

# The Public

Dr. HJ Woodhouse  
Nov 2-01 Box 541

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 1901.

Number 156.

**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 dinner of the "Get-Together Club," which was attended on the 25th at Madison Square garden concert hall, New York city, by 500 people, who listened sympathetically to patronizing speeches from rich men on "movements for improving the condition of the employed," recalls Tolstoi's famous saying about the rich classes being so tender in their sympathies that they are willing to do anything for the poor—except get off their backs.

Extensive quotations from the Pennsylvania press, made by the Johnstown Democrat, show that Pennsylvania also is awakening to the importance of the movement in this country in favor of the Australian tax system—so much of it, at any rate, as allows localities to decide for themselves what kind of local property they will tax for local revenues. In bringing this reform to the attention of American legislatures, through his report upon the subject and his success in securing favorable action by the Colorado legislature, Senator J. W. Bucklin, of Colorado, has rendered a most useful service, not only within his own state but to the people of other states.

Pernicious governmental interference with individual concerns receives a new exemplification from Minnesota. The senate of that state has passed a bill which would require, of every person about to marry, a physician's certificate that "neither such person, nor the father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, or any brother or sister of such person, ever was af-

flicted with chronic imbecility or insanity." With the theory of heredity running mad, and the craze for regulating other peoples' lives and doing them good by law growing by fits and starts, the goal of such legislation as this Minnesota bill is easy to foresee. That some one in the lower house may stigmatize the bill as it deserves is to be sincerely hoped. Of all the "scientific" fads, statutory stirpiculture is the most abhorrent.

According to a Honolulu correspondent of the New York Evening Post, the Hawaiian legislature is likely to adopt two important reforms, one political and the other economic. The political reform is proportional representation. This alone is one greatly to be desired everywhere. It is a system of minority voting which would make legislative bodies proportionately representative of the conflicting views of their constituencies. The economic reform mentioned is also likely to be adopted in Hawaii, is the single tax. Of this the Post's correspondent says that it "would throw almost the whole burden of taxation on the sugar interests," which own "nearly all the cultivable land." A single plantation in one of the islands is 30,000 acres in extent. It seems that the single tax measure is supported by the native members. The white members oppose it, but are in the minority. We shall be no less surprised than gratified, however, if the white members do not disorganize the majority on this matter. Though in the minority, they represent the landlord class; and, as Carlisle would say, that means much.

Judge Dunne, of Chicago, has made a sensible decision on the question of excluding unvaccinated children from the public schools. He holds that this cannot be done unless

smallpox is so prevalent as to create an emergency. There is no compulsory vaccination law in Illinois. Therefore, according to Judge Dunne, the health and school authorities can restrain unvaccinated persons only in the exercise of a reasonable discretion. "Children infected with or exposed to smallpox," he says, "may be temporarily excluded, or the school be temporarily suspended; but like the exercise of similar power in other cases such power is justified by the emergency, and like the necessity which gives rise to it, ceases when the necessity ceases." The principle of this decision apparently ignores the question of vaccination for school children altogether, and properly so. Essentially, that is, it ascribes to the school authorities legal power to make rules for the prevention of contagion during epidemics. In such times, therefore, they may exclude unvaccinated children. But they might also exclude vaccinated children.

Democratic opposition to Mr. Harrison's reelection as mayor of Chicago found its most pronounced expression on the 28th at a public meeting at the Auditorium, at which Altgeld was the principal speaker. What effect this negative movement may have upon the result at the polls it is impossible to predict. It may be impossible to judge even after the event. But it is certain that in no other way can the democrats of Chicago disentangle themselves from responsibility for the city hall ring. The situation is a difficult one. If the republican candidate were worthy of popular confidence, the democratic ring might be kicked out of power in the democratic party and thereby in the city, by voting for the republican, which in that case could be done without re-

pugnance. Had Harlan been nominated by the republicans such an opportunity would have been offered. If there were, a third party candidate (no matter what he stood for, so it were legitimate and he were a reputable man), whose party was of importance as a political factor, an effective protest might be made through that agency. As it is, nothing remains for democrats who see the importance of ridding the party of responsibility for Harrison but to vote for Hanecy or "take to the woods."

Between these two courses there is no difference, except in degree. To "take to the woods" in any of the variety of ways in which that may be done, is to produce the effect of giving Hanecy a fraction of a vote. To vote for him is to give him a whole vote. In other words, the latter is the more effective of the two ways of doing the same thing. And if the thing ought to be done at all, it ought to be done in the most effective way. That it ought to be done there is, in our judgment, no doubt. The Burke-Harrison ring has gained control of the democratic machinery of Chicago, and through patronage and intimidation can retain control as long as it remains in official power at the city hall. The Lorimer ring, operating in the field of county offices, nominates weak or bad candidates for city office, so as to perpetuate the power in the democratic party of the Burke-Harrison ring; which in return helps Lorimer's party in county elections, and in those state and national elections in which it is not personally interested.

The trick about nominating weak or bad republican candidates is to take advantage of that quality of human nature which makes men recoil from punishing bad officials of their own party by supporting equally bad candidates of the other. It is a shrewd trick, and there is but one way of meeting it. It is this: Since a bad man is to be in office whether or no, vote in the most effective way against the reelection of the one already in. That

is to say, vote for the bad candidate for election as against the bad candidate for reelection. That is the kind of voting that disturbs the calculations of bosses and smashes rings.

Tom L. Johnson's campaign for the Cleveland mayoralty makes interesting reading as accounts of it appear in the local papers. Whether he shall be elected or not, the campaign will have been well worth making; and as he asserts his intention of working for the city's interests, regardless of the result of the election, the greatest loss from his defeat would be the consequent loss of official opportunity for such work. But, notwithstanding that Cleveland is a republican city, the indications are that Johnson will be elected. These indications grow out of the peculiar weakness of the campaign against him hardly less than out of the very strong campaign that is being made for him. His own absolute candor is a refreshing novelty in politics, which cannot but make favorable impressions. He was asked, for instance, at one of his large meetings, if he as mayor would send policemen in citizen's clothes to watch saloons. This is a ticklish question for Cleveland candidates. To answer one way is to arouse the hostility of the temperance element; to answer the other way is to invite the virulent opposition of the dive interests. Here is Johnson's answer:

I don't want anybody to vote for me under a misapprehension. My attitude on this question may not suit some people, but that is my position, and I will tell you why I take this view. I think, in the first place that the police force is too small to dress men in citizens' clothes to find out whether some one is violating the law. Goodness knows there is enough vice in plain sight. With 250 policemen I do not believe I will try to keep 1,900 back doors closed. I will not make this city a temperance town, for I am too liberal for that. Men are not so much miserable because they drink as they drink because they are miserable. Misery is produced by poverty and poverty is the product of injustice. Justice will abolish involuntary poverty and when men are relieved of want and the fear of want more will have been accomplished for temperance and the

suppression of vice than all suppressive measures. I do not believe in lawmade morality. I want it understood that I will not allow a lot of dives to continue in existence which are running down-town to-day. The dives, I promise you, I will make an earnest effort to suppress. Further, I don't want that element to vote for me. I would rather be defeated than be elected by the support of that element.

One of the decisions of the federal supreme court, handed down on the 25th, apparently establishes a very important and far-reaching principle in the interests of sound public policy. The issue involved was the question of whether a municipal franchise for a term of years, which allows a public-service corporation to charge at specified rates for its service, constitutes a contract that cannot constitutionally be revoked, or is only a license which, in respect of the rate of charges authorized, may be altered if they are excessive. The decision was made in what is known as the Rogers Park water case. The village of Rogers Park, Ill., had granted a franchise to a water company for 30 years, empowering it to supply water at certain rates of charge. That was in 1888. Rogers Park was afterwards annexed to Chicago, and in 1897 the Chicago city council reduced those rates. Its action was sustained by the state supreme court, which held that the franchise did not constitute a contract as to rates of service, but that the company, by accepting the franchise, stood "charged with a legal duty to supply water to the inhabitants of the village for reasonable compensation." This decision is affirmed by one of the decisions just made by the supreme court of the United States. Exactly what may be the force of the affirmance as establishing a general principle of constitutional law, cannot be determined without an examination of the opinion, and that has not yet been published; but apparently it must be sufficient to enable municipalities to regulate the rates of all public service corporations—street car fares as well as water

tariffs—regardless of the rates specified in the franchises.

The London municipal election of the 2d proves to have been the greatest victory for progressive government in the history of the council. It was at the same time a stunning rebuke to the jingoes, who had run their campaign on imperial lines. Until within ten days of the election the progressives lacked confidence. So they neglected seats which they might have carried. But as it was, they won 86 seats out of 118. The overwhelming character of this victory may be appreciated by comparing the distribution of council seats between progressives and moderates (radicals and conservatives) since 1889:

	1889.	1892.	1895.	1897.	1901.
P .....	71	84	59	70	86
M .....	47	34	59	48	32
P. Maj.....	24	50	00	22	51

This election is in effect carte blanche authority from the people to the progressives to sweep away some of the worst monopolies of London; and unless the tory majority in parliament interferes, the popular mandate will surely be obeyed. There is, moreover, encouragement in the election for the true progressives of this country. It is indicative that public opinion has recoiled from the brute patriotism which carried the British and American elections last fall.

