

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1904.

Number 337.

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.

President Roosevelt's letter accepting the nomination of his party for election to the dignified office he now administers, is a marvel of excellence—by nearly all the tests of rough-and-tumble stump-speaking. A comic story or two aptly applied, and a few pathetic touches, would have made it perfect. But Mr. Roosevelt is not handy with pathos, and comic stories are out of his line; he is too strenuous for the one and takes himself too seriously for the other. It is not remarkable, therefore, that his letter is wholly lacking in both, nor shall we be over-partial if we judge it regardless of these qualities of the supreme artist in stump oratory. Judged thus considerately, it is perhaps not too high praise to catalogue this Presidential letter as one of the best specimens of unrestrained stump-speaking on record.

If Judge Parker is the affable gentleman he is reputed to be, we shall not expect his letter to rival President Roosevelt's in this its distinguishing quality of excellence. How, for instance, could any affable gentleman hope, in writing a public address second only to a state paper in importance and dignity, if second even to that, to match this gracious compliment which we quote from Mr. Roosevelt's letter: "Exactly as it is impossible to call attention to the present promises and past record of our opponents without seeming offensive, so it is impossible to compare their other and later official utterances and not create doubt as to their sincerity." As

Mr. Roosevelt's whole letter is written in this key, Judge Parker may well confess his instinctive incapacity to compete, and strike a key of his own.

But dare he strike a key of his own? Dare he make himself the leader of a militant democracy, for which his position as the Democratic candidate and the exceptional frankness of the Democratic platform afford him so rare an opportunity? Dare he seize this opportunity as it knocks at his gate? Or will he continue to doubt and hesitate until it passes on to another and bolder leader? Dare he meet Roosevelt's bumptious challenge with a clarion call that will thrill the democratic heart of his countrymen? Or will he minimize issues as he did in his acceptance speech?

Roosevelt's letter offers more than one impudent and cynical challenge to Judge Parker to raise the standard of national ideals. On the Philippine question, Mr. Roosevelt challenges the integrity of the Declaration of Independence; on the question of protection he challenges the moral law. These questions and all that they involve are relegated by him to the quicksands of mere expediency.

With reference to protection this is done in express terms. He calls it not a question of morals primarily, but "primarily one of expediency"—"a matter of business." And with some approximation to justice, even if without dignity, he sneers at protectionist free-traders who don't seem to realize that it is just as immoral to revise the tariff downward, still leaving it protective, as to enact it. Of course it is not as immoral to reduce the tariff as a step toward abolishing protection, as it

is to enact it; for all obstacles to the abolition of a national evil cannot be overcome at once. But Roosevelt is right as to Democrats who would reduce the protective tariff merely for the purpose of regulating the robbery. Both the moral stamina and the political strength of the tariff issue on its democratic side, lie in the policy of abolition—in the policy which the Democratic platform proclaims, that "protection is robbery."

Dare Judge Parker accept Roosevelt's challenge to avail himself of this untested strength? Dare he reply to Roosevelt to this effect: "Yes, your opponents have, as you say, 'committed themselves to the destruction of the protection principle in the tariff;' their platform denounces 'protection as robbery;' the only words in that denunciation are those of which you must admit, to quote your own language, that they 'if honestly used forbid them from permitting this principle to obtain in even the smallest degree;' and I reiterate that clause of the platform, without modification either expressed, implied or mentally reserved; if elected I will do all in my power legitimately as President to eliminate the protective principle, root and branch, from our tariff laws." Were Judge Parker to take this stand, defending it as he easily could with cogent arguments both for its morality and its economic expediency, the deathly pallor and calm of his campaign would give way to healthy activity. Though he might miss the plutocratic-Democrats who are now trying to tie him to the chariots of the trusts, he would get a response from the people well calculated to gladden the heart of even the most hopeful candidate.

For the people of this country

do respond to moral appeals when they seem to ring true. Bryan's career is an illustration of that. True, Bryan failed of election; but so will Parker if the campaign goes on as it has begun. Bryan's failure was due to other circumstances than his moral appeal. And though he failed of election, he stands to-day taller and fairer among his brethren than any who have succeeded by appeals to self-interest. Let Parker raise the moral standard of his platform, that "protection is robbery," and Roosevelt with all his party will be instantly thrown into a panic and back upon a weak defensive.

Roosevelt's contention that protection is not robbery, has no staying powers. Protection consists in compelling some of the people of a country to pay tribute to others. When it fails to do this it fails to protect. From that characterization, conceal the protective method as you will, there is no possible escape; and any law which designedly accomplishes that end perpetrates robbery. Not only is protection robbery, but it is inexpedient. No process of reasoning from effect back to cause can demonstrate its expediency. To say that we have prospered under it is only a form of words. Without showing how we have prospered under it, one may just as well say we have prospered in spite of it. It is only by referring to prosperity and protection as having existed at the same time, and tracing no relation of cause and effect between them, but only asserting it, that Mr. Roosevelt is able to make protection so much as appear to have been expedient. Such reasoning is like that of the noodle doctor, who, upon learning that a sick shoemaker had eaten cabbage and died, while a sick carpenter had eaten it and lived, wrote in his commonplace book under the initial letter C: "Cabbage—kills shoemakers and cures carpenters."

Even with this handy mode of reasoning, Mr. Roosevelt finds it

necessary to conceal the tremendous fact that right along with an enormous protection system and its alleged prosperity, there has been maintained the greatest system of free trade the world has ever known. Trade between our States has been free for over a century. There is no protection there, as there used to be. And this inter-State trade is vastly greater than our international trade. Why may not our free trade, instead of our protection, have been the determining cause of our industrial growth? Why, at any rate, does Mr. Roosevelt neglect to notice this great free trade example? Were Judge Parker to make a brave and sincere campaign for the principle of abolishing protection, it might not win in eight weeks, but it would win in four years. It would be buttressed by every sensible consideration of expediency, while resting upon the fundamental principles of morality; and to such considerations, resting upon such principles, the people would not be unresponsive.

President Roosevelt's confusion of ideas is well exemplified by the juxtaposition in his letter of his protection theory with his monetary theory. He regards protection, whereby the law levies tribute on some for the enrichment of others, as raising only a question of expediency. But the gold standard he regards as a principle. If Mr. Roosevelt were consulted about gambling, he might be expected to conclude that while the color of the "chips" raises a question of principle, gambling itself is only a matter of expediency.

One of the interesting facts about Mr. Roosevelt's letter is his innocent reference to the aggregate deposits in savings banks as evidence that "the savings of the workingmen" have "increased by leaps and bounds." It is common knowledge that savings bank deposits are made up largely not of workmen's savings but of overflow incomes of the well-to-do and

the rich. A similar mark of unsophistication is Mr. Roosevelt's reference to the increase of farm values as evidence of the prosperity of farmers. Since a very large percentage of farm owners are not farmers, and a very large percentage of farmers are tenants, it is difficult to see how increased farm values can be regarded as evidence of general prosperity among farmers. Higher farm values mean higher farm rents, and higher farm rents cannot benefit farm tenants, nor any kind of farmers who farm farms, however grateful they may be to farmers who farm farmers. They cause an increased annual outgo to tenants for a farm to till on lease, and an increased burden of purchase price and mortgage when a farm is bought. Mr. Roosevelt is evidently applying to farmers the protection doctrine that excessive exports imply prosperity—that the more the farmer sends away and the less he gets back, the better off he is.

It must be said for Mr. Roosevelt's letter, however, that in it he strikes one true note. In dealing with the Philippine question he retorts to a criticism, that the Republicans have been "true to the spirit of the fourteenth amendment" in those islands, and asks the Democrats if they can say as much of the States which they control. This allusion to the race question is fortified by an excellent statement of principle in another part of the letter. "This government," he declares in that part, "is based upon the fundamental idea that each man, no matter what his occupation, his race or his religious belief, is entitled to be treated on his worth as a man, and neither favored nor discriminated against because of any accident in his position." If that were not a case-hardened platitude, but an expression of vital belief, one might harbor hopes that Mr. Roosevelt may yet respect the Declaration of Independence when the Philippines are involved, and the moral law in its application to protection.

For the most part President Roosevelt's letter defends protection with the logical fallacy known as "post hoc ergo propter hoc," which may be Anglicized as "after the event and therefore because of it." But when he attributes the hard times of 1893 to the tariff of 1894 he may be said, as Mr. Hanna might have phrased it, to have "seen" this familiar fallacy and "gone it one better," with the logical novelty of "before the event and therefore because of it."

"We did not take the Philippines at will," pleads Mr. Roosevelt in his letter of acceptance. Of course not. With soldiers and diplomats we did our best to avoid taking them. But the Spanish peace commissioners at Paris inveigled our reluctant commissioners into paying good money for them, while Aguinaldo at Manila fairly thrust them upon us willy nilly. What a charming historian is Mr. Roosevelt, to be sure.

In an address before the Wisconsin Conference at Sheboygan on the 13th, Bishop Warren declared that "The Philippines are God's gift to us to take care of them." There is in this pious sentiment a suggestion whereby the "hold-up" man might soothe his conscience while "taking care" of his loot.

Apropos of the incident at the banquet of the International Dental Congress (p. 355), which a distinguished dentist refused to attend because he had learned that some of his fellow delegates would remain away if he did not, he being a Negro and they being white, it appears that the behavior of these whites has been represented by some of the most distinguished among the white members of the association. The dentist referred to is Dr. C. A. Bentley, of Chicago. He has received, among other testimonials, the following address of friendship from the foreign delegates:

Dr. Charles E. Bentley: Sir and Colleague.—The undersigned, foreign mem-

bers of the Fourth International Dental Congress, regretting that a local prejudice had, without their knowledge, prevented you from taking part in the banquet of yesterday, wish to express to you their cordial sympathy and the assurance of their sincere sentiments of the con-fraternity. We hope to see you taking part in future International Dental Congresses which will be open to all honorable men whatever be their race or creed, and pray you to accept, our dear confrere, the assurance of our best sentiments: Charles Godon, Paris, France; Manuel Palacios, Durango, Spain; Cav. Uff V. Guerine, Naples, Italy; Rene Anema, Batavia, Java; George A. Russell, Paris, France; Ph. Suriani, Rome, Italy; J. S. Burke, Amsterdam, Holland; Cassulo Francisco, Buenos Ayres, Argentina; Jose J. Rojo, Mexico; Louis Subriana, Madrid, Spain; Jaine D. Losada, Madrid, Spain; Florestan Aguitar, Madrid, Spain; S. A. Pratto, Buenos Ayres; B. Platschick, Paris, France; F. Martin, Lyons, France; Charles Jenkins, Dresden, Germany; Emile Sauvez, Paris, France; Joan de Otaola, Bilbao, Spain.

