vote, if he had choked back his angry adjectives and given Mr. Smith a free hand to answer for him.

But while Mr. Smith replies to Judge Tuley with unruffled temper and good grace, and considers the distinguished judge's criticisms with fairness, he is not likely to be regarded as having satisfactorily met them. His plea for this compromise is the plea of the cautious lawyer, who turns instinctively—often wisely, but not always—to any compromise that serves to gain something, in preference to incurring the risks of a litigation that may possibly lose something. Mr. Smith is no more urgent, no more earnest, no more obviously sincere in advocating a compromise on the basis of the present ordinance than he was in urging one on the basis of the worse ordinance for which this is the substitute. That there should be a compromise seems to appeal to him with greater force than that it should be a good one. But this is not the attitude that is needed in this case. While the compromising instinct is often serviceable in this world of complexity and controversy, there are issues which cannot with safety be lightly compromised, and Chicago now confronts one of them. The essence of the traction issue in Chicago is not good service, nor municipal ownership for its own sake; it is the issue of honest city government, which is impossible without municipal ownership. So long as we incline to yield to the monopolizers of our streets, so long will great financial interests tempt our public men, breed corruption in our public places, and make the campaign pledges of

candidates for office trifles light as air.

It is to be said of Mr. Smith's reply, also, that it suggests an unnecessary solicitude lest vested interests in a crooked grant be in some degree confiscated. But those interests—so far as they are legal, and as to morality they have none—will be well enough guarded by the lawyers for their beneficiaries, and sufficiently protected by the courts; they stand in no need of any solicitous consideration on the part of counsel for the city. This solicitude seems to sound a false note in Mr. Smith's reply to Judge Tuley. So does his intimation that the Mayor's pledges regarding a referendum cannot be redeemed because there is "no authority of law" for passing the ordinance "with a proviso that it take effect only on approval by vote of the electors." That statement in that form is probably true. Such an ordinance might either be a nullity because of its proviso, or be at once effectual without the popular vote it called for. But is there anything in the law to prevent submission of the ordinance to the people under advisory referendum between its second reading and its third? Or, if there are no regular parliamentary stages in the Chicago Council, is there anything in the law to prevent the council from receiving the perfected ordinance from committee of the whole and then laying it on the table, or making action on it a special order for a time subsequent to the municipal election, providing meanwhile for a referendum on it, and then voting in accordance with the advice of that intermediate referendum if they wish to? If there is nothing in the law to prevent this procedure, then what is there to interfere with the redemption of those campaign pledges which the Mayor seeks to evade? This is something that Mr. Smith should explain. For, after all, the vital thing under present circumstances is not whether the proposed extension ordinance may properly be esteemed a good one, but whether, in view of the cam-

paigned pledges of the Mayor and his party convention, it can in good faith be enacted without a popular vote upon it.

Even the worst enemies of Thomas E. Watson will hardly withhold from him some tribute to the political shrewdness of his letter to Judge Parker on the race question. It is no doubt true, as he says, that the politicians of the South are availing themselves of anti-Negro prejudice to arouse Southern feeling against Roosevelt and thereby to keep the South solid for Parker. In these circumstances the questions Watson asks Parker are well calculated to disturb a certain equilibrium. Would Judge Parker "refuse to eat at the same table with Booker T. Washington?" Would "he refuse to appoint Negroes to office in the South?" Would he refuse to receive distinguished Negroes at the White House? And so on. Should Judge Parker answer these questions so as to please the South, he would lose Northern votes by shoals. Should he answer them so as to avoid damaging results at the North, he would have to take the same stand on the race question that has made Roosevelt unpopular at the South. "So there ye are," says Mr. Dooley. The only thing for Parker to do is to make no reply. But in that case Watson will rally the populists of the South with the cry that all this talk against Roosevelt on account of the "nigger" is humbug, designed to fool a "nigger-hating" South into voting for a Wall street candidate.

It is a deplorable fact that the South has gone into a mad panic over the race question and thereby brought demoralization upon the national Democratic party. With her hundred-and-fifty-odd electoral votes, solid for this party whose traditions are slimy with the political ooze of chattel slavery, she has become a standing menace to the democracy of the party. Corrupted to the core by her railway and factory interests controlled by Wall street, her

politicians and newspapers are for the most part ready to bargain away all their democracy to foster the race hatreds whereby they hold the panic-stricken whites together as a malleable voting mass. Never democratic on the race question, the South is fast losing her democracy on everything else. Her politicians apologize for tariff protection, they compromise with plutocratic corruption, they are cultivating monopoly investments, they offer anything and everything for the barbarous boon of being allowed to reestablish Negro slavery in new forms. Is there no dominant chivalry in the South to protect the weak and to cow her demoniacal mobs? Are there no great democrats there to protest against the base surrender of her people's birthright to Northern monopolists under the cover of factitious race passions?

President Roosevelt's puff for suppressing "graft" in the post office department, which has been constructed with admirable literary skill for the September McClure's, would have been tremendously more effective if the facile writer had been able to tell of the suppression of the equally notorious and corrupt and vastly more multitudinous railroad "graft" which prevails in that department unquestioned even unto this day.

Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, in his speech at Nantasket Point, Saturday, Aug. 27, said:

There is not a newspaper in the country that doubts the opinion of Theodore Roosevelt as to the tariff.

"Political economists have pretty generally agreed that protection is vicious in theory and harmful in practice," said Theodore Roosevelt in his *Life of Benton*. Is this the "opinion" to which Senator Lodge alludes?

There is nothing startling in the report from Wisconsin that ex-Senator Vilas successfully opposed a demand by the Democratic convention for primary nominations. Between Vilas and

Payne there is no difference, except that Vilas is a Grover Cleveland Democrat, while Payne is a Mark Hanna Republican; and this difference as a rule is only skin deep. Democrats of the democratic variety in Wisconsin will serve their party best by voting for La Follette for governor. A democratic Republican is always preferable to a plutocratic Democrat; and if Peck has any claims to being a democrat, except the party label, he has kept the secret well.

There are signs of a resuscitation of the anti-protection work of the Reform Club of New York. The tariff reform committee of this club did splendid work in the early '90's; but with an injection of protection sentiment into the club, the club deteriorated and its free trade work languished. The only unfortunate thing about the proposed revival of the work is the persistence of the name, "tariff reform." Free traders look askance at this name because they were buncoed by it once; and protectionists, of course, are not to be caught with a name which, though it might mean reformation favorable to protection, is associated with the activities of such doubtful protectionists as John De Witt Warner, Charles S. Fairchild, Henry de Forest Baldwin, Charles Biggs, Robert Grier Monroe, P. J. Mosenthal, Franklin Pierce, Henry B. B. Stapler, Anson Phelps Stokes, Calvin Tompkins, Seth Sprague Terry, and Louis Windmuller. These gentlemen, free traders all, will strengthen their work immeasurably by coming out squarely and fairly for the fullest measure of free trade the Constitution permits—a tariff only for revenue. "Tariff reform" is a back number, with the reputation of a humbug; "a tariff only for revenue" suggests a policy to command respect and it is distinguished by a name that inspires confidence.

From the altitude of an offer to convict the Colorado labor leaders of moral responsibility for the Colorado outrages, before a jury

composed of the leaders of the decent labor organizations of the country, down to a bare assertion that his charges "have already been made good to the satisfaction of nine-tenths of the people and press," Walter Wellman makes a somewhat precipitous descent. This is his reply, however, when challenged by the Chicago Federation of Labor to make his offer good.

In Denver a "Peabody Law and Order League" has been organized. What kind of law and order is that?

At a banquet on the occasion of a national convention of dentists last week, one seat was reserved for a Chicago dentist of large practice, exceptional professional ability, and undeniable personal charm, who happens to be a Negro. Against his presence at that banquet there was a protest, some of the other dentists announcing that they would not attend if this their fellow-worker appeared. He heard of it and stayed away. Which of all these, say you, was the gentleman?

THE INSPIRATION OF THE CANDIDATES.

According to an article by Walter Wellman in the Record-Herald of Sunday, Sept. 4th, the favorite poem of both the Democratic and the Republican candidates for the Presidency is John J. Ingalls's "Opportunity," which runs as follows:

Master of human destinies am I,
Love, fame and fortune on my footsteps wait.
Cities and fields I walk; I penetrate
Deserts and seas remote, and passing by
Hovel and mart and palace, soon or late
I knock unbidden once at every gate.
If sleeping, wake; if feasting, rise,
Before I turn away. It is the hour of fate,
And those who follow me reach every state
Mortals desire, and conquer every foe
Save death. But they who doubt or hesitate—
Condemned to failure, penury and woe—
Seek me in vain and uselessly implore.
I hear them not, and I return no more.

Mr. Wellman states that this is the inspiration of Judge Parker's life, he often reciting the lines aloud; while "an autographic copy

of it, by Mr. Ingalls himself, hangs within a frame upon a wall of President Roosevelt's office at the White House."

If our poetic tastes are an index to our philosophy of life, to our ideas of morality, to our ideas of the relation of society to the individual and of the individual to society, as I think they are, the views on these subjects which the candidates must logically entertain are not complimentary to them.

The only analogy to an admiration of "Opportunity" I can think of, is the worship, in pagan days, of the Goddess of Fortune; or the belief of Napoleon in his lucky star, which is another phase of the pagan conception.

The doctrine of Ingalls's sonnet is an assertion that chance and accident are the essence of the universal scheme, and that all-prevailing, immutable, but beneficent law has no place therein.

For why, from the nature of things, should any choice outside of ourselves have a whit to do with our being successful in the true sense of that word? Why may we not be successful by simply "laboring in the sweat of our brow," physically or intellectually, and observing the dictates of morality, of which every normal person is innately conscious? And, since every normal person may of his own free will labor and practice morality, why should success not be simply a matter of his volition to do these things? Who has had any authority to amend the natural law, that nothing can come except by the exertion of labor, and nothing lack with it, by adding, "if the time and circumstances be favorable, and the individual act then and only then, he may have the good things of life"?

... But they who doubt and hesitate—
Condemned to failure, penury and woe—
Seek me in vain and uselessly implore.
I hear them not, and I return no more—

runs the verse. Why hasn't one a right to doubt and hesitate? Why should he be "condemned to failure, penury and want," if he labors, tho' he do as much doubting and hesitating as he pleases?

It is the melancholy fact that natural law has been amended by men by introducing the element of opportunity; melancholy, because the disturbance of natural har-

mony has "condemned to failure, penury and woe," thousands who might otherwise walk with their eyes to the sky.