Buffalo has a free water question under discussion. It came before the council last week upon a motion for a public hearing on the proposition to abolish the water rates and distribute water to consumers free. The matter was made a party question, and the resolution was voted down—13 republicans voting against it and 12 democrats voting for it. It was argued by the democrats that the support of the water system by general taxation would lessen the burdens of water consumers by distributing the cost of water supply more equitably. That is, that the increase in taxes upon tenants and home owners would be less than their exemption from wa-

ter rates, thus relieving them; and that the difference would be made up by higher taxes on vacant lots, which now contribute nothing to the support of the water system, though the water system enhances their value. A free water issue in any large city would result in a good deal of needed enlightenment, if thoroughly discussed. Was that the reason the Buffalo republicans voted against discussion?

An expensive jingo policy and an empty exchequer have produced a fiscal problem in England, and tariff duties having been proposed as the best solution, because they cast the burden of taxation upon the masses without letting them know they are taxed, an opportunity is offered the British protectionist to raise his voice once more in the land. How familiar it sounds to us of this country. Here is the complaint of one protectionist member of parliament:

England has become the dumping ground of Europe; and now we are getting to be a dumping ground for America, too.

Strangers to protectionist terminology might suspect from this that England has become a dumping ground for the world's garbage. But not at all. What the member of parliament complains of is her becoming a dumping ground for the good things of the world that go there because her people want them and wouldn't go there but for that. Think of a householder complaining that his house has become a dumping ground for groceries, dry goods, clothing, carpets, fuel and luxuries of all sorts! What cause would he have for complaining? Wouldn't he say, "Let 'em dump?" Why shouldn't a nation say so, too?

The British tory leaders who are advocating an extension of the customs tariff, argue that the people pay such taxes without knowing that they pay them, and that this promotes good feeling at home while expensive imperial policies are carried out abroad. They are right. All indirect taxes have the virtue of soothing the taxpayer. They are to plundering

governments what chloroform is to plundering house breakers. This is the reason they were recommended by that eighteenth century Frenchman whose theory of taxation methods was that they should conform to the principle of "plucking the geese in such manner as to get the most feathers with the least squawking." To point the moral properly, it must be remembered that in our own country almost all taxes, national, state and local, are indirect. Under the operations of this system our largest class of taxpayers are called and call themselves nontaxpayers. They pay their taxes "all unbeknownst" in the prices of what they buy.

Something which seems to be entirely new in American legislation has been proposed by Representative Crafts in the Illinois legislature. Mr. Crafts has put his proposition in the form of a bill, which provides "for an expression of opinion by electors on questions of public policy at any general or special election." The bill is short enough for quotation in full:

Section 1. Be it enacted, etc., That on a written petition signed by five per cent. of the registered voters of any incorporated town, village, city, township, county or school district, or one per cent. of the registered voters of the state, it shall be the duty of the proper election officers in each case to submit any question of public policy so petitioned for, to the electors of the incorporated town, village, city, township, county, school district or state, as the case may be, at any general or special election named in the petition: Provided, such petition is filed with the proper election officers in each case, not less than 60 days before the date of the election at which the questions or question petitioned for are to be submitted.

Sec. 2. Every question submitted to electors shall be printed in plain, prominent type upon the official ballot, to be used at the election at which the question is to be submitted, in form as provided by law.

Only one criticism of this bill occurs to us. Instead of requiring the question to be printed upon the official ballot on which the names of candidates occur, it should be printed upon a separate ballot to be handed to every voter with the regular ballot. This

has been found by experience in voting on constitutional amendments to draw the attention of voters, thereby securing a full expression of opinion. In other respects the bill is excellent. There is probably little hope of its passage this year; yet if it should pass, it would be extraordinarily effective in distinguishing and promoting popular legislation. If the people could officially express their wishes regarding legislation by voting upon important questions free from entangling preferences for candidates, we should at least have opportunities for learning what now it is impossible to learn, the actual will of the people regarding the questions that concern them.

In the Commoner of last week Mr. Bryan called Grover Cleveland to account on the score of his democracy, apropos of Cleveland's characteristic letter to the Crescent Democratic club of Baltimore. Mr. Bryan's offer of a reward of five dollars "for a written statement, not to exceed 500 words, signed by Mr. Cleveland, applying democratic principles, as he understands them, to at least five of the questions now before the country," has been criticized as "infra dig." The contemptuous offer may be; but that is a matter of mere taste—something which is never open to discussion. The essential thing is Mr. Bryan's demand. Forever prating about democratic principles, Cleveland never applies them. If he would respond to Mr. Bryan's demand and make a statement applying democratic principles as he understands them to five of the questions now before the country, he might furnish some test of his democracy. What, for instance, in Mr. Cleveland's opinion, is democratic doctrine on the Spooner amendment? What is it on the Cuban resolutions? What is it on trusts?

Mr. Cleveland's nearest approach to practical democracy was in 1887-88, when he blazed the way for a campaign of free trade. But that ap-

pears now to have been an accident, for in no other important respect does his record tally with it. The free trade issue itself he shunted off the track, as soon as it had put him back into the whitehouse with a strong majority behind him in congress. Instead of calling an extra session of congress at once to give effect to the popular mandate on the only issue of the campaign, he let the spring and the summer and the fall go by, let the opposition catch their breath. Meantime he called an extra session to make an entirely new issue, the money issue, on which he took the republican side. Cleveland could not be better described than in these words of Mr. Bryan: "To desertion of the party organization and betrayal of the principles of the party, he adds ostentatious pretence of interest in the plain people, while he conceals his ideas in ponderous and platitudinous phrases." He yearns in his Baltimore letter for the old days of democracy when "democratic principles, advocated in democratic fashion, gave guarantee of democratic supremacy—or at least strength and influence in our national councils." Which old days does he mean? Those proslavery days that ended with Buchanan's term? or the days that followed the close of the civil war? If the former, what is there in them for a democrat in principle to be proud of? If the latter, what record of democratic accomplishment is there to show for "democratic supremacy" or democratic "strength and influence"?

A London paper, the Daily News, reported on the 28th that Denmark has communicated to the United States the following conditions for the sale of the Danish West Indies:

1. Four million dollars to be paid to Denmark.
2. The population to decide by vote whether to remain Danish or to be transferred to the United States.
3. If the vote is favorable to the United States then the inhabitants to become immediately not only American subjects, but American citizens.
4. Products of the island to be ad-

mitted to the United States free of duty.

It is supposed in London, says the News, that the United States will not readily accept the third and fourth conditions. A shrewd supposition. The United States is less intent, under the present administration, upon establishing citizenship than upon acquiring subjects.

Senator Hoar, who, by the way, is reported by those who have talked with him within the last week or so, to be waiting the proper occasion to declare himself in favor of the repudiation of our national pledge to the Cuban republic, built that masterly speech of his of April 17, 1900, which has been the text-book of anti-imperialists, on the assumption that we would keep our word to Cuba and make her really free. All the way through it occur expressions like this:

Every people is by right entitled to its independence that has got as far as Cuba had in the spring of 1898. You all admit that. Admit! You all avow, affirm, strenuously insist on that. You will always pledge your lives and fortunes and sacred honor for that. You will go to war and send your sons to war to maintain that. If Spain shall deny it, or any other country but Great Britain, woe be to her. It is not necessary, according to you, to have a constitution; it isn't necessary to have courts; it isn't necessary to have a capital; it isn't necessary to have a school. The seat of government may be in the saddle. It isn't necessary to occupy a city, or to have a seaport; it isn't necessary to hold permanently an acre of land; it isn't necessary to have got the invader out of the country; it isn't necessary to have a tenth part of the claim the Filipinos have, or to have done a tenth part of the things the Filipinos have done.

The motto of that speech on its title-page stands in three lines of bold-face type:

No right under the constitution to hold subject states. To every people belongs the right to establish its own government in its own way. The United States cannot with honor buy the title of a dispossessed tyrant, or crush a republic.

The amazing and painful depravation, intellectual and spiritual, which permits the author of this once great speech (it cannot be esteemed any-

thing but word mongering now, alas!) is one of the saddest and most wonderful phenomenon of the general spiritual decline of our day.

In the same speech, Mr. Hoar girded at the administration for its silence on the Boer struggle and contrasted the eagerness of the republican senators to express their sympathy for Venezuela in its contention with Great Britain, with their silence on the murder of the South African republics. "Where are they now?" asked the old Massachusetts senator. "They are bound over to keep the peace; they are bound over to hold their peace, the open door and the shut mouth." And the joke of it is, as we now see it, that the door was soon after shut as well as their mouth, and the British as well as Yankees outside of it, while direct overland connection with China is made for England's inveterate enemy whom she has always been preparing to fight for the last three generations. It is the work of the wills of the gods, most assuredly, that just at the appointed hour, when Asia is dropping into Russia's grasp, as England has always dreaded its doing, Great Britain finds herself so limited with Chamberlain and Rhodes's shameful and disastrous commercialism in South Africa, plain sandbagging highway robbery in the eye of international law, that she cannot move hand or foot to resist!

It is proposed by L. A. Russell, the Cleveland lawyer, that—

American citizens get together everywhere in their home localities in mass meetings and send word direct to the citizens of Cuba and the citizens of the Philippines that we perfectly understand that our hired men at the present moment operating our governmental functions are betraying our faith toward them, and ask them to administer their own affairs as patiently as they can till we can get our affairs into such hands as will execute our intentions by respecting the independence of Cuba and the Philippines and letting them alone except in friendly intercourse and mutual helpfulness. It seems to me straight talk from us to those peoples is now necessary to save our nation from doing them more wrong

and to save ourselves and our posterity from being slaves to tyrants.