One of the impressive and somewhat painful indications that Negroes are men as other men, is afforded by the attitude of the Conservator, a Negro paper of Chicago, regarding the recent strike in the packing houses. This strike was defeated with the aid of Negroes who took the places of strikers. It was as unwise a thing as they could have done, for it served the ends of a "superior" class and naturally tended to revive a declining race animosity among the working class. For this the Negroes who took the vacated jobs are not to blame. They could not be expected to act in large numbers with due regard for the complexities of the labor and the race problems. But that excuse cannot be claimed by the editors of the Conservator, who seem to be "blind leaders of the blind," if the following paragraph from that paper fairly represents them:

Presuming that the packers will act in good faith toward the men and women of the race, who within the last few weeks have faced danger and almost death in many forms to serve them, the precedent once established that Negroes can be depended upon to take the places deserted by other laborers will at once become contagious and the doors of every industry heretofore closed against him will sooner or later swing open to his approach. Men

and women of the race, a great opportunity, a great chance is opening before you!

Nothing could be better calculated to revive race hatred in the one place where it is rapidly disappearing. And it serves no purpose in other directions. Negro workmen will have no better opportunities with employers because they have served as tools to break this strike; while their relations with white workingmen will in consequence be strained to the point possibly of hopelessness of adjustment.

"Oh, I never read a book before reviewing it," said Sydney Smith; "it prejudices me so." Sydney Smith has many imitators, not only among book reviewers but among editorial writers. Here, for instance, is the Portland Oregonian, one of the strong editorial dailies in the country. Not long ago it criticised a labor day orator, Mr. George F. Cotterill, of Seattle, who had spoken at Portland, because Mr. Cotterill seemed to propose that "the men who put their manual labor into a product shall receive all its value, while the man who puts his money into it shall receive nothing." Mr. Cotterill had given no excuse whatever for this interpretation of his speech, as the Oregonian writer might have known had he not adopted Sydney Smith's rule for avoiding prejudice. In that speech, as published in the same issue of the Oregonian, Mr. Cotterill had distinctly declared that capital, stored up labor, "is entitled to receive its proportionate share with new labor applied to develop a new product." In elucidation of this, that there might be no such mistake as the Oregonian promptly made, he added:

When I am ready to invest the true "capital" which is "mine," unite it with the labor which is "thine," and together we apply it to the natural opportunity, the public utility which is "ours," then and not until then will there be possible the mutual confidence, the real respect, which can come only from the equitable distribution of the joint product. Capital and labor can then travel together, each in its

own path, neither treading on the toes of the other.

Another editorial writer who seems to have adopted Sydney Smith's easy preventive of prejudice, belongs to the New York Evening Post. Having occasion in an editorial to refer to Henry George, this writer sneeringly remarked:

Nothing is more instructive than to read in the autobiography of the late Henry George how that apostle of justice was led to discover the iniquity of landed property through the destitution to which a persistent course of gambling in mining stocks had reduced him.

Here were three misstatements that might have been avoided had the writer risked acquiring a prejudice by turning to the "autobiography" from which, without turning to it, he inferred so much that might be important but isn't true. In the first place, he would have found no "autobiography" at all, unless some of George's letters in the biography by his son have changed the biography into an autobiography—something which only a detected prevaricator would assert to be the case. In the next place, having given up his futile search for an "autobiography" and turned to the biography, this humble imitator of Sydney Smith would have learned that George was never "reduced to destitution by a persistent course of gambling in mining stocks." He did frequently make investments unsuccessfully in that class of property, but long before he had thought of the land question. Sydney Smith's imitator would have found, furthermore, had he read the biography, that so far from being "led to discover the iniquity of landed property" through his bad luck in mining stock investments, George discovered it (page 210 of biography) quite accidentally through observing some of the phenomena of an era of land speculation in which he had no part, and while he was not destitute, nor under the influence of any gambling experience whatever.

Hard driven indeed must those

Colorado corporations and their friendly newspapers have been to exploit the uncorroborated confession of a criminal as evidence of the responsibility of certain union miners for the explosion at Independence (p. 328). One Chicago paper thought the confession quite probable because it was "so circumstantial." It has since been knocked to pieces by indisputable proof of alibis. The accused men were attending a convention at Denver when, according to the confession, they should have been much nearer the scene of the crime. The fact is that no confession implicating union miners in that crime is worth the paper and ink, unless it explains how the criminals could, without detection, make the elaborate preparations for the explosion necessary to be made on the ground, at a time when the ground was guarded by mine-owners' detectives.

AMERICAN 'ANTI-SEMITISM.

Harvard university has been mentioned as a place from which anti-Semitism is absent. In support of this view, personal relationships and individual expressions are frequently cited. But it is not likely that public sentiment at Harvard differs materially from public sentiment elsewhere; and in all probability any one wishing to prove that anti-Semitic sentiment does exist at Harvard could collect as many incidents and expressions to prove his case as are offered in support of the opposite side.

However that may be, it is a fact, of which as a Jew myself I am fully cognizant, that widespread antipathy to Jews exists. It is also a fact that this antipathy cannot be satisfactorily accounted for on the ground of religious bigotry, racial animosity, or even business rivalry.

Jews insist, as a rule, on attributing anti-Semitism to one of those three causes; or in some other way put the blame anywhere but with their own conduct. Individuals may be found among all nationalities and creeds, who will relate sorrowful experiences of continu-

ous harsh and unjust treatment from all with whom they have come in close contact, and have tried to befriend. It is seldom an error in a case of this kind to attribute the real blame to the individual aggrieved. So when a whole class see fit to indulge in continual tales of woe about their treatment by the rest of mankind, the fault is likely to be found with the complainant, rather than with those complained against. Jews have not as a rule the gift of seeing themselves as others see them.

If they had they would not be surprised at beholding prejudice aroused on account of actions showing the person committing them to be extraordinarily filled with conceit and vanity, and impelled by an irresistible desire to attract the attention and admiration of every one else, to his wealth—real or imaginary, to his extraordinary shrewdness, or even to qualities which ought to cause shame rather than pride.

In the discussion and settlement of great public questions, in which there is involved a conflict between greed and human rights, the Jews, with a few honorable exceptions, are invariably found on the wrong side. In this country we need but refer to the frantic support they almost unanimously gave in 1896 to the side of plutocracy, corruption, and legalized plunder. Other creeds and other nationalities were to be found on the same side, of course, but there was not the same unanimity, nor to the same degree such disregard of former partisan affiliations.

Again in 1900, although the issue was largely the question of putting an end to a war of subjugation against a weak nation struggling against greater wrongs than even the Jews of Russia are compelled to suffer, American Jews could not get over the ridiculous fear that justice to the Filipinos might possibly endanger their own money-bags, and frantically aided in heaping upon the American people the shame and disgrace of stamping with their approval a colossal crime.

The record of the Jews of the British Empire in the Boer struggle is as contemptible and disgraceful as that of their American compatriots in dealing with the

Filipinos. Yet how indignant and horrified were both American and British Jews at the news from Kishineff!

The Jews have still the lesson to learn that their own rights are not secure so long as the rights of others are trampled upon.

When the Jews are willing to extend their love of justice, of liberty and of equality to others besides themselves, and devote some time and attention to the support of rather than opposition to movements with this end in view, they may be surprised to find anti-Semitism die a natural death. Such Jews as have, to the horror of their race, cast in their lot with some such movement, know that among their comrades in this struggle there is no prejudice except against wrong, no hate but of injustice. In this limited number, Dr. S. Solis Cohen, of Philadelphia is prominent. In a comparatively brief article entitled "What Zionism May Mean," and which all Jews, particularly Yale and Harvard graduates, might read to their profit, he says:

The ready acquiescence of well-to-do Jews in the social injustices by which they are surrounded, and from which they, equally with their Christian neighbors, derive wealth and comfort; the leading part that many of them take in the perpetuation of these smug injustices; the horror with which they regard those who question the wisdom or rightfulness of existing institutions; and, saddest of all, the facility with which Russian Jews, that 20 years ago were exploited by their American and German brethren, to-day enter the ranks of the exploiters, to rob where they were robbed and to oppress where they were oppressed—all these sorrowful but indisputable facts emphasize the need of Zionism.

I would add that Zionism has no place for lengthy statements of petty slights by either self-satisfied Jews or Gentiles. Dr. Cohen and such other Jews have realized the truth of the words of Henry George on this subject:

"The gospel of deliverance, let us not forget it, is the gospel of love, not of hate. He whom it emancipates will know neither Jew nor Gentile, nor Irishman nor Englishman, nor German nor Frenchman, nor European nor American, nor difference of color or of race, nor animosities of

class or condition. Let us set our feet on old prejudices, let us bury the old hates. There have been 'Holy Alliances' of kings. Let us strive for the Holy Alliance of the people!"

DANIEL KIEFER.

EQUALITY.

Uniformity of condition is by no means to be desired. That would make for social stagnation. What men must insist upon is equality of opportunity. If uniformity of condition were the social ideal either they that could and would rise above the common level would be arbitrarily held back, or else they would be compelled to support and carry forward all others, equally with themselves. How could social progress be made under conditions so formidable? The industrious man would be compelled to divide his hard-earned substance with the sluggard, thus putting a premium upon laziness, and penalizing thrift.

