

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 27, 1901.

Number 173.

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 column of last page.

When the British house of lords convicts a peer of bigamy and sentences him as a first-class misdemeanor to comfortable imprisonment for three months, as in the case of Lord Russell, it seems as if the maxim that "the king can do no wrong" might properly be extended so as to read "and a peer can't do much."

That Massachusetts judge before whom the Fosburgh murder trial is proceeding deserves commendation for warning the newspapers to refrain from coloring their reports with comment. Court reporting has for some years been one of the favorite methods of making criminal trials unfair and forcing convictions regardless of guilt.

Another law suit won by the city of Chicago goes to exonerate the railroad strikers of 1894 from the charge of riotously burning railroad cars. A firm of packers sued the city for the value of cars alleged to have been destroyed by riotous strikers. The city defended on the ground that the cars had not been destroyed by the strikers, and the jury so decided. This is the third verdict to the same effect on the same question. It should be recalled in this connection that the strikers have always insisted that the cars destroyed were old ones which the railroad managers themselves had caused to be destroyed for the purpose of making the strike appear to have become a riot and thus furnishing an excuse for military interference.

When Gov. Yates, of Illinois, charges Miss Lathrop (who resigned from the state board of charities be-

cause the governor had set about making the board partisan) with making "grossly inaccurate" statements, but refuses to reply because "she is a lady," he commits a greater offense than he is probably aware of. Implying that Miss Lathrop has told falsehoods, he yet declines to meet her accusations with his rendering of the facts. This is contemptuously insulting to her. It is also contemptuous to every woman who doesn't belong to the order of "the clinging vine." When women act in a public capacity, they ought to expect and they do expect to be treated as mature persons, and not as children, society belles or wax dolls.

In Chicago Gov. Altgeld has taken up the tax question very much to the consternation of some "law and order" folks who believe in a drastic personal tax law, but don't believe in enforcing it. Mr. Altgeld has gathered facts to show that the personal assessments of Chicago are grossly unequal. People worth \$1,000,000 or more are assessed at only a few thousands. One prominent citizen is named by Altgeld as worth \$2,000,000 in personalty, and yet as being assessed at \$6,000. Another worth \$1,000,000 is assessed at \$100. It is to be hoped that Altgeld will make the fight hot enough to overturn the whole system of taxing personal property. He should leave no alternative except vigorous enforcement or repeal.

James E. Eckels is rushing into the newspapers with advice to young men about the methods of dollar-making success. He regards honesty and industry as everything, and doesn't think that opportunity counts for much. Yet there are irreverent folks who connect his own success with the

opportunity which came to him through the accident which made him one of Mr. Cleveland's chums. Indeed, some of his old acquaintances do not hesitate to say that Cleveland's powers as a miracle worker are proved by his having made a financier of "Jim Eckels." Far be it from us to argue that honesty and industry are not factors of success. In a normal state of society they are the only factors. But how absurd it is to name them as the prime factors of business success to-day. It is a gratuitous insult to the millions upon millions of honest and industrious people who are not successful, and bare-faced self-flattery on the part of the few beneficiaries of privilege who are rich.

A trade union official of Chicago has been elected to an office in his organization as a special mark of honor and confidence, because he had disregarded a court injunction against "picketing." This little fact is so significant that it needs no prophet to interpret it. Nothing more is necessary than a reasonable degree of knowledge of human nature. It means that the time is almost at hand when strikers will quietly disregard injunction orders and suffer such penalties as the courts may see fit to impose. That is destined to be one of the episodes of the development of government by injunction. Nor will it be an easy thing to deal with. When injunctions are issued prohibiting strikers from peacefully persuading their fellows not to work in their places—the injunctions go that length even now—and strikers decide nevertheless to persuade, the courts will be confronted with a serious problem. So long as strikers obey these injunctions, the matter presents no difficulties; but when judges find that they must send scores of thousands of peaceable men to jail, men who have

done nothing but peaceably to request and try to persuade others to join them in a strike, or else see the injunction treated with quiet contempt, another and less simple phase of government by injunction will be presented.

The degradation of American ideals is often felt, but nowhere is it so bluntly expressed as in the financial papers. They circulate chiefly where there is little call for euphemistic paraphrase, and the editors make no effort to disguise their sordid sentiments. An example is afforded in a recent issue of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, one of the great American authorities in financial matters. Commenting on the steel strike, in sympathy, of course, with the financial ring that has cornered the steel business, this paper makes no concealment of the satisfaction it derives from the statement of Mr. Shaffer, the strike leader, that the strikers "are not contending for wages, but for a principle." It is sure that the strike cannot last long, being for principle and not for money. So thoroughly saturated is it with the idea that men neither fight nor endure for principle, and that principle wouldn't be worth the sacrifice anyhow, that it doesn't hesitate for an instant to assume that upon the basis of principle instead of wages the strike is necessarily lost from the start. Nor is there any implication that the strikers are peculiarly sordid. No slur is cast upon them. The whole matter is regarded as a business affair, in which the strikers are subject to the same considerations that influence the paper's own constituency, to whom money always talks and principle never. This aristocracy of wealth, which is taking possession of our country, and in the talismanic name of Liberty destroying Liberty herself, has confessedly, even boastfully, come to merit the condemnation of Lowell's Hosea Bigelow. It—

don't vally princerple more'n an old cud.

But that condemnation does not apply in financial circles alone. Of the leader of the steel strike himself,

notwithstanding his verbal appeals to principle, Hosea Bigelow might also say that—

He don't vally princerple more'n an old cud.

In an interview published in the paper of the 22d, this leader, Mr. Shaffer, was quoted in these repulsive, even if excusable, terms:

If the republican party is going to obtain power to foster institutions that will destroy labor organizations it cannot longer rely on the support of labor. I have always been a republican, but if it comes to the worst and the administration stands by and allows the combine to crush us out of existence, in the future I shall be "all things to all men." Suppose the administration should be offended at J. Pierpont Morgan and his colleagues, and to punish them, should present restrictive measures to congress—laws tending to restrict the Morgan power—could not the administration have these laws passed? You will admit that it could. Then the administration is all-powerful and will be held responsible for the consequences of this conflict to labor and to the republican party.

Mr. Shaffer found no difficulty, it seems, in supporting Mr. McKinley when engaged in the ruthless slaughter of his brethren of the Philippines. That was not Mr. Shaffer's fight. He was deaf to principle when the crushing out process only affected others, and is ready to support Mr. McKinley again if Mr. McKinley will join the strike. But why, if Mr. McKinley may crush a distant republic with Mr. Shaffer's assent and hearty cooperation, may he not allow Morgan to crush the steel workers' union without Mr. Shaffer's assent and against his protest and threats? What is the difference—in principle? When Mr. Shaffer talks so glibly about principle, does he mean principle so far only as he and his are concerned? Is the crushing process right enough in principle when applied to men fighting for their homes against a foreign invader, and bad in principle only when applied to Mr. Shaffer's labor organization? In a word, is Mr. Shaffer one of those—

slaves most base,
Whose love of right is for themselves
and not for all the race?

Wisely, but not unexpectedly, Mr. Bryan has distinctly refused to countenance the folly of a bolt from the democratic party in Ohio. The stronger such a movement could be made, the weaker would the democratic democrats of Ohio be in their fight for democracy within the party.

That the fight within the party is being made with vigor and intelligence is evident from this resolution, proposed by Mr. Salen, of Cleveland, and adopted by the state committee on the 20th:

Resolved, That the next call for a state convention shall contain the following provision: That in all counties containing a city in which there is registration of electors, and in which the number of voting precincts in such city form a majority of the precincts of the county, delegates to the state convention must be selected by a direct vote of the people, or by a convention composed of delegates selected by a direct vote of the people, at a primary election held under the laws of Ohio relating to primary elections; and no county central or executive committee shall have power to name delegates to the state convention.

The meaning of that resolution is not hidden in verbiage. To understand it nothing is necessary but to know that McLean's power in Ohio conventions has been due not to his influence with the democratic voters of Cincinnati, but to his control of a self-perpetuating committee. When Cincinnati elects delegates at primaries, instead of having them appointed by Mr. McLean's committee, Mr. McLean will not be able to enter state conventions with packed delegations. This is the beginning of a new regime in the democratic party of Ohio.

It was hardly necessary for the mayor of Cleveland to deny that he is about to announce his candidacy for the United States senate. He has said that he is not a candidate for the senate, and he is believed in spite of gossip newspapers. The once prevalent idea that his public actions are directed by some new and unfathomable kind of insincerity has been dissipated. Prof. Bemis was right when, in writing to the Springfield Repub-

lican that Johnson "declares that there is no use in trying to assert that he is sincere, for time will sufficiently prove it," he added: "I observe that it is already beginning to do so." Few any longer doubt Mayor Johnson's sincerity. The people not only in Cleveland, but throughout Ohio and over the country, are coming to realize the force of what Prof. Bemis said in the same letter to the Springfield Republican:

The people who voted against him are now praising his work, and it is entirely possible that he may carry out his present ambition, which, as recently stated, is to give Cleveland so good an administration that he will be reelected two years hence by twice the recent majority, which was about 6,000, in a city that went republican for the rest of the ticket, by 5,000 majority.

The mayor says that those who charge some inconsistency entirely miss the point that he is driving at. If he criticises Mark Hanna and others for owning street railways, he would be inconsistent, but he does nothing of the kind. He simply urges the community to change the system of private control of such enterprises. Where, however, the community refuses to do this and insists that private management is better than public, there is no crime, he holds, in receiving the enormous financial benefits which the city thus insists upon bestowing upon private management, provided, of course, that no corruption is used to secure the favor of the city government. He is willing to pursue a public policy inconsistent with large gains to himself as an investor, and he not only prides himself on that form of inconsistency, if others choose to call it so, but is constantly appealing to other men of wealth to do the same, and we all remember how President Hadley, of Yale, has lately declared that unless our leading men of wealth and power are thus willing to pursue a public policy in opposition to their private financial interests, there are serious and dangerous times ahead for this republic.

