

# The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1901.

Number 169.

**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 "safe man" is the one who has the wit to use his knowledge with discretion, provided he has enough knowledge to make discretion necessary.

"The flag will stay wherever it is planted," exclaimed Senator Foraker in his speech as temporary chairman of the republican convention of Ohio. But that is not the important thing. The pillaging chieftains of ancient Rome used to boast in like manner about the Roman eagles. The important consideration is whether the flag, wherever planted, shall wave over American citizens or over American subjects.

The federal authorities are now credited with an intention to put down the trusts, and for that purpose with investigating them secretly. This is not a vaudeville joke. It is serious newspaper information, inspired by the attorney general's department.

Verevstchagin's realistic paintings of battle scenes in the Philippines are said to be completed, and it is understood that he will exhibit them in this country. Some law ought to be found to stop him. It was well enough for us Americans to slaughter men who, like our own forefathers, were struggling against terrible odds for independence; but to have a foreign artist show us in vivid pictures the bloody horror of it all is too much for patriotic good nature.

Now that interest rates in London have fallen, how will our "favorable export balance" theorists account for

the fact that nothing comes back to us for our enormous exports. They cannot say any longer that we have a European credit for them which is allowed to lie in open account abroad for the high rates of interest prevailing there.

Mr. Bryan advocates the nomination of Hanna as the next presidential candidate of the republicans, now that Mr. McKinley declines a third term. He calls Hanna the logical republican candidate. But what would the republican party do with anything logical, even a logical candidate? Its experience and aspirations are not along logical lines.

It is jolly good sport that the administration papers get out of the Manila dispatch, which, in reporting the surrender of Gen. Cailles, described him as shedding tears. Genuine sentiments of patriotism have become so blurred in the American mind lately that the spectacle of a brave man weeping because compelled to surrender his little army after fighting two years for the independence of his country against the great odds of a horde of well-armed invaders, is supposed to be only an object of mirth. At this rate of imperial progress we may yet live to see the memories of Valley Forge ridiculed by American newspaper wits.

Every now and again something favorable to the annexation of Canada appears in the press of the United States. These papers have one thing to learn. Canadians do not want political annexation, and nothing short of successful "criminal aggression" on our part would reconcile them to it. But Canada could be annexed almost as closely to the United States as is any state in the union, without "criminal aggression"

on our part or any less forcible method of annexation. What welds our states to the union is not political but commercial annexation. Abolish free trade between the states and the years of the union would be numbered. But the union would be as closely welded as ever without political association but with free trade. That suggests the way in which Canada could be annexed. Let the tariff laws which separate Canada and the United States be repealed, and Canada would be for all practical and desirable purposes part of the American republic.

Revived activity in real estate transactions indicates to the masses with whom times are hard all the time, that we are now in reality passing through an era of prosperity. The fact that this activity has but recently begun goes to show that the prosperous era we are in does not date back to 1897. Real estate feels the impulse of prosperous conditions in much less time than four years. All the boasts of prosperity with which the papers have been padded since Mr. McKinley's first election were evidently nothing but puffing. Only great trusts and some farmers have been prosperous until recently. And now that "general prosperity" has come, the rise in land values testifies that the landed interests are as usual absorbing its pecuniary benefits.

Regarding the third party movement in Missouri, a word or two may be worthy of consideration. It is to be thought of first with reference to national politics. The organizers of this party appear to contemplate the probability of a split in the next national democratic convention. Their idea seems to be that the reactionary democrats will get control, and that the progressives will thereupon leave the party. That the progressives

would leave the party if the reactionaries got control is doubtless true. It is to be both expected and desired. But if they went out of the old party into any ready-made third party they would break all precedents, and that is unlikely. When parties split, the outgoing members form a party of their own as naturally as a sailor goes to sea. There is another consideration in this connection. By forming a third party for national purposes, the progressive democrats of Missouri facilitate, by so much, the efforts of the reactionaries to get control of the democratic party. They thereby withdraw such strength as they may control from the radical wing of the democratic organization. Only this sort of thing can reinstate the reactionary leaders. In the very nature of the case, as circumstances now are, the democratic party cannot nominate any of the old leaders. Cleveland, Hill, Gorman or any other of that antiquated set of whigs are utterly impossible as democratic nominees, unless premature defections of the radical wing make it possible. The presidential candidate must be either Bryan or a new man without a Bourbon record or Bourbon affiliations. For these reasons we sincerely regret the giving of national character to the new Missouri party. As a state organization, the matter has a different aspect. Even in that connection it would be better to have organized as a wing of the democratic party in resistance to the domination of the state organization by Bourbons. Within the democratic party an organization such as could be formed upon the basis of the Meriwether vote of last spring in St. Louis might put the Bourbons in bad shape at the national convention. But an independent party, repudiating all allegiance to the national democratic party, can accomplish nothing in national politics and will soon fritter away its power locally. Still, the democratic situation in Missouri necessitates some action hostile to the machine, on the part of the radical elements; and in so far as the organization is strictly

local, it is not for democrats in other states to criticise.

The rupture that may yet divide the liberal party of England adds emphasis to the fact, which has long been clear, that the condition of parties in Great Britain and in the United States is much the same. What the Tories are to Great Britain the republicans are to the United States. What the Boer war is there, the Philippine aggression is here. What the liberal party is to Englishmen, the democratic party is to Americans. The latter resemblance holds good with reference even to the diverse political elements of which the liberal party is composed, and to the imminent probabilities of its complete disruption. Just as in this country there are democrats with republican principles, so in England there are liberals with Tory principles. That element has now found a spokesman if not a leader in Herbert Harry Asquith, who has come out openly in opposition to the liberal leader, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. In harmony with the Tories, he approves the annexation of the two Boer republics. The hopeful thing about this incident is the prophecy it bears of a general break-up and realignment along more radical issues than have ever before divided political parties in Great Britain. Signs of a similar readjustment in American politics are not wanting.

Gov. Crane's veto of the Boston subway grab, which we noticed editorially last week, has been sustained in the legislature by a vote of 135 to 98. Even the majority that originally passed the measure melted away under the governor's scathing message. Sixty-six members who had voted for the bill changed their minds and supported his veto.

That affair in Boston brings into bolder relief the shameless action of the Pennsylvania legislature and governor, and the Philadelphia council and mayor, in connection with the

monumental grab which Senator Quay engineered, and on which also we commented last week. John Wanamaker has taken another important step. Ignored by the mayor when he offered \$2,500,000 for public franchises which the mayor was about to present to the Quay gang for nothing, Mr. Wanamaker now renews that offer, with a supplementary offer to buy off the gang for \$500,000, stipulating that in using the franchises he will establish three-cent fares and universal transfers, and will sell back the franchises and equipment to the city at any time within ten years for cost. This great grab promises yet to be a blessing in disguise. It has aroused public sentiment in Pennsylvania to an appreciation in some degree of the iniquity of private franchises in public property; and encouraging developments may be looked for at an early day in the politics and laws of the Keystone state.

The letter in which Mr. Wanamaker conveys his second offer makes good reading. We quote from it enough to show its motive and purpose. It was addressed to Mayor Ashbridge and his associates in the franchise scheme. Mr. Wanamaker says:

You say that I had no charters and that the council should not have made the grants to me. Very well, for the sake of argument, be it so. There is no legal or other objection to you and your colleagues selling to me the franchises of which you are now the donees and owners without recompense to the city. I therefore renew the offer which I made to the mayor, to pay, as therein stated, to the city of Philadelphia \$2,500,000, and in addition thereto I will add \$500,000 as a bonus to yourself and associates personally for the conveyance of the grants and corporate privileges you now possess. There is no strong opposition to this proposition. When you and your associates assign to me capital stock ownership and control of the corporations you now possess, with the engineers' plans, I will pay to you the sum of \$500,000, and you may pay to the city of Philadelphia the \$2,500,000, under the conditions stated in my letter to the mayor, and \$1,500,000 of which amount I should stipulate should be used for the deepening of the Delaware river channel and \$1,000,000 be applied to the building of public schools and for the pur-

pose of public education. In addition to this I will agree on the surface roads covered by your charters and the ordinances that three-cent fares only shall be charged between the hours of five and eight a. m. and five and seven p. m., and not over five cents for the other hours; and I will further agree that any time within ten years the city of Philadelphia may resume the franchises upon the payment of the actual money expended and invested in the various enterprises covered by the charters and ordinances. If the proposition I have made to you is not acceptable I should be glad to know what sum will tempt you and your associates to surrender the privileges you now own, and which were obtained by methods so unusual and defiant of the public will as to have aroused the indignation of the people of the entire nation. There may be those who will raise an ethical objection to the payment of any sum of money to persons obtaining valuable property by such methods. As a question of casuistry there may be some force in such objections, but I am advised that the payment proposed in this letter of \$500,000 to you and your associates would not be indictable as the compounding of a felony, but will be defensible as a bonus merely paid for the restitution of public property wrongfully obtained.

The street car situation in Chicago has taken a new turn. There has been an understanding that the important existing franchises expire in 1903, and considerable subdued excitement has resulted with reference to the terms of extension, of which the legal limit is 20 years. Whether extensions should be upon the basis of a three cent fare, or a tax upon gross receipts, has been the crucial point; although the owners of the existing franchises have put forward a claim that the franchises on the north and those on the west sides of the city were extended in a blind way, back in 1858, so that they will not expire until 1957 on the north side and 1960 on the west. This is known as "the 99-year claim." It has been regarded as a desperate resort held in reserve by the companies for fighting ground when everything else should fail them. But this claim they have now made the basis of legal proceedings to prevent the city from terminating existing franchises or exacting terms for renewals. William L. Elkins,

of Philadelphia, brings the suit. He has gone into the United States circuit court asking for an injunction. If brought in good faith, and not merely as a cover for corrupt negotiations with the city authorities, this lawsuit puts the street car controversy of Chicago in a better position than it has yet been in. For the franchise grabbers to lose the suit is to lose all possibility of further bluffing with "the 99-year claim." If they win it they add to the Philadelphia grab another instance in emphasis of the rottenness of the whole private franchise system. Either way means ultimate defeat of the conspirators.

