

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 8, 1901.

Number 166.

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.

The price of beef is advancing. But let no one complain. This is a peculiarity of the McKinley brand of prosperity. Bigger incomes for trusts; heavier living expenses for their victims.

Mrs. Nancy B. Irving's offer of \$1,000 reward for any successful business man who can conduct his business for one month without lying, has stirred up a tremendous commotion in Chicago. The offer seems to have rubbed a raw spot. It has also called out many responses. Two bank presidents, presuming upon Mrs. Irving's inability to make a conclusive test, have applied for the reward. But cold chills must have vibrated up and down their respective spines when she icily announced her purpose to look into their tax records before paying either of them the money.

The Chicago grand jury, which has refused to indict Dr. Dowie, merits the strongest kind of commendation. The whole local press was mendaciously hot upon Dowie's trail. It hounded him as only a sensational and irresponsible band of newspapers can. Then the public officials took up the cry, and with no legal grounds for action strove to secure an indictment as they seldom strive when real but unsensational crime stalks abroad. Added to this were the indefensible action of the financiers, and the hue and cry of doctors and clergymen whose professional prejudices rather than their civic obligations govern their opinions on questions of public order. To cap all, Dowie often makes himself appear to be a character who would naturally excite in the thought-

less an itch to indict him whether there were legal grounds for it or not. Yet the grand jury, unlike the coroner and his jury, has calmly, judicially and sensibly decided that as Dowie has committed no crime it will find no indictment.

In Florida a negro was charged a few days ago with assaulting and murdering a white woman. He sought refuge with his own race, and they, law and order fashion, brought him to the jail to stand trial. But he was immediately seized by a white mob, carried to the place of his alleged crime, saturated with oil, and burned at the stake. Which, say you, are better fit for self-government—the white mob who committed, and their white neighbors who approved, that infamously barbaric defiance of law, or the negroes who brought this alleged criminal of their own race to the officers of justice, supposing in their simplicity that he would have the protection of the law and its officers and of a law-abiding community?

American patriotism blazed forth in newspaper head lines with meteoric splendor when the cable told of the glorious victory of William C. Whitney's "great brown colt" at the Derby races. This typographical illumination was enhanced in brilliancy by the lustrous fact that an American jockey had made "the nation's glory all the greater," because he "was the winning horse's rider." When American horses and horse fanciers and horse jockies win British horse races so gloriously, it really doesn't matter how much the administration and the supreme court (5 to 4) drag "old glory" through imperial mud.

The state tax commission of Minnesota has a problem to solve. It

must draft a bill for improving tax methods without coming in collision with the state constitution, which requires the general property tax. Since the commissioners appear to realize the absurd injustice of personal property taxes—unjust because, for one thing, they fall with excessive weight upon farming communities; absurd because farming communities nevertheless demand them—this problem is not wholly unlike that of the immovable body and the irresistible force. Perhaps the easiest way out of the difficulty would be to devise some scheme of constitutional franchise taxation sufficient to raise state revenues, and then recommend a constitutional amendment permitting local option in taxation for local revenues.

At the recent Australian commonwealth elections of members of the federal parliament, the Hare system of proportional representation was used throughout the island state of Tasmania. This was the largest scale on which the proportional method of voting has ever been tested. Proportional voting, it should be understood, is a system under which electors may vote for as many different parliamentary candidates as they wish, indicating which is their first choice, which their second, which their third, and so on. When the ballots are counted, the candidates who are found to be the first choice of a majority of the voters are at once declared elected. If they have more votes than they need, these surplus ballots are counted for their respective second choices. Then third choices are taken up, and so on until the full parliamentary delegation has been chosen by a majority of votes for each. At the election in Tasmania the total number of spoiled

ballots was less than 1,000—no more than were usually spoiled under the old system. As it happened, the persons elected were those who received the largest number, each, of first choice votes. The election, therefore, failed to exemplify some of the more complex features of the system. But as only three candidates out of the 11 senators and representatives to be elected received a majority of first choice votes, the work of assigning second choice votes became necessary. The system seems to have worked satisfactorily. Its principal advantage consists in destroying the effectiveness of party nominations. Voters can support their first choice for an office without risking, as under our system they do, the defeat of their second choice as well as their first. That is, they can vote for a minority candidate without "throwing away" their vote.

On the whole, the federal elections in Australia do not turn out to have been so bad for the free traders as they were at first reported. These elections, held on the 31st of March, were for the members of the first federal parliament. The first reports to come to this country were in substance that the free traders had carried the senate and the protectionists the lower house. Later reports put this somewhat differently. The Barton ministry, which is protectionist, has a majority of 12 in the lower house, and is in a minority of two in the senate. That would seem to be only another way of stating what the first reports stated. But it is not so. The Barton ministry represents other political interests besides protection, and part of its support in the federal parliament comes from free traders who are with the protection ministry only on other points. This ministerial party in parliament is described as the most heterogeneous fiscal following a ministry ever had, ranging from protectionists, who are commercial prohibitionists, through all the gradations of high and low tariff men to absolute and avowed free traders. Competent

Australian judges of economic conditions predict that the ministry cannot survive its tariff proposals. If it proposes protection it is likely to lose six or seven of its free trade following, men who are anxious for a good excuse to break away. If it leans far enough toward free trade to hold these members, it will lose protection support.

Whether the present ministry succeeds in carrying a tariff measure, or resigns, and Mr. Reid, the opposition leader, forms an anti-protection ministry, in either event it is not probable that the measure will satisfy either party. It will be fought over at the next election, three years hence. What the result of that election will be, cannot, of course, be foretold; but free traders are now confident that they will go back with a majority. Even in Victoria, which was always protectionist as a colony, before the federation was formed, the free trade campaign last winter was aggressive and effective. A superfluity of local and minor issues kept the free trade delegation to the federal parliament from Victoria down to four out of a total of 23; but three of the other 19, though provisionally supporters of the Barton ministry, and therefore nominally protectionists, are in fact free traders, and at the next election the Victoria free traders will probably secure at least ten seats.

One of the contests in Victoria in the late election, though lost to the free traders, will almost certainly be won by them at the next trial of strength. They were led with great ability by Max Hirsch, who is conceded to have won a moral victory in what was regarded at first as a hopeless campaign. The district was strongly protectionist to begin with. Then there were adverse political complications locally. Piled on top of these obstacles was the fact that Mr. Hirsch is a German, and the Germans in Australia have excited political prejudice by sympathizing with the Boers. On top of that again was

a widespread hostility to Mr. Hirsch among farmers, because he is a famous Australian single tax advocate, and the farmers had been taught that as such he sought to put all the burdens of taxation upon their class. But in spite of these apparently insuperable obstacles, besides the difficulties in the way of a poor man's reaching an electorate of some 7,000 in a country so sparsely settled that he was obliged to travel 1,800 miles with horse and buggy, and 3,000 miles by train, in order to make 150 speeches, Mr. Hirsch soon had his adversary completely routed. This was so evident that the adversary's party withdrew him, although he was conceded to be their strongest man in the district, with but a single exception. The stronger man was put forward in his place. Even then Mr. Hirsch would have won the seat, but for the local ambitions of a candidate of Mr. Hirsch's own party for a seat in what we should call the state legislature, from the legislative district of Mr. Hirsch's new opponent. Mr. Hirsch's opponent had three times defeated that candidate, and was even then occupying the legislative seat; so, in order to get him out of the way, the legislative candidate and his friends threw their votes to Hirsch's opponent. This, and this alone, defeated Mr. Hirsch. He carried every legislative district but his adversary's, and would have carried that had not his own party support in that district been diverted from him, as already explained, to promote his adversary out of the way. As it was, Mr. Hirsch had 3,091 votes in the federal parliamentary district, to 3,632 for his adversary. In consequence of his having polled so large a vote and being defeated by a majority so narrow, together with his having made an astonishingly effective free trade and single tax campaign, his return to parliament at the next election is regarded as certain.

There were remarkable developments elsewhere in these Australian elections. So completely had the

war fever died down that at the local parliamentary elections, even in Melbourne, pro-Boers were successful at the polls; and in Queensland "patriotic" labor members were dropped by the voters, while those who had staunchly opposed the conquest of the Boer republics were successful favorites. In the federal contests, although the state of Victoria remained protective and there is nominally a protection majority in the federal parliament, as stated above, yet New South Wales maintained her free trade attitude, and South Australia, Tasmania, and West Australia, hitherto protectionist, returned majorities against protection. In West Australia the protectionists were politically almost annihilated. In this state as well as in Hirsch's district of Victoria, the single taxers came just in sight of success. The president of the West Australia single tax league, J. A. Thompson, a candidate for the federal senate, was seventh in the poll for a delegation of six. Similar exasperating fortunes attended the single taxers of New South Wales, where Mr. Lonsdale polled over 3,000 on that ticket only to be defeated by four votes. The leading single tax candidate in South Australia was Crawford Vaughan, who ran for the federal house of representatives. The delegation numbers seven, and there were 17 candidates. Mr. Vaughan was a "straight out" single tax candidate, yet he stood eleventh and polled 11,800 votes. It will be peculiarly interesting to American readers to learn that questions of conflict of power between the Australian states and the central government have already taken shape, and that Hamiltonism and Jeffersonism are dictating the direction of party lines of division.

Senator McLaurin, of South Carolina, is doubtless congratulating himself upon having a friend in the governor. This senator, though elected as a democrat and professing still to be a democrat, has voted consistently in the senate in support of President McKinley's administration. He voted

for the Spanish treaty of peace, not as a Hobson's choice, but cordially; he voted for the Puerto Rico bill; he voted for the Platt amendment in opposition to Cuban independence; he voted for the ship subsidy bill; he voted on all important measures with the administration republicans, and has been rewarded with administration patronage; and he is now advocating in South Carolina the adoption of the McKinley policy by the democratic party. Upon this record, Tillman challenged McLaurin's democracy, and the two agreed to carry that issue to the democrats of their state. For that purpose they resigned. But it became instantly clear that Tillman would overwhelmingly defeat this democratic candidate for republican service and honors, and the governor—also a McKinley democrat—interposed with a request that the resignations be withdrawn. McLaurin rectified his mistake at once by withdrawing his, for which he is being heartily applauded by the republican press of the country. The governor relieved him and his republican confreres mightily. After that, of course, nothing remained for Tillman but to withdraw also. It would be especially interesting to learn from Senator McLaurin upon what principle of southern honor he backs out from a joint agreement of honor without consulting the party of the other part.

