

# The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1904.

Number 338.

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.

There is some probability that the Chicago traction question (p. 376) may become further involved by the merging of the Chicago City Railway interests (local capitalists) with the Union Traction Company interests (Philadelphia and New York capitalists), and the consequent breaking up of all the compromise arrangements thus far tentatively effected. This consummation is very much to be desired. If the merger should have the further effect of releasing the city's servants from the spell which seems to have been cast over them by the magic potency of local financial interests, it will prove to be one of the best beloved mergers ever made.

Whether or not this expected merger shall come in to break up the pending compromise, there is reasonable certainty that the proposed ordinance is already as dead as Julius Caesar. The petition which the Mayor cynically demanded as a condition of recommending the postponement of the ordinance until after a referendum, is being signed so rapidly that there remains little doubt of its immediate success. In this work the value of the service provided by the Chicago Examiner and the American, the only local dailies not devoted to tying the hands of the city, is incalculable, and they are being cordially supported by such societies as the Turners and the Federation of Labor as well as by bodies more distinctly identified with the municipal ownership movement. We shall be surprised if the 100,000

signatures are not secured before the 3d of October. No other petition ever put out in Chicago has met with so little opposition and so ready and hearty a response from citizens approached for their signatures. Should it be fully signed even as late as November 15, the Mayor and at least two of the compromise newspapers will be obliged in consistency to advocate postponement. Of course the Council might nevertheless pass the ordinance. But they would have to do it over the Mayor's veto and in the face of public opinion clearly expressed. Should they indulge in this piece of "railroading," however, their reputations would be ruined even if their persons escaped discomfort. To defend the character of any man who should participate in so defiant a proceeding would be almost impossible. His action would be well-nigh incomprehensible upon any other theory than that of corruption.

Should the petition be fully signed and action on the proposed ordinance be in good faith deferred, the merits of the ordinance would come before the people for discussion. This would insure its defeat, for it cannot stand discussion. The representatives of the city have been outmaneuvered by the traction attorneys at every turn. A more interesting specimen of the bunco brick it would be hard to find even in the gripsack of the greenest Jonathan Wayback. The most urgent arguments for its adoption are precisely the same in substance and spirit, whether made by avowed believers in corporate control or by compromising advocates of city control. If this is not hypnotism, what is it? These arguments simmer down to the one proposition that without the proposed compromise Chicago will

have litigation and bad service for several years; whereas, with it, good service will begin at once and litigation will be avoided. Yet no one has yet shown how good service can be enforced under the compromise, or long litigation be prevented at its expiration.

Regarding the question of good service, for instance, the president of the Corn Exchange National Bank, Mr. Charles L. Hutchinson, rests his confidence not upon any coercive powers in the ordinance, but upon the good faith of the present administration of the company. "Under the former management of the company," he says, "it might well have been doubted whether the service would be good; under the administration of Mr. Hamilton and his associates, the prospects are excellent for good service." It is proper enough for Mr. Hutchinson to trust, for good service under the compromise, to the good faith of his chums; but the people should have better assurances before they consent to have the city shorn of its coercive possibilities.

On the question of quieting litigation and securing a peaceable adjustment, the compromisers are assertive but not demonstrative. Prof. Harry Pratt Judson, for example, asserts that the proposed ordinance "puts an end once for all to the present situation of doubt as to the respective rights of the city and the company, and to the interminable litigation in which the whole matter seems involved." Yet he absolutely refrains from indicating how the proposed ordinance would accomplish that happy result, notwithstanding that good lawyers, including both Judge Tuley and Judge Dunne, have definitely explained that it would not accomplish it.

The methods of all who have thus far come to the defense of the compromise ordinance are extremely unsatisfactory. Upon them rests the burden of showing that the ordinance would effect the results they claim for it. But instead of attempting this, they ignore and evade. It seems almost like a pre-arranged policy. They echo one another in asserting that the ordinance would secure good service, but shuffle away from the objection that it confers no powers to enforce good service, short of the drastic and therefore often impracticable one of forfeiture. They echo one another in asserting that the possibilities of litigation would be removed, but shuffle away from explanations that these possibilities would be augmented. Why don't they answer these objections frankly if their proposal is meritorious?

And why do they echo and re-echo the challenge to their critics either to stop criticising or to offer a counter-plan? Why do they do this while ignoring or sneering at every plan that does not contemplate compromise? Is it because they want compromise, or because compromise is necessary? If the latter, why don't they relieve the situation by explaining why? The issue now is compromise or no compromise; and this issue, as with every objection to their own plans, the promoters of compromise have so far refused to meet in any other spirit than that in which it is met by the traction interests. This cannot be in conservation of public interests. The people of Chicago have emphatically demanded municipal ownership without any intermediate compromise. Is that legally possible or isn't it? If it is, then the Mayor, the City Council, the corporation counsel, and the special counsel (all of whom are paid to find means for effectively realizing the people's will, not to hunt diligently for reasons for thwarting it), are under the most sacred kind of civic obligation to turn that possibility into a reality. If, however, it is in their best judg-

ment not legally possible—and this is the only honorable explanation of the policy they are pursuing—then they are under equally sacred civic obligations to take the people into their confidence and candidly explain why it is not possible. Their explanations thus far are of a kind which, if made by a lawyer to his client, could hardly have any other effect than to startle the client into a conviction that he had better get another lawyer—one who would be at least as considerate of his interests as of those of his adversary.

A very suggestive letter to the editor of the New York Evening Post appeared recently in the columns of that paper over the signature of Samuel H. Bishop. Its immediate reference was to the changes regarding civil service reform and class legislation that have come over Theodore Roosevelt since his accession to the Presidency; but its possible applications are many, from President down to city councilman. "When we study men as men," writes Mr. Bishop, "we know their opinions and where to find them; but when we study men as officials, we do not know their opinions and we do not know where to find them." With that apt phrasing of a thought that has floated at times in the minds of many of us, Mr. Bishop proceeds:

I remember that a great clergyman now dead once said to me: "I wonder if it would be possible for a bishop to be the same man in thought and policy that he was as a clergyman;" by which remark I supposed he meant that he was puzzled as I am puzzled to understand the change that comes over men who are put upon the apex of official positions. Let us grant that such men do become necessarily subject to the influence of motives which are not felt and cannot be understood by men not in those positions; that they are the subjects of wider laws and multiplex forces, which we who are not in those positions cannot understand; yet do we not need now some light to be thrown upon official exigencies and necessities, so that we can have at least some understanding of those exigencies and necessities, and can in some measure determine how far men ought to be changed in thought and policy

when they become executives either in church or state?

Having thus described the problem in terms which must appeal forcibly to all who have observed the phenomena of democracy, and pointed to Mr. Roosevelt as a type of the men who lose their ideals upon coming into high office; having, moreover, refused to accept the explanation that this deplorable transformation originates in bad motives, Mr. Bishop looks for "the deeper, the final effective cause." What he has to offer as the result of this inquiry is an impressive and as we believe a substantially true explanation of a very puzzling social riddle. He says:

I think it is the mental and moral perplexity involved in official positions, the sudden and overwhelming perception of a great new class of motives, exigencies and forces to which the official is now subject. The consciences of most men are so ill-trained that they cannot adapt and adjust themselves to this new multiplex system of motives and forces to which executive officials are subject. Indeed we are going through a time when the ordinary man—the business man, the director, the merchant, the clerk, men in every kind of occupation are unable to see what the strictly right thing is, or unable to adapt and adjust their consciences to the intricate and complex system of modern life; and so cannot act according to the stern dictates of the personal conscience.

Recurring to Mr. Roosevelt's case for a concrete illustration, Mr. Bishop continues:

I believe that the Republican policy, which is essentially a selfish and class policy, adds very greatly to the mental and moral perplexity of its executives and its politicians. Mr. Roosevelt is mentally and morally bound hand and foot by the selfish and class interests which really constitute Republican policy. He is not great enough (and I am one of those who think few men would be) to withstand the mighty force which presses upon him from the selfish interests involved in the continued subjugation of the Philippines, the class tariff and the other policies for which the Republican party stands.

Reflection upon Mr. Bishop's really profound observations might incline us all to be a little more charitable towards the motives of officials perplexed by conflicting social forces. Better yet, it might stimulate the officials them-

selves to cultivate more sensitive consciences. For the same selfish class-interests that confuse President Roosevelt's moral sense press all the way down from the White House even to town constable, confusing the moral sense of all who stand in their path. The question is in truth a social and not an individual one. But while this calls for charity toward the motives of officials, from those whose moral sense happens not to be exposed to the confusion, it does not call for toleration toward the officials themselves. The only way to rid society of social forces so confusing to the moral sense of officials, is to divest ourselves of confidence, pretended or otherwise, in all officials whose moral sense they have confused and whose fidelity to public trusts they have consequently baffled.

Among the syndicate articles now floating through the press, is a series purporting to be by "an ex-mayor of one of the largest American cities." Whoever the writer may be, he touches a chord very like that which is touched in Mr. Bishop's letter. Referring to what he justly characterizes as the "visionary character" known as the "ideal mayor"—and for mayor you may substitute any office you please, President, governor, legislator, etc.—this writer remarks:

To one who has filled a mayor's chair for at least one term, these efforts to fashion the improbable out of the hardly possible are calculated to establish an all-embracing feeling of intense and prolonged fatigue. Such a one knows from bitter experience that the ideal mayor cannot become a realization until the ideal city is an actuality. And you can never get the ideal city. I am repeating substantially what I said to a couple of well-meaning gentlemen who called on me near the end of my term to enter a mild protest against some official act of mine. One of them asked me to give him my views on the ideal city, and I replied: "A town whose business men do not have one standard of honesty for private business and another for public business." I felt safe in venturing that opinion, for I sincerely believe that if the representative business men of any large city would measure their civic

relations, duties and obligations with the same rule of conduct they use in private affairs, that city would become the ideal municipality.

Can it be that this ideal is impossible? If so, whose is the fault, if it is not the fault of the much-belauded business man himself? Would that the business and professional men of Chicago might at this time take to heart that just characterization of their immoral ethics—honesty in their private business, dishonesty in their public relations.