Those who know the mayor of Cleveland best, even though they may disagree with him, candidly admit that he has retired from money-making in the very vigor of his manhood, when he could probably double his fortune in the next five years by keeping out of public life. The only kind of an attack that remains is to assert that the man who will do this may do so in order to so win the approval of his fellow-citizens as to secure still higher positions of public

honor and trust, and such an ambition which these critics assume that Mr. Johnson possesses, is held to be ignoble. That such a view should be taken of the effort to merit high position by public service, while kindly consideration should be given to the efforts of corporation attorneys to secure senatorships in less honorable ways, speaks volumes as to the mental and moral attitude and standards of those who take that view.

If Mayor Johnson becomes a candidate for governor, senator, president, or anything else, it will not be as a mere seeker for place, but as a faithful public servant, whose promotion, not so much to higher honors as to larger possibilities of public usefulness and wider fields of public duty, the people themselves, those of them that are democratic, unmistakably demand.

Having accepted the responsibilities of mayor of Cleveland, Mr. Johnson has made those responsibilities his first care. He has even refused not only to abandon the duties of his office for a place upon the state ticket of his party; but also to accept the obligations even of a member of the executive committee of his party during the campaign. How exacting the duties of his office are, ambitious as he is to promote what he believes to be the true natural solution of social problems while serving the city and securing to all its inhabitants the fullest possible equality of rights with the laws as they are or as he may cause them to be amended, may be seen by reference to his work in equalizing taxation. Some account of this and other work of his has been given in these columns (pp. 23, 28, 43, 66, 84, 100, 115, 131, 139, 155, 163, 173, 187, 229). But it has only fairly begun.

We told last week of the action of Mayor Johnson's city board of equalization in raising the tax valuation of the "Little Consolidated" street car company (so called to distinguish it from the "Big Consolidated," the former being capitalized at \$8,000,000 and the latter at \$12,000,000) from half a million to \$6,000,000. Since then the director of law of Cleveland

has given an opinion sustaining the method of the board upon legal grounds, and this revaluation of the monopolies is going on in a way that exposes the enormous tax dodging they have been doing. When the case of the "Big Consolidated" came before the board, its officials procured an ex parte injunction against the board. The injunction was issued by Judge Ford, of Cleveland, on the 22d. This is the beginning of the legal proceedings that will test the validity of Mayor Johnson's efforts to secure an equitable distribution of tax burdens. Whatever the decision of the courts may be, however, the cat is now out of the bag. Johnson's proceedings have already disclosed an enormous extent of monopoly tax dodging in Ohio. In the case of the "Big Consolidated" the city board of equalization has discovered facts upon the basis of which it was about to raise the assessment some \$9,000,000, when the injunction intervened.

Another of the tax dodging monopolies of Cleveland is the gas monopoly. When Mr. Warmington, the president of one of the two gas companies (which operate in different districts), appeared before the board as a witness as to values he was questioned about the other company, it appearing that he owned stock in it. He said he owned some, and would be glad to sell it at \$250 a share. He must have been ignorant of the mayor's custom of offering to buy undervalued property. Hardly had the words left Mr. Warmington's mouth, when, according to the Plain Dealer, the mayor exclaimed:

"I'll take it."

"Well, I don't know as I want to sell just now," slowly answered Mr. Warmington.

"I'll buy all you have right now and pay the money at \$250 a share," stated the mayor.

But Mr. Warmington backed down. He did not want to sell.

The assessment of this company has not yet been raised by the board, but on the 22d that of the other company was almost trebled. The board found its money value to be \$1,790,000, and

assessed the same for taxation at 60 per cent., or \$1,074,000. This was by unanimous vote of the board, the minority which at first objected to the mayor's policy having now joined the majority in supporting it. Unless prevented by the courts, Mayor Johnson expects the increase in the valuations of the properties of the two street car companies and the lighting companies to amount to \$22,000,000, which would produce a decrease in the tax rate of the city from \$3 per \$100 to \$2.55. Should the valuations of the steam roads be fairly increased the rate would fall to \$2.00.

As will be remembered, the county auditors refused to assess the steam railroads on more than 12 or 15 per cent. of true value, though farms and homes are assessed at 60 per cent.; but the state board of equalization is yet to pass upon that matter, and two of the four state officers composing this board are candidates for reelection at the coming election, which may make them less deferential to railroad sentiment than to public sentiment. The board has agreed to give Mayor Johnson a hearing. He will be accompanied by Prof. Bemis, as an expert; and the mayors of several other cities have agreed to appear and support him. This question is now attracting more attention in Ohio than any other, and is almost certain to be the only live issue in the campaign—the question, that is, of whether steam railroads shall be taxed on only 10 or 12 per cent. of the true value of their property, or on 60 per cent., the same as farmers and home owners.

The new chief of police of Chicago, Mr. O'Neill, has given, since his accession to that office, several indications of his special fitness for the place. He seems to realize that Chicago is not Moscow and that he is not a censor, something which chiefs of police are usually slow to learn. Some of them never learn it. Mr. O'Neill's most notable act is his refusal to suppress a socialist street meeting near Newberry library. These meet-

ings are orderly gatherings to which no objection had been raised except by habitués of the library, who complained that the talking upon the street disturbed their thoughts. It is suspected, however, that they were less concerned about their own continuity of thought than with a desire to interfere with free speech. At any rate the chief of police decided in favor of free speech, and for that he should be applauded, not only by the socialists whose rights he has respected, but by every one who believes in protecting the rights of citizens regardless of diversity of opinion. Every city ought to maintain at convenient points open air forums for public meetings such as the socialists are holding in Chicago. But so long as this is not done, street meetings which do not interfere with traffic should be encouraged, not suppressed. What is said at these meetings makes no difference, with respect to the right to hold them. Public security is always conserved and public opinion kept wholesome by free speech. Even dangerous sentiments are less dangerous when they may be freely expressed.

A new term has been contributed by Dr. Lyman Abbot to the discussion of social and industrial subjects. It is "medicine-man"—not a new term absolutely, but new in this application. In explaining the term, which he introduces in his serial essays in the Outlook on the rights of man, Mr. Abbot says:

The fourth leader who adds to our perils I call the "medicine-man." I will not call him "quack," because this would involve too great obloquy; nor "professional reformer," because this pays to him too great deference. I call him medicine-man because he thinks there is one medicine which will cure all the ills to which humanity is subject. He is generally morally honest, but intellectually narrow; he is not a hypocrite, but he is apt to be a pharisee, with a strong sense of "I am holier than thou" pervading his dogmatic utterances. He imagines that universal suffrage will cure all political evils; or free silver all commercial and financial evils; or a single tax on land all industrial evils; or woman suffrage or

prohibition, or the two combined, all moral evils. I do not here consider the value of prohibition, or woman suffrage, or the single tax on land, or free silver, or universal suffrage; but he who imagines that all evils are due to one social or political cause, and can be cured by one social or political reform, has studied human nature and human history to little purpose. And, unfortunately, there are many good men in America who cannot be influenced by the demagogue—their moral sense resents his appeals to popular prejudices; nor led by the boss—they are too independent; nor purchased by the plutocrat—they are too honest—who are swayed by the medicine-man because he appeals to their conscience, and their conscience is not very intelligent.

If an unintelligent conscience were especially susceptible to hypnotism of the sort Dr. Abbot describes, he himself must long ago have fallen a victim to some "medicine-man." No one with a very intelligent conscience could have written what we quote from him above. A more absurdly unintelligent interpretation of the idea of so-called panaceas for social ills it would be hard to find elsewhere than in the comic papers. Writing on a philosophical subject, not as a penny-a-line paragrapher but as a philosopher, Dr. Abbot seizes upon a colloquialism and treats it as if it were the complete statement of a philosophical proposition! No social reformer ever claimed for his reform a cure-all quality in the sense in which Dr. Abbot interprets this colloquial expression. What such reformers do claim in that particular is that their respective reforms are fundamental. Universal suffragists have never meant to assert that universal suffrage would cure all political evils, but that political evils cannot be cured without universal suffrage. Prohibitionists do not maintain that prohibition will cure all moral evils, but that drunkenness is a root of moral evil. Woman suffragists make no such absurd contention as Dr. Abbot, with childish literalness, attributes to their colloquial phrases; their contention in that regard is that woman suffrage is indispensable to wholesome political development. Free sil-

ver men have never held up free silver as the cure for all financial and commercial evils; their point is that silver coinage is necessary to prevent scarcity of money, and that scarcity of money is a prime cause of financial and commercial evils. Single taxers have never pretended that a single tax on land will cure all industrial evils. What they claim is that land monopoly is the fundamental cause of industrial evils, the cause that would produce them though all other causes were removed; and that an ad valorem tax on land exclusively is the easiest method of undermining and finally destroying land monopoly. It happens that there is a recognized exponent of the single tax idea, to whose writings reference may be made for authoritative interpretation. In the eighteenth chapter of his "Social Problems," doubtless intending to anticipate just such superficial criticism as Dr. Abbot's, Henry George says:

Let me not be misunderstood. I do not say that in the recognition of the equal and unalienable right of each human being to the natural elements from which life must be supported and wants satisfied, lies the solution of all social problems. I fully recognize the fact that even after we do this, much will remain to do. We might recognize the equal right to land, and yet tyranny and spoliation be continued. But whatever else we do, so long as we fail to recognize the equal right to the elements of nature, nothing will avail to remedy that unnatural inequality in the distribution of wealth which is fraught with so much evil and danger. Reform as we may, until we make this fundamental reform our material progress can but tend to differentiate our people into the monstrously rich and the frightfully poor.

If Dr. Abbot does not see the truth of that, it is he, and not the "medicine-man," as he would classify George, who "has studied human nature and human history to little purpose."

