

willing to run the risk of losing in this way his own possessions, provided only he stands a chance of experiencing the gratification of this lust.

All this in case of honest betting. But so opposed to charity is the inherent spirit of betting that charity cannot live in the gambler's heart, and hence gambling is almost invariably connected with dishonest modes; nay, with crime. It is so closely allied to robbery that it naturally allies itself to the robber's purpose, and he makes use of it as the outer form in which to cloak his crimes. The gambling passion vitiates the love of use, and from its inherent nature is the offspring of hell. We apprehend that it is this, its alliance with crime, that makes it so offensive to the law.—New Church Messenger.

A LETTER TO THE COBDEN CLUB. Boston, July 9, 1902.

Harold Cox, Esq., Secretary of the Cobden Club, London, England.

My Dear Sir: In response to your inquiry I beg to say that I have duly received and profited by the many publications so courteously sent to me by your association. They have been helpful and illuminating.

Although the United States suffers from an oppressive tariff on foreign trade, its vast extent, its natural resources, and, above all, its absolute freedom of exchange within its own borders, have enabled it to enjoy a phenomenal prosperity. While this has been achieved in spite of the restrictive policy, an ignorant and superstitious belief prevails that the country's commercial progress is chiefly due to the tariff.

Nevertheless, the cause of free trade advances steadily, and, in my opinion, its adherents were never so many. Like England we have been engaged in a lamentable war of foreign conquest for power and material gain. In such periods of abnormal excitement and false ideals all reforms are arrested. Popular attention is diverted from home evils and concentrated upon military glory.

Great captains, with their guns and drums,

Disturb our judgment for the hour,
But at last silence comes,

and with it sober reflection and a returning sense of war's demoralizing cost. Meantime the natural forces which ever oppose moral and social wrongs have not been inactive. Our much lauded Dingley tariff has proved

a constant irritant, its excessive duties working to our own commercial disadvantage not less than to the abasement of our ethical standards.

For our productive industries have outgrown, even if they ever needed, the shelter of protective laws, now a manifest barrier to the wider markets of the world towards which our manufacturers are compelled to reach. It has dawned upon them that they can cope with all other nations in the industrial field if unhampered by taxes upon raw materials. The fact has been demonstrated by their present success, notwithstanding their self-imposed disadvantage. Given equal opportunity, American enterprise would show results far more striking than those already attained.

It is also becoming clear that the retention of the protective tariff is chiefly for the nurture and perpetuation of the monopoly combinations known as trusts. By this special privilege the monopolists are able to maintain high prices in the domestic market while selling their surplus abroad at large reductions. On its account the cost of living has increased in greater proportion than have wages. Hence discontent and a multiplication of strikes with lawless and deadly violence. The fact cannot fail to influence the thoughts and votes of the laboring men who have cherished the fallacy that indirect taxes enhance wages. The demagogue's cry of "the full dinner pail" has lost its force.

More power will come to the free trade party when it resolves to oppose uncompromisingly the principle of indirect taxation, not excepting "a tariff for revenue only." That fatal exception can always be made to cover special privilege and keep alive the protective spirit. If it were easy to draw a strict line between revenue and protective duties, the latter would go down by the force of the constitution and the condemnation of the supreme court. But in a free government no indirect methods of taxation should be tolerated. Eventually they threaten its supremacy.

Permit me to say frankly that the true admirers of Cobden in this country believe that the Cobden club would have a far wider influence if it should occupy the radical and logical ground which Cobden foreshadowed. With the total abolition of indirect taxation the way opens for the only just and equitable economic revenue—that derived from the taxation of land values.

That Richard Cobden foresaw that the land question was to be the inevita-

ble sequel to the corn law triumph is clear from this memorable utterance:

I warn ministers and I warn land owners and the aristocracy of this country, against forcing upon the attention of the middle and industrious classes the subject of taxation. For, great as I consider the fraud and injustice of the corn laws, I verily believe, if you were to bring forward the history of taxation in this country for the last 150 years, you will find as black a record against the land owners as against the corn law itself. I warn them against ripping up the subject of taxation. If they want another league, at the death of this one—if they want another organization and a motive—for you cannot have these organizations without a motive and a principle—then let them force the middle and industrious classes of England to understand how they have been cheated, robbed and bamboozled upon the subject of taxation.

These pregnant words were spoken in 1845. Is it not the part of wisdom of all who profess to be disciples of Cobden to push forward the cause of impartial government and real democracy by attacking the heart of privilege, whose outer breastworks only were carried by "the great commoner" and his coadjutors in their noble and historic struggle for human rights? Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

THE BASIS OF HARMONY.

Portions of the address delivered by Wm. J. Bryan before the New England Democratic League, at Nantasket, July 24, as reported in Chicago Evening Post.

In view of numerous harmony dinners and the discord they have created, it may not be out of place to consider the basis of harmony. Harmony is but a synonym for order, and is not the result of chance, but a product of inexorable law. The musician must learn the scale and properly arrange the notes, or harmony, no matter how earnestly wooed, can never be won. Harmony in government is likewise the result of fixed and unchangeable rules. Jefferson states two of these rules—absolute acquiescence in the will of the majority and frequent elections. The second aids the first by giving hope of a remedy from present ills, however grievous. If he were living to-day his observation probably would suggest a third rule—the ascertainment of the will of the people by methods so direct, so fair and so honest that the minority cannot doubt that that will has been actually expressed.