Temporarily the excitement in Ohio over the tax fight which Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, is making against the railroads and the county auditors has subsided. This, however, is only a lull. In a little while trouble will begin again. Meantime the mayor is preparing to bring other taxation delinquencies to the front. The most interesting proceeding in this respect, so far reported, is the mayor's reorganization of the local board of equalization. This board, as we noted last week, is now controlled by a majority who sympathize with the mayor's views on taxation. It had never used its powers, and was generally made up of very ordinary if not corrupt

men. But Mayor Johnson discovered that the members are appointed by the mayor, two every year, each holding office for three years. The first two vacancies would have occurred the 16th of next July; but that was too far off for Mayor Johnson's purpose. He, therefore, found pleasant and profitable occupation in other city positions for four members, and so made room for four new ones out of a total of six. To these vacancies he has appointed four men who can be relied upon absolutely both for intelligence with reference to matters of taxation and for the necessary moral stamina to resist temptation. The mayor expects that this board will be either legislated out of office, or suppressed by the supreme court as an unconstitutional body. But he says he neither knows nor cares which course is adopted by the tax dodging interests, for the board will have exposed them to the full before it can be disturbed.

As to the political situation, every eye in Ohio appears to be turned upon Cleveland. To average politicians Johnson's political tactics are inexplicable. They supposed at first that he was working either for the governorship or the senatorship. But this theory collapsed when Johnson published a positive statement saying that he was under contract for two years to the people of Cleveland to manage their city affairs and that nothing, not even a governorship or senatorship, could tempt him to quit the mayor's office. Then it was surmised that he had made a combination with John R. McLean, whereby he was to become democratic boss of Ohio and McLean was to go to the senate. The McLean party exposed their willingness to make the combination, by consenting to have the state convention held at Cleveland yet changing to Columbus as soon as Johnson publicly declared war upon McLean. Johnson did declare war upon him, and at the very moment when McLean's friends had consented to a Cleveland convention. For Johnson never fights in the dark. He regards McLean, and justly so, as

an enemy to democracy, who must be driven from party councils if the party is to be democratic; and he was unwilling that McLean should remain in doubt upon that point for a single instant. After all this, the politicians wonder what Johnson does want.

Yet what he wants he makes no pretense of hesitation about asking for. He wants the state convention to adopt such a platform on taxation as was adopted at the Cuyahoga convention. It appears in another column. And he wants it to nominate a candidate for United States senator, so that nobody can buy the seat by corrupting an unpledged legislature. Johnson's political policy is simple. He conceals nothing. Like expert whist players, he regards the advantages of having your friends understand your play as more than offsetting the disadvantages of disclosing it also to your enemies. The only way for friend or enemy to understand Tom L. Johnson is to take him at his word.

An attempt to establish woman suffrage in California through the courts, has been defeated by the decision of Judge Sloss, of San Francisco. He holds that the courts have no authority to make law; that it is their function to construe the law as they find it. This is good doctrine. The pity is that judges do not more consistently conform to it. Judge Sloss accordingly decided that women have no legal right to vote in California. We assume that he is right in that also. As a legal proposition, the suffrage in California doubtless is unjustly limited. In every respect, Judge Sloss's opinion appears to be supported by sound reasoning, except at one point, which, however, was not material to the case. This is where he goes out of his way to say that if the suffrage were placed upon the basis of natural right, the argument that places it there, if carried to its legitimate conclusion—

would result in the franchise being extended to idiots and insane persons

as well as to individuals of sound mind, to infants in arms as well as to men and women of mature years, to criminals as well as to law-abiding citizens.

With all due respect for the California judiciary in general, and Judge Sloss in particular, that is "bosh." It might pass as argument in some magazine studies, but it is unworthy of a trained lawyer. By the same kind of reasoning one might prove that no one has a right to ride a bicycle, because babies and idiots cannot and convicts are not allowed to. Or by reversing the direction of this reasoning, it might be shown that it would be right, or at any rate not wrong, to take the suffrage away from everybody in California.

Two Iowa lawyers have been proceeded against by the supreme court of that state for contempt of court. An important case had been decided against them by this tribunal, under circumstances which indicated that the court had given scant attention to vital points which they had raised. For this reason they filed a petition for rehearing, in which they charged the court with a habit of discriminating against obscure attorneys in favor of those that are distinguished. The petition begins:

With a full realization, from long experience, of the futility of efforts to correct judicial wrong on rehearing, we file this petition because of a sense of duty to make every effort to exonerate our clients from an obviously unrighteous judgment.

Declaring then that "cases should be classified according to their judicial importance, as affecting the rights of the masses, and not with reference to the distinguished ability of counsel," the petition charges that the rights of their clients were disposed of "in a perfunctory manner, without reading the argument." Doubtless this manner of addressing the court warrants the proceedings for contempt which the supreme court judges have instituted. But a question still remains. When lawyers thus deliberately place themselves in contempt of a court, may it not be that the court has de-

served to be held in contempt? It is almost unthinkable that any set of judges should be subjected to the indignity of such criticism, if they had taken pains to make themselves worthy of the respect and confidence of the whole bar. It may be that these two refractory lawyers deserve punishment. It may be that this is necessary, not only to check them, but to make a wholesome example and maintain the dignity of the court. But it is difficult to avoid the conviction that less sensitiveness about judicial dignity, and stronger assurances of judicial fidelity, would serve better than anything else to rebuke contemptuous lawyers and to maintain true judicial dignity. In this particular case, for example, the disrespectful tone of the obnoxious petition is of far less importance than the charges upon which it brings the judges to judgment. The community can get along fairly well, even if somebody does once in awhile make faces at judges; it cannot survive an indolent and unfaithful judiciary.

In a recent report the New York chamber of commerce expresses regret over the failure of the Elsberg local option and apportionment tax plan (see vol. iii., pp. 342, 629, 692) in the New York legislature at its session this year. The plan, as to its apportionment feature, would reduce boards of equalization to clerical bodies, leaving them no discretion. That is accomplished by making the local tax of each locality for one year the basis of the proportion of county and state taxation of that locality for the next year. As to its local option feature, the plan would allow each locality to levy its taxes upon such class of property — personalty, landed improvements, land, or all three—as the people of the locality might prefer. This measure was unanimously approved by the New York chamber of commerce in January last, and in the excellent report of May 2, now before us, which bears the signatures of George F. Seward, Charles S. Fairchild, Alexander E. Orr, John Harsen

Rhoades and Clarence H. Kelsey, as the committee on taxation of the chamber, the committee declares that it—

is no less satisfied now than it was in January that the local option and apportionment plan is the only one by which a just balance of taxation can be secured for the several political divisions of the state.

A Chicago paper, protection of course, boasts of American commerce by comparing it with that of Germany and Great Britain for the year ending December last. The comparison is made in the following table:

	Imports.	Exports.
United Kingdom.....	\$2,548,262,360	\$1,418,347,781
United States	829,019,337	1,453,013,659
Germany	1,322,580,000	1,050,611,000

Germany and the United Kingdom here appear to have a somewhat larger aggregate commerce than the United States; but the excess, proudly observes the paper from which we quote, "is due solely to their greater imports." That is as if a merchant should explain that he had as good a trade as his rivals, and that the fact that theirs appeared to be bigger was "due solely to their greater receipts" from sales. If it is profitable for the United States to import so much less than it exports, then it would be more profitable if it imported nothing. Were that the case, we should have this table:

	Imports.	Exports.
United Kingdom.....	\$2,548,262,360	\$1,418,347,781
United States	0,000,000,000	1,453,013,659
Germany	1,322,580,000	1,050,611,000

But if that were indeed the situation perpetually—all outgo and no income for the United States—would this Chicago paper be boastful? If not, why not? What is the difference between exporting without importing at all, and exporting more than you import? Is it anything but a difference in degree?

The conscience of a Philadelphia woman who owned some Northern Pacific stock which she sold at a heavy advance during the Wall street storm, troubled her so that she returned the profit to her brokers, refusing herself to benefit by it. If this satisfies her conscience it must be harder than her head. That profit, like

nearly all the profits of our complex civilization, is more surely her property than anybody else's. She cannot get it to the persons who are impoverished by her fortune. They cannot possibly be identified. The money therefore is hers, quite as much as if she had found it and no owner could be discovered; and she no more rids herself of responsibility for the evil it represents by returning it to her broker, than she would by spending it for a trip to Europe. Whatever she does with it, she does necessarily not by way of restoration but by way of expenditure. There is but one thing the beneficiaries of inequitable industrial conditions can do to escape the sin of them. It is not to refuse to benefit by them. That at the best is only charity. You get money that you regard as foul and give it away; or you could get it, and you refuse to take it. In either case you divert the foul money from yourself to others who have no more right to it than you have. And this you do as its owner, as the person, that is, who directs its expenditure. You can't help yourself. But if you really think the source of the money is foul, you can avoid responsibility by using all your influence to purify the source. There is nothing else you can do. That is the only possible way in which an individual can repent of social sin.

JAMES A. HERNE.

In the death of James A. Herne, the drama does not suffer alone.

Mr. Herne was an accomplished actor. He had few superiors in any line of the player's work that he engaged in, and in some respects he was without an equal. To the accomplishments of a skilled player, he brought also the genius of a great play writer. If a greater constructor of American plays out of American material has yet appeared, his claims to superiority have not been recognized.