But both the monopolist and the lazy (and therefore penniless) man have a common interest in confounding the meaning of the term "equality," as used by democratic reformers. The monopolist purposes to discredit the reformer by dint of putting a ridiculous interpretation upon his demand of equality, and the sluggard adopts that interpretation because it expresses his desire. They both wish to get something for nothing. Under a regime of uniformity of condition the sluggard would get something for nothing; for if his condition were equal with that of the industrious it would necessarily be at the cost of the latter. Now, that would be ridiculously unjust; and the monopolist, knowing that the common sense of mankind would repudiate such a proposition, craftily puts precisely that proposition into the mouth of the reformer, thus purposely misrepresenting him.

Under the prevailing conditions the monopolist actually gets something for nothing; and, realizing that society would put an end to such injustice if it recognized it, and knew how to, and perceiving that equality of natural opportunity would effectually solve the problem, he cunningly

clothes the term "equality," as used by the reformer, with the signification attached to it by the possessionless sluggard, and so presents both as individuals having an identical aim. The result is that the reformer is regarded by the general public as being the champion of the shiftless and improvident, and thus the monopolist is enabled to continue his plundering of the befuddled public.

The voluntarily idle poor produce nothing, and the monopolist, as such, produces nothing; therefore it necessarily follows that, whatever either of them gets is derived from the industrious, who produce more than they consume.

I say that the monopolist, as such, produces nothing. Here again the defender of monopoly may befool the public. The monopolist may also be a producer, and this fact may be pointed out in controversion of what I have said. Of course, such an argument is irrelevant and puerile; but it will pass current with the unthinking just the same. A thief may also be a blacksmith, and, as such, a producer; but as a thief he merely appropriates what others have produced. Likewise, a monopolist may, in addition, be a producer; but as a monopolist he appropriates what others have produced.

Every man, monopolist or not, is in justice entitled to the equivalent of his product, and no more. For how can we get more except that some one else gets less? The individual may have a threefold income, as, a salary for service, interest on his capital, and tribute to his monopoly, if he have one. He is justly entitled to salary and interest, but not to the monopoly tribute. Monopoly affords opportunity to its beneficiaries in proportion to and because of, its deprivation of opportunity to general society. Equality of opportunity and monopoly cannot co-exist; either one destroys the other. Monopoly is inequality of opportunity.

Now, monopoly does not absorb all the increasing produce of industry, but it seeks to do so.

Take, for instance, the anthracite coal monopoly: Why does it not advance the price of coal to

the extent of a dollar a ton at once, instead of ten cents a month? Because so great an advance all at once would concentrate universal attention upon the enormous power of the monopoly, and, by alarming the public, would lead to remedial legislation. The alarmed and outraged public would rise and crush the monopoly. Therefore, the monopoly uses its power discreetly. But it has the power just the same and it uses it.

This monopoly is but one of many, all of which exploit the public, with greater or less discretion, to the limit of what they deem expedient; that is, so far as they can without bringing upon them the destructive wrath of the public.

It is inequality of opportunity that gives the monopolist the power to exploit the public.

But (it will be retorted) would equality of opportunity enable the average mechanic, for instance, to cope with such a man as Mr. Baer?

The question is irrelevant. Mechanics, as such, never compete with entrepreneurs, as such. Equality of opportunity would enable any one, or all, of a thousand men, as able as Mr. Baer, to compete with him in operating coal mines and transporting coal to market; and this competition would result in the mechanic's getting his coal at an equitable price, instead of paying a price that includes a monopoly tribute to the Baers, as now.

The act of competition is, in effect, a bid for the opportunity to render service. The method of competition is to give an increased value in exchange for a given compensation. In the absence of all monopoly this increased value would go to the consumer, by virtue either of improved product or of diminished price; but under the conditions now prevailing, the increased value goes to the monopolists by virtue of increased price of monopolized material or service. This accounts for the coincidence of progress and poverty.

Equality of opportunity would not produce uniformity of individual personal conditions; but it would determine the benefit of

competition to the consumer, whose patronage is its object.

In the absence of monopoly all strenuous competition would be entirely voluntary. But the monopolist forces the consuming manufacturer into intensified competition; because if he raise his price in order to cover the tribute to monopoly the market will absorb less, and if he do not raise his price, he must either redouble his manufacturing economies or else pay the monopoly tribute from his own pocket.

In the absence of monopoly the business man would have to increase his exertions only in response to the voluntarily increased exertions of his business competitors, but monopoly drives him and his competitors into desperate competition.

In the former case the purchasing power of the public would rise in proportion to the decline in price of commodities, and thus demand would gain on supply and an expanding market would clamor for greater product; but in the latter case, the purchasing power of the public would be reduced in proportion to the arbitrarily increased price of commodities, and thus demand would fall below the current rate of supply, and a consequent glutted market would necessitate diminished product, entailing intensified, destructive competition and business wreck.

The vast majority of business men have the alternative of natural, voluntary competition, under circumstances where the very act of competition would enrich general society and expand the market for product (demand leading supply); or, on the other hand, of unnatural, involuntary competition, superimposed by the arbitrary power of the monopolists upon natural, voluntary competition—that is, in addition thereto — under circumstances wherein the coerced measure of competition yields only tribute to monopoly, while curtailing the market for product (supply leading demand) with consequent business stagnation and frequent bankruptcy.

That is the alternative. But before it can become available, the more intelligent business men, at least, must be able to distinguish

between the significance of Uniformity of Condition and Equality of Opportunity.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Sept. 15.

As authentic news from the field of the Russian-Japanese war (p. 356) comes slowly in, the fierce battle of Liaoyang, a continuous struggle for almost seven days, appears to have terminated in great disaster to the Russians. They are now under the necessity either of engaging in another terrific battle to save Mukden, or of abandoning that place and seeking winter quarters still farther north.

Official reports of Japanese casualties at the Liaoyang battle are at hand. They aggregate 17,539 officers and men killed and wounded. Of these the army of the right (Kuroki's) lost 4,866; the center (Nodzu's) 4,992; and the left (Oku's) 7,681. The number of officers killed was 136, and the number wounded 464. The Russian casualties are roughly estimated by the official reports of Gen. Kouropatkin as less than 17,000—4,500 killed, and about 12,000 wounded.

The Russians are supposed to have sent a formidable naval reinforcement to the scene of the war. On the 11th their Baltic fleet sailed from Cronstadt, at the head of the Gulf of Finland, apparently bound for the Far East. It consisted of 8 battle ships, 4 cruisers, and several torpedo boats and torpedo-boat destroyers, and was under the command of Vice Admiral Rojestvensky. On the 14th, however, reports from St. Petersburg announced that the fleet had been detained at Reval, near the mouth of the Gulf of Finland, and instructed to remain there for orders.

The United States has become slightly involved in this Eastern war by the act of the Russian cruiser *Lena*, of the Vladivostok squadron, in taking refuge on the 11th in the port of San Francisco. She is under the command of Capt. Benlinsky, and with 488 men and 16 officers carries 24 guns.

One of her officers, Commander Rytschagoff, who speaks English, explained the event to the newspapers as follows:

About three weeks ago the *Lena* was ordered to proceed from Vladivostok to San Francisco, in response to an urgent request from the Russian consul general at San Francisco that a war vessel be sent here. What the reason for his request was I do not know, but to-night the captain is to have a conference with him. We came by the great northern circle, passing the Aleutian islands, but we are out of coal, and the boilers are in such a terrible condition that they must be thoroughly overhauled before we can go to sea again. I understand that the ship will be dismantled, and it may be necessary to remain here a whole month before the repairs are finally completed.

Rear-Admiral Goodrich, of the American navy, Pacific squadron, reported the arrival of the *Lena* and was ordered from Washington to hold his squadron at San Francisco until the *Lena* departs. An examination by the American navy department has shown that she could not leave at once without positive danger of being lost in the first storm. Repairs would require a delay of about six weeks. No decisive action has yet been taken either by the American government or the Japanese. The Japanese minister called at the state department at Washington on the 13th, but merely to acquaint the department officially with the fact of the *Lena's* appearance in the harbor of San Francisco. He made no protest against her presence nor any demand as to her withdrawal, but simply expressed his willingness to allow the United States government to deal with the case without interference or suggestion from him. Meanwhile, Rear Admiral Goodrich has taken the precaution of surrounding the *Lena* with torpedo-boat destroyers, for the double purpose of guarding her against Japanese attack and insuring her detention until her case is disposed of by the American government. On the 14th her captain was notified to state early and definitely whether he desires to make temporary repairs and put to sea upon their completion, or to remain at San Francisco until the war ends. No reply has yet been reported.

The most important proceeding

of the twelfth conference of the Interparliamentary Union, which assembled at St. Louis on the 12th, related to the war. Francis B. Loomis, first assistant secretary of state of the United States, representing President Roosevelt, made the address of welcome, after Congressman Richard Bartholdt of Missouri had been elected president of the conference. There were 226 delegates in attendance from fifteen parliamentary nations. At the session of the second day, the 13th, two important resolutions were adopted, one of which referred directly to the Russian-Japanese war. It was as follows:

The Interparliamentary Conference, shocked by the horrors of the war that is being waged in the Far East between two civilized states, and deploring that the Powers signatory to the Convention of The Hague have been unable to have recourse to the clauses thereof, which direct them to tender their mediation immediately upon the outbreak of hostilities, asks the Powers signatory of the Convention of The Hague to intervene, either jointly or separately, with the belligerents in order to facilitate the restoration of peace, or instruct the Interparliamentary Bureau to bring the present resolution to the knowledge of said Powers.

At the same session of the Conference the following resolutions relative to a second arbitration conference at The Hague (vol. ii, No. 69, p. 9) were adopted without dissent:

Whereas, enlightenment, public opinion, and the spirit of moderation and civilization alike demand that differences between nations should be adjudicated and settled in the same manner as disputes between individuals are adjudicated—namely: by the arbitrament of courts in accordance with recognized principles of law; the Conference requests the several governments of the world to send representatives to an international conference to be held at a time and place to be agreed upon by them for the purpose of considering:

1. The questions for the consideration of which the conference at The Hague expressed a wish that a future conference be called.
2. The negotiaton of arbitration treaties between the nations represented at the conference to be convened.
3. The advisability of establishing an international congress to convene periodically for the discussion of international questions.