Word comes up from South America that the people of those countries are mentally disturbed by a growing conviction that the United States contemplates appropriating their countries as additional "new possessions." This is what it means to get a bad name. After our national crime with reference to the Philippines, and our unblushing national perfidy with reference to Cuba, no foreigner would believe our most solemn protestations that we are not ambitious of empire, and none would trust us again in the presence of a national temptation. This is humiliating to an American, and it is inexpressibly disappointing and saddening to those European lovers of liberty who have been accustomed to look to the United States as the exemplar of the nations. We are told that Russian exiles in Siberia, victims of an absolutism from which at the risk of fortune and life they have struggled to free their own country, were dumb with amazement and sorrow when they learned that the United States had taken the title and the place of Spain in subjugating the Filipinos. At first they refused to believe it, suspecting the story as another St. Petersburg lie invented and published for their discouragement. But time brought confirmation of the story, and they were forced to acknowledge, what the loyal officers of the tsar had long insisted upon, that the aspirations of the United States were the same as those of the oppressive land-grabbing nations of Europe. The pity of it! The shame of it!

The system of putting prisoners accused of crime into what the police significantly and aptly call the "sweat box," has been vigorously condemned by Judge Tuley, of Chicago. In the particular case, it was charged that the prisoner had been brought to the prosecuting attorney's office and questioned. Judge Tuley said of this: "I cannot countenance the

practice of the state attorney's office in sending for defendants charged with crime and interviewing them in the state's attorneys office in the absence of their attorneys." This practice is denied by the state's attorney, but it is a common practice with the police. One of the favorite methods of extorting confessions is the police "sweat box," which is a sort of European court of "first instance." The prisoner is subjected to a torturing cross examination without the advice or protection of counsel, but none of the safeguards of "courts of first instance" are thrown about him. The "sweat box" is an irresponsible and pernicious institution. Its object is not so much to expose crime and punish criminals, as to confuse prisoners and make them, innocent or guilty, convict themselves.

We have no disposition to say anything about Andrew Carnegie's munificent benefactions. On the one hand there is nothing in this philanthropic spree of a modern Dives to call for commendation; and on the other, the expenditure by any man of what society concedes to be his own fortune, is a private matter outside the pale of criticism. It is only when the question of how a millionaire ought to use his wealth is brought forward in connection with these charitable performances that the subject becomes one of public concern. Then it is of public concern only to the extent of justifying the retort that it is nobody's business but his own how any millionaire uses his wealth, provided he does not use it prejudicially to the rights of others. The vital question is not how millionaires use their wealth, but how they get it. Not how they did get it, for what has happened has happened, and by-gones should be by-gones; but how they are getting it now. Have they a hoard of goods formerly accumulated, from which they draw? Then their getting it hurts nobody. Do they earn it as they go along? Then their getting it benefits everybody. Or do they merely possess legal authority

to levy continually upon the common earnings for their own enrichment? Then their getting it is a present and continuing wrong, which is of incalculable public concern.

There is more idiotic bragging about our wonderful excess of exports. For the eight months ending with February, the excess of exports of merchandise was \$492,224,994. That means that nearly half a billion of goods have gone out of the country, over and above what were paid for by goods coming in. To the country, therefore, these figures show a loss—unless the difference has been, is now, or is to be paid, in some way or other. It has not been paid in the past, for our excess of exports has been almost continuous since 1873, and foots up an enormous total. It is not paid with gold or silver now, for during the same eight months our excess of silver exports was \$17,951,416, thus increasing the aggregate of our export balance instead of paying any part of it; and our excess of gold imports during the same period was but \$23,886,395—only \$5,934,979 more than enough to pay for the exported silver. Of the excessive merchandize exports of the past eight months, then, we have received back in gold payments less than 1¼ per cent. What has become of the rest?

Absent-minded persons searching the house over for their spectacles which all the time rest upon their foreheads, furnish material for jokers; but these absent-minded mortals, when their attention is directed to the location of the missing spectacles, instantly find them and laugh over their stupidity in not locating them sooner and without outside help. Not so with your "favorable balance of trade" man. He looks at first for the profits of his boasted favorable balance in gold importations. You may talk yourself hoarse explaining to him that an excessive outgo implies loss, and that if it is perpetual it implies perpetual loss; but he assures you that the balance

is paid in gold. Learning after many humiliating disappointments that the balance is after all not paid in gold, for there is an excessive outgo of gold also, he then looks for some other plausible explanation of his conviction that balances of outgo are profitable, instead of acknowledging the simple truth that profit lies not in outgo balances, but in income balances.

At the present time he is content with the notion that our perpetual outgo balance is favorable because it creates obligations abroad which are to be paid in gold some time or other. But he is as far afield as ever. Though we have had a continuous export balance for almost 30 years, our net foreign credits are nil. We owe more to foreigners than foreigners owe to us. American securities are dealt in on the foreign exchanges, but foreign securities are not dealt in on our exchanges. Foreigners own American land, but we own no foreign land worth mentioning. And so it goes. If the books were balanced, it would appear—and nobody disputes it—not only that we owe foreigners enormously more than they owe us, but that they own ever so much more American property than Americans own of foreign property. Yet our excess of exports since the foundation of the government runs well up into the billions. And what is more remarkable, our astute economists, as well as our rule-o'-thumb business men, point to this excess as evidence of our abounding prosperity. It is as if a debtor seeking credit should offer to prove his solvency by showing that although he is deeper in debt than ever, he has for 30 years paid out continuously more than he has received in.

Of the tendency toward cramming the heads of the common people with one-sided political opinions, there is increasing evidence. A correspondent calls our attention to an instance. The Carnegie free library of Allegheny holds itself out as a public

institution. It is therefore under obligations not to be partisan in its selections of reading matter. Acting upon this theory, our correspondent last year subscribed for *The Public* for the reading room of that library, and offered to do the same this year. But the librarian has courteously declined the offer on the ground that the reading room is congested—that, in other words, the space is too limited to admit *The Public*. Our correspondent ventured to doubt this explanation; and, haunted with a suspicion, he made a census of the reading room literature, with the result that he found only one democratic paper, the *Pittsburgh Post*, in the collection. With the exception of that daily, and regular magazines like the *Arena* and *Municipal Affairs*, he did not discover any democratic publications. He expresses his conviction, therefore, that "the democracy of *The Public* is the reason for its exclusion, and not the congestion of the reading room." Facts like these are worth collecting for the light they throw upon certain tendencies in certain paternalistic quarters.

From different sources we have been asked about Prof. Gunton and his college of economics. It seems that he is working his ideas of protection, plutocracy, and so on, into the Y. M. C. A.'s of the country, and a suspicion has arisen that he is a hired emissary of Hannaistic republicans. We have good authority for saying that Gunton is managed by nobody but Gunton; that he is one of those self-sufficient mortals who is conscious of little but his own cerebration. Prof. Gunton does a great deal of thinking. He claims, indeed, so we are reliably informed, to be a professional thinker, having so trained his mind as to be competent to wrestle mentally with any subject, whether acquainted with it or not, and promptly to see its bearings, define the information needed, weigh the information when obtained, and produce an expert con-

clusion. By many of those who know him he is regarded as a sincere and veracious man, whose methods of economic reasoning, like those of the once famous Joseph Cook in another department of thought, are well adapted to the rational undoing of listeners unaccustomed to dissecting logical fallacies. It is only fair to say, however, that other good authority is not so favorable to Prof. Gunton. He is believed to be working in the interests of the Standard Oil trust, and there are certainly no surface indications to the contrary. Of his qualities as an economist, Prof. Commons might speak with effect, as he has done at least once. For ourselves, we venture nothing beyond the assertion that Gunton is no fool.

#### COMPETITION AND ECONOMIC SCIENCE.

Several months ago President Hadley, of Yale college, stimulated the hilarity of the irreverent with a solemn proposition to abolish trusts by socially ostracizing their greedy beneficiaries. Since then he has on every favorable occasion burnished up this serio-comic suggestion with scholarly elaboration. His latest effort was made in an address on true citizenship, at the charter day exercises of the University of California, at Berkeley. Doubtless Mr. Hadley said many useful things with reference to citizenship on that occasion. He is capable of it. But so much of his speech as has reached the Chicago papers is in the main a rare specimen of scholarly moonshine.

Upon his reported test of a gentleman, we are not disposed to indulge in extended comment. It is somewhat worse than absurd on its face. Readiness to subordinate one's "own convenience and desires to a social code," be the code "a good one or a bad one," hardly indicates anything better, as "the essential mark of a gentleman," than "accident of birth and clothes, of manners and of speech," from which Mr. Hadley distinguishes it. We should suppose that rational sensitiveness to others' rights might be regarded as a fair test of the gentleman. With this suggestion, however, we forbear further

criticism. It is quite possible that Mr. Hadley gave an explanation and a setting to his test, omitted by the reporters, which might make it worthy of favorable consideration.

But another of his points is stated fully enough and clearly enough to leave no room for doubt as to what he meant. It had reference to the trust question, and was calculated to depreciate the value, as a social force, of competition.