With reference to the question of three cent fares or taxation of receipts, the fact cannot be too often repeated that the latter policy is what the franchise grabbers want. In advocating this policy Mayor Harrison plays into their hands. When street car companies are allowed to charge five cents, being required to pay a tax on receipts, they rob passengers by charging two cents more than a ride is worth, and divide the plunder with the city. Even if the tax were two cents, thus leaving only a net three-cent fare, franchise beneficiaries would prefer the tax; because, to the extent that they can cheat the city out of it, they are gainers. A three cent fare straight, with no tax on receipts, leaves them without any opportunity to get more than three cents and also keeps them honest. Let every street car passenger bear in mind that a five cent fare, with the so-called franchise compensation tax, is a scheme to tax him for the franchise, and not the company, every time he rides. It is a corrupt scheme at that, for it creates an incentive in the company to falsify accounts and bribe officials in order to retain as much of the tax as possible. But a three cent fare, without the tax, abolishes the corrupt and corrupting character of the franchise arrangement, and requires passengers to pay no more for their rides than rides are worth. This is manifestly the honest arrangement. Public of-

ficials who advocate the other render themselves and their integrity subject to just suspicion.

The American military observer with the Boer army in South Africa, Capt. Charles Reichman, has just made his official report. It is especially interesting with reference to the British accusation of violations of the rules of war by the Boers. Of these accusations Capt. Reichman reports:

Such alleged unlawful occurrences were not confined to the side of the Boers; they occurred on the British side also. When they occurred on the British side the Boers had little to say about them. When they occurred on the Boer side a horde of war correspondents stood ready to snap them up and heap libel on the Boers.

Some hostile comment has recently been indulged in with reference to the referendum which the constitution of South Dakota allows. It is objected that the referendum is not what it has been cracked up to be, or it would have been resorted to in that state. But it has been resorted to, and with gratifying effectiveness. Last winter the republican ring tried to jam through a plundering measure in redemption of campaign promises. In the senate the measure passed triumphantly, and the house was ready to rush it through as smoothly as Quay ran the corrupt franchise bills through the legislature of Pennsylvania, where no referendum right is reserved to the people. But at that point the ring met a sudden and decisive check. It ran up against the referendum clause of the South Dakota constitution. Opponents of the corrupt measure warned the republican leaders that if the bill were passed a referendum vote would be called for. This would have sent the measure to the people for approval or rejection, and the republicans dared not face such an ordeal. Orders were consequently given, and the lower house obediently defeated the measure. One beauty of the referendum was here exemplified. It is not always neces-

esary to resort to it in order to get the benefit of its protection. Like a good watch dog, it may as often drive away thieves with a growl as with a bite.

The state of Oregon has adopted a reform in taxation which may be of great value to Oregon and may furnish an example for all the states in the union. Most of the states still obtain a large part of their revenue for state purposes from the general property tax; and the reports of state officials and commissions are full of complaints of the undervaluation of property by local assessors, due to their desire to shift the proper burden of their towns and counties to the other counties. In February of this year an act, drawn by Senator R. A. Booth, was passed in Oregon, providing for the apportionment of the state tax among the several counties of the state in proportion to the revenue raised for county purposes in each, exclusive of expenditures for roads and highways. We have several times referred to the bill for the apportionment of state taxes and for local option in taxation, drawn by Lawson Purdy, of New York, and unanimously indorsed by the New York chamber of commerce. In this bill the state tax is apportioned to the several counties, on the basis of the total revenue of each county and all the tax districts within the county. The Oregon plan only differs from this in that the Oregon apportionment is based on revenue raised for county purposes only. It would seem that Mr. Purdy's plan is more correct in principle, but in practice the Oregon method may work substantial justice and is a recognition of a principle which is certain to be of great value. It entirely does away with the incentive for the undervaluation of property by local assessors, and removes all obstacles to local option not embedded in state constitutions.

Theological controversies of the credal sort are not exactly in the line of our thought or discussion. We are nevertheless much interested in a

singularly logical defense (if reasoning by analogy can be called logic) of the sacrificial doctrine of the atonement, which appeared recently in a Chicago newspaper from the pen of the Rev. J. Jay Dugan, a clergyman of the Methodist church. The argument runs in this wise: Every constitutional need in nature has its supply or complement; as water for thirst, or food for hunger. Man cannot create a single supply for a constitutional need; neither water for his thirst nor food for his hunger. They originate in a higher power. Being constitutionally a sinner, as well as constitutionally subject to hunger and thirst, he needs religion as certainly as he needs water and food. And as with water and food, he instinctively feels the need of religion—he feels, that is, that he is out of harmony with God and that his salvation depends upon reconciliation, which must come from God. So far Mr. Dugan's argument by analogy seems to be without a flaw. But now he essays to jump a chasm, and, logically speaking, misses his footing and tumbles into the depths. He asserts as his next step that "reconciliation cannot be had without some kind of sacrifice." Why not? Without any sacrifice man is reconciled to water when his body thirsts and to food when it hungers. Why, then, by the same process of reasoning which Mr. Dugan adopts, should sacrifice be necessary when man's spirit hungers and thirsts for religion? Upon no other plane of life does sacrifice appear to be necessary for the reconciliation of man to God. Man has only to put himself in harmony (and that without sacrifice, vicarious or otherwise) with God's physical laws, whereupon God instantly establishes reconciliation as to them. Edison has done this over and over again in the field of electricity. Similarly we all get into harmony with God's laws when we drink, or eat, or work, or play, with satisfaction. We get into harmony and God does the rest. Whence then comes the idea that reconciliation with God

without sacrifice, which is true of all our physical concerns, is not true of those that are spiritual? Can it have any other origin than in the degraded pagan notion of a vindictive deity, half vampire half devil, who fattens upon the sacrifices and revels in the fears of superstitious men? Following the analogy of thirst atonement, and hunger atonement, and electrical atonement, and every other variety of physical atonement, what better conception of spiritual atonement, with a God of love and the justice of love, could there be than that which came through Isaiah, the great prophet of Israel, who closed a comprehensive denunciation of atonement by sacrifice, with this familiar precept: "Cease to do evil, learn to do well."

There is a spice of the comic in the protests evoked by Dr. W. S. Hall, at the Y. M. C. A. convention in Boston, when he sought to reconcile Christianity with the Darwinian theory of man's evolution. Some of the young men of the convention held the same objections that their fathers did to accounting themselves descendants of monkeys. But how narrow must be their conception of divine potency. Whether man is a product of evolution from a lower order of animal creation, is a problem that should give no concern to any intelligent Christian. In this evolutionary theory there are unbridged chasms so wide as to make one ask what science is if this theory be scientific; but even were the theory proved conclusively, there would be in that nothing to shake any rational religious belief. The Creator of this universe could have developed man from monkeys quite as easily as to have made him outright.

Senator Foraker, of Ohio, makes a better candidate for reelection than he would make for Mrs. Irving's offer of \$1,000 to the successful man who can carry on his affairs for a month without lying. While delivering the opening speech at the Ohio republican convention he tried to fool the people

by declaiming against municipal ownership of public utilities as enlarging "the field and opportunities of the political boss." So gravely and with such oiliness was this said, that one might suppose Senator Foraker had never heard of "the field and opportunities of the political boss," in connection with public utilities, which his good friend and copartisan, the delectable Senator Quay, has in Pennsylvania utilized beyond the dreams of avaricious power—without municipal ownership. Yet some of Mr. Foraker's hearers must have known, as Mr. Foraker doubtless did himself, that with municipal ownership, nothing like so great an abuse of power over public utilities would be possible.

Senator Foraker ruled himself out of Mrs. Irving's \$1,000 contest at another point in his convention speech. He appealed to what he assumed to be the moral obliquity and mental density of Ohio farmers, in a denunciation of "the single tax," which he associated with the work of the new mayor of Cleveland. It is proposed, he said, that "in the name of the single tax, the farmers and other real estate owners and holders shall be compelled to bear all the burdens of taxation, while those who hold mortgages and stocks and bonds shall be made a privileged class and be exempted from all the expenses of government." It would be an insult to Senator Foraker's intelligence to suppose him sincere in that utterance. He must know that the owners of bonds and mortgages cannot be regularly taxed. A tax on bonds and mortgages increases interest. He must know that a tax commission of his own state, appointed by Gov. McKinley, has reported the impracticability of regularly taxing this kind of property, and has shown that the inequitable burdens of the attempt to do it in Ohio have been evaded by Ohio cities and fallen upon Ohio farming communities. He must have known, moreover, that stocks represent land values more than any other kind of

property, and that those who hold them would therefore not only not be exempt under the single tax, but would have their taxes on valuable stocks very decidedly increased. He must have known, finally, that the single tax, so far from falling upon farmers, would fall upon land monopolists, to the relief of farmers. Taxes on working farmers would be considerably reduced if the single tax which the mayor of Cleveland advocates were in operation.

In an article by Dr. Azel Ames on labor conditions in Puerto Rico, published in the United States Labor Bulletin for May, a multifarious explanation of the extreme poverty of the working classes of Puerto Rico is advanced, though a simple explanation suffices. "The mass have been content to live and die as their fathers did," is one of the explanations. This is blended with another, "the comparative ease with which the actual necessities of life can be obtained, and the consequent absence of either means or ambition for better things." That blend is heightened by an observation that the average peon has no visions of a decent cottage and garden of his own, because it involves "too much of imagination, of initiative, of energy, and too slow an acquisition, little by little, to bring it within the bounds of his hope or even his yearning." Then comes the simple but comprehensive explanation. It accounts for all the squalid "contentment" of the peon, all his absence of "means" and "ambition," all his deficient "imagination" and "initiative" and "energy," all his lack of "hope" and "yearning," all his poverty. It is the explanation of explanations. "If ever his mind awoke to thoughts and plans of better possibilities," continues Dr. Ames, "reflection reminded him that property was only for the masters; that taxes were adjusted by omnipotent alcaldes to take from one of his class about all he had; that to labor, to acquire and to serve was to do so only for some one more powerful and acquisitive, to

whom he must sooner or later surrender." That is the true and all-sufficient explanation of peon poverty in Puerto Rico. And with only slight variations of phrase, without any variation in substance, that explanation accounts for the social institution of poverty wherever it exists.