And this Conference respectfully and cordially requests the President of the United States to invite all the nations

to send representatives to such a conference.

A few days prior to the conference mentioned above, the 38th annual session of the International Peace Union was held, also at St. Louis. On the 10th resolutions were adopted by this body declaring that the President of the United States should be empowered to call a conference of the representatives of all the civilized Powers every four years to consider questions of general interest, the common welfare, and those looking to more pacific relations and the prevention of war. An earnest request was also made that every European representative present at the conference of the Interparliamentary Peace Union, then about to convene (the subsequent proceedings of which are described above), take back to Europe demands for a truce that will stop the present war between Japan and Russia and convene the arbitration court pursuant to the second section of article 3 of The Hague treaty.

In American politics the Maine election may be regarded as the most important event of the week, owing to its traditional significance with reference to the approaching Presidential election. It took place on the 12th. Full returns show a 6 per cent. gain to the Republicans and a 29 per cent. gain to the Democrats over the vote at the corresponding election in 1900. The Republican plurality is 27,130. The Republicans had claimed from 15,000 to 25,000, while the Democrats had declared that a Republican plurality of less than 34,132 would be a Democratic victory. Following is a tabulation of the vote at the corresponding elections in the Presidential years since 1892:

| | Rep. | Dem. | Rep. plu. |
|------|--------|--------|-----------|
| 1892 | 67,699 | 55,078 | 12,531 |
| 1896 | 82,764 | 24,387 | 48,377 |
| 1900 | 73,955 | 29,823 | 24,132 |
| 1904 | 78,460 | 51,330 | 27,130 |

The Democrats of Utah nominated James H. Moyle for governor on the 8th. On the same day the Democrats of Wyoming nominated John E. Osborne for governor of that State; and the Republicans of Montana nominated William Lindsay for governor of Montana. The Republicans of Connecticut nominated Henry

Roberts for governor on the 9th. Gov. Peabody was nominated on the 9th by the Republicans for reelection as governor of Colorado.

President Roosevelt published his formal letter of acceptance as the Republican candidate for President (p. 356) on the 12th. It is a document of about 13,000 words, and in substance as follows:

The letter begins with an extended and lively challenge to the Democratic party to join issue with the Republicans, coupled with a criticism of their strictures upon Republican administrations. It proceeds from this to a declaration in favor of the gold standard "and a sound monetary system as matters of principle" and not of "momentary political expediency," and refers to the "record of the last seven years" to prove "that the party now in power can be trusted to take the additional action necessary to improve and strengthen our monetary system." Reference is then made to the record as a guarantee of the Republican party's policy with reference to the organization of labor and of capital and to the question of trusts. Regarding human rights, Mr. Roosevelt says: "This government is based upon the fundamental idea that each man, no matter what his occupation, his race, or his religious belief, is entitled to be treated on his worth as a man, and neither favored nor discriminated against because of any accident in his position. Even here at home there is painful difficulty in the effort to realize this ideal; and the attempt to secure from other nations acknowledgment of it sometimes encounters obstacles that are well nigh insuperable; for there are many nations which in the slow procession of the ages have not yet reached that point where the principles which Americans regard as axiomatic obtain any recognition whatever." Some remarks upon the civil service law follow, and these are succeeded by a discussion of the tariff question. On that subject he says it is impossible to compare the platform of the Democrats "with their other and later official utterances and not create doubt as to their sincerity." While the platform describes protection as robbery, yet prominent Democrats assert that if their party comes into power it will adopt the Republican policy as to the tariff, while "others seem anxious to prove that it is safe to give them power because their power would be only partial and therefore they would not be able to do mischief." Advancing to a discussion of the bearing of protection on prosperity Mr. Roosevelt says: "It is only ten years since the last attempt was made, by means of lowering the tariff, to prevent some people from prospering too much. The attempt was entirely successful. The tariff law of

that year was among the causes which in that year and for some time afterward effectually prevented anybody from prospering too much and labor from prospering at all. Undoubtedly it would be possible at the present time to prevent any of the trusts from remaining prosperous by the simple expedient of making such a sweeping change in the tariff as to paralyze the industries of the country. The trusts would cease to prosper, but their smaller competitors would be ruined and the wage-workers would starve, while it would not pay the farmer to haul his produce to market." On the same general subject he adds: "From time to time schedules must undoubtedly be arranged and readjusted to meet the shifting needs of the country; but this can with safety be done only by those who are committed to the cause of the protective system. To uproot and destroy that system would be to insure the prostration of business, the closing of factories, the impoverishment of the farmer, the ruin of the capitalist, and the starvation of the wage-worker. Yet, if protection is indeed 'robbery,' and if our opponents really believe what they say, then it is precisely to the destruction and uprooting of the tariff, and therefore of our business and industry, that they are pledged." Mr. Roosevelt closes his extended discussion in behalf of the principle of protection with a favorable word for "including in some way the merchant marine within its benefits," though without specifying the way usually proposed, that of a ship subsidy. The army question is next taken up, and this is followed by an explanation of the treasury deficit. The next subject is the Philippine question, regarding which Mr. Roosevelt makes an argument too lengthy and closely linked to admit of fair condensation. Its spirit animates the closing paragraph: "This is as true now as four years ago. We did not take the Philippines at will, and we cannot put them aside at will. Any abandonment of the policy which we have steadily pursued in the Islands would be fraught with dishonor and disaster; and to such dishonor and disaster I do not believe the American people will consent."

Gov. Garvin's call for a special session of the legislature of Rhode Island (p. 54) has resulted in a refusal of the legislature to consider the subject matter of his call. He had directed their attention to three things neglected by them at the regular session, namely, (1) the constitutional initiative, which would allow 5,000 electors to propose specific amendments to the State constitution; (2) equal suffrage, which would confer upon registry voters in cities the right to vote in the election of city councils; (3) the veto power, which

would enable the governor to check hasty and vicious legislation. The legislature had buried these and other popular measures in committees, and with a mass of unfinished business before it had adjourned to a date succeeding the Fall elections. It was also because he believed that this adjournment had been taken to enable the present legislature to dispose of that business improperly after the election, and thereby obstruct the new legislature to be then elected, that Gov. Garvin called the special session. Upon assembling on the 13th, in accordance with this call, the legislature refused to consider the subject matter of the call, and, after passing a concurrent resolution condemning the governor for having ordered the special session, adjourned.

A new turn has occurred in the traction contest in Chicago (p. 357). On the 9th the Chicago Examiner made the following announcement:

A petition for a referendum on the Chicago City Railway ordinance must be made. Mayor Harrison has declared that such a petition is the only thing that will prevent the passage of the infamous street car franchise ordinance now pending in the council. The petition, therefore, should be made. It must be made. The Chicago Examiner and the Chicago American will undertake the herculean task, and ask the cooperation of the people of Chicago who believe in the rights of the people in their own streets and who believe in public honesty. An army of men must be had for the work. They must be such public spirited and patriotic citizens of Chicago as will volunteer their assistance and give their labor to help make this gigantic petition within the short space of time remaining for its completion.

The Examiner thereupon called for 2,504 volunteers pledged to secure 50 signatures each, and has ever since been urging on this work. Later in the day of the above announcement, the 9th, Mayor Harrison extended the time for holding back the proposed ordinance pending the filing of a referendum petition, from October 20th, the date named in his proclamation (p. 305), to November 15th. The Referendum League published informally on the 10th a refusal to prepare a petition "until the council has amended and mutilated to its heart's content the ordinance" in

question; because these changes would nullify their work in securing petitions by destroying the identity of the ordinance. The emergent petition put forth by the Examiner and the American is as follows:

To the Board of Election Commissioners, Chicago: We, the undersigned, registered voters of Chicago, respectfully petition that the following questions of public policy be submitted to the voters of the city of Chicago, at the regular election to be held in and for the said city of Chicago, on the first Tuesday in April, A. D. 1905:

(1) Shall the City Council pass the ordinance reported by the local transportation committee to the City Council on the 24th day of August, 1904, granting a franchise to the Chicago City Railway Company?

(2) Shall the City Council pass any ordinance granting a franchise to the Chicago City Railway Company?

(3) Shall the City Council pass any ordinance granting a franchise to any street railroad company?

The volunteer signature-solicitors began their work on the 14th.

NEWS NOTES.

—The annual convention of the American Bankers' Association, met at the Waldorf-Astoria hotel, New York, on the 14th.

—George H. Shibley, of Washington, who was nominated on the 31st for vice-president of the United States (p. 342) by the Continental party, declined the nomination on the 7th.

—At Lhassa on the 7th Col. Younghusband, head of the British expedition into Tibet (p. 296), secured a treaty, and was then reported as in readiness to return, the object of his mission having been thus accomplished.

—The Negro militia company of New Haven, Conn., were stoned at Manassas Junction, on the 12th, upon their return from the government mimic war maneuvers at Bull Run. Their assailants were members of a Texas regiment.

—Louis Deibler ("M. de Paris."), chief executioner of Paris from 1879 to 1896, died on the 8th. During 39 years' experience as an executioner he had guillotined 327 convicts. He came of a family of executioners and his son is now the chief executioner of Paris.

—On the 8th the petitions for the three public policy questions proposed by the Referendum League of Illinois to be voted upon at the coming election (p. 358), were filed with the Secretary of State at Springfield. The signatures to these petitions numbered 130,852.

—The packers' strike (p. 358) was

"called off" by President Donnelly on the 8th, under instructions from the national executive board of his organization, the following terms of settlement having been agreed upon:

Unions to call the strike off; packers to take back men as fast as needed; rate of wages of skilled men to remain same as before the strike; the above to cover all points affected by the strike.

—The National Afro-American Council, in session at St. Louis, issued an address on the 8th in which they said:

We view with alarm the rapid spread of race prejudice in this country. As a race we have striven to impress this nation with our sincere desire to be identified with its prosperity and to even share its failures, if failures must come. We wish to declare that the cry of social equality made by those who seek our humiliation, is without the least foundation, and those who make this argument know that it is a mere subterfuge.