There is in this country a society known as the "Daughters of the Revolution." The membership consists of female descendants of revolutionary patriots. It is a caddish sort of so-

ciety. Instead of seeking to perpetuate the principles and to intensify the love for human liberty and equality for which their "ragamuffin" ancestors suffered and died, instead of trying to make toryism as odious to this generation as it was to that, the highest ambition of these frivolous "daughters" of a serious ancestry seems to be to perpetuate the fact that they are "descendants." How worthy of such descent they are is indicated by the tuft hunting spirit in which they publish a message from the private secretary of King Edward—the great man's great man—in reply to their message of condolence on the occasion of the death of Queen Victoria. In publishing it in the March number of the Patriotic Review—a sort of organ of similar societies—they describe it as "a gracious acknowledgment from King Edward." Here it is:

The private secretary is commanded by the king to express his majesty's thanks to you for your loyal letter of sympathy from the Daughters of the Revolution.

The king's private secretary, unconsciously no doubt, was cuttingly sarcastic when he described the sympathetic letter of the "Daughters of the Revolution" as "loyal."

What a lot of caddishness some of our American women are breeding, to be sure. Here is another entertaining specimen: Mrs. Sherwood, the American authority on social frippery, compares American with English society by telling how—

We Americans, without exception, spring from more or less rusticity. Most of our mothers baked their own beans and made their own apple pies. My father was a man of wealth and leisure and my mother a very beautiful and elegant woman; but when a person like Hon. Mrs. Wellesley comes to lunch we cannot escape the consciousness of her superiority. Such women never speak or act amiss. Whether they eat or drink or whatever they do, they do all beautifully. Their conduct suggests a strain of music.

For such stuff as that there appears to be enough American demand to pay newspapers for soliciting and cabling it and that is humiliating.

It is not good manners that it holds up to American admiration. Examples in good manners should be welcomed from every source. There is nothing caddish about cultivating good manners. But Mrs. Sherwood's dominant note is elegance bred in idleness. Do the elegant Wellesleys and the admiring Sherwoods realize, we should like to know, that in the path of the elegant idlers of France a century and a quarter ago the guillotine loomed up, and that history sometimes repeats itself? Elegant idleness always derives its sustenance from the plunder of industry; and now and then the plundered, not intelligent enough to protect their earnings in peace, revolt with brutality.

BRITISH TAXATION AND THE LAND QUESTION.

The people of Great Britain, who, like those of the United States, are agitated over questions of inequitable taxation, have received a most suggestive contribution to the discussion in the final report of the royal commission on taxation which has just appeared.*

This commission was appointed by parliament in 1896 to inquire into the present British system of local taxation, and report whether all kinds of real and personal property contribute equitably, and, if not, what alterations in the law are desirable in order to secure that result. It consists of Lord Balfour, of Burleigh, chairman, Earl Cawdor, Lord Blair Balfour, Sir John T. Hibbert, C. B. Stuart-Wortley, C. N. Dalton, C. A. Cripps, Harcourt E. Clare, T. H. Elliot, E. Orford Smith, James Stuart, John L. Wharton, Sir Edward Hamilton, Sir George Murray and Judge Arthur O'Connor.

Twelve members of the commission sign the majority report, but only seven—a minority of the commission

*Final Report of His Majesty's Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Subject of Local Taxation. England and Wales. Presented to Parliament by Command of His Majesty. London: Printed for his majesty's stationery office, by Eyre and Spottiswoode, printers to the king's most excellent majesty; and to be purchased either directly or through any bookseller, from Eyre and Spottiswoode, East Harding street, Fleet street, E. C.; and 23 Abingdon street, Westminster, S. W.; or Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh; or E. Ponsonby, 116 Grafton street, Dublin. 1901. Price, 1s 6d (38 cents).

—accept it unreservedly, and there are several minority reports or statements, the main point of disagreement being the subject of land value taxation.

The majority report, which condemns land value taxation, considers that subject in two aspects: first, whether land values should be separately assessed; and, second, whether they should bear special burdens in connection with local taxation.

On the first point the report concludes that while it would not be impossible to value sites separately from the value of structures, yet it would be very difficult and uncertain. That conclusion, which is based upon the testimony of tax valuers and real estate men, will seem marvelous to American readers. On this side of the water, even though real estate values are returned in lump, without distinction as between the value of the site and that of the structure, assessors find it cheaper and more certain to make this distinction as part of their process of valuation. In Chicago, for instance, the assessors are accustomed to note in their field books the site value and the structure value separately. They then add the two values, thereby ascertaining the true value of the real estate. After that they make such deductions as custom or bribery may call for, and return the result as the valuation of the property. These field books are inaccessible to the general public. Assessors claim them as private property. But such as have been seen disclose this method of computation. It is understood to be in general use not only in Chicago but elsewhere, which goes to show that the majority of the British commission is mistaken in its conclusion that the separation of site values from structure values is necessarily expensive or uncertain.

But the difficulty of making the distinction seemed insuperable to the commissioners, accustomed as they are to levying real estate taxes upon the annual rental of property instead of its capital value. They therefore thought the distinction should not be required unless some highly important object was to be gained which could not otherwise be carried into

effect, and they were unable to find such an object.

Considering the special taxation of sites as the most important object of such distinction in valuation, they rejected it as inequitable. Their reason for this deliverance rests upon their notion that land values and other values are in justice equally legitimate subjects of private property. On this point their argument reads like a weak special plea for the landed interests of the country.

A much abler document than the majority report is the minority report of Sir Edward Hamilton and Sir George Murray, who had refused altogether to join in the majority report.

These dissenting commissioners lay down two primary principles: (1) that taxation for "onerous" expenditure should be according to ability to pay; and (2), that taxation for "beneficial" expenditure should be according to benefits received. This compromise of the two conflicting theories of taxation may be heartily adopted by all who believe in measuring taxes by benefits. It is a compromise which, in any equitable system of taxation, must totally exclude taxes according to ability to pay. If only "onerous" as distinguished from "beneficial" expenditure, is to be met with taxation according to ability to pay, that kind of taxation must disappear when "onerous" expenditure does. Now, can anyone defend "onerous" as distinguished from "beneficial" expenditure under any fiscal system having the slightest claim to being equitable? What these minority commissioners doubtless had in mind when they wrote of "onerous" expenditure was expenditure like that for preserving the peace, enforcing the criminal law, etc. But this expenditure is beneficial to the land owners (or tenants when under long leases tenants are essentially owners) of the place where the expenditure is made. Land is worth more, other things being the same, where the peace is preserved and the criminal law fairly enforced than where it is not. This is true in principle only of land. Other property is cheaper where government is good than where it is bad. Expenditures for good gov-

ernment, then, are beneficial to a particular class of property owners, the owners of land, and the benefits of each can be measured by the site value of their respective holdings.

Supplementary to the Hamilton-Murray minority report is one by the same commissioners, together with Lord Balfour of Burleigh, Lord Blair Balfour, and James Stuart, all of whom had joined in the majority report, but with reservations.

This supplementary report deals with "urban rating and site values"—that is with the taxation of the site values of cities for local purposes. It is probably the strongest plea for the principle of land value taxation that has yet emanated from a thoroughly conservative and highly aristocratic source.

The most orthodox follower of Henry George would hardly object to its economic reasoning. Take this illustration for example:

The real question as to the taxation of site value is the question whether there ought not to be a tax on site value where it exists, and in proportion to the amount of it which exists in each place. In other words, site value is in essence local, and the effect of taxing site value would be primarily a local redistribution of burden, not primarily a redistribution of burden as between the parties interested in each single hereditament, but as between different districts and different hereditaments.

Suppose three properties, the annual value of which is made up of site value and structural value in the respective proportions indicated by the following diagrams:*

| A | B | C |
|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| \$125 Structure. | \$250 Structure | \$375 Structure. |
| Site \$375. | Site \$250. | Site \$125. |

Each property is of the ratable value of \$500, but in A the site is worth \$375, in B it is worth \$250, in C it is worth \$125; structural value constituting the balances of \$125, \$250, \$375 respectively. The question at issue as between an ordinary rate and a site value rate can now easily be made clear. Suppose \$15 is to be raised. Under the present system, as each house is of the same ratable value, \$5 will be charged in respect of each, but under a site value rate the result would be different, because A's

*The values in these diagrams and their explanations were expressed, of course, in pounds and shillings by the commissioners. We change them to dollars and cents.

site is worth three times as much as C's, and therefore the charge will be—
 In respect of A..... \$7 50
 In respect of B..... 5 00
 In respect of C..... 2 50

Total\$15 00

It will be observed that the charge in respect to B remains the same in both cases.

This illustration shows the manner in which the burden would be redistributed as between different hereditaments and different districts, if a site value were substituted for an ordinary rate. It is this redistribution of burden between hereditaments and districts which constitutes the essential and peculiar feature (good or bad) of site value taxation.

These commissioners do not, of course, advocate Henry George's single tax. It would be remarkable if so many men of their aristocratic origin and associations should come together upon a tax commission at this stage of fiscal development, with so radical a proposal. They are, indeed, careful to avoid lending any countenance to what they call "crude and violent theories" on the subject of "the taxation of land." But, saying with fairness that "a cause which is reasonable in itself ought not to be prejudiced by the excesses of its unreasonable advocates," they announce their conclusion "that a moderate rate proportioned to site value ought to be imposed as part of any scheme for the readjustment of local taxation in urban districts."

In support of this conclusion they mention several considerations. For one thing, "the owners of urban land have received and continue to receive increases of value which are not due to any exertion or action on their part, but to causes over which they have no control." For another, there is a "feature about urban site value, which appears" to them "to be almost if not quite peculiar to it; that is, the increase of value due to the expenditure of public authorities on improvements." But those are not in their judgment the weightiest considerations. They proceed:

There are, in our opinion, other even weightier considerations in favor of a special rate on site value. In the first place, there is a strong argument for rating site values on the ground of public policy, regard being had to the effects of taxation on industry and development. Our pres-

ent rates indisputably hamper building. . . . As Mr. Fletcher Moulton says: "A tax upon buildings proportionate to their value necessitates that the rent of buildings should represent a high rate per cent. on the cost. In other words, it drives people to take (and, therefore, drives builders to build) poorer houses. Taxation on the land has no such effect." . . .