In his baccalaureate sermon at Dartmouth college on the 23d President William J. Tucker probed to the core, with a trenchant sentence or two, the social question of wealth and poverty. Said he—

I doubt if men care to be equally rich. It is evident that they do not care to be equally intelligent. What human nature cannot endure is that one man should be rich at the price of another man's poverty, or intelligent at the price of another man's ignorance. The man whom everybody hates is, first, the unjust man and the man who, without being actually unjust, is willing to thrive upon organized injustice.

To the thoughtful consideration of all persons who attribute motives of covetousness or envy to men that cry out against the organized injustices of our time, which make a few luxuriously rich at the expense of millions of working poor, those truthful words of President Tucker are respectfully commended.

Why is it that republican papers confidently take Mr. McKinley at his word when he denies ambition for a third term, while they brutally discredit the sincerity of Bryan's declaration that he will not be a candidate again? Is it because their partisanship requires them always to fondle political friends and growl at political adversaries? If either of these men is to be regarded upon the evidence of his record as insincere, it certainly is not Mr. Bryan. On several occasions Mr. McKinley has made important declarations, not merely of purpose but of principle, which he has afterwards repudiated. He has changed from a silver coinage advocate to a gold standard man; from promising free trade for Puerto Rico as "a plain duty," to applying a Puerto Rican tariff; from denouncing for-

cible annexation as "criminal aggression," to adopting it as a species of patriotism; from the home market theory to the foreign market policy. But Mr. Bryan has never yet been even accused, villainously as his political enemies in both parties have attacked him, of the slightest infidelity to principle or unfaithfulness to his word.

From Washington comes the ominous information that American fruits are about to "invade" the European markets. At this announcement Europeans are expected to blanch with fear. But why should they? The world is full of people, and Europe must have her share of them, who would rejoice if American fruits or any other fruits were to "invade" their homes. Yet it is by invading markets that such things as fruits do invade homes. How strange it is that what we all work for, good things from everywhere, should when they come, be described as "invaders." Do the inventors of these ugly military terms for peaceful commerce really live in looking glasses where everything is reversed?

After electing a tory parliament with large majorities and a great flourish, in recognition of the tory triumph in South Africa, the people of England are beginning to realize, eight months later, that the triumph in South Africa is not yet secure, that the war is not yet at an end. "Theoretically," says the London Financial News, one of the most enthusiastic propagandists last year of the theory that the war ended with the fall of Pretoria,—"theoretically the war was already concluded at the time of the general election last October, but that was only a political fiction, concocted for political purposes; that purpose having been served, we might as well acknowledge the truth now, and the truth is that the war is not over and that if the present methods of conducting it are to be continued there is no probability that it soon will be."

#### MILITARY ETHICS AND FREE THOUGHT.

A Vienna paper reports that Arthur Schnitzler, novelist and playwright, has been expelled from the ranks of reserve officers in the Austrian army and "infamously degraded by a military court of honor" because of a recent novel in which he ridicules dueling. The fact that Schnitzler was an officer of the reserve must come as a surprise to those who have followed the career of this clever young writer, and it is strongly suspected that he held his position merely to make some such "public disgrace" possible, and thus expose the ridiculous ethics of the military code of honor.

Arthur Schnitzler, some five or more years ago, wrote a play which is the strongest arraignment of militarism and the spirit it fosters that modern literature has to show. Dramatic talent of a very high order, superb character drawing, thorough knowledge of the subject and the strength of feeling which carries conviction, make "Freiwild" (Free Game) a play which no serious thinker can forget. And, proving beyond a doubt how true were the poet's deductions, the very thing, the tragedy he had painted as a bare possibility of the system, occurred in still more tragic shape in real life, after his play was written and had been accepted by the manager of a prominent Berlin theater.

In his play, Schnitzler portrays the brutal shooting of a civilian by an officer, because the latter's demand for a duel was refused by his victim. The civilian had administered a public rebuke to the officer, when the latter, also in public, insulted a defenseless woman. He saw no reason for a duel. "I have chastised a brute; that is all there is to it." But the military code of honor will not permit an officer to take a rebuke, however deserved, so he shoots in cold blood the man who refuses "satisfaction."

Schnitzler saw with the poet's insight how easily the system of military ethics could lead to, and justify, a deliberate murder; and several months after the manuscript of his play had passed out of his hands Lieut. von Brusenitz, a Karlsruhe officer, deliberately stabbed to death a civilian who

refused to apologize abjectly for having accidentally jostled the officer's chair in a restaurant. None of the mitigating circumstances which the poet allows the officer in his play were to be found in the real life drama; it was the crassest, crudest murder, with absolutely no cause but the compulsion of a false "code of honor." This tragedy of the Karlsruhe restaurant and Schnitzler's play are both worthy of recollection by those who would talk of the "ennobling" influence of a military training.

Schnitzler has been a marked man with both Austrian and German military authorities since the performance of his play, but the Karlsruhe affair excited public opinion to such an extent that the powers that rule dared not take action. But military governments have long memories, and have scored at last against the fearless young writer. It is not to be supposed, however, that a man of Schnitzler's opinions will be much concerned about his "infamous degradation" at the hands of the military court, and the whole affair will probably result in another fine play or novel in which Schnitzler will deal more cruelly with the military authorities than they have dealt with him.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

## NEWS

Political excitement in England has been raised to a high pitch by a speech of Herbert Harry Asquith, a liberal leader and at one time home secretary in Mr. Gladstone's cabinet. The speech was important because it virtually announced a split in the liberal party over the issue of imperialism. Ever since the South African war began, the liberal party has come far short of being a unit on this question. By appealing to British patriotism the conservative government loosened its political bonds, making a good many liberals, especially those with social affiliations or ambitions, uneasy about being denounced as traitors, and thereby driving a wedge into the party organization. An "imperial liberal" movement was consequently set on foot, somewhat upon the plan of the organization that Mr. Chamberlain made a bridge of several years ago, over which he and his followers passed into the conservative party. This "imperial liberal" move-

ment was brought into prominence and made a political factor by Mr. Asquith's speech, referred to above, which he delivered at a dinner given in London by the Essex liberals on the 20th. The speech appears to have been provoked by two or three important events. Six days before, at a dinner of the National Reform union, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, who is the official leader of the liberal party, followed by Sir William Harcourt, his predecessor in that position, and John Morley, had made strong and acceptable speeches against the policy of the government in South Africa. That anti-imperial demonstration was followed by a parliamentary hitch. On the 17th, when the ministry admitted in parliament that 40,229 Boers were in the British reconcentrado camps, and that in these camps 98 men and women and 318 children had died in May (p. 171), a liberal member moved an adjournment as a protest against the inhumanity implied by this admission. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman spoke and voted for the motion. Mr. Asquith and his following of "liberal imperialists" in the house refused to vote, but without giving any reasons. Next came a so-called pro-Boer meeting at Queen's hall, London, on the 19th, at which Mr. Labouchere presided, and resolutions against annexation were passed. These events provoked Mr. Asquith's speech of the 20th. He protested against the acceptance of the Queen's hall resolutions of the night before as a pronouncement of liberal policy. Asserting that liberals favor a free, federated South Africa, on the lines of Canada and Australia, he declared that Boer independence is impossible. He went on to explain that although at the beginning of the war he believed it possible to restore the South African republics, he was now a reluctant convert to the necessity of annexation. Notwithstanding Asquith's expressions of desire for a united liberal party, his speech as a whole was immediately recognized as a proclamation of hostility to Bannerman and his following. The London Daily News, the liberal organ, responded with an urgent call to the party to rally to Bannerman's support. For all practical purposes the party is now divided, with Bannerman at the head of one wing and Asquith at the head of the other.

Meantime the war in South Africa, which is the occasion of this split,

drags on without reason to hope for an early end. Hardly any news is allowed to escape the British censor, but it leaks out that the Boers control a large territory and make frequent incursions into the places nominally under British rule. Another battle was fought on the 20th. It was at a place called Waterkloof. The result is not divulged, but the British loss is reported as 8 killed and 6 wounded, besides 66 captured. The cost of the war, as reported on the 25th to parliament, is £250,000 weekly—about \$60,000,000 a year.

The Filipinos are less fortunate than the Boers. Their republic comes to an end with the surrender of Gen. Cailles, which took place on the 24th at Santa Cruz, in the province of Laguna, island of Luzon. The number of men surrendered was 650 and of rifles 386, with 4,000 rounds of ammunition. Certificates for \$30 for each surrendered rifle were delivered by Gen. Sumner, who received the surrender; but Gen. Cailles returned them, saying indignantly that the rifles were surrendered voluntarily and not sold to the Americans. When he tendered his own sword, in token of submission, Gen. Sumner handed it back, an act which the soldiers on both sides cheered. All who surrendered took the oath of allegiance to the United States. As the pathetic ceremony of this final chapter of the brief but bloody history of the first republic of Asia drew to a close, the heartbroken Filipino general gave way to weeping. Recovering sufficiently to make a farewell address to his little army, he advised the surrendered soldiers to uphold American institutions. At the termination of the ceremony he and his troops were released—all except one, a lieutenant, who was identified as Frank Meekin, a private in the Thirty-seventh United States volunteers. This young man had deserted the American army some time ago and joined Gen. Cailles's force. Upon recognizing him, the Americans put him in irons and sent him to Manila for trial.

Official steps were taken at Washington on the 21st for the reorganization of the American government in the Philippines. The president issued an executive order on that day appointing William H. Taft as civil governor of the islands; and on the same day he appointed Gen. Chaffee as military governor. The term of

office of each will begin July 4 and continue until otherwise ordered.