But Mr. Herne was more than a great playwright and skillful actor. He was an intelligent and conscientious student of sociological and political subjects and an eloquent orator

who had serious things to say. Though he modestly cherished his honorable reputation as an actor, and was justly proud of his truly remarkable achievements as a dramatic author, yet if he himself had chosen his chief title to immortality in the memory of his brethren, he would doubtless have turned to another phase of his life. He would have named his part in that most genuinely radical and rapidly advancing movement for industrial order and consequent social regeneration to which Henry George gave his work and name.

The very first of his profession to be deeply stirred by George's clarion call, Mr. Herne became a devoted disciple of this "prophet of San Francisco" nearly two decades ago, and so remained during all the years until his death. This devotion, coupled with unusual charms of oratory, made him a welcome guest in many pulpits where the spirit of the Nazarene lingers, and did much not only to promote the cause he pleaded for, but also to break down the barriers between wholesome play-acting and true religion. The fame of an actor can hardly survive the generation that knew him. A playwright's work may somewhat longer keep his memory green. But when Herne the player and Herne the author shall have been forgotten, this modest, sincere, able, useful and lovable man of the theater will be affectionately remembered as a companion and coworker of Henry George.

NEWS

Owing to the supreme court decisions reported last week, intimations were for several days thrown out from Washington that a special session of congress might be called to legislate with reference to the Philippines. Mr. Root, the secretary of war, was reported to be an advocate of a special session, while Mr. Knox, the attorney general, opposed it. In the De Lima case it had been decided that ceded territory ceases to be foreign immediately upon the ratification of the treaty of cession, and that thereupon the general tariff act imposing duties upon foreign imports no longer operates between that territory and the United States proper. This be-

ing so, the policy of the administration with reference to the Philippines is illegal, since the Dingley law duties on imports from the Philippines are being collected. Moreover, according to the De Lima case, the president's military authority in the ceded territory as commander in chief ended with the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain, so he could not make laws on the basis of military necessity. But in the Downes case the court decided that congress may legislate without constitutional restraint with reference to new territory. This, however, congress has not done regarding the Philippines, except by the Spooner act, which assumes to delegate congressional power to the president and is therefore of doubtful validity. For these reasons it was proposed to call an extra session for the purpose of securing an act of congress for the Philippines like the Foraker act with reference to Puerto Rico, which the supreme court had upheld in the Downes case. In opposing that proposition the attorney general urged that the Philippine case differs from the Puerto Rico case, and that if congress were to assemble in special session it would be as much in the dark as to its power as the president is as to his, with reference to the Philippines. What the attorney general, therefore, proposed was that the president maintain in form a military occupation of the Philippines at least until congress acts in regular session. By doing this it is hoped that the administration will be in position to claim before the supreme court that although the Philippines ceased to be foreign territory immediately upon the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain, yet, owing to the resistance of the inhabitants the military character of the American occupation, and consequently the military authority of the president as commander in chief, continue. The attorney general's suggestion was adopted at a cabinet meeting on the 4th, after which the following semiofficial announcement was given out at the white house:

The president has determined that existing conditions do not require or warrant calling congress together during the present summer or making any change in the policy hitherto pursued and announced in regard to the Philippine islands.

As the cabinet decision intimates, there is no intention of abandoning the plan of instituting civil government in the Philippines on the 1st of July.

But this will not now be done with the flourish that was originally intended. Civil government there will assume a tentative character, with the military authority still in the ascendant, nominally if not actually, and will so remain until congress acts and the supreme court sheds more light upon the possibilities of a colonial establishment.

On the question of Philippine citizenship, an expression was drawn from the government on the 1st by an application which two Filipinos in London made to the American embassy there for a passport to enable them to travel in Russia. Instructions were cabled for to Washington, and Secretary Hay directed the American ambassador to issue passports describing the applicants as "residents of the Philippine islands, and as such entitled to the protection of the United States."

From the Philippines there came a report on the 30th of a skirmish in which a surgeon was killed; and on the 4th a Manila dispatch told of an interview between Aguinaldo and the adjutant to Gen. Cailles. The Filipino adjutant said that Gen. Cailles did not believe that Aguinaldo had been captured, but supposed that Aguinaldo's proclamation was an American forgery. According to the Manila dispatch, Aguinaldo sent word back to Gen. Cailles advising him to surrender.

The Chinese situation, to which reference was last made in these columns on page 89, has advanced somewhat, though the finality is not yet. No action had been taken by the powers at the time of the last report, with reference to China's reply to the indemnity demanded, in which she offered 15,000,000 taels (about \$10,500,000) annually for 30 years. They subsequently agreed upon an indemnity of 450,000,000 taels (\$327,000,000), with four per cent. interest until paid, and this demand the Chinese envoys have acceded to. The bonds are to be secured by an increase of five per cent. in maritime customs, by a tax on salt, and by inland customs. Accordingly affairs have been put in readiness by the powers for the return of the Chinese court to Peking. The administration of the city is to be transferred gradually to the Chinese officials during the pres-

ent month, and the evacuation is now going on.

An end to the ministerial crisis in Japan (page 89) has been reached by the formation of a new cabinet. Count Yamagata, who had been invited to form a cabinet, upon the resignation of Marquis Ito, who had succeeded him last fall, was unable or unwilling to undertake the responsibility, and it was turned over to Viscount Katsura, who succeeded in the task on the 3d.

Once more public interest is startled into activity by the Boer war. Just as the people of Great Britain were again settling down to the conviction that only occasional and harmless guerrilla skirmishes remained to remind them of hostilities, and that these, too, would soon cease, the London Times published a three-column list of British killed and wounded in engagements which the government had never reported. That was on the 30th, and on the 31st a dispatch was received from Gen. Kitchener in which he reported desperate fighting and heavy British losses at Vlakkfontein, within 40 miles of Johannesburg, on the Durban-Johannesburg railroad. Gen. Kitchener's dispatch, dated the 30th, is its own best commentary. He said:

Gen. Dixon's force at Vlakkfontein was attacked yesterday by Delarey's forces and there was severe fighting. The enemy was eventually driven off with heavy loss, leaving 35 dead. I regret that our casualties also were severe. The killed and wounded numbered 174. Four officers were killed.

Later reports of British losses put them at 6 officers and 51 men killed, 6 officers and 115 men wounded, and 1 officer and 7 men missing.

That dispatch was followed on the 4th by another in which Gen. Kitchener told briefly of the surrender on the 2d, by the British, of Jamestown, in Cape Colony, to a body of Boers, after four hours' fighting. As Gen. Kitchener explains it—

the town guard and local volunteers were overpowered before our pursuing columns could come up. Our casualties were three killed and two wounded. The Boer loss is said to have been greater. The stores were looted, but the garrison was released. Have placed Gen. French in charge of operations in Cape Colony.

President Kruger was reported on the 30th from Brussels to have peti-

tioned the international arbitration court to convene and arbitrate the issues involved in the South African war.

Coming back to American affairs, the Cuban controversy looms up again in consequence of the explanations of the Platt amendment which the Cuban convention inserted in their acceptance of it, as stated last week. These explanations the president declines to reaffirm. The matter came before a cabinet meeting at Washington on the 31st, at the close of which Secretary Root cabled to Gen. Wood that the president and cabinet decline to accept the Cuban constitution; that the declination applies to every part of the instrument as well as to the Platt amendment part; that the convention must reassemble and adopt the Platt amendment in its exact form as it passed congress and without interpreting clauses; and that the establishment of the Cuban republic and the evacuation of the island by United States troops will be delayed until the terms fixed by congress are accepted. A written statement to the same effect was mailed to Gen. Wood on the 2d. Havana dispatches of the 5th tell of a secret meeting of the convention on the 4th, at which it was tentatively decided to reaffirm the previous decision of the convention after Secretary Root's written refusal to accept it shall have been received.

There is an unexpected turn in the Tillman-McLaurin senatorial contest in South Carolina, reported at page 123 last week. Senator Tillman, it will be recalled, had denounced Senator McLaurin as a republican. When McLaurin resented this, saying he was as he had always been a representative of South Carolina democracy, Tillman challenged him to resign and go before the people. "If you are a democrat," said Tillman, "I am not," and "if the people reelect you I will take it as notice that they don't want me." McLaurin responded that in challenging him to resign Tillman had been careful not to resign himself, whereupon Tillman challenged McLaurin to a joint resignation. This was at a meeting at Gaffney, on the 25th, where McLaurin had been advocating imperialism. The immediate result was the joint resignation reported last week. But when this resignation reached Gov. McSweeney, he returned it, urging the two senators to reconsider, and warning them

that if they did not he would not call democratic primaries to secure a popular expression on the senatorship, as they requested, but would appoint other men to fill the vacancies. McLaurin promptly withdrew his resignation, saying:

For the sake of the peace, prosperity and happiness of the people of this state I am willing to hold to my commission as United States senator and to continue to serve as I have done in the past to the best of my ability.

Prior to learning of McLaurin's individual withdrawal of his name from the joint resignation, Senator Tillman wrote the governor protesting against his interference with a popular expression of opinion upon the vital questions upon which Senator McLaurin votes in the senate with the republicans. He said:

You declare the people are entitled to at least one year's freedom from political battles and bitterness. That is very desirable, but our race has ever thought war preferable to dishonor. What you consider a calamity would be hailed by thousands as an opportunity to get rid of a traitor who now disgraces the commonwealth. The session of congress beginning next December marks an era in the history of our republic, and the patriots who will then and there inaugurate a struggle for the restoration of our free institutions will need every voice and every vote that can be had. The fact that the republicans have a good majority in the senate does not alter the case in the least. The recent decision in the supreme court promulgating the damnable doctrine that this republic, whose bedrock principle is the "consent of the governed," can acquire by conquest or purchase territories and peoples, to be controlled and taxed without representation through congressional absolutism, must be met and plans must be laid for the battle to the death. Yet with such a crisis on hand the governor of this grand old state appears willing to have the state misrepresented and its voice silenced because its two senators stand on opposite sides of the question. I claim to represent the people. The result of the Gaffney meeting has brought Senator McLaurin within reach of his constituents. There is nothing personal in my feelings toward Senator McLaurin. I speak bluntly because I have taught myself to call things by their names. Material prosperity and progress may be worth more than strict adherence to principles and loyalty, but I cannot see it in that light. Holding this view, I decline, for

the present, to withdraw my resignation. It was tendered to obtain the resignation of Senator McLaurin and will not be withdrawn till he has shown his unwillingness to let our people pass on his conduct this year instead of next.