—The Georgia court of inquiry appointed by Gov. Terrell to report upon the conduct of the militia in failing to protect Negro convicts from a mob at Statesboro (p. 329), has made a severe arraignment of the militia for its failure to perform its sworn duty, the officers having been shown to be in sympathy with the mob. In consequence, five out of six of the officers are to be tried by court martial on the 29th. The sixth, Lieut. McIntyre, is exonerated and praised for his efforts to defeat the mob, and several privates are commended for their individual efforts to uphold the law.

PRESS OPINIONS.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S LETTER.

Chicago Examiner (Dem.), Sept. 14.—Swearing that he has been true to the Constitution in all acts, hinting at a big stick for the South American Republics, with a sop to the Negro voters in the North by a covert threat that he will see to greater privileges for the Negro in the South, Mr. Roosevelt closes with a warning to the people that if they do not elect him they will soon regret it. Here is a sentence in his closing paragraph that for splendid egotism does Mr. Roosevelt infinite credit: "If, on the other hand, they (the Democrats) should come in and reverse any or all of our policies, by just so much would the nation as a whole be damaged." The big stick, the spurs, the six-shooters and the flannel shirt may be hidden now, but in the event of his election the Broncho Buster will again take the saddle. That is the keynote of Mr. Roosevelt's letter, and he cannot smother it.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem), Sept. 13.—Mr. Roosevelt contends that it would be an "injury" to the consumer if the "prosperity" of the trusts should be abated. As their "prosperity" means their profits, Mr. Roosevelt's contention is tantamount to a declaration that the consumer's prosperity depends upon the continuation of monopoly exactions. "If a tariff law is passed aimed at preventing the prosperity (profits) of some of our people," he says, "it is as certain as anything can be that our aim will be achieved only by cutting down the prosperity of all our people." This confused reasoning is met with at every hand. . . . It is an absurdity that the interests of the exploited and the exploiter are "identical," and that the welfare of the one depends upon the welfare of the other. The welfare of the exploiters, it is quite true, depends

upon the welfare of the exploited, but the real interests of the exploited require that they escape the exactions of the exploiter.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), Sept. 13.—"We are content," says Mr. Roosevelt, "to rest our case before the American people upon the fact that to adherence to a lofty ideal we have added proved government efficiency. . . ." What, pray, is the lofty idea? Is the big stick lofty? Are we striving to attain a worthy government ideal in oppressing the Filipinos, in fomenting rebellion in Panama, in assisting in the dismemberment of South African republics, in fostering trusts that are crushing individuality, robbing the consumer for the benefit of the manufacturer, thus making the rich richer and the poor poorer, in fastening a crushing weight of indirect taxes upon the citizens? What of the promises respecting reciprocity treaties, and what party was responsible for the fulfillment of the promise made Cuba to give her trade concessions that would make the tilling of her fields profitable and save her from famine? If war and the things of war be a lofty ideal, if legislation for the trusts and other special interests be fulfilling a governmental ideal, then Mr. Roosevelt is right in saying that we have attained the ideal. But he is wrong in his conception of what constitutes a lofty ideal.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Sept. 12.—Mr. Roosevelt stands pat on the tariff. He takes back nothing he has previously put forth in the way of claiming credit for curbing the trusts and putting shackles on cunning. The big stick looms large behind the pacific utterances given forth regarding our foreign policy. And if the career of imperial conquest is ever to be abandoned the country must look elsewhere than to Theodore Roosevelt for promise of that end. That Mr. Roosevelt makes a telling point against the half-hearted "tariff reformers" must be admitted—and it is cheerfully admitted. They deserve the keen thrusts which he delivers. They haven't a leg to stand on and Mr. Roosevelt reveals the fact with cruel fidelity. And his reflections upon these apologetics for Democracy is all the more welcome because it will serve to draw the lines more clearly and to force the real issue, which is that of free trade or protection. Mere "tariff reform" is nonsense. It has nothing but a question of percentages behind it. It raises no moral question. It appeals to no sentiment that is worth considering. And it is so cowardly and so utterly lacking in real conviction that it is not strange that the American people have not listened very responsively to its appeals.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), Sept. 12.—If Mr. Roosevelt is elected he intends to carry on the government in the same way that the government has been carried on during the past three years. If Mr. Roosevelt is elected the trusts will flourish and the trust magnates will continue to defy the law. If Mr. Roosevelt is elected, we shall have colonies; imperialism will be "irrevocably" established. If it is within the power of the Republican administration to so establish it, we shall have colonies, we shall deny the good old American doctrine of government with the consent of the governed; militarism will be a conspicuous feature; the arts of peace will be abandoned and the tricks of war will be taught to the youth of the land; government by the few will be preferred to government by the many; we shall continue to strive to be a world power, not by the force of our example, but by the power of our battleships and the strength of our armies. A careful reading of Mr. Roosevelt's letter of acceptance will, we think, show that in the event of his reelection, the American people may well prepare for four years more of plutocracy, four years more of trusts, four years more of extravagance, four years more of colonialism, four years

more of "Rooseveltism" and all that the term implies in connection with our national policies.

CHICAGO TRACTION.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind. Rep. and pro-ord.), Sept. 15.—The mayor has shown that he does not propose to act precipitately, that he wishes the people who are opposed to the ordinance to have abundant opportunity to register a protesting petition. Nor are the friends of the ordinance inclined to insist that just so many names shall be brought in. It is not a question of a certain percentage, but of a big enough showing to prove that the opposition is of serious proportions. This, at least, is the view of the Record-Herald, which has indicated clearly heretofore why without such a showing it would not defer action.

Chicago Daily News (Ind. and pro-ord.), Sept. 14.—It is a mere committee report as it stands. Its main features are admirable and have received general approval from persons who see the folly of a battle for so-called immediate municipal ownership regardless of the vast difficulties in the way. Still, the ordinance requires amendment to secure better city control. Loose grants of "switches" and "connections," as well as other wide-open privileges, will have to be narrowed down before the ordinance can be chilled acceptable. It needs to be changed in various ways to safeguard the people's rights and insure the best possible service.

Chicago Examiner (Dem. and anti-ord.), Sept. 13.—Some of the hired agents of this mammoth steal have pretended to argue in the traction newspapers that it would not be possible to take over the roads now because the attempt would involve years of litigation. It will require exactly as much litigation 13 years from now, or 50 years from now, or any other number of years from now. Whenever the city may undertake to buy the roads the gentlemen that have enjoyed fat dividends from public plunder are certain to resort to the courts to try to save the good thing they have had from us for so long. If litigation is a bar now it is a bar always and municipal ownership is forever impossible. But the argument about litigation is no more made in good faith than this lying ordinance is offered in good faith.

Chicago Tribune (Rep. and pro-ord.), Sept. 14.—The Mayor is in favor of the ordinance. The Council is likely to be in favor of it. If the petition for a referendum vote on it fails to get the requisite number of names the ordinance is likely to become law. Citizens who believe that the ordinance would be good for the city ought to want it to become law as soon as possible. They are under no legal or moral compulsion to sign a petition or to do any other act, which might delay or prevent it from becoming law. The Mayor has said that if the requisite number of names were not secured for the petition he would assume that the people were in favor of it and would advise the Council to proceed to passing it. The way therefore to show the Mayor that you are in favor of the ordinance is to refrain from signing the petition. The negative act of not signing the petition amounts to the positive act of voting for the ordinance.

THIBET.

Chicago Chronicle (Rep.), Sept. 13.—Having concluded a "treaty" with the dalai lama, it is announced that John Bull will now evacuate Lhasa. If you have a few hundred years to spare just sit down and watch the evacuation.

"Do you remember his name?"

"I don't have to. My wife remembers it. All I have to remember about him is that he knows me. My wife remembers all the rest."—Life.

MISCELLANY

THE SONG OF THE RETREATING RUSSIAN ARMIES.

We're marching on to freedom, in the dark before the dawning;

The shells are bursting round us, and the shrapnel shriek on high.

We're marching on to freedom, through the black and bloody morning;

A crimson thread is in the east, and creeps along the sky.

We're hopelessly defeated: let the joyous news be shouted.

Our armies are in full retreat, and soon we shall be free.

Outfought and outmaneuvered, outflanked and raked and routed,

Two hundred thousand beaten men are singing like the sea.

Our forces fill the valleys full: the plain is overflowing;

Our bayonets clothe the trampled earth like fields of sioping corn.

Above the distant mountain tops, the light is slowly growing;

A scarlet cord is in the east, and soon it will be morn.

O grave, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy stinging?

We die that Russia may be free; we lose that she may gain.

There's blood upon the road we take, but still we take it singing.

Our triumph is in our defeat, our glory in our pain.

We're marching on to freedom through the blood-red light of morning;

The cannon roar behind us, and the dead are falling fast.

You can see our patient faces, in the crimson of the dawning;

We've suffered through the weary night, but day has come at last.

For we're beaten—beaten—beaten! Let the joyous news be shouted;

We've lost the tyrant's battle now, and soon we shall be free.

Wronged, robbed, oppressed, tormented, imprisoned, exiled, knouted,

A hundred million Russian Slavs are rising like the sea.

—Bertrand Shadwell, in the Chicago Evening Post.

HUMANITY IN THE RANKS.

From "Notes from the Doukhobor Land," by Joseph Elkinton, published in the Friends' Intelligencer, of August 3, 1902.

The Patriarch [Ivan Mahortov] gave us some of his experiences during the 28 years he served in the Russian navy. From 1840 to 1853 he had no active service. Then the Crimean war opened, and he was stationed on the warship Catherine II., then anchored off Sevastopol. . . .

The united fleets of England, France and Turkey then concentrated their attack on Sevastopol, anchoring at Eupatoria. As the Russians had no mounted artillery, the Russian sailors carried their guns and cannon on shore. . . .