An instructive incident bearing on the race question was that at the convention of the American Bankers' Association at New York last week, one that might with great profit be compared with the antithetical instance at the dental convention in St. Louis (p. 371) a week before. At the bankers' convention, as at the dental convention, one Negro member attended. But here the parallel ends. The Negro at the bankers' convention was not insulted—neither at the sessions of the convention nor at the banquet. Nor was this due merely to Northern sentiment. The most gratifying thing about the incident was its disclosure of what is in some degree the fact, that race persecution at the South is not expressive of the better white sentiment of that section. To this fact the president of a Georgia bank was the witness. The Negro member of the bankers' association, John Mitchell, Jr., president of a Richmond savings bank, had insisted that there is no color line in business at the South. Replying to this, Col. Lowrey, president of the Lowrey National Bank, of Atlanta, Georgia, said:

There is no trouble between my race and his race in Georgia. Both the loafing white men and the loafing black men are despised in my State. I am glad Mr. Mitchell has spoken and gone on record that the Bankers' Association draws no color line and welcomes successful bankers, be they white or black, as members.

Col. Lowrey spoke rather loosely when he said that both "the loafing white men and the loafing

black men are despised" in his State. To have said that loafing white men (if poor) are despised, and loafing black men are burned, would have expressed the fact more closely. But his intent was evidently good and Southerners ought to applaud him. The time is ripe for Southerners with democratic blood in their veins to stand up for their section and their race by rebuking those childish assumptions of weak-minded Southerners that they have an inborn and ineradicable superiority because they have white skins. It is no honor to any country to boast of color. It is too suggestive of the possibility of there being nothing else available for boasting purposes. But the fact is that in the South there are many noble things to boast of.

At the bankers' convention in New York the head of the Standard Oil banking system, Mr. James Stillman, spoke with cordial approval of "the great economic value of cooperation," and deprecatingly of "the waste which follows "unintelligent competition." One must rub his eyes after reading that to be sure that the speaker was not making a "socialistic harangue." For Mr. Stillman has expressed the economic theory of socialism perfectly. The difference between the regular socialists and the Stillman type is that the former, while they advocate "cooperation" and the abolition of "unintelligent competition," just as Mr. Stillman does, would distribute the profits equally among the cooperators, whereas Mr. Stillman would distribute them in chunks more or less unequally among the men with a "cinch."

What queer folks some Christians be! Here is a Chicago reverend, whose calling is emphasized by his name, for it is Priest, and his religion by the name of his church, the "Church of the Redeemer," who so far forgot his calling last Sunday as to preach a vindictive sermon against highwaymen. His reliance was not upon the regenerating force of the

religion he preaches, nor the precepts of its Exemplar, but upon the "just, swift, terrible, certain" infliction of capital punishment. This may be good enough for piety, but it is doubtful Christianity—unless the Nazarene's Christianity was all wrong. A much more sane, not to say Christian, way of considering such things as desperate predatory crime, was suggested on the same day by another Chicago clergyman, the Rev. W. A. Bartlett, of the First Congregational church. Some of the things Mr. Bartlett said are well worth quoting, remembering, and inwardly digesting:

They say there is a reign of crime in Chicago. If we follow the method of the psychologist we ask what is the nature of the crime, and what are the characteristics of Chicago? The answer is that the crime most conspicuous is that of thieving. And the answer to the other question is that the atmosphere of Chicago is that of money getting. You hear practically but one conversation among the men everywhere—money. And with the women just as universally—clothes. The thief tells you that he fleeces one, while the man in a palatial suite fleeces a thousand. I am not extenuating the horrid crimes which make us afraid. Let us study them fearlessly. It comes home to be a matter of individual holiness. The man, however high up, who is unclean, dishonest, greedy, is making the soil of Chicago.

If this is true, and at any rate the shaft of truth in it was pretty well aimed, whom shall we send to the gallows, if the gallows is the remedy for highwaymanship? Shall we send the highwayman who expresses our dominant social evil brutally, or the greedy business man who less brutally but more destructively sets the pace?

Quite unintentionally the lawyer for one of the Chicago elevated railways, which is involved in franchise legislation with the State of Illinois, has paid a compliment to three Chicago judges—Murray F. Tuley, Edward F. Dunne and Edward Osgood Brown,—by challenging them as unsafe men for franchise corporations to try their cases before. No one doubts that all these judges

would accord to any corporation whose case they were trying its full legal rights. But franchise corporations are not content with that. They are like the prisoner who asked his lawyer to challenge a juror for saying the prisoner should have justice; he didn't want justice, he wanted an acquittal. In that view of the matter, a conscientious judge might like the unintended compliment to Tuley, Dunne and Brown somewhat better than the unintended slur upon their colleagues.

Why an organized effort should have been made to obstruct the reopening as a theater of the Chicago Iroquois, in which many lives were lost last winter (vol. vi, p. 744), is not very easy to understand. If a fatal accident had happened to one family there, that would have been no good reason for abolishing the theater, and no one would have proposed it. But the death of 600 persons, while it augments the number of mourners, adds nothing to the intensity of their grief. Why, then, should theatricals be barred from the place, if it is better adapted to that use than to some other? If the use in itself is not repugnant to good morals, the fact that the place was the site of a catastrophe raises no reasonable objection. In the centers of our civilization, births and deaths, weddings and hospitals, theaters and casualties are in constant juxtaposition. There is nothing peculiar about the Iroquois instance except that the deaths in that catastrophe were numerous.

#### HERBERT S. BIGELOW.

In the city of Cincinnati there is a Congregational church of attractive individuality and interesting and instructive history, with a pastor eminently fitted for his place by rare oratorical abilities and a spiritual devotion refreshingly unconventional.

Over the outer door of this church is the truly Christian legend, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." Upon the interior walls are

inscriptions such as these: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.—Jesus." "Far, far beyond our ken, the elemental laws must hold their sway. — Henry George." "He's true to God who's true to man.—Lowell." "Our country is the world, and our countrymen are mankind.—Garrison." "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty.—Jefferson." "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves.—Lincoln." "Those who make private property of the gift of God pretend in vain to be innocent.—Pope Gregory the Great." "What does the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.—Micah."

The preaching of that devoted pastor and the history of his practically religious church, are in harmony with the spirit of these inscriptions.

Originating in the Abolition movement, this church was dedicated from the beginning to the principle of equal human rights.

Its founders were seceders from a Cincinnati Presbyterian church, the pastor of which had grossly offended their Christian sensibilities by embarking upon a pulpit defense of Negro slavery on scriptural grounds. This occurred in 1831. The seceders chose a courageous Abolitionist for their pastor, and under his ministrations their religious society became famous, as "the Vine Street church," for brave exemplifications of the Christian principles of liberty, fraternity and equality.

Not only did its early pastors preach the right of the slave to freedom, unpurchased and inalienable, but the church building served as a depot, and the church officers as conductors, of the "underground railroad" which, stretching across Ohio, led on from Kentucky slavery to Canadian liberty. Within its walls, moreover, the first evangelical anti-slavery convention ever held in America was organized.

The fidelity of the original pastor was put to serious tests. He was ostracized professionally by the rest of the Cincinnati clergy, and his family as well as himself were brutally assaulted upon the streets by pro-slavery mobs. Lane Theological Seminary tried in vain to have him dismissed as "a

disturber of the peace." When he left this pastoral charge it was to become president of Oberlin college. His successors have been "disturbers" like himself.

In time the bitterness of the chattel slavery conflict passed away. But it was succeeded by the bitternesses of the conflict over economic slavery in the turmoils of which society is now involved. This newer struggle for liberty, equality and fraternity, against the powers of a species of human slavery subtler than the chattel form, found in the pulpit of the Vine street church the brilliant preacher and devoted minister who is still its pastor—Herbert Seely Bigelow, of whom we are able this week to offer our readers an excellent portrait.

The experiences of Mr. Bigelow at the Vine street church in connection with the American conflict over economic slavery, have been very like those of his first predecessor in connection with the American conflict over chattel slavery. No feature of that persecution has he escaped, except mobbing on the streets; and in some respects his experiences have been more bitter than those of the first pastor, whose example he has followed.

Mr. Bigelow was a conventional minister when he came to the Vine street church—one of that army of theological graduates who are so apt to be paganistic Christians and to become perfunctory preachers. If he differed from others it was in his exceptional pulpit powers and his still more exceptional lack of ambition for mere professional success.

Born at Elkhart, January 4, 1870, his preliminary education was acquired in the public schools of that Indiana town. His college course began at Oberlin and was completed at the Western Reserve in Cleveland. His theological studies were pursued at Lane Theological seminary, of which he is a graduate.

Soon after graduating from Lane, Mr. Bigelow was called to the Vine street church. Early in his pastorate there, some impulse moving him to become a resident of the "slums," he went with his young wife, Margaret N. Doane,

a Cleveland girl, into the tenement district to live. They didn't play at living there; they lived there. Not only did they make themselves neighbors of the "slum" people, they accepted the slum people as their neighbors.

This experience opened Mr. Bigelow's eyes. He began to appreciate the injustice of economic conditions, as the founders of his church had appreciated the less subtle but essentially identical injustice of chattel slavery. He awoke to the fact that infidelity was again masquerading in religious garb, as in the days of his earlier predecessors. A bright light shone before him. A cross appeared in his sky. Under these spiritual influences his perfunctory piety evaporated, and he began to get religion.

True to the anti-slavery traditions of his church, as he got religion he preached it. Then it was that the pharisee "came also," and trouble for Mr. Bigelow began. He soon learned that the cross he had seen was no phantom cross, no illusion. It became an agonizing reality. The rich men of the "old Vine street church" turned against him. Its anti-slavery traditions were not tenacious enough to save him from persecution even for admitting a Negro to membership; and their influence was still further weakened as the paganized conscience of influential parishioners detected in his preaching a note of appeal to the biblical command that "the land shall not be sold forever."

Old parishioners abandoned the church, but new ones came. As aforetime, the note that offended pharisees attracted publicans and sinners. The publicans and sinners had lean purses, however, and for a while destitution threatened the Vine street preacher with one of the penalties of getting enough religion to hurt. For months his income was almost nothing. He and his wife were upon the verge of starvation, and the question of being able to keep on became a serious problem.

But the problem was solved at last. The Vine street church has been as firmly reestablished on the abolition side of the question of economic slavery now, as it was originally established on the abolition side of the question of Ne-

gro slavery some seventy years ago.