Mr. Hadley led up to this point with what purported to be an analysis of the principles of democratic government. "There are two theories," he said, "the individualistic, which relies on the self-interest of the various citizens acting independently, and the socialistic, which relies mainly on the votes of those citizens acting in a body." Neither had, in his opinion, proved wholly satisfactory. As to the individualistic theory, he remarked that this is now admitted. Though self-interest in competition—the social impulse under that theory—is a powerful stimulant for good, he continued, "neither in economics nor morals is it that panacea for social ills which so many persons two generations ago thought it to be." While "free competition," true enough, "was far better than the old systems of class legislation which it superseded," "we cannot have free competition everywhere, nor is it certain that in those cases where we can have it it produces so great a degree of justice as was once supposed." This conclusion naturally suggested the demand by "the socialists, and many who are not socialists," that business be conducted by government; and, quite as naturally, that demand in turn made Mr. Hadley shy off like a timid horse. Very dubiously did he now inquire whether a democratic government can cope with the problems which the failure of competition has thrust upon us. Without stopping to follow him there, let us consider the vitally important part of Mr. Hadley's speech—his fundamental misconception regarding free competition.

It is not quite fair to Mr. Hadley, perhaps, to call the misconception his. He has doubtless absorbed it

from his authorities. As one of the "scientific" cult in politics and economics, he must have a great deal of confidence in the authority of "scientific" professors and books, and very little recourse to the simple methods of clear thinking. And the notion that free competition has had its day and is destroying itself is, in the estimation of the economic "science" cult, which draws inspiration from the labyrinthine methods of German thought and dominates the modern university, one of the things established.

Why a notion so manifestly false should be regarded as scientific, is itself a problem. It may possibly be explained by the abuse in economics of what is known as the scientific method. Economic scientists are so deeply absorbed in the contemplation of multitudinous and multifarious minor data that they give but scant attention to familiar and simple major data; and in their perspiring efforts to accomplish a monstrous and impossible task in synthesis, they neglect logical analysis altogether. Overtraining seems to have undone them. It is known to have that effect upon the body; why not upon the mind?

But whatever the explanation of this "scientific" absurdity may be, the proposition that competition has had its day and is destroying itself is false in both its branches. It is false in its assumption that there has been an era of free competition within historic times; and it is false in its theory that competition is now being destroyed by competition.

What everybody means by free competition is free bargaining.

This is not to say that the term is never used so as to include more than that idea. Unhappily it is so used altogether too often. But as it always does include that idea, it cannot comprehend another and discordant idea without carrying a double meaning. Anyone has a right, of course, to use words with double meanings; but persons who do so are necessarily ruled out of the ring of sane and serious discussion, even though they be "scientific" economic teachers. No degree of liberty in the choice of words, nor any extent or antiquity of verbal usage, will justify in scientific

discussion or investigation the ascription of discordant meanings to an essential term. Inasmuch, then, as free competition always does comprehend the idea of free bargaining, and cannot, therefore, be legitimately used for economic inquiry as including any idea inconsistent with that one, we are fully warranted in saying that free bargaining is in simple speech synonymous with free competition.

Divested thus of the conflicting and confusing meanings of unscientific usage, competition is instantly recognized as the name of a principle of social or industrial life which has never been given full play. Though it has approximated freedom at times on the frontiers of civilization, and within the narrow boundaries of those primitive communities has worked well both in economics and morals, there is no record that the civilized world, considered as one community, or even any nation so considered, has ever had an opportunity to test it. For monopoly in some form has always characterized our civilization; and when and where there is monopoly, and to the degree that there is monopoly, then and there and to that degree competition, or free bargaining, is impossible.

Where slavery is, competition is restricted; the slave cannot make free bargains. Where private corporations control the highways of commerce, competition is restricted; producers and consumers cannot make their reciprocal trades without paying tribute, and tribute is inconsistent with free bargaining. Where protective tariffs prevail, free bargaining is prevented, not only obviously, but with deliberate intent. Where revenue tariffs and taxes are imposed upon producers and consumers, as such, free bargaining is obstructed. Where mines, and oil wells, and salt deposits, and forests, and rights of highway, and terminal points, and farming places conveniently located, and city building lots, and water power, and all the innumerable provisions which Nature has made for human use—where these are monopolized, free bargaining is nothing but a free farce. There cannot be free bargaining when one of the bargainers in a trade has a legal or institutional advantage.

It is true that in more modern times monopolies themselves have been made subjects of free competition. We have free trade even in that greatest and most fundamental monopoly, the monopoly of the earth. But this does not alter the question. If monopolies obstruct competition, they will obstruct it none the less from being made subjects of competitive purchase and sale. Though this may operate to shift the monopolists, the monopolies still hold sway; they still abridge the free bargaining, still interfere with the free competition, of all whose transactions come within the influence of their tribute-exacting power. What of it if all are free to bargain for an interest in a railroad right of way or terminal privilege? What of it, if anyone may now have a place upon the earth if he can get it by bargaining? To argue that this is free competition, that this is free bargaining, is like saying that there is no slavery under the American flag in the Sulu islands, because the flag guarantees Sulu slaves the right to buy their freedom at the market price. Freedom to trade one's own labor for a right which in common justice belongs to him without labor—as the right to breathe, the right to be free, the right to work, the right to go to market, the right to a place upon the earth, the right to share in the benefits of common development—is not free bargaining. Such freedom is not free competition.

Now, when, in the history of our civilization, have the obstructions to competition noted above—when have some or all of those monopolies, with their complex variations, not been in vogue? We have had them always with us. One of them, the monopoly of the earth, is a hoary institution which has followed the development of our civilization and soaked up like a sponge the benefits which a loosening of other trammels upon bargaining has produced. A band of feudal lords, drunken with consciousness of unlimited arbitrary power, could hardly interfere more disastrously with free bargaining between producers and consumers than do the land monopolizers whose hope of profit from commercial growth, as expressed in land values, binds them

unconsciously together in a grand monopolistic conspiracy to compel the masses of men to pay exhaustive tribute.

Yet economic "scientists" teach that free competition has had its day!

Not only have we never had an era of free competition, but such degree of competition as we have had or have now is not being destroyed by competition. That it is being destroyed is quite evident; but competition is not destroying it. What is destroying it is monopoly.

As already indicated, our civilization is impregnated with institutional monopoly. Though its outward form is competition, and more or less freedom of competition has vitalized it, the seeds of the monopoly disease have always been in its system. Under the influence of miraculous progress in the production of wealth, this disease has rapidly gained in strength, and as it has strengthened, the influence of competition has naturally weakened. Only by ignoring the fact of institutional monopoly is it possible to infer with even an approximation to scientific precision that competition is destroying itself. To consider the fact of monopoly, but to regard it as the natural (or must we say "scientific") product of competition, is a little like regarding a pumpkin as the "scientific" product of a grapevine. When of two conflicting forces—and that is what competition and monopoly are—one is subdued by the other, it is not usually considered scientific to conclude that the one has destroyed itself and produced the other. The usual, not to say obvious, conclusion is that the one force has for some reason been overcome by the other. Yet economic "science" encourages the notion not that monopoly is overcoming competition, but that competition is overcoming itself and creating monopoly!

Briefly stated with reference to current problems, the misleading teaching of these "scientists" is that free competition has had a trial in which it has destroyed itself and produced monopoly in the form of trusts. What they would do about this depends upon their respective reformatory tendencies. If they have im-

perialistic tendencies, they are for the trust from start to finish. If their tendencies are socialistic, they advocate the appropriation of trusts by the whole people. If they are like Mr. Hadley, they would punish every trust beneficiary who forgets his obligations of honor to society, and punish him severely by striking him hard with a feather.

Yet, after all, the whole matter is a simple one. A little less minute learning and a little more broad common sense would soon solve the problem of the trusts, which does in fact turn on the question of competition.

Mr. Hadley had hold of the "clew end of the skein," when in his speech at Berkeley he distinguished individualistic from socialistic government. But he held the clew in an unfamiliar and awkward way. The true distinction is not between two kinds of government, but between two kinds of function. There is no such thing as individualistic government, unless in a loosely colloquial or very fanciful sense. But there are individualistic functions. There are also socialistic, or governmental functions. Let these functions be kept distinct in thought and in legislation, and many a perplexing problem will solve itself.

What are governmental or socialistic functions, then, as distinct from individualistic? There should be little difficulty in deciding, if individual freedom is really desired. They can all be summed up in the one word, "monopoly." The management of those things which are monopolies necessarily, is a social function if there is any. Delegate to private management the preservation of the public peace, and you have a destructive monopoly, such as feudalism developed. Turn over the highways to private control, and you have a destructive and multiplying monopoly, such as our corporate railroad system has developed. Make the earth private property, and you have a monopoly to which all others are as pigmies to giants. One of its marked manifestations in our day is a continent fenced in and barely used, with every city and town displaying more valuable vacant lots many times over than valuable buildings, while half the population is landless and the whole of it is

land hungry. Whatever other functions, then, may or may not be socialistic, these certainly are—the regulation of land tenure for the equal good of all, the maintenance of highways for the equal use of all, and the preservation of the peace for the equal safety of all. When those unmistakable social functions shall have been socialized, we shall be able to judge what other functions, if any, belong in the same category. Until then we can only guess.