The element of opportunity may cause "love, fame and fortune" (especially fortune, since the most loved and famous have in many cases been unsuccessful, from the point of view of the sonnet), to wait on the footsteps of the cunning, the strong and the unscrupulous; but it also causes thousands of men to feel with Omar Khayyam:

We are no other than a moving row
Of magic shadow-shapes, that come and
go
Round with the Sun-illumed Lantern
held,
In midnight by the master of the show;
But helpless Pieces of the Game He plays
Upon this Chequer-board of Nights and
Days;

Hither and thither moves, and checks and
slays,
And one by one back in the Closet lays.

Mr. Parker and Mr. Roosevelt and others who are churchgoers and still find an inspiration in "Opportunity," think they believe in an overruling Providence; but they are really fatalists, for fatalism is the only logical deduction from a belief in man-made laws, which violate God-made laws.

While these men continue infatuated with such catch-words as "the strenuous life," "opportunity," "the man of the hour," etc., there are many other men, mostly lowly and unheard of, whose confidence in God-made law is so great that the heart of their religion lies in the verse of Joaquin Miller:

In men whom men consider ill,
I find so much of goodness still;
In men whom men pronounce divine,
I find so much of sin and blot,—
I hesitate to draw the line,
Between the two, when God has not.

While its meter and rhyme are perfect and it is a "finished literary product," Ingalls's sonnet cannot be compared to Miller's lines. The sonnet is like the perfect-looking apple which conceals a worm.

ABRAM E. ADELMAN.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Sept. 8.

According to the latest advices from the seat of the Russian-Japanese war (p. 30), the Russians have suffered disastrous defeat in

one of the most stupendous battles of the world's history. The fighting around Liaoyang, mentioned in a general way last week, and in which nearly 500,000 men have been engaged (p. 31), has continued ever since and is terminated now by the retreat of the Russians.

Liaoyang was evacuated by the Russians on the 1st. They crossed the Taitse river, to the north of Liaoyang, and were pursued by the Japanese. After this retreat and pursuit began the dispatches were conflicting, affording no basis for any trustworthy conclusions. The latest authentic report up to the 7th was a dispatch of the 5th from Gen. Kouropatkin stating that the Russian—

army is advancing northward. It has extricated itself from the dangerous position in which it was placed, being threatened by the enemy and having a narrow front. The Japanese throughout the day cannonaded our rear guard, especially its left flank, but without much effect.

Although the wires between St. Petersburg and Mukden were working, no word came from Kouropatkin after the above dispatch of the 5th, and anxiety was felt at St. Petersburg lest Kouropatkin's retreat to Mukden might have been cut off. Later in the day of the 7th, however, authentic reports were received that Kouropatkin had reached Mukden. But these are followed by reports that he cannot make a stand at that point, and is pushing on to Tieling, about 30 miles farther north, still pursued and harassed by the Japanese. A battle with his rear guard before Mukden is said to have begun.

No trustworthy estimate of casualties in the great battle preceding this retreat is yet at hand, but the slaughter and destruction are described as appalling. Even the work of the Red Cross was almost as dangerous to nurses and surgeons as the fighting to soldiers. Many bearers and their assistants were killed or wounded in attending to the injured under fire. Among the killed was a Sister of Mercy and an Associated Press correspondent.

The Japanese movement upon Port Arthur (p. 341), although

overshadowed in the dispatches by facts and surmises regarding the northern campaign, has neither been abandoned nor stayed; but no pronounced results are reported.

Publication on the 4th at Tokio, of the treaty between Japan and Korea (p. 118), signed at Seoul on the 22d of August, pursuant to a protocol of February 23 (vol. vi, p. 743), shows the treaty to be in substance as follows:

(1) The Korean government shall engage as financial adviser to the Korean government a Japanese subject recommended by the Japanese government, and all matters concerning finance shall be dealt with after his counsel has been taken.

(2) The Korean government shall engage as diplomatic adviser to the department of foreign affairs a foreigner recommended by the Japanese government, and all important matters concerning foreign relations shall be dealt with after his counsel has been taken.

(3) The Korean government shall previously consult the Japanese government in concluding treaties and conventions with foreign powers and in dealing with other important diplomatic affairs, such as the granting of concessions to or the making of contracts with foreigners.

Under the first article of this treaty, Mr. Megaly, director of the Japanese revenue bureau, is to succeed J. McLeavy Brown, an Englishman, as financial adviser of Korea; while Durham White Stevens, an American and legal adviser of the Japanese legation at Washington, will become, under the other articles, adviser of Korea as to concessions and grants to foreigners in the sphere of commerce and industry.

A battle in the Uruguayan civil war (p. 341) was reported on the 6th from Buenos Ayres. It is said to have lasted three days, to have involved the loss in killed of 2,000 and in wounded of 4,000, and to have resulted in the defeat of the government forces under Gen. Vazques, the minister of war.

The first election since the Presidential nominations in the United States (p. 341) came off in Vermont on the 6th. The September election in this State is usually regarded in Presidential years as indicative of the result of the national election. Not that the na-

tional election is expected to go as the Vermont election does, for Vermont is a strong Republican State; but the rise or fall of its Republican majority is supposed to indicate the trend of national opinion. The Republican managers predicted on the eve of this election a Republican plurality of 25,000 or more, while the Democratic managers predicted 28,000 or less. The chairman of the Republican committee said:

With a good day we feel reasonably sure of 25,000, and we should look for more but for local conditions where fusion exists.

On the other hand the chairman of the Democratic committee thought the Democrats would be able to cut the Republican plurality well under 25,000. The night before the election he said:

If the Republican plurality is below 27,000 or 28,000, it would be a victory for the Democrats. We feel that if the figure is below 25,000 this year it is a sure indication that the national election will go Democratic.

The Republican leaders generally admitted that they would not come anywhere near the Republican plurality of 1900, and explained this by the apathy caused by a feeling that Roosevelt is certain of election. When the returns came in, however, the Republican plurality, was in round numbers 33,000. This exceeds the plurality of 1900 by about 2,000. The comparative figures from 1896 are as follows:

	Rep.	Dem.	Rep. plurality.	Dem. Per ct.
1896.....	53,247	14,855	38,392	22
1900.....	48,411	17,129	31,282	26
1904.....	47,000	14,000	33,000	23

At the Arkansas election Gov. Jefferson Davis was reelected, but by a vote falling far short of that for the remainder of the Democratic State ticket, which polled about 85 per cent. of the total vote.

After a bitter contest in the Democratic convention of Delaware on the 6th, Caleb Pennewell was nominated for governor. On the 7th the Democrats of Connecticut nominated A. Heaton Robertson for governor. The same party in New Hampshire nominated Henry B. Hollis for governor on the same day.

In Wisconsin the Democrats

nominated ex-Gov. George W. Peck on the 1st. A plank favoring the La Follette primary election plan for the nomination of all officers was rejected by a vote of 172 to 404, one favoring two-cents-a-mile railroad fares was changed to a demand for mileage books at two cents a mile, and a plank for the regulation of corporations was modified to satisfy the conservatives. William F. Vilas was leader of the convention.

The Socialists of this State nominated W. A. Arnold for governor, at their convention on the 4th.

At the Democratic primaries in Cleveland, on the 1st, where Mayor Johnson was opposed by a small faction of his party vigorously supported by the electric lighting and other local corporations, he and his friends won a pronounced victory. The three Democratic members of the council who have most prominently opposed his anti-corporation policy, were defeated by emphatic majorities; and out of the 13 candidates to be elected to the City Council, 9 of those nominated at these primaries were pro-Johnson men. The nominations were all made at the primaries; no conventions are to be held.

Following Judge Tuley's condemnation of the Chicago traction-extension ordinance now pending before the city council (p. 343), Judge Edward F. Dunne addressed the Fortschritt Turner Society at length on the same subject on the 4th. Besides also condemning the ordinance, Judge Dunne denounced the circumstances of its promotion as suspicious. In the course of this speech, which was an elaborate review of the history of the traction question and a careful argument on the proposed ordinance, Judge Dunne took occasion to say:

I was one of this community who advocated and worked for the election of Carter H. Harrison. Indeed, I think I may claim, without being guilty of exaggeration or conceit, that were it not for the fact that I succeeded, by going to Springfield and having a long and earnest talk with Clarence S. Darrow and having Mr. Darrow declare himself for Carter H. Harrison for Mayor, that Mr. Harrison would not

now be occupying his present position. I believed at the time, as the public in general believed, that Mr. Harrison was a man who would respect and keep his own words of promise to the people. It is because I advocated his election in private and did what I could as a citizen to procure that election that I feel that I have the right to discuss openly and fearlessly his present position on the traction question, and I propose to do so without fear or favor.

Judge Dunne then recited Mayor Harrison's pledges in detail, charging him with proposing now to violate them, and proceeded:

On March 20, 1903 Mr. Harrison stated: "Mr. Harrity took me up on a high mountain, as it were, and told me that the world was mine if I would betray the people of Chicago and extend the traction franchise." He has evidently made up his mind in August, 1904, to betray the people of Chicago and extend the traction franchise for in the proposed traction ordinance there is no provision for a referendum that he repeatedly and persistently pledged should appear thereon. . . .

Who was the man who took him up on the high mountain this Summer, and did that man tell him the world was his? . . . From a financial and economical standpoint, the most serious and far reaching question that has ever been presented to the citizens of Chicago is before us to-day. In 1883 the traction companies of this city were granted an extension of their franchises for a term of twenty years, which term expired in 1903. Shortly after these franchises were given in 1883 for twenty years the corporations securing the same were capitalized by the issuance of stocks and bonds to the amount of \$117,000,000. The recent report of Bion Arnold shows that the value of all the tangible property owned by these corporations did not exceed \$27,000,000. In other words, these traction companies, after the procurement of the franchises giving them the right to operate street cars in the city of Chicago for twenty years, sold to investors stocks and bonds to the extent of ninety millions of dollars in excess of the value of the tangible properties of the corporations, and the investing public regarded these franchises as being worth, and paid therefor, \$90,000,000 in excess of the tangible value of the property. These corporations, until within the last two or three years, have paid interest satisfactory to the stock and bondholders upon this enormous capitalization. The Federal census, taken three years before the extension of these franchises, shows that there were less than half a million people in the city of Chicago. In 1883, when the franchise was extended, there were

probably not 700,000 souls in the city of Chicago. If the right to operate street cars in a city having a population of less than 700,000 people for twenty years was capitalized in 1883, or shortly thereafter, at \$90,000,000 over and above the value of the tangible property, am I not safe in saying that the renewal of these franchises to-day, in a city having a population of 2,000,000, giving these companies the right to carry three times the number of passengers they carried in 1883 at the same rate of fare, is worth at least the sum of \$300,000,000? . . . This figure, however, must be modified in at least one respect. In 1883 there were no elevated roads in Chicago; in 1904 there are, and they are carrying, in all probability, not to exceed one-third of the total car-using population. Conceding—which I very much doubt—that they carry one-third of the population of Chicago, these figures would have to be modified to the extent of reducing the total value of the franchises from \$300,000,000 to \$200,000,000. The question then presented to the citizens of Chicago at the present time is, whether or not they will consent to make a gift to the traction companies of the exclusive right to operate cars on the streets of this city for twenty years, and to charge therefor the same prices that they charged in 1883—a nickel a ride. These franchises are worth \$200,000,000. Should they be handed over to private corporations as proposed by the Mayor of this city, or should they be retained by the people themselves? There seems to be but one answer to the proposition.