While Mr. Bigelow was in the midst of his church work, at a critical stage in its progress, Tom L. Johnson's political plans in the same general direction were taking shape in Ohio, and Johnson called upon Bigelow to lend a hand. This call to participate in practical politics was unwelcome; but Bigelow could not refuse without resisting the anti-slavery spirit and stultifying the anti-slavery traditions of the Vine street church. Regarding the political cause that Johnson was leading as being also religious if pursued with religious motives—devotion to the Christian principles of liberty, equality and fraternity—the Vine street preacher responded to Johnson's summons; and for two years he lived and faithfully and effectively labored in what to him was hell, the maelstrom of practical politics. He did it in the same spirit in which he had before lived and worked in the social hell of the slums.

It was while performing this distasteful but necessary duty in practical politics, that Mr. Bigelow became a prominent candidate for political office. The office offered neither profit nor honor, and the nomination did not so much as promise election to the office. But it did offer an exceptional opportunity to preach the gospel of liberty, equality and fraternity to the people of Ohio, while serving as a pioneer in politically organizing the believers in this gospel against the cohorts of special privilege. For that reason Bigelow accepted the nomination, in 1902, of the Democratic party of Ohio for secretary of state.

For two years thereafter, without neglecting his church duties, he battled in political warfare against the combined forces of hoodlums and pharisees in Cincinnati. But now he has withdrawn from all active political service.

Not as a deserter has Mr. Bigelow withdrawn. He has done it because he believes that the obligation of that particular call has been, for the present at least, completely redeemed. When the call came, he alone could answer to its demands, but that is no longer true. Into the political work which Bigelow has faithfully

helped Tom L. Johnson to do in Ohio, other men have come who are capable of taking Bigelow's place.

One can easily believe, what Bigelow's friends know to be true, that Johnson and his purposes, understood so well by Bigelow though as yet so vaguely by the public, must have filled a large measure of Bigelow's thoughts when he decided to withdraw from politics. A warmth of affection glowed within him as he considered that Johnson must struggle on in the maelstrom he himself was quitting for more exacting duties. No matter what the public may think of Johnson's political battles, at least Bigelow knows that he has never suffered defeat. In everything and in all circumstances, what Bigelow has seen in Johnson is what all who know him well have also seen, "the man in him victorious." It is easy to believe that the loyalty of such a supporter cannot falter, and that Bigelow's faith in Johnson's leadership is such that if the call were to come to-day to go down again into the political hells, Bigelow would be there before the set of sun, making the same devoted fight though it held forth no prospect but certainty of defeat. It is of his nature to help the more the greater the need. No light tribute was that of a clergyman, spontaneously offered while Bigelow was in the midst of his political work,—a clergyman in good, even in high standing in one of the most ecclesiastical of denominations, and whose personal relations with Bigelow were not intimate, but who judged him by his career. Said this clergyman to a clerical friend of the same denomination: "I regard Herbert S. Bigelow as a consecrated man."

As may be seen from the portrait of Mr. Bigelow accompanying this issue of *The Public*, his smooth-shaven face reveals a finely chiseled jaw, massive and firm; while all the face above is expressive of the gentleness, charity, and unaffected humility and good humor which are known to be as characteristic of the man as his strength. He speaks in public after careful preparation, but with extemporaneous delivery. Although his oratory often emits flashes of eloquence that

thrill, his rhetoric and elocution are so free from affectation that his speeches, lectures and sermons produce the effect of elevated and earnest conversation.

He is a man to whom the externals both of politics and religion are of little importance. Externalities concern him only as they present obstacles to be overcome in getting to the truth within. Along with Emerson he believes that "he who would gather immortal palms must not be hindered by the name of goodness but must explore if it be goodness," and with Michelet that "no consecrated absurdity would have stood its ground in this world if the man had not silenced the objections of the child."

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

##### COLORADO.

Micanite, Col., Sept. 12.—There were five of us bound for Colorado. We had long planned our trip to go by way of Colorado Springs on "The Short Line" to Cripple Creek. Some of us had seen this land of greed and gold; others had no notion of what the Rocky mountains were like. As we were about to purchase tickets a telegram came from Canon City advising us to avoid the Cripple Creek district as dangerous. To say we were nonplussed was putting it mildly. Had we been anticipating a trip to the Fiji islands, and it had become known to our government at Washington, D. C., that American citizens could not go there safely, there would have been "something doing" in the departments. The whole available navy would have been at our command. But here in these United States, "the land of the free"! we could not credit the report. However, the wire had the effect of intimidating the majority of the party, so the tickets were bought to Canon City.

Our destination was Micanite, Fremont county. When seated in the Pullman we made the acquaintance of two very beautiful women, both from Cripple Creek. We related the fact of the telegram as to Cripple Creek's being unsafe, whereupon the younger woman declared it false. She said that Cripple Creek district was perfectly safe. "But," we replied, "we are women of pronounced opinions. We believe in the spirit and letter of our Declaration of Independence. We believe in 'trial by jury,' 'free speech,' 'free press,' 'the right to organize,' etc. We believe Gov. Peabody has overstepped his authority." The young woman's eyes blazed fire, and in a very forceful manner she said we would not be safe if we thought that. She would guarantee that we should be "pinched" if we expressed "such views in Cripple Creek."

It transpired that she was the wife of one of the largest Cripple Creek mine owners.

After two weeks at Micanite, we decided to visit Cripple Creek at all hazards. As we approached the town we were impressed with the signs "For Rent" and "For Sale" everywhere conspicuous. We counted 19 in two blocks. As buildings are far apart, this is a large average.

During the day the streets were comparatively quiet; toward evening the people paraded the sidewalks in large numbers. It is a significant fact that nearly all of the stores, even the large ones, were presided over by the proprietor himself. As business no longer warranted the paying of clerks, the largest dry goods store had but two or three.

Yet, these short-sighted citizens are the only happy people in Teller county. One has but to visit the merchants of this district to verify the verdict of Mr. Steffens, the investigator of municipal affairs and writer for McClure's, and Mr. Woodruff, the president of the National Municipal league, of Philadelphia, who agree that the worst citizens we have are our business men. They seldom come out in the open and declare for a principle. They are seldom sufficiently unselfish and public-spirited to lend time, brains or money for a cause or for principle's sake. They seem indifferent to the weal or woe of those around them. Nothing appeals to them until their receipts fall off. When their own pocketbooks are affected they come to life and creep out from behind their counters with the one idea of bringing back trade or revenging themselves upon those who are responsible for its falling off. This is all true of Cripple Creek district business people. When the receipts dropped to actual loss, they came out into the open and formed a "Citizens' Alliance," which is nothing more nor less than a "vigilance committee," or organization of "white caps," backed up and encouraged by the military.

While few sympathized with the Federation of Labor methods, we found the "Citizens' Alliance" had discounted the Federation's acts of lawlessness and tyranny until no man could secure work in Cripple Creek district without a card from the vigilance committee. Even business men are boycotted unless they affiliate with this organized mob.

We met friends on the street and were cautioned to speak in whispers because everyone is a spy upon his neighbor. This vigilance committee, or "white cap" brigade, is breeding hypocrites, liars and bearers of false witness. The word of a member of the Citizens' Alliance has more effect and weight than the solemn oaths of 20 reputable citizens not members of it. Consequently any member of this organized mob, who has an enemy, can get him

deported with little trouble. No one is safe. When a man is "pinched," as they term it, he is put into the "sweat box" and silly questions asked him. If his answers are not satisfactory, he is given so many days to leave the State.

One prominent gentleman told us that there were already enough martyrs to the cause; that citizens were becoming satisfied to answer questions to suit their oppressors; that they were willing to denounce organized labor, to confess the Declaration of Independence a lie, willing to laud the acts of Peabody and Gen. Bell to the skies; willing to say anything or do anything to escape deportation.

There are two things which the Citizens' Alliance detest supremely. One is any mention of the Declaration of Independence and the other is an "agitator." To be an "agitator," or to be thought an "agitator," is to be considered as deserving a death sentence. The inflamed and drunken imaginations of the members of the Citizens' Alliance prevents their remembering that such men as Jefferson, Jackson, Wendell Phillips, William Lloyd Garrison, Lincoln, and Jesus of Nazareth were agitators, and that the last was crucified by a "Citizens' Alliance."

Four years since it was predicted that our conduct towards the Filipinos would, if continued, be soon imitated in these United States. How true the prophecy! Who can tell how long before the "water cure" method of exporting "confessions" will be indulged in here? One pitiful result of the presence of the military is the fact that the youth of this locality looked with envious eyes upon these beardless soldier boys, with pockets full of pistols and belt loaded with ammunition, carrying a rifle and strutting about "lords of all they surveyed," drunk with power and importance.

Little effort is being made to find the real culprit or culprits of the explosion at Independence. Many think it very significant that as soon as the explosion occurred it was found that the "Citizens' Alliance" was instantly and thoroughly equipped with guns and ammunition, while the Federation of Labor was practically unarmed. So crazed and unjust have those in power become that any mention of the fact that every man is innocent under the law until he is proven guilty is sneered at as mere "rot." The most pathetic sight in Cripple Creek is to behold the efforts of the "Citizens' Alliance" to defend their position and to express their loyalty to their association to visitors who converse with them.

A prominent member of the Cripple Creek Woman's club declares the entire reign of tyranny and military despotism existing in Teller county is one of politics. If the sheriff in the begin-

ning of the trouble had sworn in deputies and stood up in his boots, and not have become intimidated, the people would have been rulers of the situation. The county clerk was asked to resign, and the same tactics of threatening him with hanging, etc., were used to secure his resignation that were so effective in the case of the sheriff; but he would not give up, and down to date he holds the fort. The politicians desire to control the county clerk's office even more than they desire the sheriff's office. That it is politics is seen from the fact that all those deported are Democrats, with the exception of Republicans who have declared their intentions of quitting the Republican ranks.

That Gen. Bell sincerely believes that the militia are for the purpose not of preserving rights, but of "breaking strikes," is apparent from his declaration at Victor during the meat packers' strike in Chicago, that if he could pick 200 of his men and go with them to Chicago, arriving in Chicago in the morning, he would break the strike and be ready to return by night.