Mahortov said: "At least three times during the siege of the city when the batteries on either side were decimating the ranks of the other, and these were being immediately replaced," he heard repeatedly the appeals from the enemy in these words: "Brethren, Russ (Russians) don't hit—fire aside;" and the Russians responded: "Fire aside, brother." "After this," the old man told us, with tears in his eyes, "there was no more carnage, and would to God that men and angels might never witness such hellish work again!"

He related another instance of that humanity which will ever assert itself while men are men, even when their rulers are compelling them to act as destroyers. The commander of his ship detailed him to visit a small detachment of the ship's crew, who had been stationed on the land to raise some vegetables in the Oushakova ravine. These Russian sailors had been captured by the English, and their comrade took tremendous risks in stealing his way through three picket lines at night, especially as it was "in the very hottest times of the war." "One of my brethren found me secreted in the bush near their station, and threw his arms around my neck. After inquiring for their health I asked whether they had any food for themselves. 'Oh! yes, the English send us coffee, bread and butter in the morning, and the same food they have themselves twice a day besides this.' And then they tell us, 'Don't be afraid; we won't harm you; it is only Victoria and Nicholas who are guilty in this business.'"

ERNEST H. CROSBY ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION.

An interview with Ernest H. Crosby, reported in the New York World of Aug. 30, 1904. Mr. Crosby is so generally known to readers of The Public that an estimate from him of the relative values of the political issues of the present campaign cannot fail to be of interest, regardless of any possible question as to the correctness of his views.

The economic issues are absolutely overshadowed this year by the question of imperialism and militarism. It is impossible to devote serious attention to the great domestic question of the distribution of wealth while the public mind is distracted by the fireworks of foreign conquest and such pretty and expensive toys as a new navy; and it will be permanently impossible to settle this question in any other than an aristocratic and oligarchic way if we per-

mit the final establishment of a system of dependencies across the sea inhabited by races condemned to political inferiority. Caste under the flag abroad means caste sooner or later at home.

Mr. Roosevelt has deliberately made himself the incarnation of the spirit of militarism and imperialism. His idea of national greatness means nothing but physical strength, and for great ideas he would substitute a big navy. Freedom, equality, justice, must all be subordinated to brute force. The change shows itself already on the surface of life in Washington. Uniforms and brass buttons, new-fangled military escorts, war talk and army manners are gradually making headway there as fast as circumstances permit. It is the kaiserism of the German kaiser which seems to have roused the emulation of our President and his Cabinet, and Kaiserism, with all that that word implies—Prussian junkerism, lese majeste, enormous armaments, and all peaceful pursuits subordinated to military enterprise—that is the issue at the coming election.

Judge Parker has spoken plainly on this subject. He believes in neighborly conduct between nations as between individuals. He is opposed to slave dependencies as well as to domestic slavery. We may be sure that he would have protested as President against the annihilation by Great Britain of the only two republics in Africa, and that he would never have been gully of the assassination of the only Asiatic republic—that of the Filipinos—nor of the vivisection of our nearest sister republic in South America. He would lay aside the big stick and teach the native to behave like a gentleman. In a word, he would put an end to Kaiserism, and I sincerely hope that he will have the opportunity.

DEMOCRACY IN SCHOOL RELATIONSHIPS.

From a paper read by Miss Kate Starr Kellogg, Principal of the Lewis-Champlain School in Chicago, before the Chicago Teachers' Club, Apr. 9, 1904, as published in the Chicago Teachers' Federation Bulletin.

Most teachers believe in the principles of democracy as applied to their relationship to those above them. Is it the same toward the children under their care? I am afraid not, and few are the schoolrooms, even in the higher grades, where anything save the will of the teacher, enforced by the mandates of the principals and superintendents, is law.

Verily one does not "gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles," neither can one evolve a democracy from lives

in which every free, spontaneous action, every impulse toward independent thought is stifled in its beginnings.

In the little world of the schoolroom the child as a citizen is realizing himself both as an individual and as a social being.

His individual rights, his individual opinions, within reasonable limits, are to be patiently considered, while his attention is to be steadily directed to the effect his individual action is having upon his immediate room society.

How to reconstruct his world with a living, mutually-benefitting society is the problem that calls for the most thoughtful and loving work of the teacher. I wonder if we realize how formal and unnatural the relations of most pupils and teachers are? A teacher meets her pupils at some festival or picnic and under the impulse of the new and freer conditions, all become for the time social beings humanely related. The following day, at the summons of the bell, as at the magic stroke of midnight in the old fairy tale, the charm and delight of the old acquaintanceship disappears, the straight, loud, formal intercourse is resumed.

"I never go with my pupils upon excursions," I heard a teacher remark not long ago. "I find they always presume upon the unusual liberty and it takes me a week to get them down to work again."

The other afternoon I found a young teacher trying to hold her children under control as she would have reined a restless horse. "Why do you not try some group construction work?" I suggested, "or let them go to the board and illustrate the story they have just read?"

"I don't care to," she answered, in genuine pain, her young face white with the nervous strain. "I'm afraid they would get away from me." "They won't get away from you if you go with them," I replied. Half an hour later I went back to her room and beheld 50 pupils quietly and happily engaged in cutting and pasting a miniature Fort Dearborn. They were passing cardboard and the necessary materials about freely. A group of five or six were putting in place the various parts of the fort as different children brought them. The joy of the room was reflected in the teacher's face, as she said to me with a sigh of relief: "I never would have believed it possible. An hour ago I was ready to give up and go on the unassigned list."

"TELL 'EM WE'RE RISIN', SUH!"

HOWARD AT ATLANTA,

Richard R. Wright was the little boy mentioned in the following poem by John G. Whittier. He was graduated from Atlanta University in 1876, and has since devoted himself to the teaching and uplifting of his people in Georgia. He is now president of the State College of Industry for Colored Youth at Savannah, and is one of the graduate trustees of Atlanta University.

Right in the track where Sherman
Plowed his red furrow,
Out of the narrow cabin,
Up from the cellar's burrow,
Gathered the little black people,
With freedom newly dowered,
Where, beside their Northern teacher,
Stood the soldier Howard.

He listened and heard the children
Of the poor and long-enslaved
Reading the words of Jesus,
Singing the songs of David.
Behold!—the dumb lips speaking,
The blind eyes seeing!
Bones of the Prophet's vision
Warmed into being!

Transformed he saw them passing
Their new life's portal!
Almost seemed the mortal
Put on the immortal.
No more with the beasts of burden,
No more with stone and clod,
But crowned with glory and honor
In the image of God!

There was the human chattel
Its manhood taking;
There, in each dark brown statue,
A soul was waking!
The man of many battles,
With tears his eyelids pressing,
Stretched over those dusky foreheads
His one-armed blessing.

And he said: "Who hears can never
Fear for or doubt you;
What shall I tell the children
Up North about you?"
Then ran round a whisper, a murmur,
Some answer devising;
And a little boy stood up: "Massa,
Tell 'em we're risin'!"

O black boy of Atlanta!
But half was spoken;
The slave's chain and the master's
Alike are broken.
The one curse of the races
Held both in tether:
They are rising—all are rising,
The black and white together!

O brave men and fair women!
Ill comes of hate and scorning;
Shall the dark faces only
Be turned to morning?
Make Time your sole avenger,
All-healing, all-redressing;
Meet Fate halfway, and make it
A joy and a blessing!

RICHARD R. WRIGHT.

This is the story of a little negro boy who went from the cabin of a pickaninny to the chair of a presidency. It is the story of a remark that, coming from his very soul, called out in answer a letter from Holmes and inspired a poem by Whittier and made

General Howard his friend. And this is the story of a life of incident, struggle and final success, the life story of Richard Wright, now president of the Georgia State Industrial College for Colored Youth, once a little slave boy.

"Tell 'em we're risin', suh!"

It was a large low room, closely packed with human beings. Children of all ages were there, but all were of one color—black. Two years before these would have been but so much cattle; they would have been but human flesh compounded of such and such elements and convertible into certain energies at fixed market rate.

Now they were like athletes awakening and stretching for the race. They were like dynamos at rest, infinitely potential, waiting for a touch to set them into action.

General O. O. Howard stood before this audience in the Storrs School. He represented the Freedman's bureau and was directing the work among the colored people of the South. He had told them what message the North had sent to them. Then, as he looked upon those earnest, upturned faces, he felt as so many have felt since, that this race must be its own mediator. Stretching out his hand to them he said:

"Tell me what message I shall take back from you to the people of the North!"

There was a moment's pause, then a small voice was heard.

"Tell 'em we're risin'," it said.

The audience turned to see a little black boy who had just come to the school. One arm was still raised. Enthusiasm still blazed in his face.

The answer so interested General Howard that he carried it back to his friends. It attracted the attention of Boston enthusiasts and of the cultivated friends of Negro education in the North. It was a thought to them and an instrument of salvation to the boy who uttered it.

When the audience had dispersed General Howard still detained the little fellow. Slowly he coaxed from him the history of his ten years.

Richard Wright, aged 10, and his mother, the freed woman Harriet, had walked 300 miles from Cuthbert to Atlanta in order that the little boy might go to school. While the Northern soldiers were still in Cuthbert, Ga., Harriet Wright did the laundering for one Sergeant Morris. Morris, becoming interested in the little Dick, suggested that he be given an education.

So it was that Harriet, when her old master told her she was free, had

courage to start out, penniless as she was, to get for her oldest child the advantages she hoped for.

When the troops were withdrawn and the friendly Sergeant Morris went with them, there disappeared with him all hopes of an education for the family unless they could get to Atlanta.

As refugees from the northern part of the State were returning to their abandoned homes she tried to find some one who would hire her and take her in the direction of Atlanta. At last she found a white man who was preparing to make the journey by wagon. He agreed to take her few household goods and allow the two youngest children to ride, provided she and Richard—the eldest—should walk. In exchange she agreed to work for her benefactor one year without any additional pay except board.

Footsore and weary, they reached Atlanta, and the little boy was put to school in an abandoned box car—the only Negro schoolhouse at the time. In less than a year, however, the new Storrs School was opened.