The traction companies of this city are to-day without franchises upon their trunk lines, even under the interpretation given to the act of 1865 by Judge Grosscup, and Judge Tuley truthfully says: "They have nothing but stub ends of tracks." If the city were to condemn the property of these companies to-day, as it has a right under the Mueller bill to do, and as I have been advocating in public and private for the last two years, it would only have to pay for the tangible property now owned by these companies and for a few unexpired franchises, which are of comparatively little value. By condemnation proceedings they could be acquired for a very reasonable figure at the present time. But if this proposed ordinance be granted, as a citizen and as a lawyer, I tell you that the city will be utterly powerless ever to acquire these plants.

If she were to commence condemnation proceedings within thirty days after the giving of such a franchise, these companies would have no difficulty in proving to a jury that the very franchise itself was worth in the neighborhood of two hundred millions of dollars. A giving of the franchise

under the escircumstances, which would force us to pay for this very franchise itself such an enormous amount of money, is an outrage upon the people of this community which ought not and should not be tolerated, and the man or men occupying public office who will attempt to hand over in this scandalous and shameless manner this priceless property of the people should be condemned in the public mind to lasting infamy and disgrace.

Replying to Judge Dunne, through the friendly columns of the Daily News of the 5th, Mayor Harrison said:

The trouble with Judge Dunne is that he has educated his lungs at the expense of his brains. . . . I am carrying out every pledge I have ever made. The trouble with most of those citizens who are nagging now is that they are suggesting something that cannot be carried out, and they know it. But there must be just so much brass band to it or people might think they are out of commission. They really expect the council to meet one day, condemn street-railway property and pay for it the next, advertise Mueller bill certificates and the whole thing is settled. Any one with a grain of common sense knows that is wind. I have never believed immediate municipal ownership possible, and do not think so now. Everything I have said on the subject of traction has been in contemplation of an extension of franchise. A government cannot be run on wind. We are elected to do things. My proposition has always been to secure legislation from Springfield for power to own and operate street railways. When that legislation had been secured and power had been conferred upon the city to own and operate street railways whenever it so wills, I said I was in favor of extension of present franchises, at least long enough to cover all unexpired grants.

An end to the packing house strike (p. 328) has been postponed, if not prevented, by a referendum vote of the strikers. A conference on the 4th, brought about by Dr. Cornelia De Bey, Jane Adams and Mary E. McDowell, of Chicago, between the strike leaders and the employers, resulted in an understanding that the strikers should take a referendum vote on the following proposition:

The unions to call off the strike.

The packers to reemploy as many of the strikers as they can give work to, and to give the preference to the former employes in the future; as many of the new workers as wish to remain to be retained.

Wages of the skilled men to remain at the rate paid before the strike.

In New York the skilled men had voted on the 3d to abandon the strike, but the Western vote of the 6th was adverse. As reported by the strike managers it stands 25,597 to 2,411 against accepting the terms proposed. The objection is that while by these terms the wages of the skilled workmen would remain as before, the unskilled workmen would be at the mercy of the packing house trust.

NEWS NOTES.

—The national conclave of the Knights Templar met at San Francisco on the 5th.

—On the 5th the eighth International Geographical Congress met at Washington.

—On the 1st King Edward approved the appointment of Earl Grey (p. 171) as governor general of Canada to succeed the Earl of Minto.

—On the 7th the Referendum League of Illinois completed its petition for a State referendum on three questions (p. 324) with 130,000 signatures—about 40,000 more than the public policy law requires.

—Seven white men convicted at Danville, Va., of being members of a mob that had attempted to lynch a Negro prisoner charged with murder, were each sentenced on the 7th to one day's imprisonment and \$50 fine.

—Gov. Odell has appointed Edward M. Cullen, of Brooklyn, a Democrat, to succeed Judge Parker as chief justice of the Court of Appeals of New York. Judge Cullen has been a Supreme Court justice of New York since 1880.

—A mimic military campaign on the old Bull Run battlefield has been conducted during the week with militia regiments from various States. Gen. Grant commanded on one side, the Blues, and Gen. Bell on the other, the Browns.

—The census of India for 1901, just published, shows that in 1901 the 1,254,612 square miles of the Indian empire had a population of 117,459,193. Of these the Christians numbered 2,923,241, and of them 2,664,313 were natives. Two-fifths of the latter were Roman Catholics.

—Charles B. Spahr, of New York city, long one of the editors of the Outlook, but more recently editor of Current Literature, and well known in the United States as a sociologist of the liberal type, either fell or jumped from the steamer Prince Albert, on the 3d, on her trip from Ostend to Dover.

—At Huntsville, Ala., on the 7th, a

white mob took a Negro prisoner, accused of murder, from the jail where he was awaiting trial, and hanged him. The mob was resisted by the sheriff and his deputies, aided by militia, and a pitched battle resulted in which three soldiers are reported to have been killed.

—The monthly statement of the United States treasury department (see p. 296) for August shows on hand August 31, 1904:

Gold reserve fund	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash	147,975,364.45
Total	\$297,975,364.45
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1904	319,027,242.39
Decrease	\$ 21,051,877.94

—At Pittsfield, Mass., on the 6th, a luncheon was given by Alexander Sedgwick, of New York, to Booker T. Washington, at which the guests, besides Mr. Washington, were Bishop MacVicker, of Rhode Island; the Rev. Arthur Lawrence, rector of St. Paul's church, Stockbridge; John E. Parsons, of New York; Baron von dem Busche, of the German embassy; Dr. W. Gilman Thompson, of Washington, and Richard R. Bowker, of New York.

—The monthly treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government (see p. 296) for the month ending August 31, 1904, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff	\$41,901,423.71
Internal revenue	39,010,680.61
Miscellaneous	10,777,664.57
	\$ 91,689,778.89
Expenses:	
Civil and misc.	\$27,052,270.46
War	32,508,773.34
Navy	22,148,147.43
Indians	2,117,823.49
Pensions	25,786,273.88
Interest	5,830,480.54
	\$115,440,719.14
Deficit	\$ 23,750,940.25

—The National Negro Business League in session at Indianapolis on the 2d elected Booker T. Washington president, and issued an address to the public declaring that—

The right of labor is the right divine. Our right to live is wrapped up in it and is assured to us by the law of God and the law of man. The public opinion or the private rule which infringes that right not only menaces our success as business men, but throws back upon us a volume of poverty and crime with which we cannot single-handed cope and which rests upon the character and tone of the communities in which we reside. We have our pauper and criminal classes, but we would have the public charity and the legal processes of the law and public opinion deal with them as other race elements of the national population are dealt with. We ask that we be judged in public opinion and in law as other men are judged. As business men we believe in the supremacy of the law as the surest safeguard of healthy business development and effective industrial effort.

Ah Ping—The foreign devils have a crazy idea that the earth is round.
Oh Pong—I could forgive that, but they also think they own it, and allow us to live on the under side.—
Life.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE TRACTION QUESTION.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Sept. 1.—If the present bargain falls through there is nothing ahead for either the city or the companies but litigation, financial loss, insecurity, and excrable service. The time has come when prejudice and sentiment must yield to reason. Otherwise we are adrift on a sea of discomfort and distress with all ports below the horizon.

Chicago Examiner (Dem.), Aug. 29.—The proposed ordinance for the Chicago City Railroad is a fraud and a swindle. It is as bold a piece of dishonest legislation as this community has ever seen. It pretends to grant a franchise for thirteen years, and really grants one forever. It pretends to allow a chance for municipal ownership after thirteen years, and really makes municipal ownership impossible. The franchises have expired, the courts have cleared the way by knocking out the ninety-nine-year scarecrow, the money is provided, the time is ripe, all things are ready for municipal ownership and for the emancipation of Chicago from the grasp of a grinding monopoly. And, above all, the people have twice voted for it. Nothing now stands in the way of this great reform but the greed of stockholders of these companies and the servility and cowardice of certain of the people's servants.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind. Rep.), Sept. 5.—The fall season in traction issues has opened very successfully. Judges Tuley and Dunne have indulged in their chronic habit of disregarding the ordinary decencies by discussing legal phases of the question, giving opinions off the bench on issues they may hear later as judges, and bringing their courts into contempt by their evident utter lack of comprehension of the difficulties of the situation. Mr. W. B. Lloyd and Mr. Ashton have announced their total disapproval of the Mayor, the Council, the transportation committee and all others who seek to settle the traction question. It has become apparent that the Union Traction interests are bitterly opposed to the proposed settlement, and are working hand in hand with Dunne, Lloyd, Tuley and Ashton. The Chicago American, after mature consideration, has decided to overrule Judges Grosscup and Jenkins. . . . With this accomplished, all that is now needful is the opinion of the Woggle Bug. That being had, the Council and the Mayor may proceed with the work intrusted to them by the electorate of Chicago.

BRYAN.
What's The Use (fair play), Sept.—For the first time in Bryan's career the capitalistic Republican press is doing him justice. Heretofore the Eastern papers have purposely treated him unfairly for the simple reason that they feared him. He is a peerless leader, and just now the Republicans are saying so with grace equal to that of a Chicago platform Democrat. The Populists are true to him though they and he have reluctantly parted company. The Socialists pronounce his principles ultra-conservative, but declare him the one honest Democrat in public life. The Prohibitionists admire Bryan for his personal cleanliness. Davenport's cartoons were never better, for he is sinking his shaft in a new vein. His pictures of Bryan in the Republican dailies are of heroic character, calculated to make the Nebraskan respected by all sincere outspoken people. If elected Parker will owe his success to the more than a million Democrats who are expectantly waiting for the subtle word to pass down the line: "Don't bolt; support the ticket." Without this million of loyal Bryanites the ticket will go down to defeat—and David B. Hill, Wm. F. Sheehan et al. cannot save it. The "very still" sage of Wolfert's Roost is much in evidence at the present writing, but long before November he and Wall street will be pleading for mercy from the man they sought to ignore and flout at the national convention. If Parker is defeated—and it's more than even chance,—the Colonel will wear no crane on his hat—the reorganizers will be the mourners. Bryan's business, following the passing of Parker will be to get the Western Democracy back into the saddle. The future will be Bryan's opportunity, and he will be swift to use it.