The Portland mine, since its close by military authority, the directors of that company refusing to support their manager, Mr. Burns, in his suit for \$100,000 against Gov. Peabody, was started up again with 100 union men—picked men, artisans, high-class mechanics, engineers, men who are skilled workmen, residents for years, most of them. In Cripple Creek district, owning their own homes and having children to support, all-around good citizens, so Mr. Burns declares, men who are necessary to the success of "dividends." These men, with hundreds of nonunion men, were working peacefully side by side at the Portland mine when word was received from Denver that the 100 union men intended to "walk out" in a body. In this connection, it is somewhat of a conundrum how people in Denver keep tab upon the acts, and even the thoughts, of the working men in Cripple Creek district. This mere rumor was all sufficient to set on fire the already inflamed imaginations of the "Citizens' Alliance" and the military; and these 100 tried and true men, who were giving perfect satisfaction to their manager, were accused of the (so considered) criminal plot to "walk out," and their homes were invaded. Behold the spectacle of this "Citizens' Alliance" depriving citizens of the right to quit work and discounting any tyranny ever concocted by any labor organization on earth. These men denied that a walk-out was intended, but that rumor from Denver offset their solemn oaths. Their pay days are now cut off, to the detriment of all business interests.

Colorado will speedily reap what she has sown. The educated manly workmen of Cripple Creek are fast being deported; their places are being filled by Mexicans, Italians and what-not, incompetent and ignorant. Accidents and

loss of life are already numerous on account of the inexperience of these men.

The Labor day parade at Cripple Creek, headed by Sheriff Bell, was in reality a Republican or Peabody jollification—not a labor union man was in line; and that any workmen would submit to march under such banners as "They Can't Come Back," "Down with Agitators," "We Still Own This District," "We Are Not Ashamed to March Behind Our Soldiers," etc., shows to what dependent men will resort in order to secure and hold one of those precious things called "jobs."

The Peabody deportation excursions continue, although Sheriff Bell, of Teller county, declares he will do all in his power to prevent further deportations. In this declaration Sheriff Bell is insincere, for he knows he cannot protect anyone who is in disfavor with mine owners and members of the "Citizens' Alliance." These people put him in office to do their bidding; should he refuse, it will result in his own undoing. He failed to assure Frank Hangs, counsel for the Western Federation of Miners, that he would be unmolested on his return to the gold camp, which shows plainly "where he is at." Sheriff Bell is holding his office to further the interests of one class only. No man can look to him for protection who is "persona non grata" to the mine owners. He cannot hold his position without violating the oath he took.

Preparations were made only last week for a meeting of the Woman's Democratic Club. It was arranged that Helen M. Gougar, of Lafayette, Ind., a woman of world-wide fame as an orator, should address the club; but the excitement incident to the deportation of many of Cripple Creek's most public spirited and progressive men had the effect of intimidating the members of the club. Fearing to excite the "Citizens' Alliance" and mine owners' union to take revenge upon them or their husbands, they voted to withdraw the invitation to Mrs. Gougar. So the cause of "free speech" received a black eye.

A canvass of the Staff reveals the fact that Peabody's un-American acts are condoned and even applauded by apparently intelligent people, who are greatly distressed by the attitude of the Eastern press, which so universally condemns the present lawlessness. If money can buy Peabody's election, he will be re-elected; the mine owners, bankers and railroads are all preparing to reward his services in behalf of plutocracy.

One word as to Peabody's personality. The impression has gone forth that he is a forceful man. Nothing could be farther from the fact. Gov. Peabody has a characterless face, a vacillating temperament, and is easily dominated by designing men.

MNONA S. FITTS.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Sept. 22.

The Japanese appear to be pushing the Russian army at Mukden (p. 374) farther north, and another great battle is not improbable. But the reports of movements on both sides are indefinite, conflicting, and altogether as untrustworthy as reports of other preliminary movements have been from the beginning of the war. Not until the next battle has been fought to the end can trustworthy news be expected.

Reports regarding Port Arthur (p. 356) are to the effect that another attack from land and sea has been in progress since the 19th.

A concession regarding contraband shipments (p. 296) was made by Russia to the British ambassador at St. Petersburg on the 16th. It was in the form of an oral interpretation of the Russian prize regulations. Count Lamsdorf, the Russian minister for foreign affairs, explained to the British ambassador that food stuffs, coal, and other articles of peaceful commerce, which are susceptible also of warlike uses, are, when shipped in ordinary course of trade, to be regarded as contraband only if consigned to blockaded ports or destined for the enemy's military or naval forces. This is in accordance with the British and American contention. The reservation is made, however, that irregular ship's papers or other suspicious circumstances may be held to vitiate the assumption of innocent character, although the burden of proof to warrant legal seizure in such cases will rest upon the captor.

The Russian war vessel *Lena*, which sought refuge in the port of San Francisco (p. 375), was put in course of dismantlement at the Mare Island navy yard, near San Francisco, on the 17th. The work was finished on the 19th. On the latter date her officers and crew were paroled under an agreement between Rear Admiral Goodrich, U. S. N., and her captain, that they are not to depart from San Francisco until the end of the war or a prior agreement between Russia

and Japan for their release. Their living expenses in San Francisco are to be paid by the Russian government.

Members of the Interparliamentary Union, which advocates international arbitration in place of war, and met at St. Louis last week (p. 375), are making an American pilgrimage under the escort of a Congressional committee. This Union is composed exclusively of members and ex-members of parliamentary bodies. The expenses of its St. Louis convention and present pilgrimage were provided for by a \$50,000 appropriation by Congress. Numbering about 250 persons, it is traveling in two special railroad trains. Receptions have been given these visitors by several cities, that at Detroit being notable.

Another peace convention is to be held in the United States in a few days. This is the International Congress (vol. vi, p. 810), composed of delegates from the world's peace societies. The first of these conventions met in London in 1843, as the Universal Peace Congress, and under the auspices of the American Peace Society and the English Peace Society. The second met at Brussels in 1848. At the third Congress, held in Paris in 1849, Victor Hugo presided. There was then a lapse until 1889, when the movement was revived under its present title, the International Peace Congress. The first of these gatherings, also at Paris, was presided over by Frederic Passy. Eleven others have been held, namely, at London, Rome, Berne, Chicago, Antwerp, Buda-Pesth, Hamburg, Paris, Glasgow, Monaco and Rouen; and the thirteenth is to meet at Tremont Temple, Boston, on the 3d of next month. On the 2d, Sunday, church services in Boston are to be devoted to the cause of international peace, and other public meetings are to be held in the same interest. The Congress is to be welcomed on the 3d by the Mayor of Boston, the Governor of Massachusetts and the Federal Secretary of State. The deliberative meetings of the Congress are to be in Tremont Temple every forenoon of the week; public meetings will be held in the evenings at Tremont Temple.

Park Street Church, the old South Meeting House, and Faneuil Hall. Among the subjects to be discussed are the following: "Work and Influence of The Hague Tribunal," "Reduction of National Armaments," "Education," "Mutual Relations of Races," "Special Interests of Workingmen," "Special Interests of Business Men," and "Special Interests of Women." The Congress is to close with a \$2 festival and dinner at Horticultural Hall on the 7th, at which there will be speaking. All peace and arbitration societies, and all religious, educational, philanthropic, industrial, or commercial organizations in sympathy with the general aims of the Congress are entitled to send delegates. Any individual friend of the peace cause may join the Congress upon payment of \$1. The office of the organization committee is at 20 Beacon street, Boston.

Work in behalf of the emergent petition for a referendum on the proposed traction ordinance of Chicago (p. 376) is reported to be progressing rapidly. The Municipal Ownership League endorsed it on the 16th as the most important present work for municipal ownership advocates, and pledged its cooperation. The Chicago Federation of Labor did the same thing on the 18th. The Turner societies, also, are active in promoting the petition. On the 19th it was stated by the directors of the work that 3,000 individuals had then volunteered to solicit signatures. Signature-solicitors report that citizens readily sign the petitions when presented; and the managers expect to have 100,000 when the City Council meets on the 3d.

Meanwhile, rumors are plentiful in Chicago that the two great traction systems of the city are about to merge. These rumors are to the effect that Eastern combinations interested in the Union Traction Company (now in the hands of Federal receivers) have offered \$200 a share for a controlling interest in the Chicago City Railway Company (which is locally controlled). That some such arrangements are under way is confirmed by John J. Mitchell, who was reported on the 20th by the Chicago



Tribune (which favors the proposed compromise ordinance), as saying:

The negotiations are in progress and I think there is no doubt that in four or five days they will reach a consummation which will serve as a basis for an offer to the stockholders of Chicago city. I cannot say that there will be no discrimination among the stockholders as has been reported. The offer will be made to all the shareholders, big and little, and all who wish to sell their stock at the figure offered will find a ready purchaser.

The probable effect of this merger on the proposed compromise ordinance, was suggested by an interview in the same Tribune report, with one of the receivers of the Union Traction system, Henry A. Blair, who said:

In my opinion whatever negotiations the new company has with the city should be on the "clean slate" basis. The Chicago city ordinance is unfair to the street car company. It should be ignored in all future consideration of a franchise covering the entire city. No company could afford to operate its lines on the terms embodied in the tentative ordinance. In the first place the ordinance is unfair in the particular of the commuted term in exchange for the 99-year rights. The new company should get better terms than that. I should say that the commuted term should be at least twenty years, and I would advise that nothing short of this term be accepted. In the second place, the compensation named is unfair. I am pretty familiar with the finances of the north and west side companies, and I know that they could not make a red cent over and above the 5 and 10 per cent. compensation. The company which may result from the merger of the two systems will not be able to pay any compensation at all during a certain period of time, to be determined by financial and physical considerations. I am convinced that the reconstruction of the lines so as to give Chicago an adequate service will take at least four or five years, and during that period the company could not afford to pay compensation. As for municipal ownership, I say let the city buy the lines at any time, provided the city pays for them. Let us have no confiscation of the property. I would be willing to see the city take over the lines to-morrow if the investors could get back thereby what money they have put into the property. The city can afford to be more reasonable with a company covering the entire city than it has been with the south side company in the tentative ordinance. The clean slate is the only proper basis on which the new company, if formed, should meet the city.