But McLaurin's subsequent withdrawal left Tillman no alternative, and, repeating that he had "no other motive or purpose in resigning except to force McLaurin," he reluctantly accepted the situation and withdrew his own resignation.

In view of the great machinists' strike for a nine-hour day with undiminished wages, which began on the 20th of May (page 105), the annual convention of the International Association of Machinists, which met at Toronto on the 3d, is of special importance. In referring to the strike, President James O'Connell, in his annual address, indicated the policy of the organization. It is to concentrate all the energies of the trade upon manufacturing establishments for the present, but to extend the strike to railways at an opportune time. Mr. O'Connell said:

Machinists employed in the railway service have been more than anxious to take part in the movement begun on May 20, but we have felt that many roads could not be sufficiently prepared by that date, and have advised against such a move, except in special cases. Great progress has been made for the last three months by our organization with the railway machinists, and I recommend that a date be set for the inauguration of the nine-hour day for machinists employed in the railway service.

NEWS NOTES.

—The Hall of Fame at New York was formally dedicated on the 3d.

—President and Mrs. McKinley reached Washington from San Francisco on the 3d.

—The sixth annual convention of the National Association of Manufacturers met at Detroit on the 4th.

—The Ohio democratic convention is called to meet at Columbus on the 9th and 10th of July. Charles P. Salen, director of public works of Cleveland, has been selected as temporary chairman.

—At the International Miners' congress, in session at London, a resolution inviting the United Mine Workers of America to become members and to send delegates to the annual meetings was adopted on the 29th.

—The National Association of Railroad Commissioners met at San Fran-

cisco on the 5th. The committee on legislation advocated laws against railway monopoly and the enactment by congress of the Cullom bill.

—James A. Herne, the actor, playwright and single tax orator, died at New York on the 2d, of pneumonia. The funeral ceremony, which took place on the 4th, was extremely simple. Augustus Thomas and John S. Crosby made the addresses.

—Promoters of the second social and political conference, to open on the 28th at Detroit, announce that there are abundant indications of a large and notable attendance of representatives of all shades of political, economic and religious belief.

—The statement last week, on page 123, that the Buffalo tax conference had recommended local option in taxation was an error of a Buffalo paper. This resolution was referred back to the committee on resolutions, to be reported upon at the next conference.

—On the 29th a complimentary dinner to Senator James W. Bucklin, of Colorado, author of the "Bucklin bill" for land value taxation in that state, was given by the Henry George association of Chicago at the Auditorium. Judge Edward F. Dunne, of the circuit court, presided.

—Delegates from the New York chamber of commerce were banqueted on the 5th at the Grocers' Guild hall, London, by the London chamber of commerce. Lord Brassey presided, and multi-millionaires were so plentiful at table that mere millionaires counted for nothing.

—The monthly statement of the treasury department for May shows on hand May 31:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000 00
Available cash balance.....	162,338,469 16
Total	\$312,338,469 16
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1900.....	305,705,654 78
Increase	\$6,632,814 38

—The treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the federal government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1900, to and including May 1, 1901, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff	\$220,377,862 52
Internal Revenue..	280,082,608 85
Miscellaneous	33,054,429 79
	\$535,514,401 16
Expense:	
Civil and Misc.....	\$114,278,088 98
War	134,650,912 25
Navy	55,923,705 60
Indians	9,935,975 06
Pensions	130,266,930 26
Interest	31,871,654 71
	\$476,927,266 81
Surplus	\$58,587,134 35

—On the 29th the thirty-third annual convention of the National American Woman Suffrage association met at Minneapolis and remained in session until the 5th. The election took place on the 4th when the following officers were chosen: President, Mrs.

Carrie Chapman Catt; vice president at large, Rev. Anna Howard Shaw; recording secretary, Miss Alice Stone Blackwell; corresponding secretary, Miss Kate Gordon; treasurer, Mrs. Harriet Taylor Upton; first auditor, Miss Laura Clay; honorary presidents, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony.

—At Columbus, on the 2d, the Ohio Single Tax league held its annual convention. William Radcliffe, of Youngstown, was elected president; J. S. Pomerene, of Cleveland, vice president; J. B. Vining, of Cleveland, secretary and treasurer, and F. H. How, of Columbus; O. P. Hyde, of Marietta; W. W. Kile, of Dayton; B. A. Roloson, of Dayton; F. T. Moreland, of Portsmouth, and S. Danziger, of Cincinnati, the governing board. Mr. Vining informed the convention that Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, would hereafter disburse his contributions to the single tax cause through this organization. A donation of \$100 was made by the convention to the movement in Colorado.

—Dr. Geo. D. Herron, formerly professor of applied Christianity at Iowa college, Grinnell, Ia., was on the 4th expelled from the ministry of the Congregational church, by a council of the Grinnell Congregational association, upon charges of unclerical conduct in having deserted his wife and children. Dr. Herron declined to participate in the trial beyond submitting an explanatory letter to the council. The judgment of dismissal was based upon divorce proceedings brought against Dr. Herron in the Iowa courts by his first wife last spring, upon oral testimony at the church trial, and upon Dr. Herron's letter to the church council, which that body regarded as heretical with reference to the sacrament of marriage.

MISCELLANY

HUMANITY IS ONE.

There shall come from out this noise of strife and groaning

A broader and a juster brotherhood,
A deep equality of aim, postponing
All selfish seeking to the general good.
There shall come a time when each shall
to another
Be as Christ would have him, brother unto
brother.

There shall come a time when brotherhood
grows stronger

Than the narrow bounds which now dis-
tract the world;
When the cannons roar and the trumpets
blare no longer,
And the ironclad rusts and battle flags
are furled;
When the bars of creed and speech and
race which sever,

Shall be fused in one humanity forever.
—Sir Lewis Morris.

SOCIAL STABILITY AND SECURITY.

From an editorial in Public Policy of Feb. 2.

Not all property that is legally acquired is honestly acquired. Those who hold it do so only because the people are more honest than they are. It is the climax of insolence when such property owners attempt to thwart the people's purpose to so change all laws that there shall be no possibility of any lacuna between legal acquisitions and honest acquisitions. An honest man wants only what he can honestly acquire, but he wants the conditions under which he must live and work so arranged that, using such skill, energy and thrift as he can command, he can supply all reasonable wants for himself and family. What he wants in this respect is right and just. In the proper satisfaction of such wants there is stability and security for society.

There is no discrepancy between moral and economic law. It is a far cry through nineteen centuries, from Christ until now, but those who hear his voice now are as the sands of the sea compared with the few, though called a multitude, to whom He first spoke. The moral law teaches honesty as a principle. Economic law enforces honesty as a practice. Christ's spirit lives in every honest act.

UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL.

HE DICKERS FOR THE BOER REPUBLICS.

Printed from the Original Manuscript.

Dear John: Say, I've got the darndest supreme court I ever had! A drunken man couldn't mix it up worse! What do you suppose they have done? Why, joined the McKinley revolution of 1900! They have! Decided a man may be a citizen for taxing purposes; but not for liberty. Ain't that cute? Gray-headed, too, some of 'em. Why, it took me seven years to lick that idea out of you, John. Hundred years ago! Do you mind the time, Johnnie?

Say, I'm payin' these fellows too much money fer the goods. I can get as good decisions by flippin' a cent—all on one side, too. The tea's all out of Boston harbor, John, I guess; but still my supreme court ought to belong to you.

What do you say to a trade? I'll give you my supreme court for the Boer republics—even deal! It's a good supreme court, too—fer an empire, John; not strong on Magna Charta, but h—(that's "heavy") on vested rights of property. Besides, you're not living happy with the Boers,

John. They are little, sour apples—tell tales on you; say you don't play fair; shoot a little close, and they cut off the tail of your horse Prestige.

What do you say? It's a gold brick Chamberlain and Milner sold you, John; and you ain't done payin'. I don't want the Boers for gold. I want 'em fer '76 grit, which you're not needin'. I want 'em fer seed to sow in my republican party where the growth has run out.

If you want boot, I'll go you that. I've a married men's club in Kansas who vow not to kiss their wives; and another club formin' to take their job. I'll go you both clubs and the supreme court—all three—fer the deal!

What do you say?

UNCLE SAM.

HOW MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES WORK IN CLEVELAND.

From the Cleveland Plaindealer of May 29.

Clerks and others now employed in the city hall are working as few of their predecessors have worked. They want to hold their jobs, and they know, they have a notion, there is only one way to do it—that is work.

The emphatic declaration of Mayor Johnson that municipal employees would not only have to do what was laid out for them to do, but do it at once, was without precedent in the municipal building, and almost revolutionary.

At a private meeting with his directors the other day the mayor said: "Gentlemen, I am determined that the affairs of the city, while I am mayor, shall be conducted just as though this were a private corporation and I its president. While I do not intend to interfere with directors in the selection and conduct of subordinates, I do insist that every man shall do his work and do it right. I depend on the directors to assist me in managing the affairs of the city economically and well.

"By economy I do not mean that any man should be paid less than he is worth or that there should be any ridiculous pruning of expenses. We want the best for the money, whether it is labor or material, and what is best for the city. There must be no extravagance, and no favors shown, and if any director finds that any man in his department is incompetent, careless or shirking his duties, I expect the director to dismiss him.

