

giving it power to formulate its own charter and to determine its own activities. True, none of these things have been accomplished, but the hands of the city were tied by quo warranto proceedings, which destroyed the charter of the city and incidentally brought down to ruin every other city in Ohio. Thirteen injunctions were brought against the actions of the administration, by which tax reforms, street railway legislation and many other similar changes were prevented, and local government was for the time being paralyzed. . . .

It is a significant thing that in Chicago, Cleveland and Detroit, wherever politics have been shaken down, the dominant note in campaign after campaign has been the relation of the city to the public service corporations. Wherever this is true, wherever these corporations are subject to the scrutiny of the public year after year and are made the issue in recurring municipal campaigns, it is safe to say that any adjustment which is not right will not stand, and that the only possible solution of the situation outside of municipal ownership is one that satisfies the people as to its fairness and honesty. And in Cleveland, as elsewhere, there is one issue that does not change. There is a third unknown party that is always active. Sometimes it works with one of the regular parties, sometimes with the other. It stands for private interests, against the public. Were the element of public franchise removed from local affairs, honest administration would be a much easier thing. The petty "grafts" of contracts, spoils and partisan advantage would sink before the innate sense of honesty and the growing desire for municipal reform were it not for the privileges worth millions of dollars which are to be had through machine organization, campaign contributions, the election of dishonest men, and the subversion of the city to private ends. And the insistent and growing belief in municipal ownership is largely due to the conviction that honest government is well nigh impossible because of the profits to be made through corruption in public grants.

Mr. Johnson has approached the street railway issue in a new way. Instead of attempting to regulate or reduce charges by legislative action, he has sought to bring about the same result by inviting competition. New street railway routes have been laid out and bids asked for a competing line on a three-cent fare basis. These advertisements brought forward last year a

bidder willing to construct and operate at this rate. But the city was not permitted to make use of its highways for this purpose. Injunctions and quo warranto proceedings were used to prevent it; for nearly a year the city was not permitted to move.

Cleveland enjoys a 75-cent rate per thousand for artificial gas, and a 30-cent rate on natural gas which is brought to the city from West Virginia and is largely used for fuel. At the same time, vigorous action is being taken by the city to erect a municipal electric plant to light the streets and furnish light and power for private use.

As a matter of fact, the question of municipal ownership has had for more than a generation a practical demonstration in the Cleveland waterworks, which has been owned by the city since 1856. At the present time the system is valued at \$10,000,000 and has a bonded indebtedness of only \$3,250,000. From this source the city enjoyed a revenue in 1902 of \$858,780 in addition to free water for all public departments. It yielded a net revenue, after the payment of all operating expenses and fixed charges, of \$483,900, which, if added to the free water supply, would show an annual net earning capacity of \$683,900. During the past two years the department has been free from politics and has been conducted on a merit basis. As a measure of reform, the administration has undertaken the universal metering of the city, by means of which all will pay according to their consumption instead of according to their waste. . . .

On the whole Cleveland is and has been, relatively speaking, a well-governed city. It has an inadequate police and health force, and is blackened with smoke. It has made some engineering mistakes, is governed by the spoils rather than the merit system, and is far from being a finished product. But its appropriations for these purposes are inadequate, and public service of an efficient sort requires large expenditures. The lives, property, health and well-being of a community of 400,000 people cannot be adequately safeguarded at \$16.75 per head. Little or no complaint is heard of police blackmail, so prevalent an evil in other cities.

It will probably be a long time before the people of America are convinced that municipal administration can be honest and efficient. There is such an accumulation of evidence against such an hypothesis. And yet, when one considers the array of forces against good government, the wonder is not that it is so bad, but that it is so good. And

many departments of Cleveland's life are conducted as honestly and efficiently as any business concern. This is now unquestionably true of the schools; it is and has been true of the libraries. The treasurer's and auditor's departments are beyond reproach. The waterworks is on a merit basis, and earns annually one-fourth as much as the total revenue from direct taxation. The fire department is efficient; the streets are now clean and well lighted. The parks are conducted to secure a maximum of enjoyment to the people, and small playgrounds and public baths are bringing the opportunity for healthful recreation to all the people. The police force has been reorganized; blackmail is almost unheard of, if it exists.