In American politics the most

important event of the week is the Democratic convention of New York, its importance being due to the possible effect of its action upon the electoral vote of that State. The convention met at Saratoga on the 20th. A stubborn struggle at once began between McCarren, the Brooklyn "boss," supposed to be a political agent of "the Standard Oil crowd," and the supporters of Edward M. Shepard, who was the most radical candidate before the convention. McCarren's candidate was Comptroller Grout, who was opposed by Tammany Hall because this organization is resisting McCarren's pretensions to leadership. A compromise was effected on the 21st by the nomination of D. Cady Herrick, of Albany. Herrick was at one time active in supporting Cleveland against Hill, but for several years he has been a Supreme Court judge. His term as judge expires with the year. This nomination has produced some curious effects. For one thing it has attracted the support of the New York Sun to the Democratic State ticket, although that paper continues to support the Republican national ticket. For another it has driven the New York Evening Post from the support of the Democratic State ticket, although the Post continues to support Parker for President. The Sun supports Herrick because the Republicans "turned down" Platt; the Post opposes Herrick because it holds him to be a mere wire-pulling politician.

Next in importance to Herrick's nomination was the Republican convention for New York, which met at Saratoga on the 14th and completed its work on the 15th. Its nomination of Frank W. Higgins for governor is regarded as a victory for the Odell wing of the party over the Platt wing. The latter were understood to favor Lieut. Gov. Timothy L. Woodruff, who withdrew his name at the last moment and moved that Higgins be nominated by acclamation.

On the following day, the 16th, the State committee of the People's party of New York met at the city of New York and named a full State ticket, with Alfred J. Boulton at the head of it as candidate for governor.

Several State conventions besides that of New York were in session on the 15th. The Democratic convention of Montana refused, by 22 votes out of a total of 500, to make a fusion with the People's party, and nominated J. K. Toole for Governor. The People's convention of Indiana nominated Leroy Templeton for Governor, making a fusion with the "middle of the road" wing (p. 342) of the party. The Democrats of New Jersey nominated Charles C. Black for Governor. The Republicans of New Jersey nominated Edward C. Stokes for Governor on the 20th; and on the same day the New Hampshire Republicans nominated John McLane for Governor of that State. The Colorado Democrats on the 21st nominated Alva A. Adams for governor.

The letter of acceptance of the Presidential nominee of the National Liberty (Negro) party, George E. Turner, was published from Ottumwa, Ia., on the 15th. It describes the Negroes of the United States as numbering more than 12,000,000; asserts that their rights are utterly disregarded and they excluded from citizenship to the extent of subjecting them to taxation without representation; argues that there is no hope of redress from either of the prominent parties; and demands complete recognition of their Constitutional rights, pensions for those that were slaves, and independence for the Filipinos.

Out of the lynching of Horace Maples, a Negro accused of murder, at Huntsville, Ala., (p. 358) have come legal proceedings calculated to discourage this species of mob lawlessness. A special grand jury has returned indictments against several participants in the lynching. It has, moreover, impeached the sheriff for incompetency and neglect of duty in failing to resist the mob; the mayor for neglect of duty in permitting the mob to organize and break the peace of the city; and the chief of police for refusal to disperse it. Owing to threats made to rescue the indicted persons if arrested, Gov. Cunningham has stationed two companies of militia at the Huntsville jail. He has also summoned a court of inquiry

to inquire into the action of the local militia at Huntsville in connection with the lynching of Maples.

Recent dispatches indicate that Great Britain had larger purposes in view regarding Thibet than she made public when the Younghusband expedition (p. 377) was on its way to that secret land. She then denied that she had any other purpose than to arrange for better trade relations, and in Parliament the ministry explicitly disavowed all intention of occupying Thibetan soil permanently. But the treaty recently signed (p. 377) and just published, not only binds the Thibetans to establish three markets for mutual trading between British and Thibetan merchants, and to permit traffic along routes existing and to be established; it also requires Thibet to pay an indemnity of \$2,550,000 in three-yearly installments, and stipulates that as security for the performance of these conditions British troops shall be permitted to occupy Chumbi valley for three years, or until the indemnity is paid. It also provides that without the consent of Great Britain no Thibetan territory shall be sold or leased to any foreign power, and that no foreign power shall be permitted to concern itself with the affairs of Thibet or to construct roads, railways, or telegraphs or open mines in the country. Russia intimates that Great Britain has by this treaty broken faith. She claims that the treaty was forced upon the Thibetans, and establishes a virtual protectorate over the country. Moreover, she contends that it is a restriction upon the sovereignty of China; inasmuch as, while recognizing the sovereignty of China by requiring her ratification, the treaty once ratified transfers the sovereignty to Great Britain by compelling Thibet to consult Great Britain in its dealings with the other powers. This is considered to be aimed directly at Russia. A protest to that effect is reported from St. Petersburg on the 20th as having been ordered to be lodged at the British foreign office in London.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—The 24th annual convention of the American Federation of Labor is to

meet at Lyric Hall, San Francisco, November 14th.

—An heir to the throne of Italy was born at Racconigi on the 15th.

—Peter Karageorgevitch, king of Serbia (p. 137) was crowned at Belgrade on the 21st.

—Joseph Jefferson, the veteran actor, announced on the 18th his permanent retirement from the stage.

—At Chicago on the 18th the 18th annual convention of the American section of the Theosophical Society met.

—A terrific storm, unprecedented in its fury and long continuance, swept the Atlantic coast on the 14th and 15th.

—Prince Herbert Bismarck, eldest son of the "Iron Chancellor," died at Friedrichshue on the 18th, at the age of 55.

—Emma Goldman was prevented by the police of Queensborough, New York city, from lecturing at a picnic at Liberty Park on the 19th. No reasons are reported.

—The body of Charles B. Spahr (p. 358), formerly of the Outlook's staff and later editor of Current Literature, was found on the 21st near Broadstairs, Kent, England, where it had washed ashore. Identification is complete.

—Serious troubles are reported vaguely from Italy in connection with impoverishment and labor strikes. Troops have been called out, and in their attempt to suppress a public meeting addressed by the Socialist member of parliament, Ferri, many persons were injured.

—The World's Congress of Freethinkers, attended by 5,000 delegates, assembled in Rome on the 20th. Dr. Henry Maudsley was appointed honorary president for England. Professor Haeckel for Germany. Professor Berthelot for France. Professor Salmeron for Spain and Professor Ardigò Lombroso for Italy.

—At a public meeting in Zion City, Illinois, on the 18th, John Alexander Dowie proclaimed himself as "John Alexander, the high priest on earth and the first apostle of the Catholic and Apostolic church in Zion of that higher priest in heaven." His announcement was formally accepted by the officers and congregation.

—In an anti-Semite riot in an unnamed German village on the 11th, incidental to the celebration of the Jewish New Year, 50 Jews are reported to have been killed, 100 wounded, and unspeakable atrocities committed. The report, which comes by way of Philadelphia, is not authentic nor confirmed. It is accompanied by a statement that the facts are suppressed in Germany

#### PRESS OPINIONS.

##### CHICAGO TRACTION.

Chicago Examiner (Dem. and anti-ord.), Sept. 21.—The people of Chicago are now enabled to see at a glance just what is the

scheme of the stock speculators that are back of the fraudulent franchise planned for the Chicago City Railway Company. The dispatches from New York render the whole device perfectly plain. The "merger" of the Chicago street railroad interests" of which these dispatches tell means, of course, that Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, whose acute interest in our traction situation has been so mysterious, intends to create here one of his justly celebrated combinations. The Union Traction and the Chicago City Companies are to be united in a way similar to that followed in the forming of the Shipbuilding Trust and the Steel Trust.

##### ROOSEVELT'S LETTER.

Goodhue Co. (Minn.) News (Dem.), Sept. 17.—Cleveland had a pretty good notion of the Cleveland administration and McKinley was complacent. But for downright self-sufficiency Roosevelt's nine column certificate of the Roosevelt administration surpasses them all. He gives Roosevelt praise which as a historian he denied to Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson and all the rest down to Lincoln. We understand Roosevelt thinks rather well of Lincoln, a little uncultured, perhaps, and inclined to be a weakling, but on the whole a good man.

##### THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.), Sept. 16.—The first reports of the Maine State election exaggerated the Republican plurality. Instead of nearly 33,000 that plurality was but 27,130. These figures are food for thought. . . . What do these figures mean? They certainly mean that the Gold Democrats of 1856 in Maine have all gone back to their party. They probably mean that the Gold Democrats of the East generally are going back to their party. These signs give no cause for panic. But they do give warning to Eastern Republicans that they can no longer count on the Gold Democrats to help carry close States like New York and New Jersey—that is, if such States are to be left Republican, they are to be kept so only by Republican work, and hard work at that.

The (Chicago) Voter (Ind.), Sept.—William Jennings Bryan is still very much in the limelight. What he will do for the Democratic ticket is, as yet, uncertain. He will be unable to prevent many of his former followers from voting for Debs and he undoubtedly knows that many of his old men will turn to Roosevelt. The moderate radicals will naturally cast their votes for the Colonel, while the extremists will turn to the Socialist leader. A godly company will go into camp with Watson and this total vote will more than offset the ballots which the Cleveland men will give Judge Parker. Colonel Bryan himself is keeping regular. He is looking farther ahead than next November. He may make some speeches for his party, but he has not retracted a single word of his attack on Judge Parker and the New York platform and his advocacy of the present Democratic platform is about as warmly enthusiastic as the editorial support accorded the candidate by the newspapers of William Randolph Hearst. Evidently Colonel Bryan does not consider Democratic success a cinch this fall for he has already announced that in the event of Judge Parker failing of election he, Bryan, will undertake the reorganization of the party once more.

##### WISCONSIN POLITICS.

The Dubuque (Ia.) Herald (Dem.), Sept. 15.—Democrats of Wisconsin should disregard party lines and vote for La Follette. Peck's election will defeat and not accomplish the reforms so necessary to good government. Cook is a mere tool. The game is to divide the Republican vote and elect Peck, thus relegating La Follette to private life, and his reforms to the junk heap. This newspaper fondly hopes that Democrats will support with voice and ballot the

fighting Governor. They can do so without stultifying themselves. Indeed there would be stultification should they do otherwise, for the principles of government La Follette urges are democratic principles, in that they contemplate the ascendancy of the people in all matters of public concern.