"I will hold each director strictly responsible for the proper management of his department, and I say

to you frankly, gentlemen, no sentiment will swerve me."

If anyone imagines that the directors listened to this talk and then went back to their roll tops and their Havanas and forgot all about it, he should "hang around the hall" a few days.

When any order is issued from the mayor's office to the head of any department the director, or some subordinate to whom he transmits it, starts right off on a run to execute it. There's no stopping to chatter with anyone on the way, and there's no putting off until to-morrow.

That "git up and dust" spirit that the mayor has injected into all the city hall employes is made more effective by the fact they feel the absolute certainty that no amount of political pull will save them if they are found derelict.

STRIKES AND MONOPOLIES.

In nine cases out of ten strikes are foredoomed to failure anyway. The plan of protecting the interests of labor by organization is weak in one vital point—the organizers cannot secure a complete monopoly of the product they have to sell—namely, labor. They are like a trust which is organized without controlling some natural monopoly. Such a trust will inevitably go to pieces, just as a labor organization which can only imperfectly control the supply of men competent to do the work required will go to pieces when its strength is tested. The trust will try to maintain its artificial monopoly by buying up competitors, but this course only encourages new competitors to arise, and the end is inevitable, unless the trust can secure some special privilege through legislation or by corrupt alliance with railroads. The labor organization will try to maintain its monopoly by enrolling all who wish to work in its trade and submitting them to its rules, but there will always be bidders for places outside of its membership. In critical moments the labor union tries to protect its members against destructive competition by violence. Then public sympathy is alienated and the militia called out. The trust in like case has been known to resort to violence, too, by blowing up rival refineries, for instance, or committing wholesale bribery. But these methods do not in the end profit the trust any more than rioting profits the striker. Neither money trust nor labor trust can compete unless founded upon control of some natural or legal monopoly,

and there cannot be a natural monopoly of men, and the labor unions have not enough influence in congress to secure legislation which would give them a legal monopoly.

Instead of striving after the unattainable, the labor organizations would better turn their attention to constructive politics and work for the destruction of all artificial monopolies founded upon legislation and the transfer to public ownership of all natural monopolies. Then they could meet employers upon a more nearly equal footing. Some people talk now of the power of the organized workers in the employ of the United States Steel corporation, or steel trust, being greater than that of the corporation, and we are asked to pause and wonder at the thought of what should happen if all those brawny workers should refuse to go on making steel for Mr. Schwab and go to making it for their own profit. That is the sort of utterance on labor questions that is very popular with writers and speakers who wish to flatter workingmen, while at the same time doing the service of their employers. It ignores the fact that the steel trust controls the mines and railroads. If we can conceive of the workmen by a system of cooperation raising the capital to erect mills, equip them with machinery and build steamboats, we would find them stopped at that point. They could not get iron, for the trust controls the supply—mines being a natural monopoly. They could get no railway transportation, for the trust controls the railroads—a natural monopoly buttressed by special legislative privilege. How would the trust come out in such a contest? As no organization can control the supply of men it would in time import enough labor to resume operations, while the best efforts of its former workmen would be impotent to overcome its monopoly of the source of production or means of transportation.—Willis J. Abbot, in Chicago Daily News of May 18.

THE DEMOCRATIC DEMOCRACY OF OHIO.

Following is the platform of the democratic party of Cuyahoga county, O., the county in which Cleveland is situated. It was adopted by the regular county convention on Saturday, May 25, 1901, under the leadership of Tom L. Johnson, and is to form the basis of the platform demands of Johnson's supporters in the coming state convention at Columbus.

We, the democrats of Cuyahoga county, in convention assembled, declare our allegiance to the time-honored principles of the party.

In approaching a campaign in which national issues are not involved, we restrict our declaration of principles to matters of state and local concern.

The most important question before the people is the growth of public service corporations and their absorption of privileges from the public, which are used by them without public accounting or supervision, and, in large part, without adequate return to the people.

For the purpose of conserving the rights of private property, both individual and corporate, and at the same time protecting the interests of the whole people from the encroachments of great aggregations of capital enjoying monopolistic privileges without accountability to the people and based upon public grants, and for the equalizing among all classes of citizens of the public burdens necessary to be borne, we demand:

1. That all property shall be appraised by assessing boards whose members shall be in session for at least a part of each year, whose proceedings and deliberations shall be open to the public, that power be given to employ a representative to present the interests of the public in hearings before these boards, and that in making assessments all properties shall be appraised at not less than their salable value.

2. That the present laws for assessing the property of steam railroads be so changed that these properties must be assessed at not less than their salable value as going concerns, and that the present evasion of just taxation by the railroad companies be prevented.

3. That the acceptance of free passes or other favors from railroads by public officers or employes shall be adequate ground for vacating the offices held by them.

4. That all public service corporations be required by law to make sworn public reports, and that the power of visitation and public report over such corporations be given to the proper state and local auditing officers to the end that the true value of the privileges held by them may be made plain to the people.

5. That fraud in party primaries, when held under general election law, should be prevented by joint primaries, held at the same time and place and using a single ballot for all parties, and be conducted by the officers authorized to conduct general elections, and that the provisions govern-

ing general elections should apply to primary elections.

6. That until United States senators can be elected by popular vote, nominations for senators be made by state conventions.

7. That no renewal, or extension of time, of any street railroad or other public service franchise shall be valid until the ordinance providing for it be ratified at a special election called therefor after its passage by the municipal council.

We call upon all democratic candidates for the legislature to secure, so far as they can, the enactment of these principles into law, as we believe them necessary for the protection of the rights and interests of all the people.

We instruct our delegates to the state convention to make every effort to secure the embodiment of the foregoing principles in the platform there to be adopted.

BRITISH RECONCENTRATION.

From the London Times of April 22, 1901.

Sir Thomas Dyke Acland, chairman of the committee of the South African women and children distress fund, writes on behalf of the committee, April 20: We venture to appeal once again to the British public on behalf of suffering non-combatants. There are undoubtedly many persons who have not yet realized that under the special circumstances under which the war has been carried on, a very large proportion of the women and children of the two colonies, covering an area far exceeding that of the British isles, have perforce been swept away out of their homes and collected into large camps, where they have entirely to depend for maintenance upon the military authorities, whose hands and resources are already fully occupied with the necessary provision of the troops. Of these circumstances it has been an inevitable consequence that their hardships have become terrible. This distress has touched the hearts of those who have seen it. We read, for instance, in the Times of March 25, of a general at Belfast, who, though not a rich man, handed £50 from his own pocket to the women's camp there. It is difficult to give any very precise information, but we may quote from an eye-witness, who says, speaking of the children: "In one tent I saw a six-months' baby gasping its life out on its mother's knee. The doctor had given it powders in the morning, but it had taken nothing since; there were also two or three others drooping and sick in the tent.

In the next, a child recovering from the measles, sent back from the hospital before it could walk, lay stretched on the ground, white and wan, while three or four others were lying about. In another a dear little chap of four had nothing left of him but his great brown eyes and white teeth; from which the lips were drawn back, too thin to close. I cannot describe what it is to see these children lying about in a state of collapse. It is just exactly like faded flowers thrown away. And one has to stand and look on at such misery, and be able to do nothing."

Though many of the officers in charge of the different places are really kind and do what they can to help, frequently the women are in want of almost the absolute necessities of life. In some cases there is so little fuel that on many days people cannot cook at all their scanty rations of raw meat, meal and coffee; while we learn that clothing is very scarce, some women having made petticoats out of thick, rough brown blankets, and nearly all the children have nothing left but a thin print frock; while shoes and stockings are long since worn out. Some of those who have recently come into the camps are shortly expecting their confinement, and yet they have to sit all day upon the bare ground, drenched with storms, or try to rest within their tents, while the sun pours down through their single canvas and the temperature reaches 105 degrees, or even 110 degrees; and with the winter, which is shortly coming on, we fear that their sufferings from the cold will be even more intense than the hardships which they have endured in consequence of the excessive heat. Most of them have no mattress on which to lie down, and are subject to any inclemency of the weather. Of course, anything like privacy is out of the question, and there are few, if any, of us who can realize what it is to spend months with very rare chances of washing either body or clothes from scarcity of water and total absence of soap. With the full sanction of Sir Alfred Milner and Lord Kitchener our representative, Miss Hobhouse, has been able to do something to alleviate the worst cases of distress, and the military authorities have shown themselves willing to adopt some of the various suggestions which her woman's wit has enabled her to put forward on behalf of her suffering sisters. For instance, in one camp where the only supply of water was impure, they consented to allow a railway boiler to be used to boil

water for drinking purposes. They have also added her name to an official committee, whom they have appointed to discuss tenders for the supply of necessary clothing. We think it necessary to state that we are well aware that some of the camps are well cared for, but the need of each camp must be considered on its own merits, as the conditions vary so widely, and even where the military may be doing everything in their power to alleviate suffering, very much remains to be done. We believe that we shall not appeal in vain to the common humanity of those who (whatever their opinion may be upon the war) are anxious to prevent as far as possible the infliction of unnecessary suffering upon women and children.

A TRAITOR TO WALL STREET.

An interview published in the Cleveland Plaindealer of June 2.

"Tom Johnson is a traitor to Wall street. That is what Wall street says, and if money can defeat Mr. Johnson's hopes and ambition, they will be defeated."

The speaker was August Lewis, of New York, one of Mayor Johnson's warmest friends. The two were perhaps closer to Henry George during the life of the great single tax apostle than any other two men in the world. Mr. Lewis came to Cleveland the other day from Buffalo, where he had been attending the exposition, to see the mayor. He will remain until the mayor returns from New York. He called at the mayor's tax bureau in the city hall to see the maps and other paraphernalia which the mayor expects to use in his tax reform fight.