MISCELLANY

"AND SOME ONE LAUGHED."
For a statesman there was with the heart of a fox,
Who tricked the nations in turn;
And he rubbed his hands as he stood and watched
The fires he kindled burn.
And he cried aloud in his soorn and pride:
"O ye who would empires make!
Go, learn to build with iron and steel,
And with blood the cement to stake."
* * * * *
And another arose, who spoke in his turn:
"Go, forge me a golden chain,
To bind me my Empire fast and strong,
Against all stress and strain;
Go, buy me their hearts with a penny-piece,
Lest our labor be in vain."
* * * * *
And some one laughed—men heard the laugh
Across the earth and sky:
"Ye builders with blood and iron and gold—
In the tricks of your trade shall ye die!"
"But learn, if ye can, there is only one
True faithful builder's art—
To bind in peace, to hold by faith,
To build on the unbought heart."
"For your wisdom is as foolishness—
And whatever the work of your hands,
It shall turn to your hurt, it shall come to naught,
It shall crumble to dust as it stands."
—Auberon Herbert, in the Westminster Gazette.

DR. GOLDWIN SMITH ON THE GEORGIA MOB.

From the Toronto Weekly Sun of Aug. 24.
There is no use in saying that this is indignation against crime, or even that it is hatred of race; it is devilish lust of cruelty, such as burned in the fiendish breast of the Iroquois.
Why are such things allowed to happen in a Republic which deems itself the flower of enlightenment and civilization?
The answer is, because there is no government in the United States. Government has been practically supplanted by the perpetual conflict and alternate domination of two factions, each of which is too dependent on mob favors to enforce the law. No such spectacle is presented in any other community pretending to civilization.

LITTLE JAPS.

Here is a thing which every visitor to Japan at once notices—their love for children.
An American woman who became acquainted with a Japanese mother noticed that she allowed her little children to ramble through the streets at will, and one day spoke of it.
"Why," said the Japanese lady, "what harm can come of it? Our children never

quarrel, and no grown person would harm a child."

"But," said the American lady, "the child might get lost."

"That would make no trouble," was the smiling reply; and then she showed how, in little children's apparel there were inserted cards containing their name and address, and explaining that should they stray, any person finding them will first give them a good meal and then bring them home.—Christian Guardian.

"ALL HUMAN TOGETHER."

We badly need the doctrine of democracy, which we too easily profess with our lips. The sublime doctrine is, that "God hath made of one blood all the inhabitants of the world." Then we hold that Divine life is also, though slumbering, in Negroes and Chinamen and Filipinos.

Then a law follows this fact, namely, that we treat men with reference to the Divine life which is in them, that we treat them not as pawns, or toys, or machines, but as men; that we look for the best in them, and hope for the best, not the worst. Do we like to be treated with deference by others? Do we like to have men salute us? Do we care to have them listen when we speak? Do we ask their respect when we make requests of them? Then we must keep our own law. We will take off our hats to their manhood. We will listen respectfully when they speak, we will count their votes, as we wish our votes to be counted. We will never forget that we are all human together.—Rev. Chas. F. Dole.

HENRY GEORGE, JR., ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION. AN OPEN LETTER TO THE TREASURER OF THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE.

Hon. George Foster Peabody, Treasurer National Democratic Committee, New York:

Dear Sir—It appears to me of utmost general and party importance that Edward M. Shepard should be nominated for the Governorship by the Democratic convention at Saratoga on the 20th instant.

His strong moral qualities, high, clear principles, splendid attainments and long training in public and legal affairs fit him peculiarly to fill with profit and honor to the State of New York and with distinction to himself an office which for years has been degraded to the lowest standards. His nomination would signify not only

that the party had taken high, moral, progressive ground, but that it intended to be aggressive, for Mr. Shepard, as a candidate, would "carry the war into Africa." My judgment is that such a nomination would assure Democratic victory in this State in November.

Confidence of this result prevailing here would over the country quicken confidence of general Democratic success, for all eyes look to New York for indications.

To men thinking as I do there is not only no good result to be obtained by voting for Mr. Watson, the People's Party candidate for the Presidency; there is a negative evil. While, despite his opposing action, he is a good Jeffersonian Democrat and while there is much progressive democracy in his platform, he has little chance even of making a good showing at the polls, not to speak of being elected. The election lies between President Roosevelt and Judge Parker, and what one or the other stands for must govern the administrative branch of the United States Government for the next four years.

In my judgment the election of Judge Parker is needed to save the Republic from imminent danger.

I never approved of Judge Parker's hiding his political views and I must condemn his timid opposition to the tariff and trust iniquities, believing that the true stand for a Democratic candidate to take, both for social justice and political success, is such as was taken by Thomas Jefferson in his famous phrase: "Equal rights for all; special privileges to none."

Yet even judged on this domestic question, more may reasonably be hoped for from a candidate who promise little, but whose actions on the bench have been consistent with the principle of equal rights, than from a candidate who, as President, repeatedly swearing eternal enmity to special privilege, had a special cabinet office created largely in order to investigate trust monopolies, and since, manifestly to insure reelection, has had that investigating cabinet officer placed in the chairmanship of his political party, with authority to solicit for the Republican campaign fund contributions from the special privileges and trust monopolies to which the President is supposed to be so hostile.

This might be a sufficient reason for supporting Judge Parker. But there is a still stronger one. The anti-special privilege fight should be made and made soon if the masses of the people are to

be rescued from a variety of huge, insidious and constant robberies that are reducing multitudes to an embroiling poverty to which other multitudes have already been reduced. But before we can bring our full or any considerable part of our strength into that fight we must battle with an enemy most active and most potent—an enemy embodied in the military idea, in a great army and a great navy, in a "strong" foreign policy, in manipulated coup d'etats abroad, in the rule of other peoples and the performance of extra-Constitutional things, and in pursuit in many ways of methods that made Rome the ravisher of the world and which helped to reduce her people to the condition of a few masters and many slaves.

Against this foreign aggression, proclaimed and practiced by President Roosevelt—an aggression at once destructive of the liberties of other peoples and ruinous to those of our own—Judge Parker has taken clear, strong ground. For this reason I shall earnestly support him, feeling that this is the eminent issue of the campaign.

And because it appears likely to be of material help in Judge Parker's election while certain to offer a proper chief magistrate to the State of New York, I think Mr. Shepard's nomination for the Governorship to be of pressing political necessity. Yours respectfully,

HENRY GEORGE, JR.

Merrilewood Park, Sullivan Co., N. Y.
Sept. 3, 1904.

THE TRACTION QUESTION IN CHICAGO.

Leading editorial in the Chicago Examiner of Sept. 7, 1904. Written for the Examiner by Louis F. Post.

Had the people of Chicago suspected that Carter H. Harrison, Democrat, and Graeme Stewart, Republican, were running for mayor on the same side of the traction issue a year and a half ago, Harrison's election would have been highly improbable. He was elected because, and only because, a large body of the voters, fearing that Stewart would settle with the traction interests without consulting the people, confidently trusted Harrison's pledges to prevent any and every traction settlement not specifically approved by referendum vote.

That they did not follow the example of the 10,000 who were so distrustful of Mr. Harrison's sincerity as to vote for Daniel L. Cruice (the third-party municipal ownership candidate) was due to the intervention of Clarence S. Darrow, made at the solicitation of Judge Edward F. Dunne. Mr. Darrow saved the day for Harrison. He did so by convinc-

ing most of the voters who were inclined to support Cruice that Stewart, whom they would thereby help to elect, would play into the hands of the traction interests by making an immediate settlement, whereas Harrison could be depended upon to prevent any settlement whatever without a referendum.

This is the true explanation of Harrison's election, as all well-informed citizens of Chicago know. Mayor Harrison himself has acknowledged it in the most pronounced manner.

Yet Mayor Harrison has the temerity now to excuse his part in promoting a traction settlement without a referendum by asserting that in the mayoral campaign both he and Stewart stood for settlement!

He has done this through an interview which appeared on the 28th of August in the friendly columns of the Record-Herald. "Graeme Stewart was a settlement man," says Mayor Harrison in that interview, "and he received 138,000 votes. I also was running on another settlement platform, and I was given 146,000. In other words, the candidates who favored a settlement of some sort or other received 284,000 votes, while the immediate control candidates (Mayor Harrison here alludes to Cruice and the Socialist party candidates) received 20,000 votes."

The Mayor then proceeds in this interview to compare the total of 284,000 votes received by himself and Stewart with the 120,000 "little ballot" votes, a majority of 70,000, cast a year later for immediate municipal ownership; and from the difference thus shown in favor of himself and Stewart, considered as one, he infers that the "little ballot" vote of 1904 was overridden by the Harrison-Stewart "settlement" vote of 1903.

According to Mr. Harrison's present views, consequently, he and Mr. Stewart were running with friendly rivalry in a combination against immediate municipal ownership and in favor of a committee-room and Council-chamber settlement of the traction question. They would appear to have differed only as to the details.

But that was by no means the policy on which Mr. Harrison made his campaign. The platform on which he then stood, and the personal pledges he then made, cannot possibly be reconciled with his present attitude.

Mr. Harrison's platform of that year expressly pledged him and his party to:

The reference of all proposed extension ordinances to a vote of the people for their sanction and indorsement.

Not only was Mr. Harrison thus pledged by his platform, but he pledged

himself to the same effect over and over again to the people whose votes he solicited. He himself has declared it. When asked by a civic committee during that campaign to sign their pledge regarding the traction question, he replied, over his own signature:

In every speech I am making in the present campaign I am calling attention to the necessity of the referendum on all proposed franchise extension ordinances, and am giving my pledge to the people direct to withhold my approval from any ordinance which does not give to the people a right they expect and demand, viz.: A referendum vote on all franchise extension ordinances passed by the City Council.

Has Mayor Harrison changed his mind since making those pledges? If so, what are his reasons? The public which elected him to serve them have a right to know whether or not his reasons are those of a statesman. If they are, they will bear publicity. Then why are they withheld? Why does he try to reconcile the irreconcilable, instead of frankly admitting a change of mind and giving his reasons for the change?

Unless he has changed his mind since his election there can be no defense for his present position. If it is possible for a candidate to bind himself by campaign pledges, if a political party is capable of obligating its nominees by platform declarations, then is Mayor Harrison bound to withhold his approval from the pending traction-extension ordinance until after a referendum vote upon it. Nor is this obligation redeemed by the Mayor's flippant challenge to its opponents to "get busy" with an adverse petition. He cannot evade his pledges honorably by assuming that the refusal of these citizens to "get busy" in the particular way which he cynically outlines for them will amount to a "silent referendum" in favor of reversing the audible referendum of last Spring and of releasing him from his pledges of the Spring before. He is pledged not merely to withhold his approval from ordinances of this kind if a popular protest is made; he is pledged to withhold it a popular indorsement has been recorded.