While the rating of site value thus concerns the public at large as an administrative reform, it is of special importance in connection with the urgent problem of providing house accommodation for the working classes. Anything which aggravates the appalling evils of overcrowding does not need to be condemned, and it seems clear to us that the present heavy rates on buildings do tend to aggravate those evils, and that the rating of site values would help to mitigate them. If more of the burden were thrown on sites, the portion left to be borne by buildings would be diminished, and this would weigh with the builder who is hesitating to embark on the erection of new structures. In the second place, site value differs from structural value, not only in origin, as we have above shown, but also in present character. A structure is a wasting, perishable property which requires repair and renewal, while a site is permanent and, as a rule, increases rather than diminishes in value. Consequently, when the main part of the value of a hereditament can be attributed to the site, that hereditament represents a greater ability to pay than one in which structural value predominates. . . . Site value and building value being thus of different and even opposite characters in many respects, it appears to us that a system which treats them exactly alike, as our present rating system does, is *prima facie* unfair and unwise.

After those reasons, moral and economic, for putting some additional tax burdens upon site owners, it is difficult to understand how the titled gentlemen who have recourse to them, and who are evidently intelligent and honest, can stop there, as a matter of principle. If land values are so radically different from building values, alike in origin and in present character, and their taxation to some extent (to the corresponding exemption of improvements) would produce such desirable results to that extent, why not tax them and exempt improvements to a greater extent and produce still more desirable results? Why stop short? We can understand

why the first step should for political reasons be a short one. We can understand the political expediency of so moderate a reform in the right direction. But in what possible way can such moderation be demanded by economic and moral principle? Yet these titled gentlemen take pains to say:

At the same time we would not propose, and we find no justification for anything like the spoliation of a particular class.

The class thus referred to is their own. It is the land monopolizing class. And their timidity in restricting their recommendations of site value taxation to a "somewhat heavier" burden than that upon buildings is explicable only upon the theory that they are unconsciously influenced—not by class interests; they are evidently superior to that fetich of narrow minds—but by class training.

The limitations, however, which these gentlemen put upon their recommendations will cut but little figure in the future. If experience proves them to be right in the social benefits they foresee as the result of a moderate application of the single tax, the people will not hold so sacred as they do the privileged class whom they would not despoil of their privileges. For all present practical purposes this supplementary minority report by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, Lord Blair Balfour, Sir Edward Hamilton, Sir George Murray and Mr. James Stuart, is quite as radical an advance along the lines of exclusive taxation of land values as could at present be desired.

If these gentlemen in their minority report stop short of the full application of the principle they accept, Judge O'Connor, in his minority report, does not. He goes the whole length of his principles, and his principles go to the core of the question of equitable taxation.

Having reviewed the present system of taxation for local purposes, Judge O'Connor continues:

The three forms of property now liable to be rated are lands and interests in land, buildings, and machinery. The question, then, which is embodied in the terms of reference will relate to all forms of property, but to these three in an especial manner; and the point for con-

sideration is, whether, in the first place, the contributions from these several forms of property are equitable as between themselves.

In the absence of any suggested standard or criterion of equity, it may be reasonably assumed that the old equitable principle will, in this case, also hold good, viz., that he who takes the benefit should also take the burden; and in the light of this principle we must proceed to consider the nature of the different kinds of property in respect of which rate payers are now burdened.

Now, between land and every other form of property there is an obvious, abiding and essential difference. Every other form of property is transitory, wasting and destructible, the temporary production of human industry, obtained by labor out of the material which the land supplies; but the land is not of human production; and as no man made it, so no man can destroy it. . . .

Equity and right reason would appear to suggest that the product of human industry should be the absolute property of the person or persons that created it, whether the creation be of food, or habitation, or instrument, or any other thing.

But with the land it is different. Equity and right reason here suggest that as access to the face of the globe is for mankind a necessary condition of existence, and yet land is incapable of creation by human industry, the same rule of absolute and exclusive ownership cannot apply. . . .

It is plain that if a man does not own any land he must live upon the land of another; and he must, directly, or indirectly, pay to him that owns it a premium or rent for permission to be there. This is the condition of the vast majority of the people of England; and every man, woman, and child in the community who has no share in the property in the land is—whether conscious of it or not—as much a rent-producing machine for the benefit of the landowners as the cattle that browse in the fields.

This fact, of itself, may of course be unobjectionable, for it is clear, firstly, that separate occupation of land, secured under the law, is indispensable for human industry and the development of the resources of the country; and, secondly, that a very large proportion of mankind have not either the inclination or the capacity to deal with it themselves. But the fact itself remains, viz., that the population of England is divided into two classes, one comparatively small, and the other immense, the one composed of the owners of the land, and the other composed of the non-owners of land. The first, qua owners simply,

"toil not, neither do they spin," but they receive from the majority of their fellow citizens a quittance amounting to more than a hundred of millions sterling in the year; while the second, or industrial class, have to labor not only for their bread, but also to pay for their foothold in the country. It may indeed be said that there are three classes, of which one not being composed of land owners, and not being industrial, are yet provided for by the industrial portion of the community. These are found in the workhouses in receipt of what is called in-door relief. However great may be the social or moral distinction between this class and the owners of interests in the land, from the point of view of political economy, the analogy is obvious.

The amount which the industrial portion of the community have in this way to pay out of the produce of their labor increases with the increase of their own number. It is only the presence of man that gives value to land. Land at the north pole has no value, because men are not there; it is of comparatively small value where people are few, as on Salisbury Plain; it is of very high value in the city of London, by reason of the concourse of people who desire to use it. . . .

The above considerations drive me to the conclusion that equity requires that houses and machinery should not be rated for local purposes; but that the cost necessarily incurred in connection with those services should be defrayed at the expense of the land interests of the locality. And this principle, being sound, will be applicable to all land, in town and country alike, to whatsoever purpose applied, and whether the particular industry carried on upon it be or be not remunerative in the hands of the industrial occupant. If this principle is adhered to, the cases of special properties such as railways, canals, docks, gas works and tramways, will present no difficulties such as beset the existing system. A railway station in a town, or the line which runs across the country, would be assessed according to the value of the land occupied, and no more; and so of all similar undertakings. An acre of agricultural land would be assessed according to its own value as land, quite irrespective of any buildings or other agricultural improvements; an acre of land in Salisbury Plain would pay its petty due; and the magnificent properties in the crowded cities would pay in proportion to the site value which the presence of the crowds has caused. . . .

The principle embodied in the foregoing remarks appears to be virtually, though not in terms, adopted in the

report on urban rating and site values which has been signed by a minority of the commissioners. I should be glad to be allowed to associate myself with that singularly able document, at any rate so far as it goes in the application of the principle. I am, however, unable to discover any logical distinction between different portions of land accordingly as they may happen to be in urban or rural areas, or as they may or may not at the moment be built on. The limitation to urban areas appears to involve an abandonment of principle, and to reduce the proposal to the level of a makeshift compromise, without logical justification.

Upon the basis of principles thus outlined, Judge O'Connor recommends "that land (except land already dedicated to public use), and land only, should be rated for local public services." At the same time he advises that existing contracts (between landlord and tenant) be respected. On that point he argues:

If it is said that existing contracts will stand in the way of, or delay to a very great extent, the reform suggested, the answer is that the duty cast upon this commission is not to secure or propose immediate alteration of the law, but rather to indicate the direction in which equity points—not to put forward proposals for immediate and universal application which would be revolutionary, but to show the direction in which reform should be attempted, and the mode in which existing injustice may be removed without shock to the body politic. But yet for the great majority of occupiers a very few years would have completely established a new system. The longest running contracts are also fewest in number, and the alteration once introduced (all contracts made contrary to it after a certain date being declared void) would work gradually and smoothly until it was in time completely effected.

If anything were needed to show that Judge O'Connor, like all his associate commissioners, is a conservative, that last quotation would do it. But he is a conservative who, to a clear apprehension of principle and logical acuteness in applying it to existing conditions, adds the true statesman's virtue of prudence. In concluding his report he modestly but pointedly suggests that—

a change based on sound principle and carried out by gradual adjustment is not only not revolutionary, but is dictated by prudence. It is difficult to believe that with the diffusion of education, or at least of

political information, the great mass of the people of England will long remain unconscious or heedless of the true economic position. If and when they realize it, they will probably be drawn to exercise that power, which the franchise places in their hands, to secure through the instrumentality of the Commons house of parliament a readjustment of taxation, relief for industry in every form, and the imposition of the burden where also the benefit rests.

Judge O'Connor believes that this can be better and more safely done through normal development in the right direction than by angry and revolutionary changes. But he clearly means to point out to the privileged orders that unless they do speedily agree to a righteously progressive policy they will have to submit at no distant day to drastic experiences.

This British tax report is justly regarded in England as another strong indication of the phenomenal advances of the movement which Henry George set on foot less than 25 years ago. With these reports before it, parliament cannot much longer delay granting the petitions—nearly 300 in number from as many different English and Scotch cities, including Glasgow, London and Liverpool—for permission to adopt site value taxation.

NEWS

The great labor conflict between the association of steel workers and the steel trust, the beginning of which is reported at pages 200 and 234, furnishes about the only important news of the week, and that is not very abundant. At Wellsville, Ohio, an attempt was made by the trust on the 22d to open the mills, but only three out of the eight started and they were not sufficiently manned for more than partial operation. They closed completely on the afternoon of the same day, on account of the extreme heat, as the managers say, but on account of desertions from the working force, as the strikers insist. The air at Wellsville has been full of rumors of arrangements by the trust to import negro workmen from the south to take the places of the strikers. It is understood that this plan is to be put

in operation in all the striking mills; and the strikers are "picketing" railroad stations for the purpose of obstructing it. As a countercheck the trust is reported as preparing to secure injunctions against picketing, from the federal courts. Another of its plans, especially with reference to Wellsville, is to move to another place, or at least to threaten to do so. This has had a tendency to throw the influence of local merchants and landowners against the strikers. The place to which the trust threatens to move the Wellsville plant is Vandergrift, Pa., where the trust has established a "model town" for its workmen, each of whom is engaged under a written agreement with the trust which would forfeit his house and lot were he to join the strike. These Vandergrift employes, to the number of 1,800, have adopted resolutions in support of the trust as against the strikers. At McKeesport, Pa., the situation is not so encouraging to the trust. A large lodge of the Amalgamated association was organized there on the 20th, in the nonunion stronghold of the National Tube works.