The object of this socialization is to secure to everybody complete freedom to perform individual functions; to secure to all, in other words, the right of free bargaining, which means the right of free competition. This is the natural, the truly scientific way of escape from the dangers of which trusts are significant. We have but to distinguish the field of competition from the field of monopoly. Many monopolies are created by legislation. Let them be abolished. Many grow out of restrictive laws, such as the tariff statutes. Let restrictive laws be repealed. Some are necessarily monopolies. Let the appropriate government control them for the common good. This done, competition will be free; for then bargaining will be subject to the mutual desires and productive capabilities of bargainers.

## NEWS

Philippine news looms up sensationally again, through the capture of Aguinaldo. This was accomplished by a trick invented and executed by Gen. Funston. Three weeks ago Funston, with four other American officers, set out for Aguinaldo's retreat, which had been revealed by a treacherous Filipino officer. Funston and his companions pretended to be prisoners of war in the custody of a body of Maccabebes (who bear to the Americans in the Philippines similar relations to those of the Indians to the British in the American colonies a century and a quarter ago), and the Maccabebes pretended to be Filipino "friendly," bringing their distinguished American prisoners to headquarters. The ruse succeeded. Access to Aguinaldo's presence was thereby secured, and when this had been done the Maccabebes and their prisoners

seized his person and brought him to Manila. The capture was made near the east coast of Luzon, about 200 miles northeast of Manila, and in the wild and mountainous province of Isabela. Aguinaldo's influence with the Filipino people is conceded by his captors to have been so great that they herald his capture as ending the war and making further enlistments of American troops for the Philippines unnecessary.

There have been during the week reports from Manila of occasional fighting in a small way at widely separated points. Surrenders of Filipinos are also reported. The surrender of a Filipino command at Antique, in the province of Panay, was announced by Gen. MacArthur on the 22d as ending "the insurrection in Panay." The arrest is reported from Manila on the 25th of Jose Lozado and Francisco Revera, prominent members of the Filipino junta at Hong-Kong. General progress is reported in regard to the organization of civil government, and it is semi-officially announced that the military system will be superseded by civil authority by the 30th of June. Five leaders of a secret society—the Mando-Ducat—have been sentenced to be hanged at Calamba on the 5th, another to imprisonment for life, and four others to imprisonment for 20 years, for the alleged murder of the native president of the town of Calamba. On the 27th MacArthur approved these sentences of the military commission.

The British-Russian difficulty at Tientsin, which we reported last week, has been amicably adjusted. Lord Lansdowne announced the agreement on the 21st in the house of lords. He explained that the dispute concerned an extensive area on the left bank of the Peiho river, upon which Russia had entered last fall and which had subsequently been ceded to her by China. As the area comprised property of the Northern Chinese railroad, Great Britain had undertaken to protect the construction of this road within the area in the interest of British owners of the railroad's bonds. Hence the difficulty with Russia. The agreement between Great Britain and Russia, regarding the matter, reserves the question of title and proprietary rights for future examination, Great Britain mean-

while withdrawing from the disputed territory.

With this settlement of the comparatively trifling quarrel over the Tientsin concession, the Manchurian question, of which we told two weeks ago (page 775), resumes its prominence. At the time of our former report on this subject, secret negotiations between Russia and China were known to be in progress for the establishment of a Russian protectorate over Manchuria, which Russia has for five years past been gradually occupying. These negotiations were objectionable to both Great Britain and the United States as tending to the dismemberment of China, and to Japan as steps toward the appropriation of Corea by Russia. It was at that time feared that the upshot might be a general war, with Russia, supported by France, on one side, and Great Britain, supported by the United States and Japan on the other. The United States had gone so far as to warn China against making concessions to any power without the consent of the others, and Great Britain has done the same. But now this affair, in so far as it is a menace of war, has settled down to a possible conflict between Russia and Japan. Russia's secret negotiations with China had led up to a demand on Russia's part that China enter into two treaties regarding Manchuria, to be signed on the 26th. What these treaties are is not yet known, except as Chinese officials have vaguely divulged their terms. Russia declines to disclose them. A British diplomatic request of Russia for information is reported to have been curtly refused. Pending the date for signing, China begged the other powers to warn Russia instead of herself; but none of the powers has exhibited any disposition to go beyond the action of the United States in its hint to Russia through its warning to China. Three of them, however—Great Britain, Germany and Japan—have notified the United States that they will regard the signing of the Chinese-Russian treaties as freeing them from their obligations to preserve the integrity of China (see page 344), and will take such measures as they deem advisable for the protection of their own interests. This notice is understood to foreshadow a policy of Chinese partition. At a cabinet meeting on the 26th, the United States decided to make no protest against the

treaties, but to stand for the "open door" policy, if Great Britain, Germany and Japan do make the Russian-Chinese treaties regarding Manchuria the pretext for a general partition. Whether the treaties have been signed is not yet known, though the time limit for signing them, the 26th, has expired.

On the brink of a foreign war which her policy of "benevolent assimilation" is provoking, Russia is also in a state of domestic turmoil. Allusion was made to this in these columns last week (page 793). The trouble began on the 17th with students' riots in St. Petersburg and the university cities of Odessa, Kieff and Kharkoff. These disturbances have continued and have been supplemented with workmen's strikes and other demonstrations. Preceding the rioting, the minister of education was assassinated and the minister of justice was fired at. An attempt has been made also upon the life of the chief procurator of the holy synod. On the 23d there was publicly posted in St. Petersburg a call to "all intelligent members of Russian society to join the ranks of the students in the struggle for freedom." It is reported, too, that a mine, intended for the assassination of the emperor, has been discovered. Though indefinite and untrustworthy in their details, the reports that reach this country nevertheless indicate a general disturbance, and it is not improbable that Russia is, as some of the reports state, upon the brink of a revolution.

There is little news regarding the war in South Africa, except that the history of the peace negotiations between Lord Kitchener and Gen. Botha have been made public in a parliamentary document given out in London on the 22d. They began with a dispatch of February 22d from Sir Alfred Milner to Mr. Chamberlain, stating that Mrs. Botha had returned from a meeting with her husband, to whom she had carried a verbal message from Milner offering to meet Botha for a discussion of peace conditions with the understanding that the question of independence should not be broached. Mrs. Botha brought back a written reply from her husband proposing a meeting at Pretoria. This meeting took place between Botha and Kitchener on the 28th. Kitchener then proposed certain terms subject to modification by his

government. They were stiffened somewhat by Sir Alfred Milner and still further by Mr. Chamberlain. As finally offered, they proposed to grant, upon the cessation of hostilities and the surrender of all arms, a general amnesty "for bona fide acts of war;" to "move the governments of Cape Colony and Natal to similar action, qualified by the disfranchisement of any British subjects implicated in the war;" to bring war prisoners back to the country; to replace military law by civil administration, and "as soon as circumstances will permit, to establish a representative government;" to establish a high law court; to respect landed property, church property and orphan funds; to teach English and Dutch in the public schools, and use both languages in the law courts; not to extend the franchise "to Kaffirs in the Transvaal and Orange River colony before a representative government is granted;" and "as an act of grace, to set aside \$5,000,000 to repay the inhabitants for goods requisitioned by the republican governments." The significant thing about these negotiations is the fact that they were initiated by the British government in the face of its frequent notification to the Boers that they must surrender unconditionally. Next to that in point of significance is Botha's refusal to accept the terms.

It is evident that fighting has been renewed since the failure of the peace negotiations, but the news regarding it is not important in itself.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—The guillotine has been substituted for the ax by Sweden as the instrument for capital executions.

—Charlotte Mary Yonge, the famous author, died at Winchester, England, on the 24th at the age of 78.

—The New York prison village of Sing Sing, on the Hudson, has secured from the legislature a change of name to Ossining.

—H. H. Kohlsaat has sold the Chicago Evening Post to a syndicate headed by J. C. Shaffer. The rumored price was \$200,000.

—The various tin can companies of the United States have been consolidated in a trust under the corporate name of the American Tin Can company.

—The Chicago Record has been sold by Victor F. Lawson to H. H. Kohlsaat, who intends to combine it with the Times-Herald under the name of the Chicago Record-Herald. Such is the authoritative announcement.

## MISCELLANY

## THE CALF-PATH.

One day through the primeval wood  
A calf walked home, as good calves should;  
But made a trail all bent askew,  
A crooked trail, as all calves do.  
Since then two hundred years have fled,  
And, I infer, the calf is dead.  
But still he left behind his trail,  
And thereby harks my moral tale.  
The trail was taken up next day  
By a lone dog that passed that way;  
And then a wise bell-wether sheep  
Pursued the trail o'er vale and steep,  
And drew the flock behind him, too,  
As good bell-wethers always do.  
And from that day, o'er hill and glade,  
Through those old woods a path was made,  
And many men wound in and out,  
And dodged and turned and bent about,  
And uttered words of righteous wrath,  
Because 'twas such a crooked path;  
But still they followed—do not laugh—  
The first migrations of that calf,  
And through this winding woodway stalked  
Because he wobbled when he walked.  
This forest path became a lane,  
That bent and turned and turned again;  
This crooked lane became a road,  
Where many a poor horse, with his load,  
Tolled on beneath the burning sun,  
And traveled some three miles in one.  
And thus a century and a half  
They trod the footsteps of that calf.  
The years passed on in swift feet,  
The road became a village street,  
And this, before men were aware,  
A city's crowded thoroughfare,  
And soon the central street was this  
Of a renowned metropolis.  
And men two centuries and a half  
Trod in the footsteps of that calf.  
Each day a hundred thousand rout  
Followed the zigzag calf about;  
And o'er his crooked journey went  
The traffic of a continent.  
A hundred thousand men were led  
By one calf near three centuries dead.  
They followed still his crooked way,  
And lost one hundred years a day;  
For thus such reverence is lent  
To well established precedent.  
A moral lesson this might teach,  
Were I ordained and called to preach.  
For men are prone to go it blind  
Along the calf-paths of the mind,  
And work away from sun to sun  
To do what other men have done.  
They follow in the beaten track,  
And out and in, and forth and back,  
And still their devious course pursue,  
To keep the path that others do.  
But how the wise old wood-gods laugh,  
Who saw the first primeval calf!  
Ah! many things this tale might teach—  
But I am not ordained to preach.