**THE COLORADO LAWLESSNESS.**

The (la.) Quasquetonian (Ind.), Sept. 16.—Another man has been found, according to press dispatches, who has confessed to the dynamite outrage in Colorado and who implicates many others, among them being leaders in the miners' union. The difficulty which the mining corporations are having to fasten upon the miners a crime which was undoubtedly committed by themselves must be really annoying. Workingmen are not all criminals and neither are they fools, therefore it is not reasonable to suppose that they would deliberately commit a crime by which they had everything to lose and the corporations everything to gain.

**GOV. GARVIN.**

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Sept. 15.—He has asked for constitutional amendments conferring upon the Executive a limited veto power; establishing the initiative and referendum; and extending to certain citizens the right to participate in the election of city councilmen. Only persons in favor of a continuance of the corrupt and oligarchic rule which has so long disgraced Rhode Island can oppose these amendments. But now the Republican party is squarely on record in opposition to these wholesome reforms. It can no longer dodge the issues. The position of the party is as clear as daylight and it can make no explanation which will be satisfactory to honest voters. And thus the enemy has played into the hands of the aggressive and fearless Governor. The only thing that can now save the Republicans is the Presidential election. In an off year their defeat would be a foregone conclusion.

**MISCELLANY**

**TO HERBERT S. BIGELOW.**

For The Public.

I like to see thee tread where others pause,  
A pioneer where pioneers are few,  
Fearless and dauntless in a holy cause,  
A man of purpose, cowerless, and true.  
Too long the pulpit and too long the cross  
Have sought to foil and crucify the world;  
Beneath hate's ban and superstition's dross  
Their tongued anathemas and curses hurled.  
Thou art a man; a free-born son of truth,  
And loyal to the cause of human weal;  
Thy faith brooks not a world of crime and ruth,  
Which only might can end and death repeal.  
But with the fervor of the earnest soul,  
By force of truth and by conviction's creed,  
Thou speakst the words that never ceasing roll,  
To yield the harvest of the righteous seed.  
Keep up the faith! with never faltering tread,  
Plant thy firm feet on freedom's rock secure;  
There thy full soul, fixed on the stars ahead,  
In noble luster, endless, shall endure.

WILLIAM HOFFMAN.

**A PLEA FOR EQUAL RIGHTS IN SOUTH AFRICA.**

A portion of a report read before the South African Press Association, sitting at King William's Town, July 6, 1904, by the General Secretary, the Rev. E. J. Mqoboli, as reported in Izwi Labantu.

The four cabled words: "Queen Victoria is dead," cast a gloom not only over those who had a consanguinary affiliation to her, but also over those sable Africans who were under her protection—nay, more, whom she had adopted and given the liberty to enjoy the same privileges and advantages which for centuries have been the foundation of British freedom. Her demise also came as a test to all classes of people in the empire as to whether the loyalty exhibited to the great Sovereign Lady was real or imaginary. If the former, her memory would in some substantial manner be perpetuated by some movement which would be known and seen and be of help to humanity as long as the sun and moon endure, inasmuch that present and future generations should call her blessed.

At her death the elder brother (the white man), had been fully equipped with all that constitutes a full-fledged man—education—while the younger (the black man) had only had his eyes just opened to observe with astonishment not unmixed with awe, the wonderful things accomplished by the former through knowledge brought about by education.

The younger brother many a time ventured to whisper a wish to his elder brother to be initiated into the mysteries of knowledge. The reply was: "Youngster, time has not yet arrived for you to be placed on an equal footing with me. You have first to acquaint yourself with industrial education, as a test of the strength of your sinews." He obeyed. He is now a carpenter of sorts, a blacksmith, a shoemaker, in fact, he is found in all departments of public labor in this country from the Cape Town docks to the marshes of the Zambesi. He is a natural engineer. There is not a railroad in this country where the Native has not worked. He is found in the cookery and nursery, he has cooked for and nursed up more than one-half of his elder brother's children; yet time has not yet arrived for him to be elevated to the educational level of his elder brother. He is strictly confined to the rudiments of education, which only helps to engender bitter feeling, the only remedy for which is good education. Half-civilization is worse than barbarism.

We do not ask that at present we should be considered on an equality with the white man in every respect, but what we do ask for is that elemental right of every human being—equality of opportunity—to enable us of ourselves if possible to attain those lofty heights of accomplishment already gained by those more favored mortals into whose midst the principles of Christian civilization have been introduced.

**GOVERNOR GARVIN AND THE RHODE ISLAND LEGISLATURE.**

An editorial in the Weekly Springfield Republican of Sept. 16.

The extraordinary session of the Rhode Island legislature, convened by Governor Garvin, on Tuesday, lasted about five hours, and then there was an end of it. With their overwhelming majority in the Senate, the Republicans were able to adopt partisan resolutions of censure on the Governor, and of adjournment, and this action was confirmed by the Republican majority in the House. The session in the Senate was stormy, owing to the deliberate purpose of the majority to choke off discussion of the measures mentioned in the Governor's message. The general result, however, was what everyone had anticipated, for the Republicans were sure to use their numerical power in the two houses to checkmate at once the Governor's move in convening in special session.

That the Governor's course in this matter was "politics" may be conceded, but, viewed in any fair or impartial light, it was a kind of politics that is the most legitimate conceivable. Governor Garvin is fighting against a powerfully entrenched oligarchy for certain desirable reforms in the government of Rhode Island. These reforms have been virtually indorsed by the people, for the man who has publicly and persistently championed them has been twice elected governor by the people of the State. He would have lacked courage had he failed to press his reform programme to the uttermost limit upon a hostile legislature that is made up on a rotten borough system of representation. Dr. Garvin has never been wanting in courage, however, and he is now too old to show the white feather to forces which he has been fighting all his life.

There are at least four points in the present system in Rhode Island which merit condemnation. One is the basis of representation in the legislature, by which the majority can never rule unless it happens to be a Republican majority. The second is the discrimination against registry voters, who can vote

for a congressman, a governor or a president, whereby they are denied the right of suffrage in the election of city councils. The third is the denial to the governor of any effective veto power upon legislation, however vicious or tainted or premature. The fourth is the method of choosing judges by the State legislature; which has resulted in the custom, now well established, of electing only members of that body to the State Supreme Court. The Governor had all of these points in mind, when convening the legislature in special session; and he has also called attention to the need of more stringent bribery laws, and the viciousness of the so-called post-election session which the Republican leaders have revived again this year.

The Rhode Island system is made a burlesque upon popular government by these various devices. The legislature has done nothing, it has even refused to consider the measures framed to remedy the evils and wrongs complained of. Governor Garvin, therefore, has done well to force the issue to the front again, and he has adopted the best possible way to command public attention. In his special message he proposes the Constitutional Initiative, which, if adopted, would enable the people to modify the present rotten borough system of representation and make the legislature truly representative of the people. He proposes equal suffrage and the veto power for the executive. His programme, in short, meets the needs of the hour, and, in pushing it upon a reluctant and enraged legislative majority, he discharges his duty to the people who elected him to office. No one can say that Governor Garvin has not been true to his pledges in these matters, and has not kept the faith that was in him.

The Governor had a most successful day with the legislature in the five hours' session, judging from the reports. He has prodded the inert body of public opinion, and it comes to a lively consciousness of its mission once more. He has again infuriated a conservatism that has crowned an oligarchy of dollars as the ruler of the commonwealth. All goes well. It will be a sad day for Rhode Island when it has no more Garvins to defy its happy and contented plutocracy under the dome of the "marble palace."

"If our combination is illegal," said the capitalist, "I suppose we will have to change it."

"Wouldn't it be easier to change the law?" asked his associate.—Chicago Evening Post.

#### THE CHICAGO TRACTION QUESTION.

Contribution of Louis F. Post to the Chicago Record-Herald, of September 14, 1904, in the series arranged for the Record-Herald, and described by it as follows:

"The Record-Herald has arranged for the publication of a series of discussions of the tentative ordinance dealing with the local traction problem so far as it pertains to the Chicago City Railway. The contributions will be from men who have given the traction question generally and the tentative ordinance specifically serious consideration. Representatives of the numerous schools of opinion that have grown out of the local traction situation will be given an opportunity to be heard, so that from the variety of expression Chicagoans who have not made a special study of the subject may be able to glean the best arguments from all sides and to form an unbiased opinion of the pending ordinance. The contributors will furnish expression of individual opinion only, and will not speak for any organization with which they may be affiliated.—Editor the Record-Herald."

Under existing circumstances the question of whether or not the pending traction ordinance would be a desirable compromise is, in my judgment, of secondary concern. The primary question now, is whether this or any other extension ordinance shall be officially approved by the mayor until it has been sanctioned by the people on a referendum vote.

That question springs from a deep political principle and involves serious civic consequences. For the mayor is firmly pledged, by his campaign platform and his campaign speeches, to withhold his approval from all extension ordinances not so sanctioned; and pledges of this character cannot be lightly broken without endangering republican institutions. The immediate tendency would be to weaken, the ultimate effect to destroy, public confidence in the election pledges of all candidates for office.

I am not unmindful of the mayor's denial of having made pledges inconsistent with the action he now proposes. But he is mistaken. His platform pledge is embodied in the Democratic platform for the municipal election of 1903, at which he was last elected. After insisting that "it is more important that the traction question be settled right than that it be settled speedily," this platform declares that one of the terms "necessary to a proper settlement of the traction question" is "the reference of all proposed extension ordinances to a vote of the people for their sanction and indorsement." The same pledge was made by Mr. Harrison himself in his campaign speeches. Of these he wrote at the time, over his own signature, the following description:

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

All the more firmly is Mayor Harrison seen to be bound by these pledges when the referendum vote of last spring is considered. By that vote the principle of the ordinance now proposed was condemned by the people of Chicago. It was condemned by an overwhelming majority of the voters who were intelligent enough to have formed an opinion on the subject and public-spirited enough to express their opinion at the polls.

Mayor Harrison cannot escape these obligations by shifting to other persons the responsibility for securing the 100,000 signatures necessary for a referendum. This responsibility does not in fairness rest upon private citizens whose petition against the principle of the ordinance was sustained less than six months ago; it rests upon a mayor who is pledged not to approve any extension ordinance whatever until it has been sanctioned by referendum.

Even if the mayor be released from his obligation to procure petitions, he cannot relieve himself from the rest of his pledge by requiring that the petitions be started before the ordinance is formulated by the council. Formulation by a council committee is not enough. How can there be a fair referendum upon an ordinance not yet considered by the council? Between the starting of the petitions and the time for the referendum vote it may be so altered, for better or worse, as to lose its identity.