It was here that little Dick Wright made his historic remark, and he adds:

"Counting all the difficulties through which I had come, I certainly felt that I was rising, too."

From the little eager boy so earnestly longing for knowledge to the president of a big industrial school the transition was natural. The boy who could do so much for himself would be quick to know what to do for others. Of the incidents which led to his present success Mr. Wright says:

"My good Yankee teacher, Miss Jennie Twichell, sister of Dr. Twichell of Hartford, Conn., who watched over me for many years and to whom I owe more than to any other one outside my sainted mother, was so very much delighted with the answer I gave General O. O. Howard that she imagined something of value might be made of me, and never tired in her efforts in my behalf, and even after she became the wife of President Ware of Atlanta University she still took an interest in me. Her husband, Mr. Ware, became my firm friend and inspiration for life. I graduated from the Atlanta University and went back to labor in the very same town where my mother and I had been liberated only about twelve years before. There were many there who knew my mother and some who remembered me. There had been erected also since my departure a school named in honor of General O. O. Howard. I was made principal of this. I pretty soon bought the white

newspaper of the town and renamed it Journal of Progress, and published it in the interest of the colored people. It was quite a novelty, for it was the first Negro newspaper ever published in that part of the State and probably the second one of the kind in Georgia.

"Imagine my surprise, when one day I discovered that my newspaper office was none other than the very dining-room in which our old master had announced to my mother: 'Harriet, you are free.' The discovery was so romantic that I could scarcely believe it to be more than a dream, and yet it was true; I was actually in possession of the house where I had been liberated.

"I was called from this place to establish the first high school supported by public taxation for Negroes in Georgia and thence to organize the State College for Negroes, of which I am now president.

"Just think of it; only a year before Lee's surrender I was placed by my master on an auction block to be sold to the highest bidder, but no one would bid high nor low for me, for I was but a puny piece of ebony. I do not think I should have been of any service had freedom not come. Since then my old master has told me that he is proud of me. I have several times been kindly received at the old homestead where I first saw the light, near Dalton, Ga., as a little Negro slave."

Services on the platform committees of various Republican conventions and as paymaster with the rank of major have varied the later years of the life of this remarkable Negro. But his chief work has been in education—the education of his race—and at Savannah he has built up the enrollment of the Georgia State Industrial College from eight to 500.

So it seems that it must be a pleasure to this man of mature years and of wide reading as he sits with his books about him, with Whittier's picture on his table, to look out through the vista of his memory to the little slab-side cabin in the shade of a scraggly oak, to smell again the hot breath of the wind from the little corn patch behind the home or the soggy brake before the door and realize that as this has come to him through the courage of his mother and his own hopes, that so it may come to many another of his race.—Anne Scribner, in Chicago Evening Post.

When we learn to sing that Britons never will be masters, we shall make an end of slavery.—Bernard Shaw.

INDUSTRIAL EUROPE AS SEEN THROUGH AMERICAN EYES.

By Judson Grenell. (Copyright, 1904, by Judson Grenell.)

Among the incidents of a story of English life which I read many years ago, the one that most impressed me was the fact that agricultural laborers wore iron collars, on which were impressed characters indicating to whom the serf belonged.

In my journeyings through England and Scotland, and on the continent, the past four months, I have never failed to find plenty of men and women wearing just as distinctive, rigid and unbreakable collars as did the old-time workers in England. There is this difference, however: The iron collar of long ago was placed around the neck of the serf by the master, whose smiths welded on the ring; whereas the tollers of to-day put on their own badges of servitude, and are proud of them. To tear off these modern labels of ownership, would be like inviting the end of the world, is the opinion of the great majority of European wealth producers, who, living often in city slums or country hovels, can conceive of no other systems of industry or government than those allowing a few self-chosen favorites the privilege of living in palaces without work.

ACCOUNTING FOR DIFFERENCES.

There is no other way for accounting for the physical differences between the masses and the classes. The environments of the masses have tended to produce mentally and physically stunted aggregations of servile common people; the environments of the classes have tended to produce arrogant men and women of mental and physical superiority. And in each case the average European citizen concedes that the inferiority of the masses and the superiority of the classes are of divine origin, and therefore not to be questioned. Thus does superstition hold as in a vise the doctrines of the wage-earning classes of Europe.

There are no economic reasons why old world wage workers cannot hold their own with wage workers of America, excepting the fact that they carry greater artificial burdens, and thus are not permitted to reap a full reward for their exertion, as do their brothers on the other side of the Atlantic. Certainly England's artisans have the skill and experience to enable them successfully to compete with all the rest of the world in turning out manufactured wares, but the landholders of that damp country, controlling legislation, have shifted pretty much all fiscal bur-

dens, national and local, on the shoulders of enterprise and industry, and have made it almost impossible for any considerable number of the common people to escape from their own class.

The point I wish to emphasize is this: While the common people of England have made great strides in acquiring, by constitutional means, some of their industrial rights, not much more can be obtained by peaceful and "legal" methods, because injustice has been so buttressed by law that there are no legal ways to dump the classes off the wealth producers' backs. This criticism applies still more forcibly to conditions on the continent. Think of the working people of such a great city as is Paris allowing their officials to charge a local tariff on the very food they need, in order that taxes may be reduced on the property of the rich; and, of permitting a monopoly of her street car and omnibus services. Think of the people of France and Germany submitting to the enormous taxes that are needed to support great standing armies and useless navies for the glory of—what? Of whom?

AMERICA'S SUPERIORITY.

The United States is a better country for wage workers than the British Isles or Europe, because of the great quantities of cheap, fertile land easy of access; a dry atmosphere which induces mental activity; good educational facilities for the common people; comparatively low taxes, part of which is borne by the landlords; freedom from governmental espionage over the everyday affairs of life, and absolutely internal free trade between 80,000,000 inhabitants distributed over a wide area and having every variety of soil and climate. Republic or monarchy, with such superior advantages the working people of the United States cannot help being more prosperous than are those on the continent of Europe who enjoy in very restricted ways only a few of these privileges.

North America is a better continent to live on for workmen and women than any island or mainland on this side of the Atlantic because it is not so closely wedded to inequitable social customs and laws, antiquated business methods and superstitious reverence for religious authority. Freedom to act comes from freedom to think, and the mind cannot be free if placed at the impressionable age under the supervision of those who decline to admit or preach the declaration that all human beings are created free and equal before the law. The doctrine of God-appointed superior and inferior

classes is a fundamental part of the religion of European countries, and none believe this more sincerely than do most of the working people. Acknowledging themselves inferior by divine will, it is no wonder they consent to continued injustice by "divinely" ordered rulers and lawmakers.

It is said, and truly, that no people can be politically free if industrially enslaved. It is my opinion that no people can be either politically or industrially free that are religiously enslaved. And this slavery exists in Mohammedan Turkey, in Protestant England, and as well in Catholic Italy. Whether the religious leader in Great Britain is a Church of England man or member of some dissenting denomination, he is equally conservative in respecting "authority," and he advises submission to wrongs in this world, holding out the hope of its all being righted in the next. There are exceptions to this rule, just as there were exceptions in the United States in slavery days among the clergy who were staunch defenders of, or at least apologists for, the "institution;" but the exceptions were few then and are few to-day. The upholder of any status quo founded on injustice does not possess the spirit that makes for industrial freedom.

COMPARING WAGES.

A day's service brings much greater reward to the worker in America than to the worker in Europe. Otherwise nearly a million people would not yearly flee the old world for America's shores in the happy and certain expectation of bettering their condition. In figures a dollar a day man in the United States receives not over 50 cents a day in Europe; yet the purchasing power of the 50 cents earned in Europe is, in some directions, as great as the dollar earned in America. For instance, rents; again, keeping warm is cheaper. Clothing costs very much less, also linen, which, being more durable than cotton cloth, is really in the long run cheaper. Transportation is less, and also the cost of amusements. Bread, milk and vegetables are about the same, but meat is dearer in Europe. Still, this latter item does not count for much, as Europe's wage workers do without it most of the time.

In a rough way, it may be said that \$10 in Europe goes as far as \$15 in the United States. It may also be said that the range of those things we call necessities in the United States is narrower in Europe. Therefore \$10 a week to the Englishman, Frenchman, Swiss or German seems, to them as good pay as does

\$18 a week to the artisan in the United States. On the whole work is steadier in Europe than in the United States. But it is impossible to make comparisons that are absolutely correct, for wages vary between London and Manchester and English provincial towns just as they do between New York and Boston and some New Hampshire hamlet.

MORE MACHINERY IN THE UNITED STATES.

One must be exceedingly cautious in making comparisons between the use of machinery in the United States and in Europe. I have seen factories over here that are equipped with about everything on the market. Perhaps it is true, now, that there are more kinds of special machines in the United States than in Europe, but if European manufacturers continue to invest in machinery during the next decade as they have recently, an equilibrium is bound to be established. Though British conservatism in the counting-room, as well as in the works, has made the introduction of new machines slow, competition is compelling their use, so that no country can for any great length of time claim a monopoly in this respect.

The average English artisan is not now striking against machinery. That period is past. He may quietly damn it as bringing another factor into the problem of daily toil, but he learns to use it. After he finds that it really increases the amount of work to be done—as it almost invariably does—he comes to like it, for he sees that it can be made a friend. Here, as in the United States, the astute labor leader seeks to obtain for the members of his organization some of the benefits following in the immediate wake of the machine. He does this by demanding a reduction in the hours of labor, with probably a half-penny or so increase in the pay per hour. For the sake of peace the employer generally concedes this; it is seldom a free-will offering. "Labor saving" machines have never yet of themselves reduced the hours of labor of a single wage-worker, but the well organized and well officered trade union has, by taking advantage of just such opportunities as the introduction of machinery affords.

COMPETITION WITH THE UNITED STATES.

The manufacturers of the United States are not going to send the manufacturers of Europe to the demnition bow-wows—at least, not this year. There will always be some things that can be done better in Europe than in America. We shall dominate those lines of manufacture where our raw material is best adapted to particular uses.