Does he intend to redeem this pledge? If not, why not? He makes no upright and downright explanation. He juggles with the question. And while he juggles with it, his supporters are either also evasive or they are silent. The public, therefore, are left to their own inferences.

Are the public blamable, then, if, under all the circumstances, they become increasingly suspicious of this settlement ordinance, and seriously doubtful of the integrity even of high-minded men who urge its speedy acceptance by

the authorities without referendum approval? These natural and fast spreading doubts and suspicions cannot be allayed so long as Judge Tuley's condemnation of the extension ordinance is ignored by all but one of its promoters besides the Mayor, and evokes from him only the arrogant exclamation that the warnings of this foremost citizen and most noted Jurist of Illinois are "ail wind."

Judge Tuley has enumerated in the columns of this newspaper no less than nineteen reasons against enacting the ordinance in question. Every reason is important. There is not one which does not call at least for amendatory clauses; many go to the heart of the ordinance, calling for its rejection as an unnecessary, if not corrupt, surrender of valuable public rights to the traction companies. Among the latter are such reasons as these: That the ordinance increases the privileges of the corporations while restricting the rights of the public and lessening the powers of the city; that it falsely professes to destroy the possibilities of long and vexatious litigation by the companies; that it falsely professes to rid the city of the companies' ninety-nine-year claims; and that it makes municipal ownership of the city's traction facilities practically impossible.

Under such an indictment, from such a source, the advocates of this ordinance cannot resort to evasion or take refuge in silence, yet hope to retain public confidence.

If Judge Tuley is in error, it is incumbent on them to expose his errors, and to do so with dignity and candor. If they are unable to do this, they must either throw their influence against the ordinance, or be prepared to bear the odium of a most reasonable, even if mistaken, suspicion.

The public will be slow to believe, and ought to be slow to believe, that a traction settlement which Judge Tuley condemns as hostile to municipal ownership while pretending to promote it, as lessening the city's powers while pretending to increase them, as increasing the companies' privileges while pretending to diminish them, as preserving the possibilities of vexatious litigation while pretending to remove them, as conserving the ninety-nine-year claims while pretending to foreclose them; a settlement which flies in the face of the referendum vote on the same general subject less than six months ago; which is to be approved by the Mayor without referendum indorsement, in spite of his campaign pledges to approve no such settlement until thus indorsed by the people; and a settlement which will

withal be of great value to certain financial interests not noted for being over-scrupulous—the public will be justly slow to believe that the sponsors of such a settlement, so condemned yet so consummated, are altogether innocent. Some of them may perhaps deserve to be so considered, and all of them doubtless desire to be; but none can escape the odium of responsibility for pledges broken, an electorate betrayed, and the rights of a city bartered for the favor of conscienceless corporations.

From this reasonable suspicion, only one among the promoters of the ordinance in question has thus far entitled himself to exemption. Edwin Burritt Smith's reply to Judge Tuley is dignified and has all the indicia of candor. It does not satisfactorily answer Judge Tuley's criticism, however, and it wholly fails to justify, to excuse, or even to explain the Mayor's proposed violation of his campaign pledges to approve no franchise-extension ordinance until it has been indorsed by popular referendum.

EDWARD M. SHEPARD ON THE ISSUES OF THE CAMPAIGN.

Portions of a speech delivered by Edward M. Shepard at Bennington, Vt., Aug. 31.

THE "PROSPERITY" ARGUMENT HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

Is it true that our increase in wealth and prosperity since the rise of the Republican party has been its work, its glory? Was it an appeal to truth for Mr. Hay to treat as result of "Fifty Years of the Republican Party" our increase in population between 1850 and 1900, our fourfold increase in farming acreage, our fivefold increase in corn crop and sixfold increase in wheat crop, our increase in manufacturing capital from \$500,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000? Does any argument deserve less respect from one who has mastered that first rule of reasoning which bids him not infer that event A is the effective and sole cause of event B merely because in order of time event B comes with or after event A? Were there not in the United States fertile soil and moderate suns and rains, the brains and hands and inventive genius of American men and women, liberty, law and order—all these before there was a Republican party; and were not they the prime cause of our prosperity? The growth of American population and wealth between the peace of 1783 and the inauguration of John Adams in 1797 was but a small fraction of the like growth under McKinley and Roosevelt. And in those fourteen years—the years when Franklin and Jefferson and Hamilton and Mad-

ison, under the auspices of the noble, unboastful character of the Father of his Country, established our Republic,—our material growth in absolute figures was small indeed—our railroad mileage nought. Were those earlier statesmen dwarfs, therefore, in comparison with the latter-day Titans, who have dwelt in the White house since March, 1897? What years, O American men and women, have done more, material and moral, than those early ones for their own generation, what years more for this very Twentieth Century prosperity of ours? Is it the Lincoln doctrine—or was it ever—that the merit of moral and political causes is measurable by the wealth and luxury accumulated at the very time of their operation? Is it not the doctrine of prophets and apostles and the lesson of all practical history, that self-denial, simplicity, economy, righteousness, sobriety, lead on—not instantly but after patient years—to power and wealth? Would not Republican orators give better promise for future fruits of present day Republican administration—if they could rather and truly claim for their party under President Roosevelt an enforcement of equal rights, a rigorous economy, a punctilious regard for law?

But if this doctrine of "Present wealth, therefore present virtue in present ruling politics," be not a shallow sophistry, still see with what absurd unfairness it is applied. Do Republican apologists say—dare they say—what alone would be relevant to the political problem, that during the forty-four years since their party came into power, the progress of our country has been as great, from year to year, as during the sixty years of general Democratic supremacy before the civil war? If the Republican party may justly ask another lease of power because from 1860 to 1900 our population increased from 31,000,000 to 76,000,000, or 36 per cent. per decade, why may not the Democrats with greater justice ask their return to power because from 1800 to 1860 the increase was from 5,300,000 to 31,443,000, or 82 per cent. in each decade? Was not the increase in the decade, 1850-1860—and in spite of slavery,—from 23,000,000 to 31,000,000, or at the same rate as in the decades, 1860-1900? If the increase in total wealth between 1860 and 1900 was from \$16,000,000,000 to \$90,500,000,000, or 116 per cent. per decade, and in wealth per capita of

* All my statistics are taken from the Summary of Commerce and Finance for May, 1904, issued by the bureau of statistics, department of commerce and labor. For total wealth and other data before 1850, there are no official figures. In each case the percentages are computed upon the earlier figure given.

population from \$513.92 to \$1,235.86, or 35 per cent. per decade—was not the Democratic increase in total wealth between 1850 and 1860 from \$7,000,000,000 to \$16,000,000,000, or 128 per cent. for the decade, being still larger than the Republican, and in wealth per capita from \$307.69 to \$513.93, or at the rate of 67 per cent. for the decade—nearly double the Republican rate? Although the value of farms and farm property increased from \$7,980,000,000 in 1860 to \$20,514,000,000 in 1900, or at the rate of 39 per cent. in each decade, was not the increase from \$3,967,000,000 in 1850 to \$7,980,000,000 in 1860, or at the rate of 100 per cent. per decade; and were not, therefore, Democratic auspices far more favorable to prosperity than Republican? Although the corn crop increased from 838 millions bushels in 1860 to 2,105 millions in 1900, or at the rate of 37 per cent. in each decade, was not the increase from 377 millions in 1840 to 838 millions in 1860, or at the rate of 61 per cent. in each decade; and if therefore, we wish large increase in the next four years, ought we not to prefer a Democratic president? Even if the wheat crop increased from 173 millions of bushels in 1860 to 552 millions in 1900, or at the rate of 50 per cent. in each decade, did it not increase from 84,000,000 in 1840 to 173,000,000 in 1860, or at the larger rate of 53 per cent. per decade? If this kind of argument be fit, what shall be said of the increases in wealth under Democratic auspices from \$7,000,000,000 to \$16,000,000,000 in 1850-1860, or at the decade rate of 128 per cent., as against the increase under Republican auspices during the decade 1890-1900 from \$65,000,000,000 to \$94,000,000,000, or at the rate of only 44.6 per cent.? Or what shall be said of the increases in wealth per person throughout the United States in the decade 1850-1860 from \$307.69 to \$513.93, or at the decade rate of 67 per cent., as against the corresponding increase under Republican auspices in 1890-1900 from 1,038.57 to \$1,235.86, or at the decade rate of only 19 per cent.? Or what shall be said of the increase in export of American manufactures of iron and steel from \$52,144 in 1800 to \$5,870,114 in 1860, or an average rate of 1859 per cent. per decade, as against the Republican increase from \$5,870,114 in 1860 to \$121,913,548 (at the abnormally high figures of 1900), or an average increase per decade of only 494 per cent.? Or what shall be said, and perhaps more reasonably, of the increase under Democratic rule in our export of agricultural products from \$25,000,000 in 1800 to \$256,000,000 in 1860, an average of 150 per cent. per decade, as against the increase under Republican rule from \$256,000,000 in

1860 to \$835,000,000 in 1900, an average of only 56 per cent. per decade? What shall be said of the Democratic increase in our total domestic merchandise exported from \$31,000,000 in 1860 to \$316,000,000 in 1860, or an average Democratic increase of 153 per cent. per decade, as against the Republican increase from \$316,000,000 in 1860 to \$1,370,000,000 in 1900, an increase of only 83.5 per cent. per decade? Or what shall be said of the Democratic increase in American tonnage engaged in foreign trade from 669,921 in 1860 to 2,546,237 in 1860, a Democratic increase per decade of 46 per cent., as against the decrease from 2,546,237 in 1860 to 826,694 in 1900, a Republican decrease of 16 per cent. per decade? Or what shall be said of the Democratic increase of tonnage engaged in domestic trade from 301,919 in 1860, to 2,807,631 in 1860, a Democratic increase of 138 per cent. per decade, as against the Republican increase from 2,807,631 in 1860 to 4,338,145 in 1900, or only 13 per cent. per decade? If the increase in railroad mileage be so significant a Republican glory, is it not fit to point out that under Democratic auspices the mileage increased from 23 miles in 1830 to 30,626 in 1860; or, if this be a crowding of the argument, then that the increase under Democratic auspices in 1850-1860 was from 9,021 to 30,626, a decade increase of 239 per cent., as against the increase from 161,276 in 1890 to 194,334 in 1900, or at the decade rate of only 20.5 per cent.?