The head of the steel trust, J. Pierpont Morgan, is credited in a newspaper interview with announcing that there can be no compromise of the strike, that the mills of the trust will be operated by nonunion men protected by armed guards, and that the trust will beat the strikers at whatever cost. To this announcement comes the response from Mr. Shaffer, the leader of the strike, that he "will take from the mills every union man in them," so that "it will be impossible to operate them." Mr. Shaffer adds:

The steel combine statement is a signal for riot and violence. Morgan has begun an appeal for lawlessness. Now let him open the mills, get his injunctions, post his deputies and incite men who are striking for their rights, to some act of violence. Then we can point to this statement of his and say: "This was the starting point. Morgan flung down the challenge." Morgan says he will beat us at whatever cost. How is he going to do it? He cannot do it until he wears out every particle of energy and every resource at our command. Dare he do this? Does he dare to inflict such a wrong on the American workingman? Besides, what guaranty has he that we can't hold out as long as his millions? I have yet to be convinced that the Amalgamated association, if worst comes to worst, cannot stand the strain as long as Morgan's money.

At present the strike centers are Pittsburg, Connellsville and McKeesport, Pa.; Wellsville, Martins Ferry, Youngstown, Dennison, New Philadelphia, Mingo Junction and Cleveland, Ohio; Cumberland, Md.; and Wheeling and Bridgeport, W. Va. Men are out at Elwood, Anderson, Atlanta, Middleton, Gas City, Hammond and Muncie, Ind.; Joliet, Ill.; Irondale, Lisbon, Cambridge, Canton, Dresden, Niles, Piqua, Struthers, Girard and Pomeroy, Ohio; Cannonsburg, Johnstown, Newcastle, Carnegie, Sharon and Greenville, Pa.; and Muskegon, Mich. Of all the mills of the trust, in the three lines—tin plate, sheet and hoop—only one tin plate mill, one steel hoop mill and five sheet steel mills are running. The tin mill is at Monessen, the hoop mill is at Duncansville and the sheet mills are at Vandergrift, Chester, Old Meadow, Saltsburg and Scottdale, all in Pennsylvania.

To supplement the steel strike, a large strike of garment makers began in New York and Newark on the 22d. All the thousands of sweat shops in those cities are reported as idle, and it is estimated that 50,000 workers are engaged in the strike. Its object is to compel manufacturers to abandon the "sweating" or contract system and to employ the garment makers directly and for time wages instead of piece work, the working week to consist of 59 hours. Before the strike the workers were putting in from 12 to 16 hours a day, at piece work under "sweating" contractors, and were then dependent upon these irresponsible middlemen for their pay.

From strikes to hot weather. From every quarter come reports of a period of heat, extraordinary in duration and intensity. It has prevailed for more than a month, and the thermometer has fluctuated from 90 or 100 degrees upwards. The heat has been attended by widespread drouths which threaten the destruction of the corn crop throughout the west. The assured loss in yield is estimated at 25 per cent. Russia is undergoing a similar experience. Phenomenal heat is reported from all the northern parts of the empire, and the Siberian crops are said to have failed.

After a long interval, news of the Chinese settlement begins again. Our last news with reference to this subject will be found on pages 134 and

153. At that time (p. 134) an indemnity of 450,000,000 taels (about \$327,000,000), to be paid to the powers by China in 30 annual installments with interest at four per cent., had been agreed upon. But differences as to the mode of payment have for several weeks held the representatives of the powers in a deadlock. This has now been broken. On the 22d the American commissioner, Mr. Rockhill, cabled the department at Washington that a plan for the payment of the indemnity had been agreed upon. The plan contemplates a bond issue resting upon the salt tax, the maritime customs and the inter-provincial customs—all indirect taxes which fall with greatest weight upon the common people.

From South Africa meager and dubious reports pass the British censorship, but all the circumstances indicate that the military problem is still unsolved and that the war is not confined to the old republics, but that Cape Colony also is in serious insurrection.

Neither are affairs in the Philippines altogether satisfactory to the invading power. After a trial of civil government in several provinces it has been abrogated in the islands of Cebu and Bahol, and in the province of Batangas, Luzon. Those districts are still in arms for independence and the American military power has consequently been restored.

NEWS NOTES.

—Local elections in France on the 22d indicate a popular indorsement of the ministry.

—The international convention of the Epworth League met at San Francisco on the 18th.

—Mr. Urquhart Lee, of Chicago, has been appointed to and has accepted the chair of parliamentary law in the University of California.

—Gen. Gomez has publicly announced that the object of his recent visit to the United States (pp. 184, 201, 217) was to induce Estrada Palma to become the first president of Cuba.

—Through expansion, caused by the intense heat of the past weeks, several suspension rods of the great suspension bridge from New York to Brooklyn were broken on the 24th, and for safety the car service was withdrawn.

—Prof. Koch, of Berlin, read a paper on the 23d before the International Tuberculosis congress at Lon-

don, in which he claims to have demonstrated that consumption is not communicable from animals or animal products to man.

—Eleanor A. Ormerod, distinguished as an entomologist, botanist and meteorologist, died at London on the 19th. Miss Ormerod held the degree of LL.D. from the University of Edinburgh. She was one of the highest authorities in her scientific specialties.

—The wife of Paul Kruger, president of the South African Republic, died at Pretoria on the 21st, aged 67 years. Mr. Kruger is still in Europe. His long absence, combined with the death of her daughter a week before, had broken Mrs. Kruger's spirit and made her an easy victim to an attack of pneumonia.

—Charles Cecil Fitzmorris, a high school boy of Chicago, accompanied by a representative of the Chicago American, arrived in Chicago on the 20th from a racing trip around the world. He was the first of the contestants to finish the trip, and he broke the world-girdling record, completing his journey in 60 days, 13 hours, 29 minutes and 42 4-5 seconds. The quickest previous trip on record was made in 1899 in 63 days.

—Rear Admiral Schley has asked "such action at the hands of the navy 'department as it may deem best, to' bring under official discussion the question of his conduct at the naval battle of Santiago, which has been impugned, scurrilously so by the third volume, just issued, of a history of the navy the first two volumes of which have been in use as a text book at the government naval academy. The request was made in a letter from Schley to the secretary of the navy on the 22d, and granted by the secretary in a letter of the 24th. It is understood the matter will be referred to a court of inquiry to be presided over by Admiral Dewey.

MISCELLANY

ALL IN ALL.

For The Public.

God is omnipotent; the priests declare, Omniscent too, is he. And, tell me where Shall space be found without him? Where Shall I escape his presence? Where?

God is omnipotent, and God is love, All force, all power must come then from above.

God is omniscent. What know we, But merest fragments of infinity?

God everywhere is present; yet we prate Of "holy places" and of "low estate;" Nor think that where God is, is holy ground;

And where He is not, no place can be found.

All are within his presence: Thou and I, The weak, the mighty, lowliest, most high.

He is; we are. He knows; we think. Without his will and power, to naught we sink.

All we are of him, therefore all divine, Who then shall dare between us draw the line?

Make one a freeman, one a slave? Bid one seek idle pleasure, one the grave?

Make one a master, and bid one to serve With brain and muscle, until nerve And sinew, racked with pain, Give out; and man returns to dust again?

Give me abundance; direct lack to others? Or set me up as master o'er my brothers, To graciously rent out to them the soil, If only they pay tribute to me of their toll?

Is it our ignorance which makes us bold Thus to define God's goodness, and to hold

That for some only he creates, And gives them title sole to vast estates?

Say, can Omniscience thus mislead? Omnipotence divide against itself? Can Omnipresence foster heaven and hell While Love looks on approving, with an "All is well?"

Bellevue, Pa. W. A. HAWLEY.

THE SOURCE OF MONOPOLY.

By a neat trick, made possible by its enormous wealth, the Standard Oil company has headed off a threatening rival in the Texas oil field and made itself absolute master of the situation. It has bought up the wharves, railroad terminals and shipping facilities at Port Arthur, the natural shipping port of the Beaumont field, together with 90,000 acres of land in the vicinity, which is doubtless located in such a manner as to preclude any attempt of the Texas oil men to establish a new outlet. It would not be profitable for them to ship their oil to tidewater at a more distant point, and hence they are at the mercy of the Standard, and must sell their product to it at its own price. This is how the ideal trust overcomes competition.—Philadelphia Ledger.

The Ledger well points out the methods by which these sort of schemes are worked and by which monopoly gets control of the sources of production, but it doth err in saying that this move of the Standard Oil company has been made possible by its enormous wealth.

Wharves, railroad terminals and shipping facilities are naturally and inherently public property. No individual nor corporation can get possession or control of such things except by means of a special charter, which means a grant of special privileges.

If the state of Texas and the city of Port Arthur had retained in their own possession that which belonged to them, the wharves, terminals and shipping facilities, it would have made no difference what the wealth of the Standard Oil company was, they would

have had no better chance in the field than other concerns.

It will thus be seen that monopolies stifle competition, not by reason of their enormous wealth, but through their ability to get from legislation grants of special privileges.

Had the people of Texas and Port Arthur had the matter in their own hands this could easily have been prevented and an immense benefit secured, not only for the state of Texas, but for the whole nation. But as it is under our present form of government the people have no voice in the matter. Our constitution grants to a handful of legislators the exclusive privilege of legislating, and this handful of legislators grants to corporations exclusive privileges in controlling the resources of wealth.

So it will be seen that monopoly rests on legislative grants of privileges, and legislative grants of privilege to corporations rest on the constitutional grants of privilege to legislators.

To get rid of the monopoly strike at the root, the constitutional grant of privilege to legislators.—The National New Era, of Springfield, O.

FROM THE ARID WEST.

For The Public.