"More eyes are on Mr. Johnson today," continued Mr. Lewis, "than on any senator or congressman in the United States. I might say with absolute truth that the people are watching him with greater interest than they are President McKinley. The masses are with him; they like him. They admire his frankness and his daring. Wall street hates him.

"All the money powers in the country are against him. They cannot understand how a man who was one of them in the grand struggle for wealth—how any man having amassed a fortune dare come out and fight the battles of the people, turning against the class to which, by right of his wealth, he belonged. So Wall street says he is a traitor. They don't know the man. They don't know that with Mr. Johnson principle is the one and great thing. He is not a seeker after

glory and he cares nothing for any position except as it may help him to carry out the purposes to which he has devoted his life. To do that he will take advantage of every opportunity.

"I don't like to hear this talk about Mr. Johnson being a candidate for president because I fear the people will not understand him. His enemies will say that everything he does is for a political purpose. I know him so well that I know that it is not true. Everything he does is for a principle.

"I remember when he was considering the matter of accepting the nomination for mayor of Cleveland. His wife was opposed to it. He was talking with me when he said: 'I don't know. What would Henry George do if he were alive and in my position?' He knew that Henry George would have accepted and that was the one thing that determined him. And thus it is that the man who, after being twice a congressman, became the mayor of Cleveland, is the most prominent man in the country.

"Down in New York state the people are watching his tax fight with perhaps greater interest than it is being watched right here in his own home. They believe that he is a great man and destined to become greater. Even old line conservative democrats are becoming enthusiastic over Mr. Johnson. 'He's the coming man,' they say. 'Whether he becomes president or not he is bound to take a leading part in American politics.'

"This talk about the next democratic ticket being Hill and Johnson is nonsense. Anyone who knows Mr. Johnson knows how ridiculous is the proposition. Mr. Johnson will not play second to any man.

"Whatever great position in the gift of the American people Mr. Johnson may accept it will be only for a principle. He has wealth and he cares nothing for honors.

"This tax fight he is waging is the making of a splendid foundation for single tax on land values. It is the only just and logical system of taxation and the people will see it. It is the light which guides Mr. Johnson in his every public act. Did you read the report of the Philippine commission? It was a most interesting document. The commission said that the Filipinos did not seem to be able to understand the wisdom of taxing only land values; that was what the commission had decided to do in the Phil-

ippines. There were great tracts of unimproved land there and the commission concluded that the only way to stimulate industry and progress was to tax it the same as improved land and levy no taxes on any other kind of property.

"The men who composed this commission could readily see how single tax was a good thing in the Philippines, but I doubt if any of them could see it in that light as applied to the United States."

Henry George's last book, "The Science of Political Economy," was dedicated to Mayor Johnson and Mr. Lewis.

THE ETHICS OF SUFFRAGE.

A condensation of an address delivered by Louis F. Post, June 1, 1901, at the National American Woman Suffrage association, in the First Baptist church at Minneapolis.

It is not the surface questions of the issue of woman suffrage that I intend to discuss, but the radical question of whether the suffrage is a privilege or a right. Is it something which those in power may grant or withhold according to their own notions of what may be wise? Or is it something which every adult and sane member of the community is entitled to as a right?

If the suffrage is a mere privilege, if it can rightfully be granted to men and withheld from women, be granted to those who are white and withheld from those who are colored, be granted to people with red hair and withheld from those with black; if it may be rightfully given to the millionaire and withheld from the day laborer, rightfully extended to those who can read and withheld from those who cannot, or to those with a college education and from those with only the education of the common school—if this is the basis of suffrage, if this is the only foundation on which women claim a share in the processes of government, then the fundamental argument for woman suffrage disappears. In that case, the best that women who want the suffrage can do, is to kneel before those who already have the power of assigning privileges of suffrage, and beg for it. All they can say is: "Please, mister, won't you let me vote?"

I do not forget that plausible arguments can be made in support of woman suffrage upon the mere basis of expediency. But neither can I ignore the fact that upon that basis arguments just as plausible can be made against it. They are made against it every day in the year, and by women

with even greater persistency than by men.

For my part, I do not believe that the suffrage is a privilege. I believe that it is a right, which belongs to every sane adult of whatever color, of whatever fortune, of whatever education, and of either sex; that it belongs to them in virtue simply of the fact that all such persons are members of the community to be governed. In other words, I place the determination of the question of woman suffrage upon the broad ground set forth in the declaration of independence, that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed.

Let us for a moment consider that proposition. There are such things as individual concerns, concerns regarding which each of us has the absolute right to control our own action, free from all restraints of government, except when we infringe upon the equal individual rights of others. As to these individual concerns, it is the business of government to keep hands off. To illustrate what I mean, the government has no right to prescribe for me, or for you, or for any other person, the hour at which we shall eat our meals or the food of which they shall consist. Such things are individual affairs, and even a popular government, managed by a majority vote, has no right to interfere.

But individual concerns are not all the concerns of social life. There are also what we may call communal concerns; that is, concerns in which we are all mutually interested, concerns in which the interest of one is of necessity the interest of all, and the interests of all are interests of each. As an example of these concerns let me mention the highways. There can be no normal social life without highways. Therefore highways are of common concern. They are partnership affairs, and every partner is entitled to an equal voice in their management. It makes no difference whether he is rich or poor, black or white, educated or ignorant, man or woman. So with the land upon which we live. It has been provided by the Creator for the common good of all. It is the right, therefore, of every person in the community to have a voice in determining the tenures upon which it shall be held. Land is a partnership asset. So again with those values that attach to the land in every community simply because there is a community there, those values that are created by the whole community and not by individuals as such, those values that are due

to social and not to individual enterprise, those values that are commonly known as ground rent or ground price. These values constitute a common income, and in the expenditure of that common income everybody in the community has the right to an equal voice. It is not a privilege; it is a right.

There is nothing to the point that voting is a privilege and not a right because we cannot grant it to infants, because we cannot give it to idiots, or because we take it from the insane or from convicted criminals. If that objection were sound as to common property, it would also be sound as to private property; and so we could argue that inasmuch as we do not allow infants, nor idiots, nor the insane, nor convicts, to manage their own private property, therefore we should allow no one to manage his own private property, except certain privileged persons. Such a conclusion would be absurd, such a conclusion would be unjust. It is also absurd and unjust with reference to the management of common affairs. The right to participate in the management of common affairs, like the right to manage one's own private affairs, is in its very nature not a privilege to be granted or withheld in the discretion of superior power, but a right to be asserted and maintained. And being a right, it is also a duty. Duties and rights are like man and woman. It takes both to make a perfect whole. They were married before time began, and even the Outlook cannot divorce them.

This is the firm rock upon which woman suffrage must rest. It must be demanded because women are members of the community, because they have common interests in the common property and affairs of the community, because they have common interests in the common purposes of the community as a community, because, in a word, they have rights in the community and duties toward it, which are the same as the rights and duties of every other sane person of mature age who keeps out of the penitentiary. If you have local problems of suffrage which you cannot adjust, make exceptions if you will. While I should not go with you, I should not blame you. I blame nobody for not living up to the very letter of a principle. But don't fool yourselves. Don't trifle with your reason and your conscience. Don't try to make yourselves believe that your exception is right. Adopt it for

what it is. Let it be a confession of your inability to adapt the right to your political environment, but don't try to justify it on ethical grounds. Stand firmly by the principle, in theory at any rate, that the suffrage is a universal right.

FOR THE YOUNG MEN WHO ARE GRADUATING.

A portion of an address delivered before the Phi Beta Kappa society at Hobart college, by John Jay Chapman, of New York, as published in the International Journal of Ethics for January, 1901.

When I was asked to make this address I wondered what I had to say to you boys who are graduating. And I think I have one thing to say. If you wish to be useful, never take a course that will silence you. Refuse to learn anything that you cannot proclaim. Refuse to accept anything that implies collusion, whether it be a clerkship or a curacy, a legal fee or a post in a university. Retain the power of speech, no matter what other power you lose. If you can, take this course, and in so far as you take it, you will bless this country. In so far as you depart from this course you become dampers, mutes and hooded executioners. As for your own private character it will be preserved by such a course. Crime you cannot commit, for crime gags you. Collusion gags you. As a practical matter a mere failure to speak out upon occasions where no opinion is asked or expected of you, and when the utterance of an un-called-for suspicion is odious, will often hold you to a concurrence in palpable inquiry. It will bind and gag you and lay you dumb and in shackles like the veriest serf in Russia. I give you this one rule of conduct. Do what you will, but speak out always. Be shunned, be hated, be ridiculed, be scared, be in doubt, but don't be gaged.

The choice of Hercules was made when Hercules was a lad. It cannot be made late in life. It will perhaps come for each one of you within the next eighteen months. I have seen ten years of young men who rush out into the world with their messages, and when they find how deaf the world is, they think they must save their strength and get quietly up on some little eminence from which they can make themselves heard. "In a few years," reasons one of them, "I shall have gained a standing, and then I shall use my power for good." Next year comes, and with it a strange discovery. The man has lost his hori-

zon of thought. His ambition has evaporated; he has nothing to say. The great occasion that was to have let him loose on society was some little occasion that nobody saw, some moment in which he decided to obtain a standing. The great battle of a lifetime has been fought and lost over a silent scruple. But for this, the man might, within a few years, have spoken to the nation with the voice of an archangel. What was he waiting for? Did he think that the laws of nature were to be changed for him? Did he think that a "notice of trial" would be served on him? Or that some spirit would stand at his elbow and say: "Now's your time?" The time of trial is always. Now is the appointed time. And the compensation for beginning at once is that your voice carries at once. You do not need a standing. It would not help you. Within less time than you can see it, you will have been heard. The air is filled with sounding boards and the echoes are flying. It is ten to one that you have but to lift your voice to be heard in California, and that from where you stand. A bold plunge will teach you that the visions of the unity of human nature which the poets have sung, were not fictions of their imagination, but a record of what they saw. Deal with the world, and you will discover their reality. Speak to the world, and you will hear their echo.