Or shall we take the increase in total manufactures, which is the glory of the protectionists? We have not the official figures before 1850 which would, no doubt, show enormous proportional increases. Let us, as we must, begin with 1850. The Democratic increase for 1850-1860 was from \$1,019,000 to \$1,885,000, or at the decade rate of 84 per cent. But in 1890-1900 the Republican and "protected" increase (allowing the abnormally high prices of 1900) was from \$9,372,000,000 to \$13,039,000,000, or at the decade rate of only 39.2 per cent. Is it not significant that, while the total manufacturing product increased in 1890-1900 by 39 per cent., the increase in wages and salaries paid employes was from only \$2,283,000,000 to \$2,735,000,000, or at the decade rate of 19.8 per cent., being only one-half the ratable increase in the manufacturing output? So it is to be noticed that, while population increased in 1850-1860 by 35 per cent., the increase in manufacturing output was 84 per cent., or 2.5 times the rate of population increase; but that the population increase from 1890-1900 was 21.8 per cent., while the increase in wealth was 39.2 per cent., or only 1.81 times the popula-

tion increase. Indeed, in whatever just way the figures of even manufacturing growth are treated, they tell for the period of Democratic rule and greater economic liberty.

The Republican orators and campaign book refer to the recent great increase in exports of domestic products as a crushing proof that, even if foreign trade be considered, Republican administration and a high protective tariff are best. Did not—so they say—exports increase from \$316,000,000 in 1860 to \$1,370,000,000 in 1900, a per decade increase of 83 per cent. upon the amount in 1860? But here again it is easy to explode their argument. For the increase in 1850-1860 was from \$134,900,000 to \$316,000,000, or at the decade rate of 134 per cent.—a Democratic rate of increase under a revenue tariff half as large again as the Republican and "protected" rate of increase. From 1890 to 1903 the increase was from \$845,000,000 to \$1,392,000,000, or at an annual rate of 4.9 per cent., being less than half the Democratic rate of 13.4 per cent. in 1850-1860.

Mr. Hay ventured to include the decade 1850-1860 in his figures of Republican glory. Yet those were years of Democratic power; and the Walker tariff, enacted by Democrats in 1846 for revenue only, was then in effect. Is there anything so truth telling in the vast masses of figures in the Republican campaign book as the fact it would conceal, that those were years of greater ratable growth in material things than any our country has since known?

I cannot leave this mass of figures, made necessary by the almost overwhelming dependence of the Republicans upon the "prosperity" argument, without asking you to think of another point. Does it not illustrate the debasing effect upon the latter-day morale of the Republican party produced by its change of dominant purpose from the restraint of human slavery to the maintenance and tightening of the shackles of a "protective" tariff, that Messrs. Hay and Root and the authors of the Republican campaign book have made no allowance for the regenerative and stimulating effect of the abolition of slave labor? If other things were equal, the rates of industrial increase from 1860, when in nearly half the country the labor was chiefly the crude, wasteful, hopeless labor of slavery, to 1900, when all labor was free, ought to have exceeded those of the preceding decade, instead of to have fallen far below them.

THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

Messrs. Hay and Root, and even the

sordid pages of the Republican campaign book, affirm a moral kinship between Abraham Lincoln and the statesmen who control their politics in 1904, between the men and women who gave the all necessary religious and humanitarian uplift to the anti-slavery struggle and the war for the Union, and, on the other hand, the vast corporate and business influences, which, by and for their own profit, dominate the Republican party. To these influences even its gallant and strenuous candidate has—after his much protesting eloquence to the contrary in 1902 and 1903—been compelled to completely submit with promises not again to "run amuck," and not again to treat the tariff question as open, even to the extent to which President McKinley at the last held that the welfare of the country required it to be open. Surely the claim to this kinship needs only to be stated to refute itself. What part, indeed, did a protective tariff play in the national uprising of 1861? How much was it discussed in the Lincoln-Douglass debates of 1858, or Lincoln's Cooper Union speech of 1859, or the important speeches, Republican or Democratic, of 1860 or 1864? It was not mentioned. The Republican platform of 1856 said not one word in behalf of protection nor did it mention the tariff, although the Walker tariff—a tariff for revenue, and not for protection—had been in operation ten years. The Republican platform of 1860 did not refer to protection or a protective tariff. In one of the later and subordinate clauses of the platform it did declare that, "while providing revenue . . . by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these impositions as to encourage the development of the industrial interest of the whole country." But even this vague suggestion, which might mean high or low protective duties, or no protective duties whatever, made no part of the campaign. Lincoln did not refer to it in his letter of acceptance or in his inaugural. In 1864 the Republican platform made not a single reference to protection or the tariff; nor did Lincoln in his acceptance or inaugural.

Something from Abraham Lincoln in behalf of a high protective tariff would be precious indeed, to the Republicans of to-day. But they can find nothing. For even their campaign book the best they can do is to pick out a few sentences from speeches of Mr. Lincoln in 1843 and 1847, a dozen and more years before he was president, and even before he was in Congress, in which he declared that the justification of a protective duty would be its result in establishing some new industry in our country, so as to secure

the goods to the consumer at a cheaper rate than he could bring them from abroad. The modern Republican idea that the use of a protective tariff is to keep prices high to the American consumer in order that the profits of other Americans engaged in gigantic and long established industries shall be increased, would have been as abhorrent to Abraham Lincoln as it is to Judge Parker.

Even in 1868 when, the war being three years ended, business questions began to be thought of, the Republican party said not a word in behalf of a protective tariff, but, rather to the contrary, declared that "it is due to the labor of the nation that taxation should be equalized and reduced as rapidly as the national faith will permit;" and General Grant in his letter of acceptance was equally silent on this question. Could there have then been Republican success in 1860 or 1864 or even 1868 unless Walker tariff men and even free traders whose economic views remained unchanged, had not left the Democratic party for the Anti-Slavery party? Would not that success have been defeat if Chase, Sumner, Blair, Bates, John M. Palmer, Trumbull and a host of other former Democrats and believers in low duties had not—and because the tariff was not in question—joined the Republican party? Are you not, Mr. Hay, forgetful, very forgetful, when you say that—

Only those who believe in human rights and . . . who believe in the American system of protection . . . have any title to name themselves by the name of Lincoln, or to claim a moral kinship with that august and venerated spirit. *

IMPERIALISM HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

And what part did colonial exploitation of inferior races or weaker countries, or the policy of "big stick" suzerainty over the republics to the south of us, or the policy of the "strong man armed" in the trade and territorial disputes of foreign countries, play in the politics conceived or directed by Lincoln or his party? If, in 1854, the Democratic party boasted the Ostend manifesto in behalf of a conquest of Cuba, did it not result in Democratic shame and disaster? If Seward, at the head of a Republican cabinet, a month after Lincoln's inauguration, secretly urged his chief to avoid domestic difficulties by plunging us into an European war, did not Mr. Hay's own disclosure in his Lincoln biography of the secret well nigh blast Seward's reputation for statesmanship? Quote, Mr. Root and

*Mr. Hay, in "Fifty Years of the Republican Party."

Mr. Hay, if you can, any remembered and honored utterances of honored Republican statesmen before McKinley's presidency, in behalf of your foreign and colonial policy. Quote, if you dare, the Republican platform assertion in 1856, that the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence is essential to the preservation of our Republican institutions, that the "highwayman's appeal" that "might makes right" would "bring shame and dishonor upon any government or people." Or quote the Republican declaration of 1860 that the doctrine that governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed," is "essential to the preservation of our republican institutions." Or quote the platform declaration by the Republican party in 1868 of its "sympathy with all oppressed peoples struggling for their rights," and of its solemn recognition of "the great principles laid down in the immortal Declaration of Independence as the true foundation of democratic government." If to these challenges you must remain dumb, are you not, truly, in Mr. Hay's eloquent words, guilty of "sacrilege to try to trade upon that benignant renown" of the humanitarian Lincoln "whose light 'folds in this orb o' the earth' "?

DEMOCRACY AND THE TARIFF.

The limits of even this long speech prohibit discussion of the great issue which Democrats wisely and courageously raise by their assertion that the system called "protection,"—that is to say, the support of specially favored interests by duties, payment of which is enforced upon the whole people—is a "robbery," and by the Republican vindication of it as a "cardinal policy" to be followed. I point out, however, that, notwithstanding the former urgency of both Mr. McKinley and Mr. Roosevelt for revision of tariff schedules in the interest of larger export trade, the Republican party is now pledged, not only against revision, but against any discussion whatever of the question. The citizen who would undo any injustice in the tariff or let down any of its obstructions by partial repeals or reciprocity treaties, or who would have light shed upon the operation in detail of its multifariously complicated system constructed by "give and take" between the attorneys of special interests before Ways & Means and Finance Committees, is peremptorily refused any relief if Mr. Roosevelt be elected. The policy of "stand pat" means that, under Republican auspices, no committee shall investigate,

nor house of Congress consider, the working of the tariff. On this subject there must be mute obedience as before a deity. If the manufacture of steel and iron be no longer an "infant industry" to be cherished, but a practical monopoly within the American republic, out of whose profits the vastest fortunes in the world have been built up—if it sell its products to foreigners more cheaply than to Americans—nevertheless there must be silence. If its charter of monopoly in the Dingley tariff or any other schedule of that law is found to be unjust, or corrupt or oppressive—still they are never to be revised until those who have made them thus vicious shall choose to revise them. Judge Parker has pointed out that, since the Senate must be Republican during the next four years, no tariff reform can be enacted without Republican support; but he promises, if elected, an effort to obtain that support, and, in any event, a presentation of the cause to public opinion from the vantage ground of the presidency of the United States. A vote for Mr. Roosevelt, on the other hand, is a vote that not even an effort at tariff reform—even the slightest measure of it—shall be made, and that every iniquity of the Dingley schedules shall be borne in silence. The Republican platform declares that, when England "agitates a return to protection, the chief protective country should not falter in maintaining it." This praise of Mr. Chamberlain for his policy of defensively economical warfare against the United States finds a fit place in the Republican creed. They applaud the retaliatory blow aimed at ourselves, so much are they in love with any blow given by any nation to another.

THE DEMOCRATIC CREED.