And the cost is lower than almost any large city in America. The per capita expenditure for all purposes was but \$16.68 in 1900. For New York in the same year it was \$30.35, and for Boston \$45.37. Cleveland stands seventh in size in American cities, and is somewhat below the average of the ten largest American cities in its net per capita debt.

It is not to be inferred from this that Cleveland has solved the problem of municipal administration. But it is a striving city, seeking by conscious action to correct one evil after another, and to enlarge the sphere of human life by offering greater opportunities for comfort and happiness. It is filled with an alert political and industrial sense, is aided by an independent press, and gives promise of being one of the great centers of the world from an architectural and industrial point of view. And in the matter of those great economic and political reforms centering about taxation, municipal ownership and home rule, it is likely to lead the way in demonstrating the possibilities of local cooperative political action, even at the point where American institutions seem to have most completely broken down.

#### ENGLISH ANTI-IMPERIALISM.

"Paragraphs" published in "The Positivist Review" (London) for October 1, 1903.

FROM FREDERIC HARRISON.

We shall have to go back to our history in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries for a record of government so blundering, so perverse and so evil as that which has afflicted our country for the last few years. Ministers of the Stuarts and of George III. may have shown equal folly, arrogance and bigotry. But even they did not rely entirely on a system of bluster and trickery. A great party, resolved to enter on a policy of grab abroad and clericalism

at home, obtained a free hand from the nation by resorting to the arts known to financial swindlers. They then put themselves and our country into the power of a tradesman who had won reputation for skill in the art of puffing his own wares, cornering his trade rivals and humbugging the public.

Having encouraged and abetted a dirty act of brigandage on an inoffensive neighbor, they eluded their responsibility for its failure by mendacity and protected their guilty agents by tricks. They then intrigued to bring about a war—the most infamous which has ever stained British annals. Rank falsehoods and blatant promises deluded the nation into abetting this criminal adventure, into which they plunged with ludicrous ignorance of all its conditions and systematic falsification of all the real facts. They gave themselves over blindly to gangs of commercial swindlers, who bribed the press and bought up agents to boom their schemes. Our countrymen were made in effect the blindfolded shareholders in huge swindling syndicates; the ministers of the crown, some of them to their own knowledge, figuring as the titled decoys who swagger in a rogue's prospectus.

From first to last the war was carried on with recklessness, ignorance, jobbery and muddle which, when exposed at last, has made England the laughing stock of foreign nations, and has made decent Englishmen sick with shame as they read the record of the blood and treasure wasted by blundering and arrogance, as they count up all the ruin, debt and confusion that the future of our country has to face. The folly, the fickleness, the mess of the whole black business, revealed to us too late, reads like a tale of Turkish or Chinese misdoing rather than the acts of European ministers. The only sign of intelligence they exhibited was in the petty tricks by which detection was delayed until parliament had risen and politicians were dispersed for the holidays. If the muddle of it all reminds us of the ways of pashas and mandarins, the stealthy way in which secret and unavowed agents are employed to embroil us with weaker neighbors and ultimately to grab their land, reminds us of the underground machinations of Russian chanceries.

Peaceful opposition to these intrigues was violently suppressed. Ministers of the crown encouraged mob outrages; and the gentlemen of England paid the blackguards of England to get up dis-

gusting orgies, which were pretended to redound to the honor of the empire, but were in fact vulgar electioneering tricks. In the meantime the law was strained or violated in ways which have never been attempted since the days of the Stuarts, unless it were in Ireland during the rebellion of '98. A party lawyer, whose name will live in history along with the creatures of Charles and James, induced the court of appeals to break up the traditional safeguards of personal liberty, and then to rescind by a gloss acts of parliament which had been accepted as a settlement of ancient class disputes.

Having embroiled their country in a disastrous war, having increased the national debt by more than a third, having handed over the laborer to the capitalist, having bribed the great beer interests, ministers proceeded to use their temporary majority, snatched by a trick in the war fever, to gratify the priests of the established church. The interests of education were only a pretext. Education was working fairly well; and required nothing more than subordinate amendment and simplification. The people were satisfied with the system, which could easily have been enlarged and improved.