Political agitation and organization in the United States with reference to the state elections next fall is gaining headway. We told last week of the organization of the Public Ownership party of Missouri. The political event this week is the republican convention of Ohio. It met on the 24th at Columbus, and after completing its work adjourned on the 25th. Senator Hanna was soon known to be in control, his domination being determined by the contest for state committeemen. All the convention committees then fell into his hands. Senator Foraker was made temporary chairman and Senator Hanna permanent chairman, while Gov. George K. Nash was renominated to head the ticket. The platform, after reaffirming the principles of the last national platform, begins with a compliment to the party on its achievements at home and abroad. It then demands a stronger navy and "such legislation as will restore our merchant marine to pre-eminence upon the sea." It also urges the speedy construction of an American ship canal. On the subject of trusts it declares:

We recognize the right of both labor and capital to combine when such combinations are wisely administered for the general good, but combinations which create monopolies to control prices or limit productions are an evil which must be met by effective legislation vigorously enforced. The only legislation, national or in Ohio, on this subject has been enacted by the republican party, and that party can be safely trusted to deal with this problem.

The continued exclusion of the Chinese is advocated, and a "most liberal application" of "generous pension legislation" is asked for. There is next a demand that the representation in congress from the southern states which suppress the colored vote shall be reduced to the basis of the actual voting population. Lynching is denounced. With reference to the question of imperialism—

the republican principle that congress has power to govern our new possessions according to the needs of their own people and in the interest of the people of the United States—

is said to have been sustained by the supreme court, which has made—

the momentous determination that the republic is a nation with the powers

of a nation in acquiring and governing territory.

The Chinese upheaval is lightly touched upon, and with reference to Cuba the platform asserts that the nation's pledge is being kept. The state administration as well as the national is applauded, and the tax crusade of Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, is noticed in these terms:

We favor such revision of the tax laws of the state as will require all classes of property to bear their equal and just share of taxation and we recommend the creation of such machinery for fixing and equalizing valuations as will be adequate at all times to correct error and take notice of changes in value. During the last ten years the general assembly has increased the revenues of the state by forms of taxation other than by levies upon real and personal property. We favor further legislation in this direction, to the end that the burden of taxation upon property may be lessened, and we denounce as unjust any scheme which aims to cast the entire burden of taxation upon real estate.

Finally, the two senators, Hanna and Foraker, are proudly described as "able in debate and wise in counsel," and the latter is nominated for reelection. The clause making this nomination is as follows:

Senator Foraker has rendered splendid and conspicuous service in our country during his term in the United States senate and we heartily indorse him for a second term.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—The international vegetarian congress opened in London on the 25th.

—A cloudburst in the Pocahontas coal fields of West Virginia on the 23d destroyed a vast amount of property and 50 lives.

—Earl Russell, grandson of the former premier of England, has been indicted for bigamy and will be tried by the house of lords.

—By injecting oxygen in its natural state, a Belgian physician claims to make almost instant cures of boils, abscesses and anthrax.

—Hoshi Toru, the Japanese statesman who formerly represented Japan at Washington, was murdered on the 21st in Tokio. The motive of the murder was political.

—Gen. Maximo Gómez, the famous Cuban general, accompanied by Senor Gonzales, secretary to Gov. Gen. Wood, left Havana secretly on the 26th for New York by way of Florida.

—The supreme court of Tennessee decided on the 20th, two judges dissenting, that women cannot be ad-

mitted to the bar in Tennessee, because lawyers are officers of the court and the state constitution forbids women from holding office.

—On the 25th the Leipziger bank at Berlin suspended payment, owing to the suspension of the "Dresden Credit Anstalt." The liabilities are estimated at \$17,000,000 to \$18,000,000, and the assets at \$9,600,000. The bank's shares had been quoted the day before at 140. This is the largest of a series of German bank failures.

—Adelbert Hay, son of Secretary Hay, and recently U. S. consul at Pretoria, was found dead on the sidewalk in front of the New Haven House, New Haven, Conn., at 2:30 in the morning of the 23d. He had fallen from a window of the hotel, where he was a guest while attending the Yale commencement, having retired to his room an hour and a half before. Mr. Hay was 26 years old.

## MISCELLANY

### IN SOUTH AFRICA.

London, June 17.—Replying to questions in the house of commons to-day. Mr. Brodric, the war secretary, said there were 40,229 persons in the "concentration camps" of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony. The deaths in these camps for the month of May numbered 98 men and women and 318 children.—Daily Paper.

### For The Public.

It hath not been the use of British men  
To war with children. See you not, my lords,

My lords and commons, how these figures read

To every man who is not blinded by  
The lust of conquest and the gleam of gold?  
Is this the England ye have vaunted of,  
Which led the world to liberty and right,  
Whose laws dealt equal justice unto each,  
Whose very flag gave freedom to the slave—

A symbol of their brightest, fullest hopes  
To the oppressed and wronged, a safe retreat

To hunted patriots, saying unto kings  
And tyrants, in their wrath: "Ye strike not here;

Beneath these folds is refuge unto all?"

Can this be England, driving from their homes

Women and children, making of sheltering walls

Fire blackened ruins, rooting out the crops,  
Killing the cattle, burning fruitful farms  
And villages, and leaving in her track  
A wilderness? Can this be England? Oh,  
'Tis thus the savage, mad with homicide,  
Drunken with human blood, exterminates  
All that his arm can reach, man, woman,  
child,

Until a hostile tribe is blotted out.  
Beware! Beware! Such wrongs pass not unseen

By the clear eye of God; each deed writes down,

In the dread judgment book, a darker fate,  
And a more terrible punishment to come.

BERTRAND SHADWELL.

### MAYOR JOHNSON ON GOV. PIN-GREE.

A telegram from Tom L. Johnson to a Detroit paper.

My deep sympathies are with Pingree's family in their loss. I will miss him greatly. From opponents we became friends; he won me to his side of many public questions and I am proud to say that the last few years he has counted me among his personal friends.

The people of Detroit have lost their greatest champion and safest adviser. I know of no one to take his place as a progressive leader of the state, but the fact most to be regretted is the loss of the example that he set of rugged courage and incorruptible fidelity to duty as he saw it; an example that public officials should emulate, for I consider Gov. Pingree's public career as a striking illustration of what a great and truly good man can do in the interest of the plain people. Each of his successive victories showed greater strength than the one before and proved how little public men should fear organized privilege when they really deserve the confidence of the communities in which they live.

There never was a time when Gov. Pingree could have been bought or frightened out of doing what he conceived to be right. The country needs the inspiration of such a career.

### AMERICAN IMPERIALISM.

Extracts from Editorial in London Daily News of May 29.

The supreme court of the United States has legalized American imperialism. It is a momentous decision, the most momentous, perhaps, that the famous tribunal has ever been called upon to make. An absolutely unchangeable constitution is an impossibility, and, rigid, as it is, and bulwarked with all conceivable safeguards, Americans have seen theirs change and develop by amendment, interpretation and the subtle growth of custom. But that it could ever be extended to embrace imperialism, to sanction colonies, and to throw its shield over the conversion of a republic into an empire, is something, we venture to say, that its framers would have laughed at as incredible. However, the thing is done. The constitution, it is now decreed, does not follow the flag. Territories and states are not the only form of government the constitution permits. The supreme court has pronounced in effect, if not in words, that, so far

as the law goes, there is nothing to prevent the Americans treating the Filipinos and Porto Ricans as the Russians are treating the Finns. The thoroughfare of imperialism, which is the thoroughfare of autocracy, is declared legally open to the descendants of the signers of the declaration of independence. A curious issue, this, to 120 years of triumphant democracy. Scoffers will welcome it as a proof that the "great experiment," as Carlyle prophesied, does not promise to be so very great or so very novel after all. By what complex process the judges of the supreme court reached their decision it is impossible to tell; but there is the past to show that on occasion the members of the tribunal which all Americans rightly reverence may not be able to put their political opinions altogether aside. This reflex action of public opinion upon the judiciary, dangerous as it is, is unavoidable in a nation which enjoys the privilege or disability of living under a written constitution. Times change and new conditions arise, and confusion becomes only worse confounded, if the instrument of government refuses to accommodate itself to progress. The Americans, as Mr. Bryce observes, have more than once been obliged to bend their constitution in order to avoid being forced to break it. This time, however, they have bent it without the provocation. It is not progress which the constitution has been stretched to cover, but retrogression; not the advancement of humanity, but that disheartening product of our times, the militarism of a democracy. The American constitution never showed its amazing elasticity on behalf of a poorer cause.

We deplore the decision with all our heart. It can only give fresh encouragement to the already ominously large party which seems bent on shaping American destinies after the worst models of the old world. If ever there was a country whose sole mission seemed to be the building up of an orderly, prosperous and intelligent commonwealth, of developing a new and higher type of civilization, that country was America. The force that the nations of Europe waste in arming themselves against one another, Americans have turned to "fruitful strifes and rivalries of peace," to subduing their vast continent, to making it, what it is now, a homogeneous and unconquerable

whole. Not one of the causes that make colonization a necessity for the powers of the old world is applicable to the United States. Stupendous as is their population, they still have room enough and to spare for twice their present numbers. There is no population question, no labor question, no question of a submerged tenth to make an outlet for emigration imperative. Their foreign commerce is large, for a European nation it would be immense, but it represents barely four per cent. of the value of the interstate trade. It will be generations before their new possessions bring in a tithe of what has been already sunk in them. And as for the fantastic notion that imperialism will steady the national character and bring a better tone into domestic politics—we confess to some scepticism as to the possibility of reforming Tammany Hall by way of Luzon. If American politics are parochial, it is the Americans who have made them so. Unless they annex a quarter of the world they will never find problems more pressing, more complex, more worthy of the finest statesmanship than those now clamoring for solution on their own continent. But, after all, it is the headlong fall in the moral scale that is most to be lamented, the turning of the back on all that has been the special glory and distinction of the country in order to join in the barbaric scramble for the waste places of the earth. It is not in a year, or even in a decade, that the evil fruits of imperialism mature. But that sooner or later America will repent her wild outburst is inevitable.

#### CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP AND THE FOURTH OF JULY.

An extract from a sermon preached in St. James' Episcopal Church, Greenville, Miss., June 23, 1901, by Rev. Quincy Ewing. Reported for The Public.

If any of us doesn't like the declaration of independence unemasculated, with its soul and character left in it; if he considers it as it stands, not a good document, but a bad one, not a true document, but a false one; why, let him say so. Let him "take no stock" in the Fourth of July; and he may, if he follows this course, lay just claim to Christian citizenship—he saves his honesty. But the man who professes to glory in the day which commemorates the adoption of the great declaration, and repudiates its essential and most distinctive propositions, can hardly lay claim to Christian citizenship in this republic, if Christian citizenship implies thor-

oughgoing honesty on the part of him who claims it; and I think it does.

We may as some other sort of citizens, but we cannot as Christian citizens—impliedly honest—celebrate the adoption of the declaration of independence as it left the pen of Jefferson and was voted for by the colonial congress July 4, 1776; and applauded the shooting to death of an incipient republic, and the denial of rights to one of our territories that we accord to others, on July 4, 1901.

Convince me that this nation has finally, for all time to come, repudiated the declaration of independence, and I could only celebrate the Fourth day of July honestly—in accordance with my emotions—by stretching the blackest crape I could find across my front door, the crape of mourning for a dead nation that I had loved—dead with that soul-death which possesses all nations and individuals who repudiate their souls!

But I do not think it will be necessary for any honest citizen of this republic to bespeak his emotions in black crape on the Fourth day of July. The nation is not finally dead; it is only sleeping. The soul of Christianity still lives, though traitors to it have worn the mitre and the triple-crown. Chartered into active life and conquering power by the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's Prayer, and the sovereign definition of religion as love of God and love of man—Christianity has survived not one Judas, but millions, and is potent and alive enough to survive billions more. So I doubt not the soul of this republic will survive all traitors who seek to deliver it to death. It is sleeping now; they are wide-awake. The day must come when it will wake, and they will sleep—not with their fathers, for as citizens of this republic they are fatherless.

The declaration of independence which chartered this nation's soul into active life and conquering power, is not dead, nor is it outgrown; and on the Fourth day of July all Christian citizens of the republic may celebrate it gladly and honestly, recalling the spirit of the colonial congress of '76, and looking to the future, to another congress, in which that spirit shall rule supreme!

#### THE AMERICAN EMPIRE. For The Public.

Less than 14 decades ago the parliament of England passed a law to tax the American colonies, explaining, in justification of the act, that the proceeds of the taxation would be used in, and for the benefit of the colonies.

The world knows the result. The colonies repudiated the act as an unwarranted usurpation of power, declared that "taxation without representation is tyranny," and fought one of the fiercest wars of history in defense of the principle that all men are entitled to self-government.

By a series of acts, culminating in the recent decision of the supreme court, the present administration and the court have approved the action of a tyrannical parliament; cast aside the declaration of independence; asserted that one race may govern another without that other's consent; denied the right of all men to self-government; declared that men may be "subjects" of America, yet not be entitled to the protection guaranteed by the constitution.

By these acts they have "drawn the black bar sinister of tyranny" across the national escutcheon. Vandal hands have desecrated the graves of the nation's noblest dead.

Humanity with all its fears,  
With all its hopes of future years,  
Is hanging breathless in thy fate!

The fatal word has been spoken; the order has been given; the ship of state has been turned adrift upon an unknown sea. The anchor has been thrown overboard; the chart has been left in port; the compass, no longer deemed of any importance, is broken in fragments, which lie scattered upon the deck.

A dark and awful storm is gathering, yet not a sail has been furled; the masts seem ready to break as they bend before the fury of the storm; the maddened wind howls through the rigging; the ship reels and plunges; she seems to be sinking. Where is the crew in this hour of peril? We hear their voices—oaths and blasphemy—and yonder in the fore-castle we look upon a vile scene of drunken revelry, as they stake their all upon the turn of a card.

We seek the captain; with hurried steps we fly to the wheel; near it he stands, but his hands do not grasp the spokes; they hang listlessly by his sides. We hear his voice; breathlessly we listen; we hear the words:

"Manifest destiny! Plain duty! Conquest!"

By the dim light of a lantern hanging near we can see that his restless eye scans the distant horizon. We follow his gaze. In the distance we see a faint light which seems to rise and fall upon the dark, heaving sea. He sees it; his hands grasp the wheel, and, with a mighty effort, the bow is turned toward the new-found light. It

seems to be a vessel in distress, and as our ship speeds on we shout: "Bravo!" for she is surely going to the aid of the stranger ship. How grandly she defies the storm, one moment in the trough of the sea, the next plowing majestically through the angry waves, but ever nearing the struggling vessel!

Again we hear the captain's voice in measured, solemn tones:

"Duty! Destiny! Conquest!"

We come nearer. We see her signal of distress. She is almost under our bow, oh, horror! Will there be a collision? She strikes. There is consternation and alarm on the stricken ship, but the shock brings every one of our sailors to the deck, and involuntarily we applaud, for they have surely come to aid the unfortunate crew.

But above the storm's roar the voice of the captain is heard as he shouts:

"Is there any valuable cargo aboard?"

"Yes," comes the answer; when, to our dismay he gives the order:

"Lash the ships together; spring upon her deck; kill or capture every sailor that resists! The ship is ours by right of conquest. Fate has brought us here. Our manifest destiny is to rule. Take everything of value." Then in lower tones, as if speaking to himself:

"Benevolent assimilation! Plain duty! Destiny! Conquest!"

A vivid flash of lightning reveals what we had not seen before. Above the stars and stripes floats a black flag, and the hull of our ship has been painted the same somber hue.

The awful truth dawns upon us. Our once noble craft, the hope of humanity, has become a pirate ship; with no destination but that determined by the storm of fate; with no mission but pillage and murder, and no code of morals but might.

Bravely the strangers defend their sinking vessel, but they read their doom in the greater number and superior equipment of the pirate crew. Still they fight on, shouting:

"Liberty or death."

The rattle of musketry, the saber's stroke, the shriek of the wounded and the groans of the dying are mingled with the roar of the pitiless storm as we turn away from the scene of awful carnage, and are greeted again by those incoherent mutterings like a funeral dirge:

"Ours by right of conquest! Benevolent assimilation! Destiny! American empire!"

J. A. GILKEY.

Montesano, Wash., June 10, 1901.

#### MR. PINGREE THE RADICAL.

Some two years ago, when the late Hazen S. Pingree was endeavoring to bring about the sale of the Detroit street car lines, to the municipality, I spent a week with him studying the conditions for and against municipal ownership in Detroit. It was just before the governor's now well-known address at Cooper institute, New York, on the trusts, and was while Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland, was with him. I had an excellent opportunity to know the governor as he was, to measure him better than cartoons or interviewers ever had. Johnson was stopping at the Russell house, and the governor came there almost every evening to consult and talk with him. One evening Mr. Johnson was so busily engaged with the appraisers who were valuing the property of the street railway lines that the governor had to sit quite a time in the anteroom awaiting him. It chanced that I was waiting for Mr. Johnson also, so I stretched my legs alongside those of the discoverer of the "potato patch" and waited for him to speak.

He started sledgehammer-like on Grover Cleveland. He exclaimed:

"Grover Cleveland had the greatest opportunity of any president since Lincoln to do great things. But he got fat on the brain. Prosperity hurt him as much as it has McKinley. Both men had desperate struggles with poverty before they got into the white house, and when they suddenly found that they were certain of three square meals a day and a change of linen twice a week they simply couldn't stand it. They got right away from the people and began to be chummy with the men who have no use for the people except to bleed them. Before Cleveland left Buffalo all his companions were fellows that swore by the vox populi, but after he got to Washington all his companions were men who think the United States is a purse to be picked. The Ohio country didn't contain a bigger radical than McKinley before he got the right dip into politics. He was for everything that means reform and greater democratic powers. Well, he ain't now. He got scared of the people, and it's the trouble of everybody that gets into too much politics that they begin to duck from the people. I never did, but I didn't have to, and I've never been afraid to be on the people's side of a proposition whether it was popular or not.

"They call me 'old Pingree,' 'demagogue Pingree,' 'crank,' and a lot of other things, but if you'll scratch the back of the fellows that are hollering the most about me and against me you'll find that what I'm doing or advocating is hurting some property right of theirs that isn't exactly on the square. You can go up and down the streets of Detroit, in all the stores and houses, and where you find a man that calls me all sorts of mean things, you'll discover that he is interested in some property or some political job that my reforms would make over; would correct abuses in. I was over in Chicago the other day and I stopped at the Annex, and Mr. — came to me, and while we were talking (we're old acquaintances) he said to me:

"'Ping, why are you making all this muss about municipal ownership of street railways? Why don't you let well enough alone?'"

"'Sam,' said I, 'how much street railway stock do you own in the companies in the United States?'"

"He got red in the face and wouldn't answer me—said that had nothing to do with the question.

"'Yes,' said I, 'it has a great deal to do with the question. If you didn't own a share and was a thinking man, instead of a money-maker, you wouldn't call my efforts a 'muss.' You'd use a better term; you'd be complimentary and would help me along. But you've got stock in these companies, you know it's watered, you know you have a thousand privileges that ain't right, and you're sore when I come along and urge the people to make you be square. You call me a fool and the people anarchists.'"

The governor thought this a capital story, and he laughed long over it. Then he took a new tack. He said:

"Most men can't get a great deal of money on hand without becoming selfish and cowards. In war times few men had money, and there was bravery on every side; the idea that money was better than honor wasn't very strong in those days. But during our little trouble with Spain I saw more middle-aged men get white at the prospect of having to go to the front than I supposed were in existence. Why? They've got money-fat on the brain, and that's a form of paresis that kills all courage.