Before we Democrats propose any specific measure we ask the American people to remember their own history. We also begin with the marvelous statistics of national growth from the first census in 1790 to the last in 1900, with the increase in population, and in the produce of farm and manufactures and forests and mines, in the achievements of American invention and organized industry. We do not say that these material results have been achieved by laws, however good. We recognize their source in the natural bounties of God, and the hearts and brains and muscle of American freemen. We do add, however, that here between the Atlantic and Pacific, between Canada and the gulf, was first tried on a great scale the new experiment of human and indus-

trial freedom, of equal rights and no special privilege. If the presence of Negro slavery, until the civil war, created dismal exceptions—and if the presence together in the South of a great or equal or even outnumbering mass of a colored race with profoundly different characteristics and as yet vastly behind the white race in the faculties of disciplined industry and high-class government, gave, and even now gives, rise to anomalies and inconsistencies—they have made only clearer the wisdom and beneficence of our fundamental policy. We Democrats point out that during this period of splendid growth, there was systematic hostility to a large military or naval expenditure, there was systematic preference for simple and inexpensive administration, there was systematic dislike of personal and sumptuary restraints. Democrats do not, like Republicans, forget how vast during our wonderful economic progress has been the American area of free trade between our 45 States, an extent of free trade far beyond anything ever before or now elsewhere known. For that area has included the widest difference of climate and soil and human labor, and also far differing conditions in organized society, ranging from settlements nearly three centuries old to frontiers occupied but a few years. They remember that the internal trade of this truly imperial domain which is free of all tariff is in volume and amount vastly, very many times, more important than its foreign trade which is subject to tariff.* They point out that for more than a century the American nation scrupulously refrained from foreign entanglements and made no forcible conquest except as it took from Mexico as a war indemnity the practically uninhabited country on the Pacific slope and the Rio Grande. They point out that, although the conditions of American life have, to a large extent, been those of a new and frontier country, the public men and the official life of our country have been so dominated by love of law as to command the just tribute of every intelligent foreign visitor, and that the very "lynch law" which has now and then in thinly settled parts of this vast domain disgraced portions of our population, has often been mere reaction against technical administration of law—that is to say, against misdirected respect for law on the part of those in authority.

From all these conditions and from

*Senator Hoar, in his speech on Trust Legislation in the Senate on January 6, 1903, states that "our domestic commerce is . . . more than twenty times as great as that with foreign nations."

these institutions—and in spite of their faults—has come—so the Democrats say—the industrial productivity and triumph of the American citizen. After praise to God for His gifts to us of land and water and climate, it is to these deep lying and truly dynamic causes, and above all to the American devotion to liberty and law, that the Democratic party assigns our splendid results in agriculture and mining, our vast treasure houses, our enormous increase in railroad and manufacturing plants, and all other material as well as political glory of our land. Democrats know, nor would they have any American forget, that the most stupendous force the world has known, is the free, self-governing, law-abiding, self-respecting citizen, regardful of the rights of other men and therefore justly insistent upon his own. From the marvelous success of our country summed up in the census of 1900 and its tables of comparisons with the results of other censuses, the Democrats draw the conclusion, not that the general and broad principles of the American people should be reversed, or their sacred traditions undone—but that they should be continued; that only faults and exceptions and inconsistencies should be eliminated. They would not have less respect for law but more respect; not less freedom of trade but more freedom; not less respect for the rights of other countries and races, however inferior to us, but more respect; not more foreign entanglements but fewer; not increase, but decrease in the proportion of military and naval and general government expenditure to the ability of the people.

Such is the general creed of the Democratic party; and such must and will be its practice when it returns to power.

THE NATURAL SENSE OF JUSTICE.

I have lived with communities of savages in South America and in the East, who have no laws or law-courts, but the public opinion of the village freely expressed. Each man scrupulously respects the rights of his fellow, and any infraction of those rights rarely or never takes place. In such a community all are nearly equal. There are none of those wide distinctions of education and ignorance, wealth and poverty, master and servant which are the product of our civilization. There is none of that widespread division of labor, which while it increases wealth, produces also conflicting interests. There is not that severe competition and struggle for existence or for wealth which the dense population of civilized countries inevitably creates. All incitements to great

crimes are thus wanting, and petty ones are suppressed partly by the influence of public opinion, but chiefly by that natural sense of justice and his neighbor's right which seem to be in some degree inherent in every race of men.—Alfred Russell Wallace, in "Malay Archipelago."

ECONOMIC RENT.

I had timber cut on Virginian tide-water rivers. A cord of pine wood at that time was selling at four dollars put aboard a schooner. Labor and capital obtained one dollar a cord to cut the wood and to put it aboard if the timber grew right at the landing; consequently for such timber the landowner netted three dollars a cord. As the trees grew without the application of any human work, this was economic rent which tenants would have been willing to pay to obtain permission to cut the wood. For that timber which grew away from the landing the hauling to the landing had to be paid before any rent could be collected. Let us say that at four miles distance this hauling cost three dollars a cord. The owners of the land at that distance just were paid for their labor and capital (use of tools, oxen and cart), but obtained no rent, whereas land on the shore was worth three dollars for each cord of wood which grew there. Why should James obtain a present of these three dollars for which William had to do the hard work of hauling?—Michael Fluerscheim, in Land and Labour.

"I'm afraid there is a great deal of dishonesty in some of these trusts," said Senator Sorghum, sadly.

"But you have always defended the trusts," exclaimed the friend.

"Yes. Of course, you expect a trust to take advantage of the public. But when the men who organize the deal get to taking advantage of one another—that's dishonesty."—Washington Star.

Brother to the Ox—Why is it that I work hard, and have nothing, while you don't work at all, and have more than you need?

Brother to the Fox—I vote for my interests, while you vote the same ticket I do.

"I don't understand why, if we vote the same ticket, I don't get half the benefits."

"I know you don't understand. That is the reason you don't get half the benefits."—Boone (Ia.) Independent.

THE HOUSE THAT JACK BUILT.

For The Public.

1. This is the house that Jack built,
2. This is the land that lay under the house that Jack built.
3. This is the property fair and wide,
Broad acres stretching on every side,
Farms and gardens, and forests and streams,
Growing in wealth while the owner dreams,
That surrounded the land that lay under the house that Jack built.
4. These are the bags of gold that went
To the landlord's coffers to pay the rent
For the property, etc.
5. These are the cattle and stacks of corn,
Raised by hard toiling from early morn,
That went to the market and had to be sold
In exchange for the heaps of shining gold
That filled the bags, etc.
6. These are the people who toil and mull,
Digging their living from out of the soil,
Or making the clothing, and hats and shoes,
Always producing, they did not refuse
To raise the cattle, etc.
7. This is the landlord who does just nought
But "owns" and sleeps, and considers he ought
(While the innocent people allow him) to take
The wealth which labor and capital make
From the busy people who toil, etc.
8. This is the sovereign single tax
That will ease the laborers' burdened backs
7. From the load of the landlord who does just nought
But "owns" and sleeps and considers he ought
(While the innocent people allow him) to take
The wealth which labor and capital make
6. From the busy people, who toil and mull,
Digging their living from out of the soil,
Or making the clothing and hats and shoes,
Always producing, they did not refuse
To raise the cattle and stacks of corn,
Raised by hard toiling from early morn,
That went to the market, and had to be sold
In exchange for the heaps of shining gold
4. That filled the bags of gold that went
To the landlord's coffers to pay the rent
3. Of all the property fair and wide,
Broad acres stretching on every side,
Farms and gardens and forests and streams,
Growing in wealth while the owner dreams,
2. That surrounded the land that lay under
1. The house that Jack built.

SAMUEL BRAZIER.

1898.

Prof. Frederick Starr, of the University of Chicago, who has issued a strong protest against the movement to clothe the nearly naked Igorrotes at the St.

Louis fair, is admitted to be one of the foremost ethnologists of the century.

Prof. Starr, in his study of the different races of the world, has had many amusing experiences among primitive tribesmen.

To an Indian one day he attempted to explain the principle of the automobile. The Indian was intelligent, and Prof. Starr's explanation was a model of directness and lucidity.

"Well," he said at its end, "do you think you understand all about the automobile now?"

The Indian, who had listened intently, replied:

"Yes; I understand all but one thing."

"And what is that?" said Prof. Starr, thinking to clear up in a word some trifling point that he had overlooked.

"I don't understand," said the Indian, "what makes the automobile go without horses."—New York Tribune.

BOOKS

SEDGWICK'S THOMAS PAINE.

This is one of the best of the Beacon Biographies, published at 50 cents, by Small, Maynard & Co., New York. It should be read by all who, knowing in a general way the great services of Thomas Paine, would like to follow the outlines of his life, and who feel inclined to think more charitably of his career than common reputation has permitted.

Mr. Sedgwick, in his 150 short pages, has told us, in terse, interesting style the salient points of Paine's life, and has succeeded admirably in the difficult problem of being simply fair. There are few brief biographies which tell so clearly so much of their subject in so evident a spirit of truth and fairness.

And this is just the kind of biography that the subject demanded; for a man like Paine most readily suggests extreme views, and is in danger of being dealt with in a one-sided manner. To say that he was a radical in both religion and politics is to utter a platitude, and radicals do not often succeed in getting impartial treatment.

We can never think of Tom Paine's religious views without thinking at the same time of that master skeptic, Voltaire. Both these men made the same mistake—the mistake of not distinguishing between true Christianity and the corruption of Christianity which they found represented by the dominant authorities of the institutional church. It cannot be too often repeated that the church leaders of the world have in no age been the representatives of the religion of Jesus of Nazareth. The strength of His religion lies far deeper than the politics of prelates and the dogmas of church coun-

cils, with which it has been too often confused. Voltaire and Paine in attacking what they saw of religion, went too far in attacking what they did not see.

Mr. Sedgwick's biography very properly deals more with Paine's politics than with his religion; for it will be evident to anyone who has even a superficial knowledge of Paine's splendid efforts for human freedom that we have not yet come near to a just appreciation of the man. Because of the prejudice against him, the histories usually read have slurred his great service to America before and during the revolution. His "Common Sense" was published in January, 1775, and by April had reached a sale of 120,000 copies. Mr. Sedgwick truly says: "No political tract was ever better shaped to serve its purpose." It met the approval of Washington and went far to stem any possible tide of Tory reaction. More timely, still, was perhaps his other pamphlet, the first "Crisis," which reached Washington during the retreat through New Jersey, and so impressed him that he had it read to the dejected army. All of Paine's American tracts had a large circulation, and the proceeds of the sales he devoted to the cause of independence. "America," says Mr. Sedgwick, "must count him among the builders of her nation. When some one said that next to George III, the independence of the colonies was mostly due to him, he doubtless accepted the compliment. But, putting aside this humorous exaggeration, it is mere justice to say that, of all the writers of the Revolutionary era in America, Paine was incomparably the most effective, that the publication of 'Common Sense' deeply and suddenly affected the judgment of a nation, and that the important 'Crises' were worth regiments to Washington."

Since the conscious struggle for the rights of man began, there has never lived one who worked more earnestly and suffered more acutely for the cause of human freedom than Thomas Paine. The answer he made to Franklin is the keynote to his life. When Franklin said to him: "Where liberty is, there is my country." Paine replied: "Where liberty is not, there is mine." It was entirely natural, therefore, that he should be in the thick of the French revolution. The part he played there was wise and honorable, and not the least so his strenuous effort to prevent the death of the King. He opposed the death sentence upon grounds of both humanity and policy, and he was as right on the second ground as on the first.