The only people who were seriously dissatisfied were the clericals, who insisted on exclusive schools of their own, but for which they objected to pay even a small fraction of the cost. The education acts were forced on parliament by the mechanical majority which seemed to take a positive delight in jumping upon dissenters and in outraging all their prejudices. The acts of last year and of this year might have been turned into useful reforms, if they had not been made a means to parade the triumph of the church, and at the same time to rouse the most bitter hostility of conscientious men, who for the first time in their lives began to defy the law in the name of religion. I have not myself opposed the acts, and I scout the idea of "passive resistance." But I feel that English statesmanship must have sunk low indeed when we see a prime minister, personally an avowed skeptic, pandering to the appetites of clerical monopoly and treating an outburst of lawless indignation with the feeble sneers by which some weak pedagogue tries to put down a school rebellion.

The situation in the last session was this. An ignominious war had produced nothing but misery, ruin and chaos in the colony. The national

credit had sunk 20 per cent. The fixed wealth of the nation had decreased, we are told, by a thousand million sterling. The military organization was found to be more that of Turkey than a European power. A series of tricks, falsehoods and broken promises had been exposed. And a large and stubborn body of zealous men had been stung to fury by insult and injustice. The most adroit member of the cabinet saw the danger; for, having worked that oracle in old days himself, he knew all the consequences of non-conformist wrath. He played a bold stroke. And he determined to draw off indignation against the failures and blunders of the government by setting the whole nation by the ears with a cry which touched every household in its daily life.

I do not propose to argue the fiscal problem. It was never flung at us as a serious policy of reform. It is an obvious trick—a mere subterfuge to divert attention from urgent abuses and to advertise its author as the hero of the day. To discuss the merits of free trade with Mr. Chamberlain would be like urging Lord Roberts to stick to rifles and cannon and not to revert to bows and arrows for the British army. To hear Mr. Chamberlain sneering at Bright and Cobden is as good a joke as if the prisoner in the dock were to assure the jury that the Ten Commandments were "stale shibboleths." There are few men living who more thoroughly understand all the fraud and mischief underlying the protection sophisms. Fraud and mischief which he has himself in quite recent years lucidly explained, and that whilst holding his present office.

Why then has he flung this dynamite bomb into the midst of the public? Well! because he is a dynamiter by profession—a desperate man who, for his own ends and to advertise himself, will take any risk and chance any public calamity. To face the angry nation with all this record of failure and shame was certain ruin. A bankrupt tradesman will set fire to his shop and chance recovering a big insurance. It is possible that, intoxicated with his previous success in gulling the nation and elbowing his rivals, Mr. Chamberlain may have begun to have some hazy idea of doing good business. George IV. swaggered about Waterloo till, they say, he had persuaded himself he had been present. These Humbert, perhaps, had got lies upon the brain till she fancied that there had been something in the safe. Per-

haps Mr. Chamberlain, after all his twistings, prevarications, thimble-rigging and false figures, may have fancied that there is something in protection. But it would be foolish to argue with him seriously. The whole thing is a fraud. It would be idle to prove to a cheap-jack on a race course that the pea is under the other cup, or the card tucked under the other sleeve.

It is a trick—a palpable swindle; and it ought so to be treated. But it is a real danger, and in the meantime a national disaster. Business, politics, reform and progress have been paralyzed by the great scare. The rich, the landed interest, adventurers, beer and church scent plunder in a scheme which must injure the masses and may benefit the few. If the scheme, or rather the heap of schemes, mutually destructive of each other, were actually put into force, it would set all parts of what is absurdly called the empire at loggerheads, and before long would land us at home in a social and democratic revolution. Mr. Chamberlain is too acute a man not to know this. As a born tradesman he understands it far better than country squires. But if it enable him to pose as prime minister for a few years why need he care?

The melancholy part of it for any man who loves his country is to see the first minister of this great nation treat the crisis with imbecile jibes, with cynical recklessness, and helpless arrogance. The first principles of the cabinet system are flouted, the house of commons is silenced, parties, reforms, policies, trade and finance are thrown into confusion. The turbulent republics that are nicknamed the empire, are excited with impossible hopes and tempted with ruinous bribes—and the man who is responsible for the peace and well-being of this mighty congerie of states has nothing for it but party tricks, double-tongued promises, and debating sneers. Mr. Balfour is a man of culture and pleasant manners; but he is no more of a statesman than is any pitiful college Don who thinks that smooth words and academic sniggering form the whole art of governing.