—Sam Walter Foss.

## A MODERN MOTHER'S DIARY.

To-night Clifford has said: "Mamma, are the stars holes in the sky to let the rain through?"

I cannot sleep, such is my agitation.

Clifford is scarcely five years old, whereas, according to the best pedagogical authorities, Martin Luther did not ask this question until he was seven, and Alexander the Great, in all probability, not until he was nine.

I know not what to think.

One moment I feel assured that Clifford is evincing an unaffected humor, only in the next moment to be overwhelmed by the suspicion that he is bidding for newspaper notoriety merely.—Detroit Journal.

## THE BLACKEST CHAPTER IN HISTORY.

As for the butchery, the slaughter and the still darker infamies with which the history of the allied occupation reeks, who will dream of questioning, still less contradicting, the unutterable catalogue? Waldersee's latest expedition showed a result of 250 Chinese killed and one German wounded! But that is only a drop in the bucket of the horrors that civilization has perpetrated on the pagans. No chapter taken from the darkest of the dark ages of the past—no exploit of brutal savagery in any period of human ignorance and degradation—is more appalling than the notorious facts in this frightful case.—The Washington Post.

## WHO ARE THE DEBTORS?

In 1878 it was reported by the Pennsylvania municipal commission, "as a remarkable but notorious fact, that the accumulations of debt in Philadelphia and other cities of the state have been due not to a non-property holding, irresponsible element among the electors, but to the desire for speculation among the property owners themselves. Large tracts of land outside the built-up portion of the city have been purchased, combinations made among men of wealth, and councils besieged until they have been driven into making appropriations to open and improve streets and avenues, largely in advance of the real necessities of the city. Extraordinary as the statement may seem at first, the experience of the past shows clearly that frequently property-owners need more protection against themselves than against the non-property-holding class." This is a statement of profound significance, and should be

duly pondered by advocates of a restricted suffrage.—John Fiske's "Civil Government in the United States," page 134.

## A MUSICAL VILLAGE.

There is a little village in the north of Hampshire, England, containing less than 1,000 inhabitants which is now styled the musical village. It is called Burghclere. The hamlet has a chorus of 100 voices capable of doing ample justice to the oratorios of Handel. The repertoire of the Burghclere chorus includes Purcell's "King Arthur," Handel's "Theodore," "Jephtha," "L'Allegro," "Belshazzar," and many other works. The presiding genius of the spot is Walter Awkwright, a brother of the well-known musical antiquary, whose zeal and industry have converted his native village into a nest of singing birds. The traveler wandering over the downs of Hampshire hears the shepherd beguiling his lonely watch with "Venus Laughing from the Skies" and similar classic songs.—The Chicago Chronicle.

## WHAT THE STEEL TRUST MAY DO.

The charter granted to the combination is of the most sweeping character. In terms it permits any kind of manufacture, mining, and method of transportation to the corporation. There is little doubt that the combination will have its own ships and railways, just as it has its ore beds and coal mines, in order to carry its own products to every market, domestic and foreign. One might think that New Jersey was granting the United States steel corporation the right to become "guardian of the world." Following is a condensed statement of the grants made:

This corporation may manufacture iron, steel, manganese, coke, copper, lumber and other materials, and all articles consisting or partly consisting of iron, steel, copper, wood, or other materials, and all products thereof.

It has the right to acquire and develop any lands yielding these materials, and to extract coal, ores, stone, oil, etc., from any lands which it may own or acquire. It may buy and sell these materials and any of their products, and it may construct bridges, buildings, machinery, ships, boats, engines, cars and other equipment; railroads, docks, slips, elevators, water-works, gas works and electric works; viaducts, aqueducts, canals and other waterways and other means of transportation. These agencies may be bought or sold, maintained or operated, but the corporation may not maintain a railroad or canal in New Jersey.

This corporation may engage in any other manufacturing, mining, construction or transportation business of any kind or character whatsoever, but it may not

engage in any business which shall require the exercise of the right of eminent domain within the state of New Jersey. It may conduct its business in other states and territories and in foreign countries.

The total authorized capital stock is \$3,000, divided into 30 shares, 15 of which are preferred stock and 15 common stock. From time to time the preferred stock and common stock may be increased. The holders of the preferred stock shall receive seven per cent. annual dividends. When all cumulative dividends of preferred stock have been made, dividends on common stock may be declared.

The duration of the corporation shall be perpetual. The board of directors may meet outside of New Jersey when and where they please. The board may vary the amount of the working capital of the company and may determine the disposition of any surplus or net profits. The board may determine whether the accounts and books of the corporation shall be open to the inspection of the stockholders, and no stockholder shall have any right to inspect any account or book or document of the corporation, except as conferred by statute, or authorized by the board of directors, or by resolution of the stockholders.

—From "Highways and Byways," in the April Chautauquan.

#### THE NEW ZEALAND SYSTEM.

Frank G. Carpenter, a special correspondent, was sent to New Zealand to investigate the land system of that country. The idea was to write down the single tax or the theories of Henry George as there applied. He went prejudiced against the whole system and with a determination to write it down, but when he came to investigate it he found that in its workings it is gradually making New Zealand a land of small farms. By the present laws no man who has more than 640 acres of land can obtain any of the public lands. The land officials will not grant more than this amount, and they will not give an applicant more than they think he can develop and care for. The government land agents examine all the applicants and those who pass their examinations are allowed to ballot for the amount distributed. The government in fact divides the land more as a father among his children than as a land speculator. Everything is done to encourage small farmers. The man whose income is less than \$1,500 a year goes scot free, paying no taxes. He whose farm is worth \$2,500 likewise escapes, and if his estate is worth \$7,500 he pays taxes on only \$5,000 of its valuation. The rich man pays increased taxes on his land, on his income—on everything. For instance, a man with \$5,000 income would pay 2½ per cent. on \$5,000 less \$1,500 or \$87 income tax. If he has an income of \$10,000 he would have to

pay five per cent. on the extra \$5,000 of \$337. But a big trust magnate or a railroad king with \$1,000,000 would have to pay \$50,000 a year while John D. Rockefeller or Andrew Carnegie would be obliged under the law to pay half of their income into the state or anywhere from \$6,000,000 to \$15,000,000. In short the laws of New Zealand, as now administered, are framed for the poor man as against the rich. The theory is that the land must be preserved for the small farmer. The man with a few acres is not crushed by the burden of taxation. He is exempt. The temptation for the capitalist is not to buy out the small farmer nor to create vast holdings. His accumulations are treated as belonging in part to the state and the state steps in and insists that he shall pay in proportion to his possessions. The attention of the world is called to this theory of legislation. Every civilization that has heretofore gone down in the night of history has done so on account of the greed of organized wealth. The rich men begin by crushing out the middle class, by ruining the small dealers, by converting the small farms into great plantations and then reducing the working man to virtual slavery. One of the beneficial results of the French revolution was giving the soil back into the hands of peasant proprietors. Henry George proposed to do this peacefully by the virtual confiscation of rents. New Zealand is the first country where his ideas have been put into operation. Even here they have not been carried out to the full limit but Mr. Carpenter's letter indicates that the experiment thus far is eminently satisfactory.—The Peoria (Ill.) Star of Mar. 13.

#### THE REPUBLIC AS A WORLD POWER.

Mrs. Susan Look Avery, of Louisville, Ky., the author of the following article, is an octogenarian. Mrs. Avery has been privileged to know the great republic almost in its infancy, has witnessed the rise and progress of the movement against slavery, and its final abolition, and has beheld this country advance in moral and material force, until it has reached a position foremost among the nations of the world. Her years and ripened experience add weight to her words of warning.

In view of what we enlightened, Christian Americans are doing in the Philippines, would not those whom some of our people are pleased to call heathen be justified in sending missionaries to us?

The reports, official and others well authenticated, of what is being done in those far away islands, and by authority of our government, are appalling,

and should cause us to tremble for the integrity and perpetuity of our republic.

War never has decided, and never can decide, a question of ethics—of right and justice between individuals or nations. It can decide only which antagonist has the most men, the most money and the best guns.

It seems incredible that we, of all the people in the world, should forget our history, discard our principles and our traditions, and wage a war of conquest on a people the head and front of whose offending is that they are intelligent enough to desire their independence and brave enough to fight for it.

We hear much of "expansion"—of the desirability, and the necessity even, of becoming a "world power." Do we not know that before our present "entangling alliances" we had become a "world power" of the very first magnitude?

Our not remote ancestors fought for freedom as the Filipinos are fighting to-day. They won their independence and framed a constitution so just and wise (having for its foundation principle government only by consent of the governed) that long ago this "land of the free and home of the brave" had become a beacon light to which the eyes of the downtrodden of all nations turned. We had become the hope of the oppressed and the fear of the oppressor everywhere. Our "world power" was a moral force with which no nation would lightly or willingly come in conflict.