It is a pleasing view we get of James Monroe in connection with Paine's imprisonment in Paris. Paine was in prison at the time that Monroe came as minister to France. Morris, the former minister, had neglected him;

but Monroe demanded his release, took him into his own house, supplied him with money, and had him nursed through a continuance of the illness he had suffered in prison.

It was in 1787 that Paine had sailed from America to France, expecting to be absent but a short while. He did not return until 1802. His last years were saddened by the ever increasing

ostracism caused by his religious writings. He died in New York city in 1809, and was buried on a farm he owned at New Rochelle. He had asked to be buried in a Quaker cemetery, but

ETHICS OF DEMOCRACY

A Series of Optimistic Essays on the Natural Laws of Human Society

By LOUIS F. POST

SECOND EDITION WITH PORTRAIT OF THE AUTHOR

"The key-note to the volume is that what is really undemocratic is just as surely ungodly; that lack of faith in the people, and lack of loyalty to the equality of the rights of people of every race and place, kindred and kind, is essential atheism, however it may be disguised."—*City and State, Philadelphia.*

Mark Twain's Opinion of "Ethics of Democracy"

Villa di Quarto, Firenze, Jan. 7, 1904.
Dear Mr. Post: I thank you very much for the book, which I prize for its lucidity, its sanity and its moderation, and because I believe its gospel.
Very truly yours,
S. L. CLEMENS.

Tom L. Johnson's Opinion

You have done a great work, one that will live a fitting monument to a man with a great moral purpose and the ability to put it into plain, simple words within the comprehension of the everyday man. The greatest accomplishment in the work is that you have made complicated problems simple and easy to understand.

Your book was a surprise to me in many ways. You have always referred to it so slightly, depreciating your efforts. The first two chapters staggered me a little and I was afraid it was going to be too metaphysical, but beginning with the chapter on "The College Graduate," to the end of the book every line seemed to make of me a better and wiser man.

If I have a preference for any one of the chapters over all the others it is the one on "Justice and Sacrifice," although the chapters on "Trust Evolution" and "The Trust and Socialism" are the ones most needed to-day.
TOM L. JOHNSON.

Edward M. Shepard's Opinion

New York City, 5th January, 1914.
Louis F. Post, Esq., The Public, Chicago, Ill.

Dear Mr. Post: I have read your "Ethics of Democracy," and I write in the first place to thank you for the work, for its truth and for the elevation and nobility of its ideals. And I wish further to congratulate you upon the clearness and interest with which those ideals are presented. It will be a sad thing indeed if the public and organized life of our country shall not, on the whole, be inspired with efficient loyalty to the interests of the masses of men and the rigorous sense of justice which you have put before us so ably.
Faithfully yours,
EDWARD M. SHEPARD.

From The Outlook, New York

"The chief merit of this volume is its fundamentally wholesome spirit. Mr. Post writes forcefully, sincerely, seriously, and with apt turns of humor. He is an ardent believer in the Single Tax, and dedicates his work to the memory of Henry George. He is rig-

orous and keen in applying moral tests to social conditions. Like the man whose disciple he is, he shows that his ethical and social faith is vitally, though not formally, religious. When he cites Biblical passages, he is generally illuminating in what theologians would call his exegesis—illuminating just because he does not intend his comments to be exegesis at all. Some readers may be surprised to find an advocate of so radical a theory as the Single Tax as conservative as is Mr. Post in his economic theories. As a matter of fact, the Single Tax depends to a great extent upon the old-school political economy, and Mr. Post defends the conclusions of that school and declares that political economy is an exact science. He is as incisive in his criticism of Socialism as he is of Imperialism; both he considers enemies of that individualism which he thinks essential to human welfare. . . . He is often academic, as he admits he expects to be considered, and bookish. He writes, however, so as to stimulate the reader to find out for himself why his statements are true or why they are not. As this is one of Mr. Post's purposes in writing the book, he has to that extent succeeded."

From The Dial, Chicago

"Mr. Post is a strong and fearless thinker, with a remarkable gift of exposition, and the radical system of democratic ethics which he outlines is fairly self-consistent."

From The Daily News, Chicago

"It may be said at the outset that Mr. Post is a democratic Democrat, one who really believes that the Declaration of Independence meant what it said in declaring that all men are born free and equal in respect to their natural political rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that Thomas Jefferson was equally sincere in holding that the ideals of this republic were summed up in the literal interpretation of the statement, 'Equal rights to all, special privileges to none.' More than this, it is a discussion of the civilization of to-day in the light of these historical declarations, written by a man who has not permitted any person or periodical to do his thinking for him, and is vastly more democratic than the Democratic party and more republican than the Republican party. In other words, it is the sort of book that all Americans should be familiar with, if the Republic is to go on with its triumphant progress as the only

government ever founded by man with a deliberate declaration of ideals concerning mankind, which, if sedulously and jealously adhered to, will enable it to escape the fate of other nations lacking these aspirations and counsels of perfection, and will otherwise plunge down into the dark."

From The Buffalo Courier

"The Ethics of Democracy" is a book that will live. It is bound to have a commanding influence upon the economic thought of this and future times and should be in the hands of every American willing to be convinced that there can be such a thing as an honest political system."

Wallace Rice in The Chicago Examiner

"Mr. Post has rewritten and compiled a handsome book, newly brought out by L. S. Dickey & Co., of Chicago, under the title 'Ethics of Democracy: A Series of Optimistic Essays on the Natural Laws of Human Society.' The work forms a harmonious whole and may be said to hold between its covers all that is essential to an understanding of the place America ought to hold among the nations. It is not by standing up and shouting that America is to retain the greatness that made her the ideal for lovers of liberty the world around; it is only by the most patient and unremitting toil that we can expect to transmit to our children the heritage we obtained from our ancestors—eternal vigilance has always been the price of liberty, and the very modern endeavors to set up a flag worship or a spurious patriotism that takes more thought for material achievements than for spiritual triumphs finds no support in Mr. Post's scheme of life."

Willis Abbot in The Pilgrim

"Mr. Post writes for men who love their fellow men. He writes, furthermore, for men who live for the present and who recognize existing conditions. The book is journalistic, but not 'journalistic,' if I may draw a distinction between the book which is written with direct reference to the affairs of to-day and that which is written in the literary style of the newspapers. It will serve, I should think, as an admirable antidote to the hopeless political economy which the colleges teach and which their more intelligent students forget as soon as they leave the college halls. It is only to be hoped that it may secure a large circulation among young men of this sort."

The volume is beautifully bound in rich blue cloth, printed on high-grade hand-laid paper; gilt top, deckle edges, 398 pages. Price, per copy, \$2.00 net

L. S. DICKEY & CO., Publishers, 79 Dearborn St., CHICAGO

The Public

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

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

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

ATTORNEYS.

HENRY B. TAWREMY,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,
218 South Sixth Street,
PHILADELPHIA.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.
30 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 4004 Corlandt. Rooms 511-512.
NEW YORK.

A VAIN ENDEAVOR.

Uncle Sam will never control the Hog on this footing.

the request was refused. Ten years later his bones were taken by an admirer to England, but there such an outcry arose that no public ceremony could be held, and no one knows what became of the last earthly remains of the great revolutionist.

Mr. Sedgwick's valuable little bibliography is supplied with a serviceable bibliography, a helpful chronology, and a frontispiece likeness of Paine, reproduced from a photograph of the portrait which hangs in Independence hall.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—Freeland: A Social Anticipation. By Dr. Theodor Hertzka. Translated by Arthur Ransom. New York: The Freeland Printing & Pub. Co., 816 Broadway, New York. To be reviewed.

—The Bible and Land. By the Rev. James B. Converse, Morristown, Tenn. Described by the author as "a Bible argument for the straight single tax," but as differing from Henry George's reform in every respect except that "both favor a tax on land." Published in 1889 for \$1, the remaining copies of the book are offered by the author to any applicant on receipt of a two-cent stamp for postage.

PAMPHLETS.

The Hammersmark Publishing company (151 Wabash avenue, Chicago), have rendered a service to American readers by publishing in a characteristically neat pamphlet (price ten cents) Tolstoy's famous London Times letter on the war between Japan and Russia.

Levi Moore Powers, in a pamphlet on "Success," published by the Universalist Publishing House, of Boston and Chicago, has an idea of what constitutes success which would hardly be liked by those who wish to live in the sweat of another's face, but it is a wholesome idea all the same.

"The Freeland Movement," published by The Freeland Printing and Publishing Co.,

816-Broadway, New York, is a prospectus by Alexander Horr, of the "Freeland" movement originally suggested by Dr. Theodor Hertzka. It is a scheme of competitive production on the basis of land communism, for the demonstration of which an American colony organization is being attempted.

Eugene V. Debs's letters of last Spring, intended to show that John Mitchell, the leader of the miners' organization, was unduly influenced by mining operators to bring about a reduction of wages last March rather than strike, are published, together with one from Mitchell and two of his associates, in a pamphlet (price five cents) issued by the Standard Publishing company, of Terre Haute, Ind.

Malthusianistic economics have been so badly battered since John Stuart Mill's unfortunate acceptance of them, that it is a little surprising to meet with an advocate of them, and somewhat disheartening when he steps lightly into the forum without a new thought on the subject. But that is what an anonymous "Doctor of Medicine" does in a pamphlet on "The State Remedy for Poverty," published for two cents by George Standring, 7 and 9 Flinsbury street, E. C. London. The poverty remedy proposed is a law to check increase of population.

PERIODICALS.

—The first of a series of papers promised by the Arena, on present perils to democracy and how to overcome them, appears in the September number from the pen of Congressman Baker. It is on "The Reign of Graft and the Remedy." Robert Tyson contributes to the same number an article on the electoral wisdom of Japan; and W. D. P. Bliss describes the Athens of Pericles as the most socialistic city of the world. Allan L. Benson, editor of the Detroit Times, discusses the President, Mr. Knox and the trusts. Dan Beard cartoons the Christian mania for war.

CONTRACTORS.

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

Campaign Subscriptions

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

TWENTY CENTS

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

"Our Foreign Trade Balance continues to enrich our nation," says senator Fairbanks, in his speech of acceptance. Pamphlet on international trade proving this to be a fallacy, mailed postpaid, 20 cents. A. C. AUSTIN, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Mr. John Z. White's Assignments For 1904-5.

September—New England States.
October—Missouri.
November—Illinois, outside Chicago.
December—Pennsylvania.
January—Washington, D. C., Baltimore, Md., and Wilmington, Del. Ten days to each city.
February—Ohio.
March—Indiana and Michigan.
April and May—Pacific Coast Tour.
June, July and August—Chautauquas.

The "Association" hopes to be able to announce within a short time a tour by Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow of Cincinnati.

For terms and particulars address F. H. MONROE, Pres., Palos Park, Ill.