The arid west is beginning to wonder about how soon it can reasonably expect to receive the farmers' bonus which the republican platform favored in 1900. Of course while the war in the Philippines was hanging fire, and the supreme court was known to have the constitution up a stump, the west sat "like patience on a monument." But everything has cooled off nicely. McKinley can once more sleep the sleep of the righteous, and the west is getting as restive as a bronco that has not bucked for quite a spell. It cannot be that the grand old party contemplates a bunco game with the people of the Rocky mountains. They have recovered their equanimity, and in the language of Shakespeare do not give a yellow dog if the white metal was turned upside down. Farming cannot be benefited by anything in this part of the world which does not increase the acreage under cultivation, the number of cultivators to the acre, the number of bushels to the acre, and also supplies a market. The present tariff will not do all these things, and there are some wool growers who have even lost faith in its efficacy, since the bottom has dropped out of the wool market. Idle men are rapidly increasing, building operations are at a standstill and some peo-

ple are blaming the labor unions for demanding an eight-hour day. Are these the premonitory symptoms of a cloudburst of colonial expansion prosperity? or only indicative of a spell of bad weather?

Some men handle any question which concerns laboring men very gingerly. It would be a shock to their reputations to be called socialists. Others are so much interested in the welfare of the kind of people Abraham Lincoln said were so numerous that the charge has no more effect than a Spanish broadside on an American battleship. A lie is its own worst enemy. If it is driven to cover it commits compulsory suicide.

Government ownership of irrigation is wanted, because no other method of supplying water to the thirsty soil can handle it at cost.

Every home builder who adds an improved ranch to the property valuation of a western state has increased the demand for the products of domestic factories. Such homemade expansion works both ways. There is a good time coming in the near future when an imaginary line cannot separate Yankees who live on either side of it. Neighbors with common interests are bound to get together.

The agricultural future of the arid west depends, after irrigation, on the South American market. An isthmian canal will be favored by the west, for a reason of its own. We want free trade with South America. Then the fortified canal is wanted by the Atlantic coast as its highway to the orient. A better subsidy to American shipping could not spring full orb'd from the brain of the republican elephant than free transportation to American bottoms across the isthmus. But unless the waterway is cut at once by popular subscription there is a chance for serious trouble with Europe. Make no mistake, Europe is after that canal hot-footed. She has blood in her eye, and threatens to take the implied powers out of the Monroe doctrine in a square stand up fight to a finish. War is not pleasant to contemplate. Sherman—an expert on the subject—declared it was hell. Europe cannot be prevented from going to hell if she chooses, but it would be well to remember the inscription which Dante saw over that open door.

JAMES C. FREE.

Billings, Mont., July 5, 1901.

It is a pity that our ancestors left us so many problems which they should have solved; also, that we are willing to pass the problems along.—Puck.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

NO MUNICIPAL POLITICAL ASSESSMENTS.

There won't be any assessments at the city hall while Tom L. Johnson is mayor. That fact was demonstrated yesterday when the mayor called a halt on an assessment that had been started. It seems that the work had been going on several days before the mayor learned of it. When the facts came to his knowledge he at once sent for a city hall employee who was said to be directing the work.

"Yes, it's true," was the answer given to a question put by the mayor.

"What do you mean by doing anything of that sort without consulting me?" demanded Mayor Johnson. "I won't have it at all. I want it stopped right here. How many men are out collecting money?"

"One, I think."

"Can you get your hands on him in a few minutes?"

"I guess so."

"Do it right away then. Tell him not to collect another cent and see to it that nothing of the kind goes on again. Send the subscription books to me."

In a short time four books were placed in the mayor's hands.

"Are these all?" he asked.

"No."

"How many more are out?"

"Two or three."

"Get them in right away. Now I want every cent collected returned to the men from whom it was received."

"All right," and the assessment collector walked out, dazed.

In the city hall there are a number of employes who are republicans. They hold their jobs because they are competent men. The mayor, apparently, does not think it would be right to make republicans contribute money to defray the expenses of a democratic campaign. He is also opposed to making a lot of low salaried democratic employes give up a per cent. of their earnings for political purposes.

The mayor's ultimatum carried joy to the hearts of some city hall people and dismay to others. Director of Public Works Salen was one of the most astonished ones when he heard what the mayor had done.

"How are we to defray the expenses of the democratic committee?" he demanded. "It isn't right to ask one or two men to put up all the money and unless we have money

we'll simply have to close the headquarters on the square. I don't see anything wrong in asking officeholders under a democratic administration to contribute to the expenses of a democratic campaign. They all expect it and the people expect it, too. Officeholders are the ones who are supposed to pay for the music."

Just where the money is to come from to keep the democratic machinery in the county oiled during the fall campaign is not quite clear. Candidates' assessments will likely be pretty stiff, and Mayor Johnson will have to go down into his own pocket for a large wad.—News Article in Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 19.

Mayor Johnson's order against the collection of political assessments from employes of the city has caused surprise among politicians and sneering insinuations of insincerity from party organs opposed to him politically. They cannot understand how one who holds a municipal position can take the stand assumed by Mayor Johnson, because the assessment of officeholders "for the benefit of the party" has been the regular custom for many years.

It is true that the custom has long existed, but it is none the less pernicious, demoralizing to the service, a wrong to taxpayers, and sometimes cruel to the employe, who is compelled to give up part of his pay that is badly needed for the support of his family. Under previous administrations assessments have been various percentages of the employe's salary or wages, generally at least two per cent. Under a late republican municipal administration the assessment went as high as seven per cent. This was nothing short of downright robbery, and either the employes or the public, or both, were the victims of that robbery.

The pretext for these political assessments is that the employe owes his position to the party, and therefore should contribute of his earnings to the party's support. The plea is of itself one of the strongest arguments for the complete divorce of municipal government from partisan politics. Make employment in the city's service dependent wholly on fitness for the position and retention in that employment dependent on faithful and efficient service, eliminating altogether considerations of political "work" or "pull," and there would be no occasion or excuse for

political assessments of municipal employes.

Take the situation as it now is, for example. Mayor Johnson owed his election to his declaration that he would run the affairs of the municipality on a business basis, and not use his position for the building up of a political machine. The people believed in the sincerity of that declaration. Mayor Johnson is responsible for the entire force of municipal employes and it is his duty to see that they perform efficient service and earn the pay they receive from the money or the taxpayers. They did not get their places from any political party. They are the employes of the people of Cleveland, without regard to political views. They are paid by money collected from the people in taxes. They are responsible to Mayor Johnson as the chief servant of the municipality. No political party appointed them or retains them in their positions, or pays their salaries or wages. They are under no obligations, legal or moral, to contribute against their will to the fund of any political party.

If an employe of the city holds a \$1,200 position, and performs its duties satisfactorily, he is entitled to all the money he has earned. If it is a \$600 position the same is true. What right has a political collector to demand of the one \$24 or of the other \$12 "for the benefit of the party?" If the employe is worth to the public what the public pays him, he is entitled to all his earnings. If he is not, he should be dismissed, or the pay of the position reduced to the value of the services rendered. That is what is done in the business world and the municipal establishment should be run strictly on business principles.

The injustice of the political assessment system is more sharply defined when it is known that a number of republicans are holding positions under Mayor Johnson's administration. The political assessor makes no distinction of individual politics. Such a position is assessed so much. No matter what the political views of the holder of that position, he is expected to pay promptly, and he pays. The wrong of compelling a republican to contribute to a democratic campaign fund, or a democrat to a republican political fund when the conditions are reversed, should be apparent to every fair-minded person.

If any man, democrat or republican, officeholder or in no way connected with the municipal government, chooses to contribute to the fund of his

political party, that is his privilege as a private citizen. If he declines to contribute, that, too, is within his rights. But political "assessments" are indefensible, both from the individual and public point of view, and Mayor Johnson is entitled to credit for taking a firm stand against the practice under his administration.

The radical remedy for the manifold evils attendant upon the municipal political assessment system is to absolutely divorce municipal affairs from partisan politics. When that is done the people will have a right to expect the full value of their money in faithful and efficient service. There will then be no excuse for political assessments, either of two per cent. or seven per cent., with the dishonesty the higher assessment suggests or induces.—Editorial in Plain Dealer of July 21.

STREET CLEANING IN CLEVELAND.

Electricity now cleans Cleveland streets with a new sweeper, the first of its kind, that was given its first working test last week. It will sweep all the streets on which there are car tracks with the exception of Superior, which is 200 feet wide and is cleaned by the "white wings" men. The electric sweeper is the invention of General Manager Ira McCormick, of the Big Consolidated Electric railway, and grew out of a suggestion of Mayor Tom L. Johnson.

One of the first things the mayor did after getting into office was to start a clean streets campaign. He found that the contractors, working with the ordinary horse-drawn sweepers, charged one dollar a square. He sent for McCormick and called his attention to a forgotten clause in the street car company's franchise that required it to keep its tracks clean. The result is the electric trolley street sweeper that will revolutionize the cleaning of streets on which there are electric car lines all over the world.

The necessity of sweeping the company's tracks for nothing started the street railway manager thinking, and he went back to the mayor with an offer to sweep the streets through which the lines of his company run for 20 cents a square, a fifth of the present price the city pays. The mayor told him he could have the business, and McCormick went to work on his trolley sweeper. He built in the company's shops a ponderous car, having, in addition to the motors for driving it, another 35 horsepower motor for driving revolving

brushes under the car. In front of the car is one brush eight feet long that sweeps the center of the street. Behind is another brush 16 feet long that sticks out on one side of the rear of the car. It is swung clear out over the pavement at the side of the track until it reaches the curb. The brushes are whirled and the car propelled by current taken from the wire over the tracks by the trolley pole, and the dirt is swept into a long, neat pile in the gutter. In the first test it swept the dirtiest street in the city, Broadway, at the rate of seven miles an hour.

This first sweeper cost \$2,800, but succeeding sweepers that are under way will cost less. The machine makes a noise like a cyclone, but two dashes through a double-tracked street clean it better than any other street sweepers ever made.

To sprinkle the miles of streets the sweeper cleans without stopping, a great sprinkling-car with a 5,000-gallon tank is used, the streets being sprinkled to prevent dust and make it possible for the sweeper to leave them cleaner. The trolley sweeper is so fast that McCormick thinks the company will make an immense profit at 20 cents a square for sweeping the streets. Mr. McCormick's company has over 100 miles of tracks in the Cleveland streets, and as the sweepers are completed they will run over the tracks of Senator Hanna's street railway, the Little Consolidated, and a large proportion of the infamously dirty streets will be kept clean by electricity.—Cleveland correspondence of Chicago Record-Herald of July 21.