So great has been the respect and admiration of the Filipinos for our government and people that they cannot believe that we know the true state of affairs—their ability for self-government, their desire and determination to have it—or we would not tolerate for an instant the efforts of our administration to subjugate them.

No nation can deliberately violate its principles, its sense of justice and right, and long survive. We have desecrated our principles in the Philippines; we have lost our moral power, and the material "world power," which we may or may not gain, cannot be worth the cost. The eyes of the whole world are turned sadly, reproachfully toward us. Let us hasten to redeem ourselves while we may, not more to escape the fate of "dead empires" than to make all possible restitution to the Filipinos. Chicago, Feb. 9, 1901.

"What does W. C. T. U. stand for in Kansas?"

"Wreckage, Carnage, Turmoil, Upheaval."—Ohio State Journal.

CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY.

We allow too much of our thinking to be done for us. Clothes are not the only ready-made things we buy, and there is some ready-made thinking which is far too dear at only a cent a copy. The newspaper is not impeccable nor infallible and he who allows himself to be bulldozed by it and the spirit of plutocracy in it and the power of plutocracy back of it, is no more a free man than was the most ignorant and abject Roman Catholic in the days of the inquisition. It has been said that our national vice is dishonesty—not, however, primarily in trade, but in speech and thought. It would seem that one might probe deeper and, seeking for the cause of this dishonesty, find it to be intellectual laziness, fostered by the daily press. If the majority of the people ever read anything else or if all knew, what only a comparatively few do, that much of the editorial writing is done with tongue in cheek, that the free press is practically an extinct species, that the so-called policy of the paper is the policy of the dime museum, then the case would be different. But as things are, it would be hard to name a greater foe to democracy than the newspapers of to-day. To them, as to no other source, may be traced confusion of ideas and consequent blurring of the civic sense, deadening of the social conscience; not entirely by what is said, but quite as much, perhaps, by a silence which at times is scarcely short of criminal. . . .

Upon each of us rests the responsibility not merely of passive obedience to the law as it stands nor of the preservation of peace and order in times of excitement and disruption but no less of making the civil authority such that it be honored and obeyed at all times and by all classes of the community. Whether we will or no, we are part of that civil authority. By our exercise of the electoral franchise and by our personal influence we contribute to the corporate character of city and state. There is no voting by proxy in civic affairs and a man commits himself quite as much by abstention from balloting as he does by any other course. There is nothing sillier than for a man to prate about corrupt politics, etc., while shirking responsibility therefor and imagining that he can keep his hands clean by doing nothing. We are part and parcel of the corporate whole; and the sooner we recognize this and act upon the recognition, the better for ourselves as for all others concerned; for it is the want of this recognition which lies at the bottom of our existing political ills.

In Switzerland, than which there is probably no truer republic in existence, this recognition is impressed upon the individual by a simple process. When a young man, having completed his education, begins the life of active manhood, he is at once assigned to some post of civic duty. His function may be in itself a slight matter—nothing more, perchance, than the keeping clear the course of a certain brook or the care of the common village pump—and the performance thereof requiring only a small fraction of his time; but the responsibility involved he is thereby made to feel and the effect upon him is far from inconsequential. Were such a system in vogue amongst us it is inconceivable that those taking active and intelligent part in political affairs should, as now, consist of only two classes of the community, viz.: those who regard public office as a private snap and so make politics the basis of their livelihood; and those miscalled "prominent citizens," "representative men," who, disdaining public office for themselves, through collusion with the former class and by the power of money, nominate and elect men who will be their servants rather than the servants of the people and buy and sell legislation to suit their own private ends.—Rev. Gustavus Tuckerman, in St. Louis Advance.

"TERRIBLE TEACHING."

Correspondence of the Herald, of Auckland, New Zealand, issue of October 1, 1900.

Sir: Before replying to my numerous critics, which I am quite able to do, kindly afford me space to show the class of people we have to deal with in these single taxers. Beaten in the argument, driven from the platform, scarcely noticed in the press, they now fall back on our children, and are striving to teach them to hate each other and despise their parents.

The following is a document which is now being issued from the business premises of Mr. George Fowlds, one of our city representatives, and chairman of the Congregational union of New Zealand. The "prize ballad for boys" is scarcely worth reproduction. It contains the same teaching as the one for girls, but otherwise is simply stupid. They have both been cunningly selected, the one to appeal to the natural religious instinct of the female nature, and the other to the love of fun in boys.

RECITATION COMPETITION.

(Prizes: Two Silver Watches.)

For the purpose of testing the elocutionary powers of our school children, two solid

silver watches will be given as prizes, at a public competition to be held on October 25. First: For the best recitation, by a schoolgirl under 15, of the poem "Restitution;" and second: For the best recitation, by a schoolboy under 15, of the ballad: "The Sea for the Fishes." For entrance forms and further particulars apply to Mr. Young, at Mr. George Fowlds', Victoria Arcade. Competition absolutely free. No entrance money.

GIRLS' PRIZE POEM—"RESTITUTION."

Enough! the lie is ended; God only owns the land!  
No parchment deed hath virtue unsigned by his own hand;  
Out on the bold blasphemers who would eject the Lord,  
And pauperize his children, and trample on his word!  
Behold this glorious temple, with dome of starry sky,  
And floor of greensward scented, and trees for pillars high,  
And song of birds for music, and bleat of lambs for prayer,  
And incense of sweet vapors uprising everywhere!  
Behold his table bounteous, spread over land and sea,  
The sure reward of labor, to every mortal free;  
And hark! through nature's anthem there rises the refrain:  
"God owns the earth, but giveth it unto the sons of men."

But see, within the temple, as in Solomon's of old,  
The money-changers haggle, and souls are bought and sold;  
And that is called an owner's which can only be the Lord's,  
And Christ is not remembered, nor his whip of knotted cords.  
But Christ has not forgotten, and wolfish human greed  
Shall be driven from our heritage; God's bounties shall be freed;  
And from out our hoary statutes shall be torn the crime-stained leaves  
Which have turned the world, God's temple, into a den of thieves.

—J. W. Bengough.

For downright wickedness it would be hard to beat this. The men who have perpetrated it know that it is utterly impossible for "a schoolgirl under 15" to have an opinion as to the merits or demerits of single tax. Yet under the pretense of teaching elocution, they offer a bribe of a "solid silver watch" to the child girl who in the most forcible manner will denounce her own parents, or the parents of her schoolfellows, or both—it matters nothing to them—as liars, thieves, as human wolves, bold blasphemers, ejectors of the Lord, pauperizers of God's children, trampers on God's word, forgetters of Christ, criminals, etc.

This is terrible teaching for our boys and girls. The men capable of doing this would not hesitate to foment civil warfare—possibly that is

the intention, for they must know that teaching children to hate each other, and despise their parents, and believe them to be wrongdoers, is the surest method of bringing about such a result.

Can nothing be done to restrain these people? Have they the right so to corrupt our children? If there is no law to reach them, there certainly ought to be. It is a disgrace to our city that such things can be done.

In the meantime let me remind my fellow-citizens that these people are the leaders of the movement for "taxation on unimproved values," by which they hope and intend ultimately to introduce the single tax, and thus steal every man's land. I am, etc.,

SAMUEL VAILE.

Auckland, September 28, 1900.

#### WHAT THE BIG, CONSCIENCELESS THUG IS DOING.

A portion of an editorial in the New Orleans Harlequin of March 21.

"Don't you think," writes a citizen of Atlanta to Harlequin, "that when you arraign this country for demanding a coaling station for our country and such other rights as it deems advisable, you should remember that we joined Cuba in the fight against Spain, and it was only with our aid that Cuba defeated Spain?"

Let us see what the demands of this country are:

First. Cuba is asked to respect the Monroe doctrine; that is, to promise that no government shall gain control of its territory by colonization or otherwise.

Second. Cuba is asked not to contract debts which Cuba cannot pay out of its own revenues.

Third. Cuba is asked to permit the United States to intervene for the maintenance of independence and peace and order.

Fourth. Cuba is asked to validate what has been done by the United States during military occupancy.

Fifth. Cuba is asked to execute plans for sanitation.

Sixth. The "title" to the Isle of Pines is to be settled by agreement.

Seventh. Cuba is asked to lease or sell to the United States coaling stations.

Eighth. Cuba is asked to embody these provisions in a treaty, after which this country will amiably withdraw its troops.

Now, to return to the Atlanta gentleman's question. Suppose you were to come across a big bully in the street, beating a little man most brutally, and, being considerably bigger than the bully, and the fight being in progress

near your home to your annoyance, you light in yourself and give the bully a good drubbing. You larrup him into surrender and send him home to repair his bruises. If you did this simply on impulse, because the fellow was so much bigger than the little man he was bullying, I fancy that, although you were bigger than he, you have done a right noble act. Its nobility, of course, would be lessened in proportion as you were actuated by the fact that the brawl was near your home and disturbed you.

But suppose, having done this, you turned on the little man you had just been defending (who, of course, would, by the laws of nature, hold you very warmly in his heart) and said: "Say, I fancy that watch of yours. I need it. I want it. And see here, I don't like the style in which you keep yourself. I want you to go home and sanitize. And here, I have a fad and that is, that whenever in future you have any troubles in your domestic arrangements at home, you must let me settle them for you. And I don't want you to get in debt. This watch I must have. I will either lease it from you or buy it."