On this point the Record-Herald itself has spoken in no uncertain phrase. In 1903 this paper, standing firmly for an opportunity for a fair referendum on every ordinance of the kind now in question, anticipated a possibility of the objectionable course the mayor now contemplates, by suggesting a method of preventing it. I quote from its editorial of January 31, 1903. After stating that, in the Record-Herald's opinion, the traction question should be settled substantially in accordance with certain specified terms, this editorial placed the following condition at the head of the list:

When the council has formulated a measure acceptable to it, a pause should ensue and an opportunity be given voters to demand a referendum.

I feel safe in assuming that the Rec-

ord-Herald does not regard Mayor Harrison's pause for a referendum, made before the council has even considered the proposed ordinance, as being substantially the same thing as its own demand for a pause for a referendum, to be made "when the council has formulated a measure acceptable to it."

Under these circumstances, there can hardly be more than two legitimate objections to a referendum on the pending ordinance.

One of the two is a possible necessity, unforeseen at the election—not a mere desirability, but a reasonable necessity—for consummating the proposed compromise before next spring's election. Such a necessity, if frankly explained, might indeed excuse a breach of the election pledges for a referendum. But that point is thrust out of the discussion by the mayor's offer to postpone until spring if the requisite petitions are signed. A compromise that can be postponed upon petition is not sufficiently urgent to excuse a violation of election pledges on grounds of unforeseen necessity.

The other of these two objections is the plea that there is no authority in law for passing an ordinance with a proviso that it take effect only on referendum approval. That objection begs the question. What if there is no legal authority for this particular method of referendum, does it follow that every possible method would be illegal?

Suppose the council were to refer the ordinance now pending before it to committee of the whole; suppose the committee of the whole were to amend it to their satisfaction, thereby formulating a measure acceptable to the council, yet not finally acted upon by that body; suppose they were to report it to the council with a recommendation that it pass in that form; suppose the council were then to make it a special order for the 10th of April next; suppose the council were thereupon to provide for the circulation of petitions for a referendum on the ordinance at the spring election under the public policy law, or were to complete the above described preliminaries long enough before that election to give opponents of the ordinance ample time to circulate petitions themselves; suppose that after the referendum vote the council should in their own discretion decide, in accordance with that vote, either to pass or to reject the ordinance—suppose some such procedure were followed, would it be unlawful?

If not, then what is there to hinder the mayor from causing the adoption

of that course by advising the council that if it is not adopted he will veto their extension ordinance? And if there is nothing to hinder this, then what law or lack of law stands in the way of his redeeming his election pledges if he wishes to?

These queries may be addressed as well to aldermen who are similarly pledged as to the mayor.

The merits of the ordinance may easily give rise to honest differences of opinion. But if some of its opponents do suspect corruption honest advocates of the measure must not be too swift to rebuke them, for the circumstances are by no means entirely free from suspicious appearances.

Among the sinister signs is the evident disposition to rush the ordinance through without referring it to referendum vote, and in the teeth of the election pledges. Why this unseemly urgency?

Another thing is the fact that this improved ordinance is advocated no less ingenuously and urgently than was the tentative ordinance of a year ago. Yet that ordinance contained some important provisions so objectionable that they could not stand public inspection, so manifestly unfair that they have been omitted from the present ordinance. How did they get into the first ordinance, and why were they clung to so tenaciously for months if an honorable compromise was intended?

Still another suspicious fact is the treatment to which two of our best judges have been subjected for very properly warning the public against what they conceived to be consequences of the ordinance which the public would not willingly invite. This deplorable treatment was not the insolence of an irresponsible mob nor the impudence of unsophisticated faddists; it was the deliberate response of intelligent leaders in the movement in behalf of the ordinance. Why such suspicious tactics if the compromise proposed is a worthy one?

Add to these and similar circumstances the fact that vast pecuniary interests are at stake, of a kind commonly believed to be administered by unscrupulous agents, and you have a situation that calls for a better explanation of the ordinance than the public has yet been favored with.

Very far am I from making or approving accusations of corruption. In the probity of some who support this ordinance I have unshaken confidence; against none have I any special information. Nor am I at all inclined to suspect the integrity of particular public servants, although not simple enough

to believe that public affairs are administered without corruption, nor unsophisticated enough to suppose that public corruption is accomplished only by raw bribery. Many a man who would not take a \$50,000 bribe in the raw will take a tithe of it in the form of an appreciation or the prevention of a depreciation of his property, and account it pay for an honest day's work. In no sense, however, do I imply that corruption is "the man behind the gun" in promoting this compromise ordinance. I refer to suspicious circumstances for only two purposes: First, incidentally to admonish those who sneer at the cry of corruption that the accusation is not without justifying appearances. Second, in order to submit to the public the important consideration that a compromise so circumstanced should be accepted with extreme caution, no matter how desirable some settlement may be in fact, nor how fair the details of this particular settlement may seem to be upon the face of the ordinance.

Only experts can intelligently discuss the details of such a settlement. The public is therefore entitled to know more from experts than they have heard. From one class—traction experts—they have heard nothing in plain language. May not the non-expert citizen fairly ask, then, whether the proposed compromise, simply as a traction question, isn't all "give" and no "take"?

And in this connection may he not ask specifically what considerations have necessitated the increase of fares from 4.17 cents (subject to compensation to the city) on a ten-year grant, as proposed by Alderman Bennett's outline ordinance of 1901, to 4.75 cents (after deducting compensation to the city) on a 13-year grant, as proposed by the pending ordinance?

About two years ago one of the best traction experts in the United States, Tom L. Johnson, made the following offer to Cincinnati:

I will personally guarantee that a syndicate, if given the opportunity, will bid and put up a forfeit for a 20-year franchise, with complete system of transfers, at a three-cent fare for the street railway lines of Cincinnati, and agree to pay present owners full value as a going concern for all tangible property, and 20 per cent. in addition; agree to public inspection of the books, and further to the sale of the lines to the city at any time for a price ten per cent. in addition to money actually invested.

Legal complications aside, why wouldn't those terms be as fair for the territory of the Chicago City Railway company as for Cincinnati? I am not venturing to assert that they would

be. But if not, why not? What is the nature and extent of the difference—apart from legal questions?

From legal experts something has been heard on both sides, but those who advocate the ordinance have done little more at the time I write than to make very general assertions. To what particular statutes, for instance, did Edwin Burrill Smith allude when he wrote that "under our statutes the board has this power," meaning that the board of directors of the Chicago City Railway company has the power to surrender its 99-year claims? A citation of statutes conferring this power might go far toward removing one of the objections to the proposed ordinance.

The questions for legal experts to answer with precision and lucidity are not numerous, but some of them are very important.

For example: If the object of the settlement be to quiet the 99-year claims, what reasonable certainty is there that this ordinance would do it? Can the directors surrender those claims in derogation of the rights of stockholders, inclusive of interests of the legally incompetent? And are those 99-year claims so well founded in law, and so important for traction operation, as to make a costly settlement desirable?

Again: If the object of the settlement is to avoid the possibility of eight or ten years of vexatious litigation, what reasonable assurance is there that this ordinance would accomplish that result? The bare possibility of litigation cannot be guarded against. But does this ordinance securely guard against eight or ten years of litigation? If not, where is the advantage in swapping litigious possibilities?

Again: If the object of the settlement is to secure good service, in what way would this ordinance effect that result? Reference has been made to the forfeiture clause. But would that be effective without long and vexatious litigation, if the company chose to resist? Reference might be made also to the clause reserving to the city the right of regulation for the safety, welfare and accommodation of the public. But doesn't the city already possess that right? If it does not, what power does the clause reserve to it? If it does, why not enforce it now? Could good service be secured and long and vexatious litigation be prevented by this ordinance except through the grateful good will of the company? If not, why make the settlement? If it could, how?

Again: If a peaceable initiation of municipal ownership at the end of 13 years is intended, would this ordinance make it legally any more peaceable and financially any more feasible than it is now? If so, in what manner? Could the purchase price be legally fixed as against the corporation by an arbitration award agreed to by the directors 13 years before? Could the city compel that arbitration, if the corporation refused on the ground that arbitration agreements are not binding until award is made? Could the city avail itself of the corresponding privilege of refusal without being forced back by a cry of "bad public faith"? With the tendency of the Federal courts to interpret public contracts with private corporations liberally in the interest of the latter, might not a board of arbitrators controlled by Federal judges interpret the valuation clause—"fair value for street railway purposes" (see page 45, line 52, of the ordinance; also page 44, lines 10 and 11)—so as practically to include occupation value, notwithstanding the express exclusion of that element under the name of "franchise" and "license"? Would it not be safer to change the phrase just quoted so as to read: "structural value plus five per cent"—or even 10 or 15 per cent.—than to leave the arbitrators free to decide what values the phrase, "fair value for railway purposes," includes? Was there, indeed, any pressing reason for modifying the Bennett outline ordinance of 1901 in this respect? In that outline the valuation clause suggested payment by the city, upon taking over at any time after ten years, of "the full value of the property for street railway purposes (which value shall be taken to be the cost of duplication less depreciation), with five per cent. additional thereon as compensation for the compulsory sale." Why has this explicit form been changed for one comparatively ambiguous? Under this general head, moreover, would the pending ordinance increase the feasibility of providing public funds for the purchase price? Unless these questions can be satisfactorily answered, why should the ordinance be adopted as a municipal ownership measure?

Conceding with George C. Sikes, as I freely do, that "the battle of the American city against the entrenched public utility corporation" cannot be won easily and speedily, the practical question remains: How would this ordinance advance the fortunes of that battle? And this question he does not dispose of. Both Judge Tuley and

Judge Dunne answer that so far from advancing the battle it would end it in the interest of the entrenched corporations.

These judges have spoken without reserve on the merits of the ordinance. No one denies their competency, and no one has reason to question their motives. If they have refused to surrender their citizenship with their assumption of the gown, they have at any rate gone behind no doors to express their opinions. They have taken the whole people into their confidence. Whatever, therefore, the conventionally-minded may think of the propriety of their conduct, none can doubt either the good faith or the expert value of their opinions. These opinions, as yet unrefuted, emphatically and circumstantially condemn this ordinance as an unnecessary, one-sided, costly and ineffective compromise, and one which would destroy all hope for municipal ownership of the traction facilities of Chicago.