"We're getting too much money in the hands of the few in this country. I don't believe our governmental system causes this or that it's any fault of the republic. It's due to selfishness—greed—the desire to have every-

thing and boss everything. We're going to be badly hurt by this selfishness some day if we are not able to reach it by legislation, because it will breed violence, riots and destruction of property. You can't steal from ten people with one hand and give to two people with the other hand, and square your conscience.

"That's the trouble with the republican party to-day. It's got a ham-fat brain, and money is its curse. The young, the independent, the free-thinking, can't stand for it, and if the democrats ever get any sense and put forth a good platform they'll give the republican machine just such a jolt as it got when Tilden ran and after Blaine was defeated."

Mr. Johnson came into the ante-room just then. Later that night I wrote this interview or talk out, and asked the governor's permission to print it. He read it, then laughed, and said as he handed the manuscript back:

"You don't want that until I'm dead."

He is now at rest.—H. I. Cleveland, in Chicago Record-Herald of June 23.

#### MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

##### THREE-CENT FARES.

A special to the Plaindealer from Lorain last night said:

Tom L. Johnson will put his Lorain street railroad on a three-cent fare basis on and after the 21st of the present month. In a notice to the public the officials of the line say they desire to put in force the three-cent fare because it is more nearly adjusted to the requirements of its patrons than existing rates. The new rate of three cents will carry patrons anywhere within the corporate limits of either Lorain or Elyria, but a nine-cent fare will be charged between the two places.

"This is the road to which I referred recently when I said that a three-cent fare line would be in operation in Ohio within a few days," said Mayor Johnson last night. "I own only one share in the line, however, and the directors of the road are entitled to all the credit if there is any credit to be given.

"I believe I am on the board of directors, but requested that my name be dropped some two weeks ago. What action has been taken concerning the request I have not as yet been notified.

"It was decided about two weeks ago by the directors to place the line on a three-cent fare basis. The result will be watched closely, as the matter is somewhat in the nature of an experiment in so small a town. The directors can change back to the old basis

at any time, as there is no ordinance compelling a three-cent rate. This will be the first line in Ohio to operate on such a basis.

"A large part of the stock of the line is held by the old Johnson company, in which I have holdings, but by no means a controlling interest. Stockholders in the old Johnson company include members of the Dupont family, and a number of Cleveland, Louisville, Wilmington and New York parties.

"While the action to put the line on a three-cent basis was taken exclusively by the directors of the road, many of the stockholders in the old Johnson company were fully aware of what was going on."—Cleveland (O.) Plaindealer of June 20.

#### GAMBLING MUST BE SUPPRESSED.

Orders for a strict enforcement of the laws relating to gamblers and gambling were issued by the mayor Wednesday after a conference with police officials and other city officials. Police Judges Fiedler and Kennedy were present, as were also Chief Corner, Deputy Rowe, Police Director Lapp, and Director of Law Beacom.

The conference lasted about two hours. Those present refused to give out anything for publication at its conclusion, but it is known that the mayor insisted on gambling being suppressed and told the police officials that he would hold them accountable. The police judges said they would do all that they could when the cases reached their courts to dissuade gamblers making their home in Cleveland. The mayor was particularly insistent on the suppression of slot machines.—Plaindealer of June 20.

#### THE SLOT MACHINES MUST GO.

Four owners of slot machines waited on the mayor as a committee, yesterday afternoon. They had been given a hint that the mayor would like to see them in his office at five p. m. and they were on hand to the minute. The men in question own perhaps half of all the slot machines that are in operation in Cleveland.

"Gentlemen," began the mayor, "I am informed that among you you control a great many of the slot machines of the city. I want to know whether you will put them out of business or whether you prefer to have the police do it. I am aware that these machines are of considerable value and that it would mean quite a loss of money to you if they were destroyed. That is why I have

called you in to give you a chance to save your property. What do you say?"

"How about locking the machines so they cannot be used and leaving them where they are until we can find a place to dispose of them in another city?" asked one of the mayor's visitors.

"I asked you whether you would take the machines out or have the police smash them."

"Do you mean that the police will haul a machine out of any place they find it whether it is in operation or not?"

"Exactly. I do not care whether the machine is being used. We cannot bother with that question. A policeman may not find it in use, but it will be used if it is left where it is. Will you take them out?"

"I'll take out all that I own," spoke up one.

"I'll do the same," said another. The other two made a like promise.

"All right," said the mayor. "You will take these slot machines out of all saloons and cigar stands and other places and store them somewhere so that it will not be possible for anyone to operate them. I expect that each of you will let me know just where he has placed his machines. Owners of other machines will receive the same chance that you have had—store their machines where they will be harmless or have the police take them and destroy them. None will escape and there will be no second chance."

"Whew!" exclaimed one of the slot machine owners as the four stepped into the hall. "What are you going to do?" turning to one of his companions.

"Dig a hole in the ground, I guess, and bury my moneymakers. I could stand it to have the police get a spasm once in awhile and smash a machine, but to put the whole lot out of business!"

"Do you think Johnson would do what he said?"

"I ain't going to think. I'm going to get my machines into a safe place."—Plaindealer of June 21.

#### FIRECRACKERS ON THE FOURTH ONLY.

"Firecrackers can be used on July 4, and then only," declared Mayor Johnson yesterday.

"Persons who use them at any other time will be arrested and fined as heavily as the law stipulates. The police department has orders for a

vigorous enforcement of the law in this regard. Recently many complaints have been made of a too frequent use of firecrackers, to the annoyance of residents."—Plaindealer of June 25.

#### THE SOVEREIGN REMEDY FOR SOCIAL DISORDER.

Henry George proposed the abolition of all taxes upon the products of labor and the concentration of all taxes for public revenue upon the value of land as the "simple yet sovereign remedy" for the evils which threaten the social stability of civilized peoples. Subsequently this plan came to be called the "single tax." Because of this proposal George was denounced as "the greatest preacher of unrighteousness the world has ever known," as a socialist, as a confiscator of property, as a destructive revolutionist, etc. But throughout the whole tirade of abuse the followers of George could easily detect the note of fear. Those who profited by unrighteous social institutions and the apologists for such institutions realized that a practical remedy for the wrongs of centuries had been found and that there was needed only determination on the part of the people to make it effective; hence the tirade.

George did not propose to invade titles to property of any kind. Socialists would overthrow the institution of private property; George would protect that institution with greater moral sanctions and no less legal power than can to-day be brought to its defense. Nor did he propose to change the laws of taxation hastily, but instead to enter upon a policy which should advance steadily to the full realization of the ideal condition proposed. With appreciable progress in this direction George believed owners of vacant land would sell their holdings at much less than present prices, thereby more freely opening the source of all wealth to labor and capital, the active agencies of material civilization. For, while the wealth we do produce is divided in a monstrously unfair manner, this fact is of trivial consequence in comparison with the enormous check upon production caused by the monopolization of land. Idle labor, wasting capital, unused land, is the condition that is everywhere presented.

Producers not driven into absolute idleness are forced to avoid the valuable vacant land that is abundant within the corporate limits of all our populous cities, and to use inferior localities as the only alternative to the

low wages to be had at such centers. To avoid these conditions many wholly cease producing and seek admission to the legal profession—already overcrowded—become physicians in a way; turn book agents or life insurance solicitors; work the shell game or the strong arm; practice any of the devious methods that human wit has invented to escape starvation wages on the one hand, and the sage brush of the west on the other, and all because our laws make it profitable to hold idle the only source from which wealth can be drawn—the land.

Is it not true that we live on the outer surface of a sphere called the earth? And if this be true, where can we get the material out of which to make our houses, our clothing, our food—in a word, our material necessities, comforts and luxuries—save from the planet itself? And how can we get all these things—called wealth—save by our own physical exertion? Does some one say we harness the forces of nature to do our bidding? True, but we cannot think a harness onto steam, nor fasten one onto an electric current by thought. We can think out the way to harness them, but cannot actually place the harness by thought alone; the physical exertion of men is necessary.

Wealth, then, is produced from land by labor. Part of the wealth when procured goes to those who have in any way contributed to its production. This portion or fund is called wages. The balance goes to the owners of the land on which the production took place. This portion or fund is called rent—sometimes ground rent.

At this point it may be said that there are other matters to be taken into consideration, as commissions, dividends, interest, royalties, and the like, and that therefore the classification rent and wages is not inclusive. Take, for instance, dividends on the stock of a railroad. The stock represents the road. The road is made up of ties, rails, cars, engines, etc., and a strip of land—continuous, maybe, across several states. That strip of land is valuable—more valuable than all the rest of the railroad property. Its portion of the dividend is rent; the balance is wages. Careful analysis will demonstrate the same truth in all lines, although in some lines the examination may be somewhat difficult to follow, because of the more or less intricate processes of production employed.

Into rent and wages, then, all wealth is primarily apportioned. Wages is earned. Rent is paid for the mere op-

portunity to produce. Land is that opportunity. Rent is not earned by those who now get it. The fact, however, that rent can be collected by those who own valuable land leads men to buy vacant land that seems likely to be in demand in the future and hold it against occupation and use by others, waiting for the rise in price contingent upon this anticipated increase in demand. If the bulk of rent (ground rent) were taken in taxation it is obvious that the incentive to speculation in land would be gone, and that under such conditions no sane man would buy land save to put it to use; and as there are not enough people to actually use to its legitimate capacity more than a small portion of the land, it follows that the source of supply from which all life draws its sustenance would forever remain open, offering to honest labor that share of wealth which is its equitable and natural reward.

There are matters which people can attend to in their collective capacity better than they can individually. Government is a necessity of civilized society. To exist government must have a revenue. To get a revenue we must tax one of the funds into which production is divided. Public revenue must be drawn from either rent or wages. There is nothing else in existence that can be taxed (unless, perhaps, the foreigner). To tax wages is to add to the cost of living; is to make men cheap. Not to tax wages is to leave to men the natural reward of their toil; is to make men dear. Not to tax rent (properly, land value) is to invite land speculation; is to make land dear. To tax land value is to destroy speculation in land; is to make land cheap. All production is primarily divided into rent and wages; if this be true, it follows that the higher one is the lower the other must be. A low-priced man is the necessary corollary of high-priced land.