I have written this with my own name, and with a plainness which is not usual in political speeches or in anonymous press, because it is what I feel, what many men feel, but what conventional habits lead them to conceal. I see with disgust the timid propriety with which party leaders and their organs are willing to accept as

part of the political game bare-faced trickery, falsification of facts and figures, and a gambling "corner" in the prosperity of the nation. The "fiscal problem" is a colossal swindle, as rank as that of any financial rogues who are serving their time in jail—only it is ten times more criminal, and a thousand times more injurious to the public.

FROM S. H. SWINNY.

The large garrison of British troops in India is already a heavy burden on that poverty-stricken country. It having been found desirable to raise the soldiers' pay, the cost of the garrison is to be increased £786,000 per annum, and the whole of this is to be paid by India. And a further and still more iniquitous charge was in contemplation. It is necessary, as a result of our glorious victory, to keep a garrison of 25,000 men in South Africa. To make England pay the whole expense would be unpopular, to make South Africa pay, would be difficult. It was, therefore, proposed to make India contribute over £400,000 a year to the cost of the South African garrison, on the ground that a part of the garrison may be treated as a reserve to assist India in case of necessity. Now the British troops in India not only may be, but actually have been within the last four years, treated as a reserve for the empire. In the hour of danger, when there was the greatest temptation to attack India, should such a design be favored by any of the powers, thousands of British troops were taken from India for the defense of Natal. Yet, neither England nor South Africa contributes toward the garrison of India.

The case stands thus. On an emergency, India has to send the troops she maintains to any part of the empire that is in danger. Her army is a reserve for all, but she alone supports it. The garrison in South Africa was to be in part supported by India, because she may draw upon it when necessary. But so may any other part of the empire; for it is not to be supposed that if Australia were attacked, help from South Africa would be refused; unless, indeed, South Africa were itself in danger, and then India also would be able to withdraw troops thence, in spite of her payments. The whole of India, Lord Curzon, the official world, the Anglo-Indian press, and the people of the country, united in protest. But the very conception of such an injustice shows the hollow-

ness of our Empire. Australia is to pay what she will, and that is not much, towards the general expenses, and to show her Imperial spirit by the exclusion of her Indian fellow-subjects. India is to pay out of her poverty for the support of an Empire in which her sons are treated as aliens and outcasts. And the people of these islands are to bear practically the whole burden of Imperial defense, save what can be wrung from India, and are even asked to tax the food of the country in order that Australia may condescend to remain in our glorious Empire, whose foundation is equal justice for all.

This paragraph was written before the announcement in Parliament that the infamous scheme might be reconsidered. It is now printed as it stood, because her Indian Minister and the Government at home expressed their desire to carry it out, and reluctantly and vaguely withdrew it under overwhelming pressure from India and Indian governors. We have yet to see what will be their next Imperial trick.

#### A KING DEPOSED.

He sat in the darkness, weeping  
By the gates of his empire closed,  
A ruler stripped of his purple,  
A king from his realm deposed.

They passed him, going to worship;  
And, wistful, behind he crept;  
And coldly they bade him be silent  
Because that the new king slept.

They lifted him up to the cradle,  
Their fingers laid on their lips,  
And he touched one baby dimple  
With his own little finger tips.

Then they set him down in the nursery,  
A wan little love-lorn heap;  
And he lay with his child's heart breaking,  
Sob-sobbing himself to sleep.

They have taken his baby scepter,  
They have taken his robe and crown;  
They have driven him out of his palace,  
And fluttered his house-flag down.

And a new king rules in his kingdom;  
For him are the gold gates closed;  
And they think that he does not notice—  
Ah! Poor little king deposed!  
—Will H. Ogilvie, in *The Century*.

A clairvoyant was fined \$150 yesterday for telling fortunes. Yet President Roosevelt and Secretary Hay are still at large, notwithstanding the display of second sight that led them to have a naval force all ready for a Panama revolution before it happened.—*New York World*.

Uncle George—I don't like to say anything, Carrie, against your Mr. Fleet-  
ing. He appears to be a nice sort of chap, and there's no denying that he's