But let the merits of the proposed extension ordinance be as they may be, Mayor Harrison's election pledges remain for the present the question of primary concern. Only in the face of unforeseen and insuperable obstacles, and upon a frank and full explanation to the public, may such pledges be deliberately broken. To break them without necessity and explanation tends inevitably to raise suspicions of corruption when great financial interests are thereby served, and otherwise to shake public confidence in representative government when those interests are not involved. The integrity of representative government here at hazard is more important than the merits of any ordinance for a settlement of the traction question.

I am homesick—  
Homesick for the home that I never have seen—  
For the land where I shall look horizontally into the eyes of my fellows,—  
The land where men rise only to lift,—  
The land where equality leaves men free to differ as they will,—  
The land where freedom is breathed in the air and courses in the blood,—  
Where there is nothing over a man between him and the sky,—  
Where the obligations of love are sought for as prizes and where they vary with the moon.  
That land is my true country. I am here by some sad cosmic mistake—and I am homesick.  
—Ernest Crosby, in *The Whim*.

## BOOKS

### A LITTLE GARRISON.

Of all the recent realistic novels that have been published in any language no one has produced such immediate

effect as Lieut. Blise's "Aus einer kleinen Garnison," published in this country by the F. A. Stokes Co., under the title, "A Little Garrison." Its exposition of army life has set all Ger-

many by the ears, including his Majesty himself. The Lieutenant has, of course, been kicked out of the army, but it is said that his book has set on foot many attempts at reform.

It is painful reading, but it is strong in its evident truth. One is almost tempted to believe, after reading it, that militarism at rest is even worse than militarism at war. Scandals and

# BISOCIALISM:

## The Reign of the Man at the Margin

By **OLIVER R. TROWBRIDGE**

THIS BOOK IS WRITTEN BY AN EMINENT MEMBER OF THE BAR, WHO HAS DEVOTED TWENTY YEARS OF HIS LIFE TO A CAREFUL STUDY OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC QUESTIONS. The author points out clearly the secret of the power of those who control successful trusts and manipulate the prices of the necessities of life, and what is the real remedy to secure permanent relief. The book treats of the positive theory of value, and of an entirely new theory of interest. Bisocialism will enable the careful student to understand clearly the distinctive economic principles which dominate the established order, and also those involved in Anarchism and in the different forms of Socialism. It points out the five possible avenues for money getting under the present order of society, making it possible for the young business man to avoid mistakes at the beginning of his career, and for others to set themselves right before it is too late. The capitalist, the small manufacturer, the merchant, the laborer, the trustifier and monopolist—all may in this book find amply stated and illuminated by the author's informing definitions and analogies, the causes for the unrest and the disappointments of the present time.

"I wish I were able to purchase a thousand copies and place them where I know they would do good."

*F. M. Crunden.*

"'Bisocialism' is a masterpiece. It is a book that will make the quibblers squirm. It meets the professors on their own ground."

*John Z. White.*

"I wish to congratulate you as the author of 'Bisocialism.' You have carried to a successful issue an evident intention to attract the Socialist mind with literature which cannot but furnish the instruction and be of inestimable advantage to the propagation of knowledge of true Economic Principles. I have been a student of 'Progress and Poverty,' which book I have read several times, and circulated widely. Some of its principles you and your book have made plainer than ever before, and you have furnished me with illustrations and applications which cannot but be useful in my propaganda work. I shall recommend your book to all those interested in the subject discussed."

*Geo. L. Rusby.*

To the student and the man and woman who think a little outside of the trivial jog trot of every-day existence, the problem of political economy, with the many branches of socialism, anarchism, governmentalism, and all the component parts that make the whole great and unsolved puzzle of life, this book on "Bisocialism" will be of intense interest. It has been the life study of the author, and between the lines one may read the steady observation, the practical demonstration and the knowledge

of life and living that have come through a deliberate and long-continued watchfulness of conditions and development.

That the book has been carefully prepared, is one of the first impressions that the reader receives. It attacks the subject with a forceful vigor born of familiarity, and each sentence presents its meaning with a concise form of expression that tells of the faithful pruning of superfluous words and ideas. The man who likes his reading to come with its thoughts square cut, and their presentation straight from the shoulder, will find pleasure in Mr. Trowbridge's new book—"The Pantagraph." Bloomington, Ill.

The Bulletin believes that Bisocialism is destined to a permanent place in economic literature, for the reason that it does not deal with theories hatched to meet temporary conditions in individual localities. It starts with basic principles of economics; takes recognition of those evils of the present system, which all but a favored few admit, and then, instead of scolding about it without suggesting anything more than a palliative, proceeds to prescribe a specific in an entirely new system. \* \* \* As to the book whether it ever sees hope realized, it is well worth the reading of anybody who desires to be well informed. It is replete with original and striking definitions and illustrations, and is written in the choicest English, choice because of its simplicity and directness, solving practically the whole problem of economics \* \* \* without subjecting the reader to pages of dry statistics or obscure phrases, suggestive of a cure for insomnia.—Bloomington Bulletin.

"Thus far, and no farther," is the law of the universe, applicable alike to things material and moral. The

world suffers from social unrest, and manifest economic injustice tends to drive the conflicting elements to one extreme or another. We have the Socialist, who would have the state the sole authority in all things; the anarchist, who would eliminate the state entirely; a limited number of snug folk, whose ample bank accounts make them satisfied with things as they are, and millions of others who know they suffer, but know not why or whence their sufferings come. Manifestly something must be done, and something will be done. It is of the highest importance to the world that it be done right. It is the happy medium which the thinking world seeks, well knowing that "each extreme to equal danger tends," and this is the purpose of a book which has just come to our table; a book of rare insight, moral uplift, and, best of all, considered from the standpoint of its chief aim, it points its way unerringly, we believe, to economic justice and social peace. To Mr. Trowbridge the center of all political and economic and social life is Man. \* \* \* Not union men or non-union men, not rich men or poor men, not capitalists or laborers, but Man.

John Mitchell, Samuel Gompers, and the thinking labor leaders of the world could do nothing better than to take this book and ponder it until the truths so clearly set forth were comprehended in their fullness. If they did that and communicated them to their followers, not another strike would be ordered; justice would be the universal order, brotherhood would everywhere be realized, and would transform industrial and commercial war into peace and universal thanksgiving. —The Farmer's Voice.

Price, \$1.50 net. By mail, \$1.60.

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.

### CONTRACTORS.

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

## Campaign Subscriptions

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

**TWENTY CENTS**

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

*The Hero*—"Take that, and that, villain!"

*Villain (aside)*—"Oh, Theodore stop it, you're tickling me so!"

By J. H. Donahy, in *The Cleveland Plain Dealer* of September 8, 1904.

cruelty were the warp and woof of the life of the army officers and their wives as the author found it, and his report is so simple, natural, and straightforward that it carries conviction. After all, the results are what one would expect of men who are given absolute power over their fellowmen, and of women cooped in a narrow circle with men of low ideals. Luxuriousness, gambling, reckless debts and money marriages seem to be the natural fruits of such a life, especially in an era of dominant materialism.

Not the least interesting portion of the American edition is the introduction by a German who writes from New York. In this introduction the writer boldly blames the Emperor for much of the bad condition. The Emperor may be partly responsible, but only as he is himself a part of the larger cause, for which the Germans have the striking name, *Zeitgeist*.

J. H. DILLARD.

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

—"Farmington." By Clarence S. Darrow. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. Price, \$1.50. "A Story of Boyhood." To be reviewed.

—"The Bible and Land." By the Rev. James B. Converse, Morristown, Tenn. In acknowledging receipt of this book (p. 368) we stated that the author would mail copies of the original edition to applicants upon receipt of a two-cent stamp for postage. This was an error, as to the amount. The necessary postage is eight cents.

### PAMPHLETS.

A very wholesome pamphlet, attractive in literary style and practical in method, is Arthur A. Carey's "Nervous Prostration and Its Spiritual Cause" (Waltham, Mass.). Frequently attributed only to overwork, nervous prostration is here accounted for not alone by the effects of overwork upon a sensitive nervous organization, but also by the spiritual cause of self-

ishness. This is assigned as its principal characteristic, although it is not always apparent. It may be "often to a considerable degree externally concealed by acts of kindness, and even thoughtfulness, for others, arising from a desire for sympathy and approval." The remedy for the disease, therefore, is not complete with physical treatment calculated to nourish and strengthen the body, nor with psychical treatment by methods akin to hypnotic suggestion. It requires what may for the sake of distinction be called spiritual treatment, which recognizes that "although the cause of the disease is primarily in the soul it is also a disease of the body, and that the treatment should not be purely psychical but physical as well." This theory is plausibly elaborated, and the pamphlet may be read with interest and profit as well by the robust, whose defects of character may thereby be concealed, as by neurasthenic patients, whose nervous breakdown may have served to reveal spiritual delinquencies.

### PERIODICALS.

—Julia Cartwright in the *Monthly Review* has an appreciative account of George Frederick Watts, one of the greatest of modern painters, who recently died. Watts was not only a great painter but a great man—large in his independence and courage and loyalty to truth. Long neglected, passed over by dilettantes who were crying up "art for art's sake," he never wavered from his course, but always said: "I paint first of all because I have something to say." Art with him had a purpose. "It may speak," he says, "with the solemn and majestic ring of the old Hebrew prophets who spoke to the Jews, demanding noble aspirations, condemning in the most trenchant manner prevalent vices, and

warning, in deep tones, against lapses from morals and duties." J. H. D.

—Now and then in the current reviews appears an article that goes to the heart of things, and lets one feel that there are still men amongst us who judge by great lights. Such is the essay by C. Lloyd Morgan in the *Contemporary Review* on Prof. Haeckel's book, "The Riddle of the Universe." It is delightfully written in the form of five open letters, addressed to one who had asked an opinion upon the book which has caused so much discussion. The point of the review is that Haeckel, as strictly a scientist, deals only with secondary causes, and never really penetrates to the heart of the question which his title implies. The article is a good antidote to the worship of science. Modern science has made marvelous progress in knowledge, but there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in the philosophy of the materialistic scientist. J. H. D.