The great founder of the Democratic party, whose profound philosophy sounded all the depths of human nature and measured the height and breadth of human government, not

long before the end of his eventful life said in a letter to Mr. Lee that there were but two paramount parties, the aristocratic and the democratic; that these two parties existed in every country, and that where there was freedom to think, speak and write these parties would become apparent. With the aristocratic party he classed "those who fear and distrust the people and wish to draw all power from them into the hands of the higher classes." With the democratic party he classed "those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most honest and safe, though not the most wise, depository of the public interests." Every well-informed student of history will recognize this distinction. In every community you can draw a line separating the aristocrat from the democrat. It will not be a perpendicular line, nor will it be a horizontal one; it will not separate those of illustrious lineage from those of humble birth; it will not separate the rich from the poor; it will not separate the educated from the uneducated; it will not be along lines of vocation or occupation, but it will separate those "with the tastes, spirit, assumption and traditions of the aristocracy" from those who "believe in a government controlled by the people and favor political and legal equality."

It is impossible to secure harmony between people of opposite sympathies, and it is a difficult thing to change a man's sympathies; it requires a political regeneration to make a democrat out of an aristocrat. It is a much easier task to show a man that the principles he has been advocating and the policies which he has been supporting are aristocratic in their present effect or in their tendencies. The Republican party of today is aristocratic in its policies and tendencies, for it is controlled by a few in the interest of a few, but there are many Republicans who remain with their party only because they do not understand the change which has taken place in that party within the last few years. When the policy of a party is controlled by its voters, then the party stands for the will of the majority, but when the party is dominated by a small minority then the organization stands not for the will of the majority, but for the will of those who dominate it. There can be no doubt of the democratic instincts of a large majority of the members of the Republican party, but that party today is so controlled by organized

wealth that the rank and file of the party are not consulted about the policies, nor are the interests of the rank and file considered by the leaders. . . .

To attempt to patch up an apparent harmony between those who are not in sympathy with Democratic purposes is not only a waste of time, but would prove disastrous. The men who deserted the party in 1896 may be divided into two classes—those who left because they understood the issue presented and those who left because they did not understand the real nature of the contest. Until the former are completely changed in their sympathies they cannot return to the party without injuring it. The latter will be reconciled to the party when they themselves become aware of the real character of the life and death struggle now being waged between plutocracy and democracy. I say plutocracy because the aristocracy of to-day is one of wealth rather than of birth, and it includes not only those who have been alienated from the common people by the possession of great wealth, but those who, although without much wealth, pander to it and measure all things by a money standard. Organized wealth has become so potent in governmental affairs that some even now despair of applying any effective remedy. But such underestimate the patriotism of the people and the strength of the public conscience. The people have a remedy within their power—the ballot—and with it they can and will right every wrong and remedy every grievance.

The struggle between human rights on the one side and greed on the other is an unending one. Our party must take part in the struggle, but that struggle cannot be permanently settled by this generation or by any future one. We cannot tell what issues we may have to meet; we can only determine to meet them in a democratic spirit, to apply to them democratic principles and to take the people's side always. . . .

How can the opponents of aristocracy and plutocracy be united for a successful attack upon entrenched privilege? Not by making peace with the enemy; not by imitating their works, their methods or their phraseology, but by honest, straightforward appeal to the American people upon a platform that can be understood and with an organization that can be trusted. Already many of the Republicans are wavering, but they can never be won to the Democratic party as long as they can say that our party is as bad as theirs. Not by surrender, nor

by compromise; not by equivocation, not by ambiguity, not by vacillation, is the victory to be won, but by bold, constant, persistent, steadfast defense of the interests of the people at all times, under all circumstances and on all questions. To lose faith in the expediency of such a course is to lose faith in the omnipotence of truth.

Representative Williams, of Mississippi has a new negro story.

"Are you the defendant?" asked a man in the court room, speaking to an old negro.

"No, boss," was the reply. "I ain't done nothing to be called names like that. I'se got a lawyer here who does the defending."

"Then who are you?"

"I'se the gentleman what stole the chickens."—Baltimore News.

"Hello!"

"Hello!"

"Is that Dr. Rybold?"

"No. Do you want Dr. Rybold?"

"Yes."

"All right. Hold the—hold the air a minute. I'll call him."—Chicago Tribune.

Muggsy—Me aunt died yesterday.

Swipsey—What was de score?—Ohio State Journal.

BOOK NOTICES.

"DEMOCRACY AND SOCIAL ETHICS."

This is one of the volumes in the series called "The Citizen's Library," published by the Macmillan company, under the editorial supervision of Prof. Richard T. Ely. It is, as the preface tells, the substance of lectures delivered at various university extension centers. The author, Miss Jane Addams, of Hull House, is sure of an audience when she speaks and of readers when she writes. People like to hear from one who is believed to have had actual experiences, and actual experiences are apt to be interesting. By far the most interesting parts of this book are those coming direct-

THE POLITICAL CAMPAIGN.

With the political campaign now opening, in which important questions of government, both political and economic, are at stake, we follow our usual custom of offering *The Public* at a reduced rate for the campaign, with the view of extending its influence and promoting its circulation. We will therefore receive

CAMPAIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS

from bona fide NEW SUBSCRIBERS from now on, to and including the issue of November 8, next, for

FIFTY CENTS.

This price is considerably below the regular terms, but we have found that a large proportion of campaign subscribers, becoming acquainted with and friends of the paper in that way, become regular subscribers, which makes it worth our while to encourage campaign subscriptions.

Address **THE PUBLIC**, Box 687,
CHICAGO, ILL.