I doubt if the manufacture of the best grades of woolen fabrics can be wrested from England, or of silk from France. Perhaps atmospheric conditions have much to do with this. There are lines of steel production that it will be next to impossible to shake out of England's grip. Our tariff can be placed high enough to keep some things out of the United States, compelling the American people to put up with inferior articles at monopoly prices, but this is a different proposition to winning markets by merit. The United States contain not over a twentieth of the inhabitants of the world, and while this twentieth is a pretty big tail for the world's industrial dog, yet it isn't going to wag the dog.

The peculiarities of each nation extend to almost everything the people consume. Home production, with an intimate knowledge of the demands of trade, will always be able to command, at remunerative figures, the major part of the home market. Just to show something cheaper or even better will not open new avenues for trade. The desires of the people must be changed before the cheaper and better article will be preferred. Price is not everything.

The "dumping" process cannot for any length of time control any market. When the "dumping" consists of raw material such as steel and iron, it gives manufacturers using steel and iron advantages over competitors paying the higher prices. When Germany gave a bounty to her beet sugar manufacturers they "dumped" their surplus stock on England at less than cost. This gave the pastry manufacturers of England an immense advantage in controlling the pastry market on the continent.

AN OPTIMISTIC VIEW.

One needs a wide horizon and an optimistic temperament to have much hope of the common people ever being able to change present inequitable conditions in the social and economic world. Yet when one's perspective is correct it is not difficult to see the progress that has been made in the past. Thus one can confidently predict more in the future. Europe is not so densely crowded that it cannot support its teeming peoples. There are here millions of acres of land put to such comparatively unproductive uses as game preserves and palace parks; and no country is making the very best use of all the land given over to agriculture. Not until these defects are remedied can it be said that population presses upon subsistence.

In the fullness of time—which doesn't mean this year or this decade, if it does even this century—industrial freedom will be attained. The slums

of the cities will disappear with the abolishing of monopolies, and especially the monopoly of the soil, for then opportunities for employment will equal the desires of the people for work, and the wages of the laborer will be the full fruit of his toil. Then both production and consumption will be immeasurably increased, and also human happiness.

This time is coming. It is not an idle dream. Kings and potentates may tremble, and holders of special privileges may worry over the outcome, but the common people will lose nothing but their superstition-made collars, the badges of their present servitude.

THE BEAST AND HIS BURDEN.

Fresh from his valet, breathing forth perfume,

Swathed in the softest product of the loom,
Full-fed and arrogant, the beggar rode

And cursed the laboring beast which he bestrode.

A pleasant beggar he, who asked mere mites,

Such as Possession of the Public Rights,
Franchises, Rights of Way, and title deeds

To profit by our children's children's needs.

Another leaped upon the laboring beast
Which faltered as he felt the load increased.
The beggar burned with wrath, but found relief

To see it was his trusted friend, the thief,
A man to scale a Congress, tie the hands
And gag the tongues, while forcing his demands

For booty and for bounty. Yet so wise
A cracksman he, he puts it in the guise
Of benefit to others, so that we
Snatch off our hats to him and bow the knee.

But now the beast, by some strange impulse fired,

Cried out: "Get off my back, for I am tired.

I want to roll upon the earth. I need
To rest a little and I want more feed."
"Beast!" cries the beggar, striking with his goad,

"We only ride to keep you in the road.
Did we not ride and feed you, you would wander
And starve to death out in the grasses yonder."

"Ass!" cried the thief, "are you too blind to see,

'Tis not your vulgar strength which carries me,

But I support you by this tight-drawn rein?

And I am almost weary of the strain,
So if you hint again you want to stop,

I swear I'll loose the rein and let you drop."
The laboring beast cried out in great alarm

And prayed the thief to keep a steady arm,
And still he keeps his patient, weary stride,

And still the thief and beggar calmly ride.
—Edmund Vance Cooke.

In one of our large city libraries, with a well equipped juvenile department, a little girl recently asked for "a good book," and, when offered one

by an author whose specialty is believed to be child-delineation, firmly shook her head. "I had it last week," she said. "It isn't a children's book." "I thought it was," apologized the librarian.

"Well"—somewhat relenting—"it's a kind of a children's book, but it's not a children's children's book, that's all!"—Miss Louise Betts Edwards.

As a magnificent steamer, the prop-

erty of the Peninsular & Oriental company, was steaming into Southan, ton harbor, a grimy coal lighter floated immediately in front of it. An officer on board the steamer, seeing this, shouted: "Clear out of the way with that barge!"

The lighterman, a native of the Emerald Isle, shouted in reply: "Are ye the captain of that vessel?"

"No," answered the officer.

"Then spake to yer equals," said the

lighterman. "I'm the captain o' this."
—London Figaro.

Visitor—You must have a remarkably efficient Board of Health in this town.

Shrewd Native, (one of the many)—You are right about that, I can tell you.

"Composed of scientists, I presume?"

"No, sir. Scientists are too theoretical."

"Physicians, perhaps?"

"Not much. We don't allow doctors

FREE AMERICA

BY
BOLTON HALL

With Illustrations by Dan Beard.

This is a book that anyone can understand who can understand anything. There are no unusual words or complicated arguments or difficult figures. It is a plain, practical statement that takes for granted neither facts nor the knowledge of them. A. C. Pleydell, so long the editor of "Justice," has compiled the statistics, in popular form.

The book shows from familiar sources, in an interesting and amusing way, the evils from which we suffer as individuals and as a society, the causes of them and their cure—which is liberty. It considers the proposed remedies, and without condemning any of them or inviting antagonism, shows how much may be expected from them and shows how present conditions may be turned to our individual advantage.

Single Tax is hardly alluded to, but the principles that underlie it and their practical application are clearly stated. There is no better book for the heathen.

"This book is all meat and no bone; every bite is consumable and digestible."

J. B. Carroll.

"I get good results from sending this book out with my compliments. Inclosed find my check for another dollar's worth."

Daniel Kiefer.

Mr. Hall has had his book printed in cheap form in the hope that thus he may reach the stupid millions who never profit by injustice. And surely these millions would find much to help them in what he has to say. In a simple and direct way, without passion, almost without argument, he tells the story of how the masses work without getting while the few get without

working. He dedicates his little book "To all those who are poor and wish to become rich; or who are rich and wish to become richer." Some of the chapters deal with "The Promise of the Century," "Our Present Drift," "Our Production," "Who Gets the Wealth You Produce," "Monopolized America," "Trusts, Good and Bad," "Railroads and Franchise Monopolies," "How It Hurts You," "Trades Unions and Their Remedies," "Political Corruption," "How the Farmers Can Become Prosperous," "Your Own Success" and "The Hope of Future Progress." In the collection of statistics alone and in their orderly and intelligent presentation the book is invaluable. In a brief compass and without a single suggestion of overloading

it gives hundreds of salient tables from the census and other treasuries of figures; and it presents them to the reader in a way that he can grasp and with a clearness that illuminates the lessons it seeks to convey.

Mr. Hall has done a real service to the people in writing this little book. It ought to be in the hands of sincere people everywhere. He has not made a class appeal. He appeals merely to justice and against privilege. And he shows that at the root of the social evils that dominate free America today lies the strange growth which the founders of the republic thought they had extirpated when they abolished kings and nobles and established all men in equality before the law.

Johnstown Democrat.

215 pages. Paper, 25 Cents; Cloth, 75 Cents, Postpaid.

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



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. TAWBESEY,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
213 South Sixth Street,
PHILADELPHIA.

CONTRACTORS.

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

THE POLITICAL PATTI.

Parker (sotto voce)—Her farewell appearance! I only hope she means it!

on our Board of Health—no, sir—nor undertakers, either."

"Hum! What sort of men have you chosen, then?"

"Life insurance agents."—New York Weekly.

"What did you do at the banquet?"

"Oh, we ate and drank and told stories and drank."

"What else?"

"Lemme see. Oh, yes, we boomed somebody for president, but I've forgotten who it was."—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

"What's he going to call it?"

"Portrait of a Lady."

"But it doesn't look like her at all!"

"Then he might call it 'Portrait of Another Lady.'"—Life.

BOOKS

ROSSITER JOHNSON'S RHETORIC.

Not only is this a handy book for reference (The Alphabet of Rhetoric, by Rossiter Johnson. New York: D. Appleton & Company), but it is so artfully put together that its alphabetical arrangement for reference purposes does not detract from its interesting qualities as a book for consecutive reading.

Many of Mr. Johnson's suggestions are sadly needed. Such phrases, for example, as "that sort of a legislature," "this sort of a boy," etc., are becoming so common in print that some one with the literary standing of Rossiter Johnson is needed to come forward and

check this slovenly tendency to overwork the first letter of the alphabet. Of like useful suggestions, offered with modesty and in charming style, the book is full; and seldom will the intelligent reader incline to question their correctness.

One might hesitate, however, to write "you would better go," as Mr. Johnson suggests, instead of "you had better go," which is more spontaneous and has the sanction of good usage, even if technically less exact. It is not so certain either that Mr. Johnson's rigid opposition to the "split infinitive" in prose is warranted. There are times when emphasis or shades of meaning may be effected by it, and why shouldn't prose as well as verse have its license where license is needed to produce a desired effect?

Several of the reference words in the alphabetical arrangement of the book are made the subject of entertaining as well as instructive essays, notably the words "poetry" and "style;" and the discussions, stiffly pedagogic from necessity, are often relieved with touches of scholarly humor. The volume ends with a practical supplementary paper on the art of elocution.

PERIODICALS.

—The Atlantic, which grows in interest every month, offers two or three exceptionally interesting articles in the September number. One of these is on social classes in Italy, by Angelo de Gubernatis; another is Goldwin Smith's "Great Puritan," Cromwell; while a third, a story full of wholesome suggestion, is "The Education of a Saint," by Evangeline Wilbour Blashfield.

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, 30 cents. A. C. AUSTIN, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Volume VI of The Public

Complete Volumes, including index, sent post paid at Regular Subscription price, \$2.00.

BOUND VOLUMES, PRICE, \$3.00, by Express, prepaid, \$3.50, are ready for delivery. Address,

PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.