Superintendent of Streets Wilhelm stated yesterday that he would add about 15 men to the force of white wings in the course of a few days. That will bring the force up to a total of about 60 men. Wilhelm says he would like to put on about 100 more men, but the street cleaning fund will not permit of such an expense.

The scope of the department is being broadened gradually. Wilhelm hopes that before long the city will not only own all the apparatus used to clean and sprinkle the streets, but that it will also own the necessary horses.—Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 21.

If we were all satisfied with things as they are they would soon be worse.—Puck.

"THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN."

For The Public.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves,—Jesus.

One hundred and twenty-five years ago the declaration of independence was signed. It declared that all men were created free and equal and endowed with certain unalienable rights, and that among these rights were life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And now, while we are supposed to be astonishing the world with our progress, few men are in the possession of the right to earn a living, though many have been fortunate enough to find masters to hire them. Considerable numbers, however, traveling both at home and in foreign lands, are unable to get even a master's permission to support themselves and families.

Whatever may be the shortcomings and defects of Kipling's greatest song, if I have read it aright he meant to assert the white man's duty to civilize the savage and barbarous peoples and teach them the way they should go. The most obvious of necessary qualifications for the prosecution of this work would seem to be a knowledge of civilization and the way men should go. Despite our lack of knowledge of these things, however, we have enthusiastically taken up "The White Man's Burden" and made it, as it were, our national hymn.

Is it not amazing that, after the centuries of teachings by men whose doctrines have raised them to the universally reputed dignity of God's inspired mouthpieces, men and nations should still act toward each other as if they were inhabiting a desert island, scantily stocked with provisions, instead of the bountiful earth, or as if this were the chance world which Hafed dreamed of, in which there were no such things as natural laws and consequences?

The Hebrew prophets were gifted with singular insight into the nature of things. The natural rewards of conforming our individual and collective lives to the principles of equity, the vast abundance of the earth under proper apportionment and development, and the penalties of disobeying the law of justice were ever the burden of their prophecies, songs and denunciations. The direst consequences were predicted as the result of national unrighteousness—prophecies which have been most

terribly fulfilled. Isaiah's parable of the vineyard is as applicable to the modern world as it was to that of his day. God still gives the world to man, filled abundantly with all things necessary for his happiness and highest development. He still "looks for judgment, but beholds oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry." And the law that "the wages of sin is death" has not been repealed. Sacred and secular history unite in testifying that national unrighteousness and aggression lead to ultimate national destruction. And our common sense teaches us that force exerted in aggression must inevitably raise up force in resistance.

If it is true that the schoolmaster has been abroad in the land, and that as a result of his labors enlightenment has taken the place of intellectual darkness, let the nations give evidence of the fact by adopting methods superior to those employed in the dark ages.

The sword is not the proper implement of true civilization; it is fatal to victim and victor alike. Our ancestors stole, enslaved and debauched a race of human beings, making veritable cattle of them. It is in the nature of things that such national crimes should bear fruits, and we reaped some of them in the awful civil war. We are still reaping others. We despise the black man because he still remains in some degree what we made him. We hang and burn negroes in order to make them virtuous, without reflecting that it is not in the nature of such atrocities to make them virtuous, but to make them revengeful.

If we have failed to civilize the negro, the reason is plain enough to those who will see. We have neglected to first civilize ourselves. How shall we give the colored people here or abroad a better civilization than we ourselves possess? We can but "compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and, when he is made, make him twofold more the child of hell than ourselves."

As we contemplate the encroachments of Europe and America in the far east, let us remember the time when Rome was enlarging her borders, extending her sphere of influence and forcibly civilizing the barbarians according to her notions. Rome taught the barbarians her ways—taught them by object lessons and express training the science of war, thus utilizing them for further conquests. They bettered the in-

struction, and in time paid back to Rome the debt they owed her.

Within 4,000 miles of Hong-Kong dwell 800,000,000 of people. The white man may, in time, perhaps, possess these peoples and their lands. He will then, for he cannot help it, teach them among other things the science of war. Every insurrection—and there will be many of them—will be a valuable lesson in military science. They have eyes for seeing and hands for doing. They have heads set on their shoulders like unto ours, the said heads containing the same kind of pulpy substance that ours contain, which we call brains. Their blood is red. When they have learned what the white man will teach them, can do what he can do and fight as well, will they not pay him back the debt which they will by that time owe him? Would they be human if they neglected any opportunity to do so?

THE SHADOW OF MALTHUS.

"My people are destroyed because they have no knowledge," wailed Isaiah, as he strove mightily to infuse a little sense into their besotted intellects. Civilization has never been aided, but rather hindered, and at times throttled by the wars for power and dominion which have cursed the world. We should thank the God of nature for the superior vitality of good and the comparative evanescence of evil, in that anything of real civilization has survived.

The evil which oppresses the world springs perennially more from ignorance than from bad intention. One of the most deeply rooted errors of the human mind is the supposition that the earth is now or at some future time will be unable to properly sustain all its inhabitants. This is believed and taught by many who are esteemed wise. It is really accepted by many who profess abhorrence for and disbelief in it. One of the natural fruits of this notion is the lust for territory and control of the earth's resources by various nations, in order that their own people, at any rate, shall not suffer from "the niggardliness of nature."

Besides justifying aggression abroad, this damnable slander on the competence of the Creator upholds hoary wrongs at home and casts cold water on humane schemes for alleviating the poverty and misery which exist in our so-called "highest civilizations." Those who assert "the irresistible tendency of population to increase beyond the means of subsist-

ence" imply by the assertion that all plans for ameliorating the condition of the poor are vain, because, even if temporarily successful, population will amid greater plenty but accelerate its increase until it once more presses upon the means of subsistence, and the old misery will be shared by a larger number.

Out of this belief the Indian famine was last year attributed to the fact that, owing to the government's prevention of infanticide, the population of India had increased to an inordinate degree, rendering it difficult and almost impossible for the country to feed its people. No earthly language contains words to fitly characterize such a loathsome heresy.

Missionaries from India assembled last summer in the ecumenical council in New York and the press dispatches from the famine-stricken districts united in asserting that India's storehouses were full and that the country was exporting foodstuffs, but that the people were too poor to buy the fruits of their own labor. Macaulay, Buckle, Florence Nightingale and hosts of travelers have borne testimony to the oppressive character of British rule in India, and to the ways and means by which the country is systematically drained of its substance.

This ought to destroy beyond resurrection the notion that India cannot feed her people, but, if it does not, there remains the fact that her people use only the rudest and most primitive implements in their labor, the product of which is therefore small compared with what it might be made with the use of modern improvements. Besides this, it is well known that large areas of the country are wildernesses, inhabited only by wild beasts. If the Malthusian theory thus falls to the ground when tested in so crowded a country as India, it is idle for less densely populated countries with better means of production to urge it or any analogous theory in excuse for the greed for territory, privilege and power which accompanies the imperial regime.

Everywhere on the face of the habitable earth the things which minister to man's sustenance increase many times faster than man himself, and by his labor, according to the skill with which it is directed, he can still further augment the increase to an indefinite degree. Every mouth is accompanied by two hands. An increasing population makes possible an increased subdivision and specialization of labor, which

increases not only the aggregate production of wealth, but the production per capita, and it therefore follows that a large population can be better sustained than a small one. Nothing but our ignorant folly—our infernal struggle to get the better of each other and the injustice which is its result—prevents this from taking place, and the preacher of the Malthusian doctrine must fall under Isaiah's denunciation of those who "set darkness for light and light for darkness."

If we will but establish justice we need not fear to obey the injunction to "multiply and replenish the earth." For if we properly replenish the earth we shall thereby make adequate provision for all who may be born. There is no need for this struggle for dominion. Every land has enough and to spare if it be properly utilized.

THE SHADOW'S SHADOW.

The shadow of Malthus casts a shadow of its own, as it were. This disreputable connection of the Malthusian doctrine is the notion that improvements in the methods of production must impoverish a people. This looks like a very ignorant notion indeed, and so it is. Nevertheless, it found forcible expression in a half-page editorial in the New York Sun about seven or eight years ago, and on or about August 1, 1899, the same newspaper published a long article on its editorial page from which the following is taken:

Suppose the inventive genius and industrial capacity of the Chinese should reach the level attained in the most highly civilized countries. Would their condition, poor as they are to-day, be improved, or would they sound depths of misery unknown to any people of our time? Labor is now a glut in the Chinese market. What would be the condition of Chinese labor if, with machinery, its ability to produce were augmented from five to twenty fold? Would not wages, already a pittance, fall almost to the vanishing point? And who would consume the surplus?

It seems difficult to discuss with patience and good temper such a proposition as that; yet the white man's civilization is saturated with the central idea contained in that bit of Sunlight, and apparently with good reason, for the facts seem to bear out the theory. No one can blame the Chinese or the Filipinos for taking up arms to protect themselves at all hazards from a regime which will not only avowedly cause them to "sound depths of misery unknown to any people of our time," but which the experience of lands coming under the white man's dominion has shown to have some such effect—nay, which the

white man's experience in his own lands has shown to have some such effect. They know how we have treated other races. They know how we treat the negro to-day. They know how the white man treats his own poor. Extinction or subjection has been the portion of the natives of every land where the white man has secured a foothold, and dire poverty and misery abound among his own people wherever his civilization has attained any degree of development.

The thought must occur to every right-minded man that they who at the cannon's mouth forced the opium traffic on the Chinese were merciful and reasonable compared with those who would knowingly by the same means thrust such a civilization upon ten millions or four hundred millions of people.

SOMETHING MUST BE RADICALLY WRONG WITH OUR CIVILIZATION, for it is manifestly absurd to suppose that under a regime of justice the augmentation of production could have any other effect than the augmentation of the general wealth, comfort and happiness.