Social and business prominence look like advantages, and so they are if you want money. But if you want moral influence you may bless God you have not got them. They are the payment with which the world subsidizes men to keep quiet, and there is no subtlety or cunning by which you can get them without paying in silence. This is the great law of humanity, that has existed since history began, and will last while man lasts—evil, selfishness and silence are one thing.

The world is learning, largely through American experience, that freedom in the form of a government is no guarantee against abuse, tyranny, cruelty and greed. The old sufferings, the old passions are in full blast among us. What, then, are the advantages of self-government? The chief advantage is that self-government enables a man in his youth, in his own town, within a radius of his first public interests, to fight the important battle of his life while his powers are at their strongest, and

the powers of oppression are at their weakest. If a man acquires the power of speech here, if he says what he means now, if he makes his point and dominates his surroundings at once, his voice will, as a matter of fact, be heard instantly in a very wide radius. And so he walks up into a new sphere and begins to accomplish great things. He does this through the very force of his insistence on the importance of small things. The reason for his graduation is not far to seek. A man cannot reach the hearts of his town-folk, without using the whole apparatus of the world of thought. He cannot tell or act the truth in his own town without enlisting every power for truth, and setting in vibration the cords that knit that town into the world's history. He is forced to find and strike the same note which he would use on some great occasion when speaking for all mankind. A man who has won a town fight is a veteran, and the country is full of these young men. Tomorrow their force will show in national politics, and in that moment the fate of the Malay, the food of the Russian prisoner, the civilization of South Africa and the future of Japan will be seen to have been in issue. These things are now being settled in the contest over the town-pump in a western village. I think it likely that the next 30 years will reveal the recuperative power of American institutions. One of you young men might easily become a reform president, and be carried into office and held in office by the force of that private opinion which is now being sown broadcast throughout the country by just such men as yourselves. You will concede the utility of such a president. Yet it would not be the man but the masses behind him that did his work.

Democracy thus lets character loose upon society and shows us that in the realm of natural law there is nothing either small or great; and this is the chief value of democracy. In America the young man meets the struggle between good and evil in the easiest form in which it was ever laid before men. The cruelties of interest and of custom have with us no artificial assistance from caste, creed, race prejudice. Our frame of government is drawn in close accordance with the laws of nature. By our documents we are dedicated to mankind; and hence it is that we can so easily feel the pulse of the world and

lay our hand on the living organism of humanity.

THE ONLY WAY TO FIGHT THE TRUSTS.

An article written by T. W. Davenport, of Silverton, Ore., and published in the Oregon Independent.

The Independent's proposition to form a farmers' trust, though as chimerical as one to extract sunbeams from cucumbers, may afford a text for examining the social and political environment wherein dwells, moves, and has being that indescribable and helpless industrial animal called the farmer.

I say helpless, because of his many ineffectual attempts to better his condition by methods which are manifestly not within his reach or control, and because he steadfastly refuses to employ others at his hand, which would give him an equal footing with all other classes of his fellow citizens.

Observing, several years ago, that national bankers had been favored by legislative enactment with the power to turn their property into money, and receive an income from both, thus doubling their productive capital, the farmers supplicated government for the like privilege of duplicating the usable capital of their farms; but they were spurned with many a jest from the foot of the political throne. Their proposition was as good in equity and as safe to the government as was that of the bankers, and farmers being one hundred times more numerous than the latter, many people have wondered why they did not succeed.

But really there should be no wonder concerning it. Privilege in any country is not for the many but for the few, for the reason that privilege expanded ceases to be privilege. A few hundred national bankers might lend money to the whole country, but if the greater part of the population were to be supplied with money by the government, who would borrow of the bankers?

At bottom there is no jurisdiction for the national bank system. A government founded for the declared purpose of establishing justice among the citizens has no right to duplicate the capital of one citizen, and refuse to do likewise for another. And really it is not the function of our government to expand the capital of individuals. The idea is indefensible, and hence there was no united action among the farming population. And even if there had been a unanimous granger request presented in due form to the United States congress, the answer of denial,

for many reasons, would have been just the same.

And one of the principal reasons why the farmer cannot be as successful as the corporations, the manufacturing and commercial interests, in getting partial legislation favorable to them, is because they declare themselves non-partisan to begin with, and rest their case wholly upon its merits, as viewed from the standpoint of the general welfare. If the other interests, or classes, should conduct their business in like manner they too would fail.

But they do not. Their demands are not predicated upon ideas of justice and the general welfare. With them their business interests control their political action. They go with the party that does the most for them, and by their campaign contributions to a great extent control legislation.

Such interests are organized and speak authoritatively through their governing heads. They support lobbies, and employ attorneys to defeat hostile legislation and secure extraordinary privileges.

Probably no more astounding governmental subservience to syndicate control was ever witnessed in any country than in the adoption of the Porto Rican tariff. Even "plain duty" could not stand against the greed of the sugar and tobacco magnates.

In comparison with such concentrated and unscrupulous powers, how is it expected that the farmers and the farm laborers, scattered all over the broad area of the republic, without any effective organization, and split into several political factions, antagonistic to their own professed interests—how can it be expected that they shall succeed in extorting privileges from a government already under control of the privileged classes? Probably a majority of farmers, especially in the northern, eastern and western states, believe firmly in the protective system, which is the parent and support of monopolies and their aggregate trusts; and they do so in spite of the patent fact that only in this way can the prices of commodities they buy be unduly raised against them. On account of the tariff-protected trusts prices of all the trust goods have been advanced more than 50 per cent., and there is no avoidance, except by knocking out the trust underpinning, the protective tariff, which the especially victimized farmers regard as sacred. Can they never learn that advance in price of things they buy is the same in effect as a decree by the

trusts that wheat shall be, say, 25 cents a bushel; oats, 15 cents; potatoes, 10 cents; hops, 5 cents per pound; and wool 6 cents per pound? If the farmers do not keep accounts, Fate keeps a ledger for them, with debit and credit columns, and the trusts have charge of the debit side. The often plucked farmer has little to do with either side. He must take what he can get for his productions in a free trade market, and suffer any trust extortion imposed upon him. Need he express any surprise that at the close of his fiscal year he cannot make ends meet?

And as the monopolies become more consolidated, and perfectly organized, the worse his case becomes.

Soon the problem of trust regulation of prices will be so completely solved that any required income to the exploiters can be realized, save what would debar a bare living to the toilers.

What is the course for them? How are they to be awakened to a knowledge of the ways and means of delivery? What Lincoln will emancipate them? There are many good people who answer: Socialism. But such a remedy, even if socialists could agree upon a programme of application, amounts to a profound reorganization of society; something that has never taken place at a single move, and probably never will, for that is not the way reforms come.

Evolution does not proceed in that kangaroo jumping style. Step by step, little by little, is the way humanity rises or recedes. That is the law of progress. True, negro slavery was abolished legally by a decree, but everybody knows it is not abolished in fact. Emancipation is slowly progressing, that is all. Socialism may be the goal to which we tend, but it will not come all at once. It will come in the normal way, by fittingly adjusted growth.

Some socialists of eminence believe that government should become more and more unjust and corrupt, as a preparation or inducement for the radical change to socialism, and at the last election voted to continue the hypocritical semibarbarism now dominant in the nation. Such an idea of itself is a striking evidence of national degeneracy. Or is it a fact that the frequent commission of sin only prepares men for the practice of virtue, the frequent shedding of human blood makes them sensitive to the sufferings of others, and the practice of the horrible cruelties of war makes them gentle and humane?

No. This is not the way of the world. Science does not teach it; experience denies it; all history refutes it.

The ameliorations which come in the social organism are the result of calling into action those faculties of human love and brotherhood held in abeyance during the clamor and barbarism of war. If it is desired that men should become more regardful of others' feelings and interests, the appeal is not made to destructiveness and covetousness, the faculties dominant in the kill and loot game, but to benevolence, sympathy, and conscience.

Progress in genuine civilization is away from the militant spirit, and all other excessive manifestation of selfishness. If socialism is that state of society in which justice becomes an established fact, then every modification of the present system (called competitive, but in reality monopolistic), which lops off an injustice, and admits citizens to an equality of industrial opportunity, ought to be welcomed by socialists as progress towards their ideal state. They should have no fears of the truth of this, and cordially cooperate to remove acknowledged evils.

It will not do for them to say: "Let us have socialism at once, or let us have despotism; we will not travel with our fellow citizens progressively away from the latter." Such a determination is unreasonable, and wholly inconsistent with that moderation and fellow feeling which must precede the reign of justice.

The rational resource of the farmers, and, in fact, of all wagemen, does not lie in an endeavor to secure privileges and organize trusts for the purpose of raising prices of agricultural products; for if such a result were practicable the maladjustments productive of evil would only be multiplied, and the struggle for existence become more like that of wild beasts than of human beings.

There is an easy and peaceful way out of the difficulties which beset us, and it is found by conforming to the Jeffersonian maxim: "Exact justice to all, special privileges to none." Let us practice upon that self-evident proposition by abolishing privileges in the United States. In the first place, as an experiment, and for the pleasure of seeing how beautifully it works, let us vote only for members of congress who will stand firmly for the repeal of all tariffs that interfere with free competition, or prevent us from receiving the full benefits of labor-saving machinery and processes, the

fruitage of progress to which all should have free access.

And then see how nicely the trusts would glide from their ornamental perches to become as one of us.

Besides, the purpose for which combinations and trusts are formed and tariffs laid, that of raising the price of industrial products, is at variance with the normal trend of human endeavor. The unfailing result of spontaneous cooperation, where human beings are unrestricted by partial laws, is to make everything cheap. Machinery is improved, processes simplified, cooperation of laborers adjusted, approximating more and more to perfection; and all in accordance with the great fundamental and irrepensible law of our being: "That men always seek to gratify their desires with the least exertion."