The art of government of the strenuous sort is to so adjust taxes that they will fall on wages (for the benefit of laborers, of course), and to tax rent but little. This is the basis of monopoly. In the United States for every dollar of taxes collected from rent wages is held up for ten. In support of the federal government rent pays nothing. No landlord, as a landlord, pays one cent to support the United States government. All of the expense of river and harbor fakes, credit mobiler and whisky steals, star route holdups, embalmed beef, Cuban post office bookkeeping, disappearing guns, Carnegie armor plates, useless

navies, Philippine butcheries, Annapolis duds, West Point toughs and court jesters; the whole thing, root and branch, is saddled upon wages. It is a good thing—for the rent collectors.

Henry George moved to change the system. Many enthusiastically second his motion. And those who are strong of sight perceive the growth of his thought in the march of events. For in the often reiterated assertion that the evil of trusts is in the monopoly, not in the combination, the idea of Mr. George is expressed. In the widespread demand for municipal ownership of monopolies, but not for flour mills, etc., the distinction made by Mr. George is adhered to.

In short, three roads along which society may attempt to move present themselves to-day:

The first is further monopoly, privilege—imperialism.

The second is further regulation by the state of private industry, declining individual liberty—socialism.

Avoid these, and no matter what may be attempted, aid and comfort will be afforded the movement for which Henry George lived and for which he died, the single tax on land values—democracy.

The sphinx of fate sits at the parting of these roads and asks its question.—John Z. White, in the Chicago Record-Herald of May 19.

#### THE TRUTH ABOUT THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

A letter from Frederic Harrison in London Daily News of May 30.

My friends urge me to send you a letter about the "Return of Farm-Burning, S. Africa (Cd. 524)," but I doubt if you would print anything which could fully express my own feelings on studying it; and I know that this incident is merely part of a far larger whole. However, if your readers would care to understand something of "the panoplied hatred" with which my friends and I regard this very brutal episode in an infamous war, I will put our case before them in plain words. I am neither "Little-Englander" nor "Pro-Boer," nor "cosmopolitan crank," but a patriotic Englishman, who does not think his country's greatness needs to be eked out with more Klondikes and Ugandas, and refuses to applaud every folly and crime into which demagogues in office may contrive to delude the nation.

The official return has disclosed a barbarous, vindictive, systematic attempt to terrorize and crush a brave enemy in arms, by devastating a coun-

try which it was found impossible to conquer, by ruining the homes of soldiers with whom we were waging war, and by exposing their wives and children to misery and want. This was a violation of the recognized laws of civilized war, and was expressly forbidden by The Hague conference. It was especially infamous when resorted to against an honorable body of citizens who were defending the existence of their country. It was insane folly in the case of a people whom it was designed to incorporate in the empire, who had actually been proclaimed as our own fellow-countrymen.

It was a policy so degrading in plan and so revolting in its consequences that any honorable soldier would have been justified in declining to undertake such butcher's work. But our commanders, accustomed to wholesale slaughter and devastation in warfare with savages in Asia and in Africa, and unaccustomed to fight with any men of European race, were found willing to act on it. And ministers at home were found willing to palliate it with cheerful indifference and evasive sneers. Both soldiers and ministers may count on this, that their names will live in history with those who ordered and executed the barbarities of the Thirty Years' war, the devastation of the Palatinate and the dragonnades of Louis XIV.

Barbarities of the kind became only too probable when our rulers entered "with a light heart" on a war to conquer and crush one of the toughest, bravest, most independent races in the world, and gayly announced that "not a shred of independence" would be left to men of proverbial courage and obstinacy, who for many generations have faced death, famine and the extremes of suffering in order to live free—and especially free of the hated British bondage. When the swindlers and braggarts told us that a little show of force would cow these Dutch farmers, that, even if war did result, it would be over in a few weeks, and would only cost a few millions, when they entered on one of the most formidable wars of the century with ignorance so laughable and arrogance so blind, it became clear to all who knew the history and nature of the Boer and the physical conditions of the task, that ghastly ferocities would be resorted to, and that our British name would be dragged down from each meanness and atrocity to still lower depths.

The horrible side of this war to us who retain some feeling for the honor

of our country is that the nature of the task to which we were committed made violent and unlawful measures almost inevitable. To conquer and annex two free and proud nations of European race and most stubborn nature is an outrage which has never been attempted since the partition of Poland. Considering the vast extent of the land, the physical difficulties of the task, and the superb fighting qualities of the patriots, it was an undertaking of extreme peril. Since they were of the same race, language and traditions as the Afrikanders of our own colony, it made civil war and rebellion almost inevitable. And yet, to fail in sight of mankind, after all our Quixotic braggadocio, would be intolerable humiliation. Accordingly they set their teeth, prepared "to fight it out to a finish" by whatever means, flinging to the winds considerations of public law, humanity and the good name of England. Men curse in their hearts the law of nations, and sneer openly at the farce of The Hague. And women of the governing class do not blush to say that "what is wanted is more cruelty." The horrible part of this war, I say, is that it has brutalized public opinion, made public men desperate and has unsexed the women whom they pervert.

The nation has been hoodwinked by an elaborate fabric of calumny and falsehood. The "Boer conspiracy to drive us out of Africa" is mere promoters' bounce, like the tales about "payable gold." It was invented by Rhodesian agents, and sent home by their gullible tool in Cape Town. The story of "Boer armaments" prior to the raid has been proved to be false. The myth that the war was "inevitable" is only true in the sense that the Crucifixion was inevitable. Everything is "inevitable" if fools will persist in their folly, and he that is unjust "will be unjust still." The war was inevitable in this sense only, that there were men resolved, in pursuit of their own ends, to spread blood and ruin far and wide. The pretext that nothing but war could decide "whether Dutchman or Briton should be master in South Africa," means only that the British were bent on crushing the Boer. It was a mere pretext for conquest. By what law of God or man was it "inevitable" that the Briton should dominate all South Africa? The Dutch were the majority; they were planted first in the soil; they were the only race which could thrive in the veldt; they were Afrikanders, bred and born in the land, not immi-

grants, passing prospectors, contractors, carpet baggers come out to make a pile. Why is it a law of nature that these men should be made the masters of the settled Afrikander population?

The origin of the war is the old struggle for "ascendancy"—just the claim of the Orange Protestant minority in Ireland to bring to heel the Catholic native race. The Orangemen, who are British by race and interest, claim the whole power of Britain to back them that they may dominate the native Irish majority, looking on themselves as the advance guard of the English conquerors. We all know what this malignant claim of "ascendancy" has cost England and has cost Ireland for centuries. In South Africa the same strife has gone on for a century, under more inflamed conditions. There the native-born majority is not only of different religion, of different race, but, is separated by their own language, their ancestral law, different habits of life, but, above all, by long traditions of independent nationality. For these reasons, it is a far more desperate undertaking to trample down the Boer race than it has been to bring into subjection the Catholic population of Ireland. But into this stupendous folly, into this abominable crime, the British adventurers in South Africa have induced our government to plunge. They rigged the political market, they gave "commissions" to leading politicians, they hired the press in Africa and at home, they poured out on the public ear a torrent of calumny and sensational falsehoods; they organized a foul act of piracy; they bullied and blackmailed the "department;" they made the representative of the crown their creature.

This responsible governor of a self-governing colony stooped to play the part which some noble chairman of a rotten company performs as the figurehead of a board of guinea pig directors. He behaved as an Irish viceroy would behave, if he made himself the grand master of the Orange faction, hounded them on to insult, misrepresent and attack their Catholic fellow-subjects, and personally labored to bring about a civil war. He mouthed out rhetorical abuse of the government with which he was sent to negotiate; he insulted and defied the constitutional ministers he was bound to consult; he resorted to his old journalistic epigrams to mislead and irritate people at home; he concealed from them the feeling of the inhabitants of the colony he governed; he deceived his chiefs at home

by false accounts of the perils before them and of the means of compromise at hand. And when he saw the possibility of a peaceful issue to the imbroglio he had fanned, he took care to make a settlement impossible and war the natural result.

War, indeed, did result; and it is only one of the same electioneering tricks to pretend that the Boers began it. When they saw the empire armed, and heard the open menaces of the official dispatches, their invasion of Natal was a mere strategic move, as a man threatened by a gang of armed burglars might give the first blow to protect himself. And now, when a wasting and savage war has gone on for nearly 20 months, with no visible result except the slaughter of myriads of men, the waste of 150,000,000, ruin, devastation and famine broadcast over the very country we pretend to call part of our empire, and deadly hatred planted in a race of men that never forgets, whom we pretend to call our fellow-citizens—now we are asked to join in the mock triumph of the author of all this shame and confusion, of this ghastly anarchy and never-dying source of future strife. This worst enemy of his country, this contriver of incalculable ruin, is called away from the chaos into which he has plunged his colony, to receive the honors of a victorious soldier. Let us not join in this squalid electioneering farce, the same kind of advertising trick by which bold tradesmen try to rouse a boom in their tea, or their wines, or their wines, or their miraculous soap.

Not only are we being ruined, humiliated and made odious as a nation, but we are being made the laughing-stock of the world. This grotesque fooling for party ends is transforming us into a race of blackguards. The disgusting orgies of Mafficking and carnivals were encouraged and financed by politicians and advertising tradesmen. They were blessed by the clergy of that church which assures us that "God made war." Soldiers who have violated the law of nations, and have left the field of their so-called conquests a scene of chaos and confusion, swept by incessant and aimless fighting, are hailed as if they were the saviors of the country. Generals who have suffered humiliating defeats, over which the civilized world has made merry, vapor about at bazars and garden parties as heroes and Heaven-born commanders. No one denies the splendid courage shown by our soldiers, officers and men alike; nor do we fail to honor the patience, cheerfulness and

tenacity of all who have borne the heat and burden of this long and cruel day. But to swagger over the deeds of men who have done their duty as English soldiers always have done, to shout about the world with this immoderate bluster over a campaign which, considering the petty enemy and their narrow means, has been one long tale of rebuff, disappointment, miscalculation, disaster and perpetual "regrettable incidents," including more British soldiers taken prisoners than ever happened in our long history before—this, I say, is more like the tone of the Hooligans out Mafficking than of the Englishmen who beat Napoleon and saved Europe.