It will be but God's own natural justice if the crimes of Christendom, committed in the endeavor to avoid the imaginary evils of over-population, shall be eventually rewarded by the uprising of all Asia to escape the equally imaginary evils of improvements and economics in production.

As for "trade" and "foreign markets," the abolition of tariffs by the white nations would instantly secure to each more trade than a century of bullying the Asiatics can possibly secure. What better proof could one have of the correctness of Machiavelli's axiom that "all men have eyes, but few have the gift of penetration" than the fact that the nations continue to dig ship channels and canals, build wharves, subsidize steamship lines and build warships to protect them, and send ministers, consuls and armies abroad for the purpose of developing and encouraging trade, while devising tariffs to restrict it?

RACIAL HATREDS.

The so-called racial hatreds are not racial at all, but spring from the relations into which the races have been forced by the white man's covetousness. Children know nothing of them until they imbibe them from their elders. The negro having been a slave, that, apparently, must settle his status for all time. He is still desired as a menial, but may not aspire to be more, even though black women may nurse white children.

Negroes of both sexes may move in the most exclusive circles if properly clothed in the garb of servitude. The yellow and brown peoples have something which the white man wants, and his efforts to possess it will generate more intense "racial" hatreds. It may be hard to confess it, but the white man has never "acted white" in his dealings with other races. The annals of the earth may be searched in vain for a more cruel, treacherous and rapacious race than the white has always shown itself to be. And yet white workingmen should know and remember that so long as any race is kept in an inferior position, just so long will they have to endure the competition of such inferior class. The Golden Rule is of universal application.

The saying that "Whoso liveth by the sword shall perish by the sword" is not merely a divine malediction, nor confined to the individual. It is the statement of an immutable and universal law of nature. Let it be repeated: We should remember, as we confront the countless millions of ordinarily placid Asiatics, that it is the nature of aggression to raise up force in resistance. It is probable that, pursuing its present policies and objects, the white race will, long before the present century closes, find itself facing a vast and compact Asiatic empire animated and directed by Japan. Its cohesiveness will arise from the well-perceived necessity of making a united and determined stand against the aggressions of the white race. If Japan is arrayed on the side of the white man just now, it is because the time is not yet ripe. Japan is ambitious, and will yet draw China and India to her with hooks of steel when the great struggle is opened in earnest. Months ago she promulgated a little Monroe doctrine of her own regarding China, and may be depended to act on it whenever the time is propitious.

Civilization, such as it is, is in great danger from its loudest friends. Its best hope is not in its armies and navies, but in that growing body of earnest, conscientious and far-seeing men who are studying the natural laws of political and social health and human progress and striving to teach them to an unwilling world. In one of E. P. Roe's novels is the story of an artist who painted the picture of a maiden asleep in a cave of ice. At the entrance stands a youth pointing to the flowery fields and shady groves

by the river in the valley below and calling her to join him; but the maiden sleeps on, unconscious of the glories to which he would lead her. The far-sighted prophets of truth and justice have for many ages been calling to a stupid and brutal world and pointing the way to a better life than we are living. Let us hope that there will be an intellectual and moral awakening before the awful consequences of the white man's policy overwhelms him at last and "Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin," becomes his epitaph.

STEPHEN BELL

Woodhaven, N. Y., July 4, 1901.

THE GRIP.

The Landlord stands at the coal mine door—
"Stand back! Stand back!" saith he.
"The bounties of God are all my store,
And ye may but work for me.

"Now doff your cap for a job, my man,
And take what the Owners give—
God help the man that's under the ban
Of the Trusts that let man live."

The Landlord stands by the iron mine,
And "the iron trade grows slack."
"Ye shall pay me more for the God-made ore,
Or for tools and labor lack."

And the tools are few in the farmers' fields

And the coal in the kitchen stove scant—
Alas, for the man who pays what he can,
And takes what the Trust-kings grant.

For the buyers wait in the market place,
And the workmen wait at the mills;
And its, Oh, for the Land in the gripping hand

Of the Trusts whose earth-grip kills.
—Virginia M. Butterfield, in Johnstown Daily Democrat.

A SOCIAL IMPERTINENCE.

Society women who in a dilettante way interest themselves in charity affairs sometimes take liberties which they would indignantly resent if the shoe were on the other foot. A case in point occurred in an eastern city recently. She was much astonished one morning to find among her mail a note reading as follows:

Dear Madam: I take pleasure in shipping to your address a rug valued at \$50, for which I shall be glad to receive your check. If you do not desire the rug, please return it.

The note was signed by the senior partner in a leading business house.

The Public

will be sent to any address in the United States, Canada or Mexico,

ON TRIAL

for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of

SIX WEEKS FOR TEN CENTS.

Send subscriptions with addresses to THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago.

The recipient was properly indignant at what she regarded as a most impertinent communication. Seating herself at her desk she wrote this reply, which she dispatched at once:

Dear Sir: I have ordered no rug from your establishment, and I see no reason why I should go to the expense of returning that which I do not want, and which was sent to me unsolicited.

Next morning oil was poured upon her still smoldering anger when she received this communication from the business man:

Dear Madam: I will send for the unsolicited rug, and I trust you will do me the favor to send for the unsolicited charity tickets which now lie, with about 28 others, on my desk.

Mrs. Hightone regarded this note as a monstrous aggravation of the original offense, never for a moment recognizing that there was the slightest similarity between her own action and that of the long-suffering business man.—Chicago Chronicle.

The American—But, of course, the condition of your people has improved since we have taken charge?

The Porto Rican—Yes, indeed! The Spaniards never gave us opportunities for taking free trips to Hawaii.

G. T. E.

The Commanding Officer—Sir, you have disgraced your uniform, and must be promptly court-martialed.

The Alleged Culprit—Pardon me, general, it was a borrowed uniform that I wore.

The Commanding Officer—The point is well taken, and the case is dismissed.—The Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Knowno—I see that Russia has expelled Tolstoi.

Ignoranzter—Tolstoy? Who is he?

Knowno—I don't know, exactly; but I have read somewhere that he is even more dangerous than Bryan is.

G. T. E.

"Ise sorry ter see a boy so selfish as ter want to eat near de hull watahmilion."

"Tain't selfishness, gran'pop, it's jes' appetite!"

BOOK NOTICES.

In "Life and How to Live It" (Philadelphia, London, San Francisco and Toronto: Drexel Biddle), Auretta Roys Aldrich outlines an attractive philosophy for healthy living, in equally attractive literary style. Serious as the subject is, and seriously as it is discussed, no one who once opens the book will close it from weariness; and we venture the guess that whoever reads it will be tempted to adopt its author's suggestions. The key to her philosophy is expressed in the one word "rhythm." Since life is expressed by motion, the perfect or imperfect quality of life must be expressed by "the rhythm of that mo-

tion." Consequently "the science which is concerned with the cure or prevention of disease must teach first of all what this rhythm is, and how it is related to the organs and their functions." Mrs. Aldrich does not believe that man can be "the plaything or victim of every chance microbe or germ that exists," while "the natural universe is governed by unalterable law," perfect in operation. "Surely," she urges, "there is a law of energy, of vital rhythm, that would keep us from such a humiliating position." Reduced to plainer speech, she believes that "where healthy blood circulates vigorously there is health, and the problem is how to keep the blood pure and in active circulation." From these premises Mrs. Aldrich discusses the breath, the voice, food, bathing, exercise, excretory action and kindred subjects not only in an interesting manner but with an excellent quality of common sense.

MAGAZINES.

—The June number of the Medico-Legal Journal (New York, Clark Bell, 39 Broadway) is given over largely to various aspects of the subject of tuberculosis.

—Another able publication along the same line as the Glasgow "Single Tax," but German, is the "Deutsche Volkstimme," the organ of the German single taxers. It is published fortnightly, at Berlin, N. Arkonaplatz, 8, Prussia, for 76 cents per half year.

—The August Arena (Alliance Publishing Co., 569 Fifth avenue, New York) opens with an interesting paper on transportation franchises, by Frank S. Monnett, whose faithful prosecution of the Standard Oil trust while attorney general of Ohio prevented his renomination by his party. Mr. Monnett argues for the perpetual and inalienable control of the state over highways.

—"The Single Tax," (published at 13 Dundas street, Glasgow, Scotland; is 6d to Great Britain and Ireland, and 50 cents to the United States, Canada and South America), is a monthly newspaper devoted to the cause of taxing land values. Being published in a city where this doctrine is so popular that it controls the city government and only awaits parliamentary permission to be adopted, the paper is a very live publication. In the July number, just at hand, it pays especial attention to the recent report of the royal commission on local taxation. The remarkable supplementary report by Judge O'Connor is given almost in full, and copious extracts are made from the almost equally remarkable minority report by Lord Balfour, of Burleigh, and three of his colleagues. American students of fiscal and social questions who wish to obtain regular and full information of tax movements in connection with such subjects in Great Britain will find this inexpensive Scottish monthly invaluable. It is edited with intelligent discrimination and conservatism, yet vigorously and with human interest.

Volume III of The Public

Complete Volumes, including index, sent post paid at Regular Subscription price, \$1.00.

Bound Volumes Now Ready. Price, \$2.00. Express charges to be paid by consignee. Address, PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

For any Book on Earth Old or New

Write to H. H. TIMBY, Book Hunter, Conneaut, Ohio. CATALOGUES FREE.

The Public

Is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, 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.

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY.
1501 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:
THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES A. BUTLER,
ATTORNEY AT LAW.
Suite 420, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.
Long Distance Telephone, Central 3361.

HARRIS F. WILLIAMS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
305 Chamber of Commerce Building,
CHICAGO.

WALTER A. LANTZ, T. G. McELLIGOTT
Telephone Central 2354.

LANTZ & McELLIGOTT,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
1025-1030 Unity Building, 79 Dearborn St., Chicago.

CHARLES H. ROBERTS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,
614 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Houston.

EWING & RING,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
HOUSTON, TEXAS.
Presley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.
Tel. Call, 1358 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015
NEW YORK.

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

Emerson Binding Covers in which THE PUBLIC may be filed away week by week, making at the end of the year a reasonably well-bound volume, may be ordered through this office. Price, 80 cents, postpaid. tf