And what does this mean to the human family, farmers, mechanics, manufacturers, operatives, professional men, wage men and all, if it is not that more of the things that human beings need—the necessities, comforts and luxuries of life—can be purchased with a day's labor?

Conforming to this normal tendency of human nature, and clearing away all laws and regulations that interfere with it, is to raise the wages of all those who are not drones in the great human hive.

This is the only way to general prosperity.

The other way, and the one in which we are now traveling, is not the normal way to prosperity at all, but a by-way leading to the trust castle of Giant Despair, who gets rich and despotic by taxing the poor dupes who dwell in his stolen dominions.

Self-esteem may whisper that overpartiality to the under-dog is not the commonest or the worst of faults. In a world which seems to be giving itself up to the law of the strong, it is at all events rather a fault on the right side. But if righteousness exalts while unrighteousness degrades and in the end wrecks a nation, he who takes the part of the oppressed is really the true friend of the oppressor. How often have nations, as well as men, abused their strength, angrily repelled remonstrance, and repented in the end?—Bystander (Goldwin Smith) in Toronto Weekly Sun.

The man whose protection from wrong rests wholly upon the benevolence of another man or of a congress, is a slave—a man without rights.—Benjamin Harrison.

THE LAY OF THE AUDITORS.

The auditors of the 12 counties in Ohio through which the Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne & Chicago railway runs met in the agricultural room in the courthouse in Canton at 10:45 Friday morning to appraise the line for taxation.—News-Democrat, of Canton, Stark County, O., for Friday evening, May 24.

And Tom Johnson 60 miles away!—News-Democrat of same date.

A crowd of jolly auditors are we,
We come from many counties, don't you see.

We are used to kicks and thumps—
We've been up against our bumps—
Mayor Johnson has just had us up a tree.

We thought that we'd adjourn to Molly Stark,

Where we think that we can work more in the dark,

And make our burdens lighter—
That Tom Johnson is a fighter—
You can bet that he is not an easy mark.

We can take the company's word without a quirk,

We are not afraid we'll bring up with a jerk.

We're not supposed to know
Where the dividends all go—
Accepting company estimates saves work.

Our love for the poor railroads is intense—
We wouldn't add a cent to their expense.

We wear the company's collar—
Assess engines for a dollar—
And we let a freight car off for 50 cents.

Ten cents a mile's enough for railroad tracks—

What's the use to delve too deeply for the facts?

Fifteen cents for a caboose—
To all equity a truce!
Let the man who labors pay the heavy tax!

We will have no trouble here with Canton's mayor,
And we're not a whit afraid of Reverend Hare.

So, boys, fill up your glasses!
We save mileage on our passes—
It's most pleasant when you don't have to pay fare!

We're a bunch of jolly auditors, and gay,
And in Canton we can pass a pleasant day;
With nobody to flim-flam us
With a bothersome mandamus—
Oh, we're happy when Tom Johnson is away.

—News-Democrat of same date.

Traveler—Eh? Has this hotel changed hands?

Clerk—Yes; the old landlord busted up—owed thousands of dollars to all the provision dealers in the neighborhood. For every \$10 he took in he spent \$20.

Traveler—Too bad! Too bad! He's the only landlord I ever met who knew how to keep a hotel.—N. Y. Weekly.

In a school for colored children there was a little boy who would persist in saying "have went." The teacher kept him in one night and said: "Now, while I am out of the room you may write 'have gone' fifty times."

When the teacher came back he

looked at the boy's paper, and there was "have gone fifty times." On the other side was written: "I have went home."—Christian Endeavor World.

Bodies of men and women, then (and much more, as I have said before, their souls), must not be bought or sold. Neither must land, nor water, nor air, these things being the necessary sustenance of men's bodies and souls.—"Time and Tide," by John Ruskin.

It was a boy at the St. Mary's Redcliffe school, Bristol, who handed to the teacher the following essay on the making of a British colony:

Africa is a British colony. I will tell you how England makes her colonies. First she gets a missionary; when the missionary has found a specially beautiful and fertile tract of country, he gets all his people round him and says: "Let us pray;" and when all the eyes are shut, up goes the British flag!

—Youth's Companion.

WHAT'S IN A FLAG?

For The Public.

O flag of stripes and many stars,
That used to freedom mean,
An emblem you of prison bars
By men of Guam are seen,

O banner on that isle remote,
We would we could deny
That when you on the breezes float
The Tagal says: "You lie."

G. T. EVANS.

BOOK NOTICES.

Charles H. Kerr & Co. (Chicago) have issued a translation, by Alex. Kerr, professor of Greek in the University of Wisconsin, of book I of Plato's Republic.

There are indications in the progress of the so-called "scientific" method of sociology that it is coming in its conclusions to the point which the a priori method attains with equal precision and greater certainty when logically and fearlessly pursued. That is to say, as the "scientific" investigators extend their knowledge of miscellaneous facts, and get a better understanding of the relations of the facts they know, they tend to the conclusion that social expediency, which is their ideal, coincides with the social justice of a priori students. An example is a book on social economy, by Louis Wallis (1350 Dennison ave., Columbus, O.), to be published in the fall, the title of which is "An Examination of Society from the Standpoint of Evolution." The prospectus, to be had of the author, outlines the forthcoming book in

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.

some detail and with sufficient clearness to show that it is likely to be revolutionary in its influence upon the historical school of sociologists. It reaches the conclusion that just human relationships with reference to capital and land, though they neither did exist nor could nor ought to have existed in previous stages of social development, are desirable at the present stage.

Another forthcoming book which seems to mark the same general tendency of this materialistic method of sociology toward the conclusions of the a priori or moral principle school, is "Democracy versus Socialism" (Macmillan & Co.), by Max Hirsch, of Australia. While having in view, as stated by his publishers, "the same object as socialists—namely, the redress of existing inequalities in the distribution of social advantages, Mr. Hirsch absolutely differs as to the means." The means he proposes are essentially the same as those proposed by the latest in the line of the great classical political economists, Henry George; but he arrives at this conclusion by the "scientific" method, the route which has heretofore seemed to lead either to socialism or to nothing.

Still another book testifies incidentally to the tendency we have mentioned. In "Newyorkitis" (New York: The Grafton Press, No. 70 Fifth Avenue), Dr. John H. Girdner, a well-known physician of the American metropolis, asserts that "the sciences of anatomy and physiology, and even of disease, point unerringly to the common origin of man; and they furnish the strongest corroborative evidence of the truth that all men everywhere are brothers." This observation calls attention sharply to what cannot much longer be denied, that the moral harmonies which clear and courageous reasoning deduces from obvious first principles, are confirmed, and not overthrown, by the laborious processes of induction, when those processes are sufficiently complete to afford a fair view of the facts in their appropriate relations. But Dr. Girdner's book is not a heavy philosophical work. It is one of the cleverest and keenest satires that has come from the press since the days of Swift. "Newyorkitis," a purely social disease, endemic on Manhattan Island and consisting in the inflammation of a New Yorker's New York, is treated throughout the book after the manner of a medical author's treatment of a new and interesting physical disease. Mentally "Newyorkitis" produces delusions of grandeur; morally its most prominent symptom is a "better-than-thou-ness;" physically it is distinguished by nervous muscular movements, nearsightedness, perversion of the appetite and partiality for perpetual noise. The treatment recommended is general culture, so that the patient may realize that there are other cities, other lands, other people and other things to think about besides the subjects that occupy the narrow space within a "Newyorkitic's" mental vision. That is, so to speak, the bony structure of Dr. Girdner's book. The book itself defies description. Nothing short of liberal quotation could do it justice. Its best and truest commendation is this, that whoever looks it over, unless he be a hopeless Newyorkitic, will read it through, from cover to cover, without missing a word. It is cutting satire, profound philosophy, and genial humor blended; and the printer's work is as inviting as the author's.

MAGAZINES.

—"Howard's Magazine," now published at New York, is justifying its reputation as the best periodical representative of the colored race.

—"The Railroad Trainmen's Journal" for June reproduces Henry George, Jr.'s discussion of the New York labor cases; and contains, besides technical articles, some valuable contributions on economic subjects, including one on "Wealth Worship and Brute Force," by that indefatigable labor writer, Jose Gros.

—"In 'The Land of Sunshine' (Los Angeles: Charles F. Lummis, editor) for May, the editor further discusses the Ross case, of Stanford university. These "Land of Sunshine" presentations of that subject give the university side of the controversy with greater fullness and vigor than any other publications on that side, and must not be overlooked in forming an opinion on the subject.

—"What's the Use" is a new ten cent magazine, printed at East Aurora, N. Y., by John B. Howarth and John A. Jordan, for the Society for the Propagation of Decency (a needed society for some parts of East Aurora), which is radical and apparently sane. The contributors to the first number are William S. Rann, C. B. Matthews, John B. Howarth, Sylvester E. Croll and John A. Sayles.

—"The Pilgrim (Battle Creek, Mich.: Willis J. Abbot, editor) for June more than redeems the promise of the May number. It is an interesting and useful home magazine of high purpose and character. Julian Hawthorne, Edward W. Bemis, Ernest H. Crosby, Bolton Hall and Eitweed Pomeroy contribute the principal special articles, and the departments are well represented by special contributors.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

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

WALTER A. LANTZ, T. G. MCELLIGOTT
Telephone Central 2254.

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

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

Houston.

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

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.
Tel. Call, 1353 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

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.

WRITERS,
CORRESPONDENTS or
REPORTERS

Wanted everywhere. Stories, news, ideas, poems, illustrated articles, advance news, drawings, photographs, unique articles, etc., purchased. Articles revised and prepared for publication. Books published. Send for particulars and full information before sending articles.

The Bulletin Press Association, New York.

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.

JOIN THOSE
WHO KNOW.

CALL FOR

Moos' Cigars

AND BE HAPPY.

J. & B. MOOS,

95 Randolph Street, 58-64 Dearborn
Street, - - - CHICAGO, ILL.

For any Book on Earth
Old or New

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