It makes me tingle when I witness these blatant Bardolphins in their carouses, got up by politicians with an eye on the ballot box. Our men are brave, and resolute, and enduring. Yes! But what are the Dutch farmers, old men and boys together, who serve under Cronje and DeWet? Has not Lord Kitchener slaughtered men in North Africa as well as in South Africa as brave as the men he commands? No one doubts that our men are worthy of honor. But are honor and glory and admiration due only to one side of this long and sanguinary war? What disgusts sensible men is all this larrakin shouting over the very disasters and blunders and failures that they inflict on our name. One would think that a viceroy has only to plunge his province into unutterable ruin by fanning civil war, by making peace within it impossible for a generation, to be received with the honors our fathers accorded to a Clive or a Lawrence. And a general has only to "fall into a trap," to lose his guns, to sacrifice brigades in unsuccessful "frontal attacks," to be regarded as if he were a Nelson or a Wellington.

"The war is now over," we are officially informed week by week by commanders, ministers and their friends in the press. We look on these brazen untruths with alarm, for it is thought to be the prelude to some new policy of rage and barbarism. But all is not "over." We are not "over" the deadly blow all this has struck at the empire, the ruin and chaos it has spread through South Africa, the blood-poison it has infused into public opinion, nor the stain on English honor in the sight of the civilized world. There is another thing, too, which is not yet "over." And that is the nationality of the Boer republics, which I believe are not yet crushed out forever—which, as a patriotic Eng-

lishman, I trust never will be crushed out forever.

ONE SMALL AND ONE LARGE.

One small and one large, and I saw them engaged  
 In a marvelous wonderful fight,  
 And the weight of the men was as one to ten,  
 In the scales of resource and might.  
 And the little man fought for his country and home,  
 And for all that a mortal should pray,  
 And the larger man fought, as he said he ought,  
 To teach him a better way.  
 And a wonderful part of this marvelous strife,  
 Was the number of lengthening years,  
 That the little man stood, as a patriot should,  
 Unconquered by wounds or fears.  
 And the on-looking multitudes, strange to relate!  
 Uttered nothing but jibes and jeers  
 At the little man's strife for his home and his life,  
 And they gave to the larger one cheers.  
 And yet there were some in the on-looking throng  
 That pitied the smaller man;  
 And they said that his cause under heaven's high laws,  
 Was just in its purpose and plan.  
 But the time came at last as the sad years past,  
 When the little man gasped for breath,  
 And when blow upon blow at length laid him low,  
 In the motionless calm of death.  
 Then the multitudes shouted, how strange!  
 Aye, how strange!  
 When all was over and done,  
 That the strong man was right in the wonderful fight,  
 Just because he had mastered and won.  
 And they chid and denounced the lone few of the throng  
 Who had even the courage to say,  
 While the little man bled and the field was red,  
 That the right is the better way.  
 And yet, thanks to God! the lone few, though they knew  
 That the weak man must lose in his stress,  
 Still said and still say that the only true way  
 Is the pathway of righteousness.  
 And still they adhere to their overtures clear,  
 That encounters for conquest should cease,  
 And that ever as now should earth's stronger ones vow  
 That theirs is a mission of peace.  
 —Henry Slade Goff, in Farm, Stock and Home.

AT NIAGARA.

Casey—There's th' big power-house yez might have hear-rd tell av.  
 Kelly—An' phwat's it for?  
 Casey—Phwat's it for? Phwy, yez great ignoramus, yez, that's phwere th' power comes from t' kape th' falls sploied wid wather.—Puck.

There are always more early birds than worms.—Atchison Globe.

MR. DOOLEY ON OPPORTUNITY.

As the pote says: "Opporchunity knocks at ivry man's dure wanst." On some men's dures it hammers till it breaks down th' dure, an' thin it goes in an' wakes him up if he's asleep, an' iver afterward it wurrucks f'r him as a night watchman. On other men's dures it knocks and runs away, an' on th' dures iv some men it knocks, an' whin they come out it hits them over th' head with an ax.—F. P. Dunne, in Chicago American.

"Papa, what is firmness?"

"The exercise of will power, my son."

"Well, sir, and what is obstinacy?"

"The exercise of won't-power, my son."—Puck.

Greene—They say that Senator Keener is on the make. They even go so far as to say that that new house of his was given him in payment for his vote.

Gray—It puts me all out of temper to hear such slanders. It is as far as possible from the truth. I know all about it. It was this way: Some people who were interested in a certain bill bet him that house that he would vote against the bill, and he didn't and won the house. That was all there was about it. The idea of Keener's being open to bribery!—Boston Transcript.

Wu Ting Fang may criticise Christianity, but he must be careful what he says about the administration.—Puck.

The teacher of a Sabbath-school class approached one little fellow who was present for the first time, and asked his name. "Well," said the youngster, "they call me Jimmie for short; but my maiden name is James." —Woman's Journal.

Chicago Man—To be perfectly candid, politics are rotten with us and I suppose they are with you.

Boston Man—On the contrary, politics is rotten with us.—Puck.

BOOK NOTICES.

"The Problem of Worry," solved by Herman Kuehn (Chicago: N. B. Irving, 70

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 607, Chicago.

Dearborn street), explains the plan of an insurance expert for "practical commercial credit cooperation." In other words, this lively little pamphlet, for it is lively, outlines one of the plans by means of which at least one ideal anarchist hopes to put his theories of a society without government into practical operation. Mr. Kuehn premises that government royalties—royalties for money, for land, for governmental special privileges of every kind—are the cause of social disorder. It follows, therefore, that he would abolish all royalties. But his plan relates especially to the abolition of the monopoly of money. He evidently regards this as the most fundamental, or at any rate the most effective, of all the monopolies; and in the royalty for the use of money he includes all interest. A large part of his book is consequently devoted to an effort to show that interest would not exist if money were abolished, and most of the remainder to a defense of his plan for free money. This plan is an adaptation to the anarchistic idea of mutual banking of the methods of insurance. Mr. Kuehn proposes a "local cooperative credit union," to be composed of any number of persons, few or many. The local unions form in turn a "general cooperative credit union." Each member of a local union must pledge himself to accept in exchange for work or wealth, the credit insurance policies of the general union at par with current money. Any member may borrow the credit of his own union upon his own note secured by a pledge of twice its value in property. Upon doing so he will receive the "credit certificates," or insurance policies of the general union, in convenient denominations, to the amount of the loan. These certificates or policies will, with the growth of the credit of the general union, become more desirable as currency than government money, and will therefore displace it. And inasmuch as they are obtainable without interest (except one per cent. or less, as may be needed, for expenses), interest will be no more. Mr. Kuehn's plan seems upon the surface to be feasible as a mode of facilitating exchanges. But the argument with which he leads up to it, whereby he limits interest to money monopoly, is not impressive. Neither does the insurance plan proposed commend itself as a solution of "the problem of worry."

**MAGAZINES.**

—The "Social Crusader (Chicago: The Social Crusader, 600 Ashland Block) contains in the issue for June the text in full of the letter from Prof. George D. Herron to the Congregational church of Iowa on the occasion of his trial by that body.

—"Sound Currency" (New York: Reform Club, 52 William St.) for June contains a compilation of the coinage, currency and banking laws of the United States from 1791 to 1900. The currency publications of the Reform club are justly famous for their accuracy, whatever may be thought of the soundness of their theories. This compilation will therefore be acceptable, for purposes of investigation or reference, to students of the money question of whatever school. It is conveniently, though briefly, indexed.

—"The Crucial Test" is the title of the issue of June 1 of "Facts About the Filipinos" (Boston: Philippine Information Society, 12 Otis Place). In the order of arrangement, though not of publication, it is No. III of the first series, and deals with the Filipino government of 1898 against which President McKinley declared war by his proclamation of December, 1898. As we have heretofore explained, these publications are made up almost en-

tirely of official documents, interspersed with accounts from personal observers. Among the observers quoted from in the number now before us are W. B. Wilcox, Leonard R. Sargent, John Barrett and John F. Bass.

—"Why" (Cedar Rapids, Ia.: Frank Vierth), the June number of which is now before us, is a model propaganda periodical. Its mission is the promotion of single tax thought, but other schools of social reform might advantageously copy its method. Instead of filling its pages with miscellaneous matter of little or no merit, which neither attracts outside attention nor excites human interest, and which at best only appeals to converts already made, "Why" reprints in support of its cause such matter as has already proved to be instructive and effective. Exceptions are made, of course, in favor of new articles of more than ordinary value which come within its reach. By following that policy this excellent and unique little magazine furnishes monthly a tract which nonconverts can be readily induced to read, and which when read both interests and informs them. The June number is a fine example. It contains two short articles by Henry George. One is George's lecture, on "The Study of Political Economy," delivered before the students of the University of California in 1877, copies of which have long been scarce. The other is an extract from "Progress and Poverty," one of those complete and fascinating illustrations of social law in which "Progress and Poverty" abounds and for which, indeed, all George's writings are noted. It is the story of the growth of a large city upon a fertile plain. Nothing could better serve the propaganda purposes of any cause than a periodical which judiciously follows this distinguishing policy of "Why."

**ATTORNEYS.**

Chicago.

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

**HARRIS F. WILLIAMS.**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW.  
806 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 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Houston.

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

New York.

**FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER.**  
COUNSELOR AT LAW,  
BENNETT BLDG.  
90 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.  
Tel. Call, 1253 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.

To Smoke  
or  
Not to Smoke  
is  
Not the Question  
if they are  
**MOOS' CIGARS.**

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.