You would be a beautiful object, wouldn't you! What difference would there be between you and a thief and highwayman who beat off some other highwayman in order that he might do the robbing?

The declaration we made that Cuba was and of right ought to be free—the declaration that Cuba was free precluded any such demands as we have made upon her, precluded our carpet-baggers being stationed there as they are now—and I wonder if it be intended that the robbery of the post office department by us (that is, by our agent) is among the things Cuba must validate!

Had the heart and honor of this country, instead of its boodle, been directing affairs, we would not have had a soldier in Cuba one week after Spain capitulated. The boys would have been back home like American gentlemen, courting their sweethearts, at the sides of their mothers and fathers, breathing the free air of American citizenship, eternally to be proud of the fact that they had participated in the whipping of a dastardly little bulldozer, in the putting an end to strife, in establishing in one more spot on the earth the principle that all men are created free, glorying in the grandeur of the greatest nation in the cycles of time. The cesspools at Washington, reeking with covetous rapacity, have fermented the baseness of our ignoble

cause, and to-day we stand before the world in the light of a liar and perjurer, demanding tribute for an act which we professed to do for God and right and our conscience-sake. The veriest blackguard would be ashamed of his conduct, did it mate with the morals of the United States.

#### THE SHOVELERS' TALE.

A. D. 19??

For The Public.

Sent below to shovel sulphur in the torrid zone of hell

Mark and William Mc. and Teddy have a doleful tale to tell.

Grimed with smoke and stung with fire,  
Wilder rolls their plaint and higher,  
Drowning Satan's loudest choir,  
Filling Satan's heart with ire.  
(Gentle reader, take a flyer  
To the torrid zone of hell—  
Hear the tale the shovelers tell.)

First is Mark in loudest solo  
Walling: "Oh! I'm in a hole oh!  
Dollars none nor dinner-buckets—  
Bribeless now! Confound the luck! It's  
Mighty hard when the inventor  
Of prosperity must enter  
Into active competition  
With the tollers of perdition!  
This thing in my craw is sticking,  
O, Mephisto, hear me kicking!  
I, the proudest priest of plunder,  
Cockalorum, son of thunder,  
Here protest against this slavery,  
Here demand that in all knavery  
I shall be a master-rogue!"

Somewhat scorched, but still quite toothsome,

Teddy roars: "I had in youth some  
Hot old times. But say, this weather  
Is too all too altogether!  
I abused the New York Ice trust—  
Tried to freeze it out—and I must  
Say it makes me rather nervous  
When I think how full of service  
Ice would be to me at present—  
How refreshing, cool and pleasant!  
Trusts in ice are very sinful;  
But I tell you, I've a skin full  
Of this fire trust in Hades!  
(Begging pardon of the ladies)  
It's the damnedest trust of all!"

Then comes William, sly and plous—  
He's a statesman (cut out bias)—  
Loud implores the gods to hear him;  
Motions all the imps to fear him;  
Reads from manuscript (asbestos)—  
Surely he will interest us—  
Wants to subsidize the devil;  
Draws analogies that level  
Demagogic opposition;  
High exalts his own position;  
Says that hell's a foreign bottom;  
Proves that populism got 'em  
Into this their plight distressing—  
Seems to think he is addressing  
A republican convention.  
(Proper here, perhaps, to mention  
That republicans are 'round him  
Thicker than when Marcus crowned him).  
Then, attacking tariff matters,  
Loud he talks and long he batters;  
Claims his project is a sane one;  
Wants a duty (not a "plain" one)  
On combustibles. It hinders  
Industry, he says, when cinders  
Are of toll the only token  
(Truthful words and fitly spoken).

Lastly, comes his dearest topic—  
Rather shrewd than philanthropic.  
It, engaging all his talents,  
Is the "favorable balance,"  
Which on earth though ill-reputed  
Can't in hell be well refuted.  
For with export trade unlawful  
And the import trade just awful,  
All imported souls must stay there,  
Working hard for naught per day there.  
Which condition can't be ended  
Till the "balance" has been mended,  
And an excess in exporting  
Empties hell, as he, exhorting,  
Demonstrates that it will do.

Sent below to shovel sulphur in the torrid zone of hell  
Mark and William Mc. and Teddy have a doleful tale to tell.

Grimed with smoke and stung with fire,  
Wilders rolls their plaint and higher,  
Drowning Satan's loudest choir,  
Fighting Satan's heart with ire.  
(Gentle reader, take a flyer  
To the torrid zone of hell—  
Hear the tale the shovelers tell).

E. J. SALISBURY.

A MONOPOLY PROP.

That at bottom all monopolies have to obtain government aid to enable them to throttle competition, is a truism that received a fresh illustration Monday. Even the Standard Oil monopoly has not been able to crush all the independent refiners, and it has a few opponents in Camden, N. J. Its local manager is a member of city council, and he introduced an ordinance which councils passed, requiring all oil tanks east of Cooper creek to be buried underground. Ostensibly this is to prevent danger from fire. In reality it is intended to put the independents to ruinous expense. For their tanks are east of the creek, amid vacant lots, while the Standard's tanks are west of the creek, near a number of frame buildings. And though the Standard could well afford to put them underground for the sake of ruining its rivals, it is so callous to public opinion that its hireling made no scruple of framing an ordinance that plainly showed its intention. Back of every monopoly there is some protection or discrimination by government. — Justice, of Wilmington, Del.

Neuman—President McKinley must feel elated when he contemplates the great power that has been delegated to him by the American people, but I should think that he would regret the fact that his legs are not longer.

Timer—What do you mean?

Newman—Why, I mean that he must feel sorry that he cannot literally use the Philippines for his footstool.

G. T. E.

Half a century ago, when the first estimate of national wealth was made by the census bureau, the aggregate value of private property, excluding slaves, was more than \$5,000,000,000. Our population is now but little more than three times as great as then, but our wealth is more than fifteen times as great. Yet, except at the south, the proportion of propertyless families is perhaps greater now than then, and the poverty of the poor is made the more distressing by reason of the contrasts in economic conditions that have developed. The increase in our aggregate wealth is likely to go on, and the nation's welfare depends upon whether the increase goes chiefly to augment the power and luxury of those already rich, or the independence, comfort and culture of the rank and file of the people. In other words, the problem before us is to make the increase in national wealth synonymous with the increase in national well-being.—The Outlook.

In a nursery which is adorned by Mrs. Dwight Perkins' gay Mother Goose pictures one of the small inhabitants was noticed studying in a puzzled way the scene where in crown and mantle

The king was in the counting-house  
Counting out his money.

"Well, Teddy, what do you think of it?" asked the mother. She had several neat lessons to preach from that picture. But Teddy had made his own observations.

"Now, mother, he—now, the king, you know—"

"Yes."

"Why, he's counting on his fingers."

"Yes."

"Teacher won't let us count on our fingers."

Teddy's tone was aggrieved and there seemed nothing to say but that kings had greater privileges than little boys of seven. You never can tell what unconsidered trifle a child will snap up.—Chicago Evening Post.

Mrs. Backlots—M'liss Dagget has got a piece half a column long in the Hustler this week about feedin' hens fer eggs. I saw her name signed ter the end of it.

Backlots—M'liss Dagget got a piece in the paper? Well, if that don't beat creation! I've knowed her ever since she was a toothless baby. I knowed her father an' her mother, an' neither of 'em amounted ter shucks. I knowed both her grand-

fathers, an' they was as worthless fellers as ever pitched boss-shoes in hayin' time. An' M'liss has got a piece in the paper! Who'd have believed it? An' I was raised right in the same neighborhood with her folks fer two generations!—Puck.

"The assertions of some men," ranted the traitor, "I would not believe, even if these men kissed the Bible and pressed it to their hearts!"

But his condign punishment came quickly, for even for less crimes than this have folks been deported to Guam.

G. T. E.

"It is claimed," said his friend, "that you sell your goods in Europe at lower prices than in this country."

"Ah!" said the protected manufacturer. "And what a boon to the pauper laborers of Europe who cannot afford to pay American prices!" —Puck.

Maber—Yes, it is said that our first president never prevaricated.

Ling Ching—But you cannot say the same of your last president?

Maber—Yes, sir, I can. But I prefer to follow the example of the first president.

G. T. E.

Paterfamilias—"Tommy, stop pulling that poor cat's tail." Tommy—"I'm not pulling it, pa. I'm only holding on to it. The cat's pulling it."—Tit-Bits.

"In a battle," said the strenuous German, "one white man is worth 200 Chinese."

"And I think it is apparent," ventured the timid Chinaman, "that the same proportion holds good in massacres."

G. T. E.

BOOK NOTICES.

"To the Person Sitting in Darkness," Mark Twain's grimly humorous article in the North American Review for February, has been published in pamphlet form by the Anti-Imperialist League, 150 Nassau street, New York, room 1520. Copies may be had by inclosing postage to that address.

In "The Valuation of Real Estate for the Purpose of Taxation" (St. Paul: W. A. Somers), by W. A. Somers, a simple and apparently practical and effective

THE PUBLIC

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

ON TRIAL

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

SIX WEEKS FOR TEN CENTS.

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

method of fairly appraising the values of real estate for purposes of taxation is described. Simple as the method is it cannot be intelligently explained in a brief notice, but Mr. Somers's pamphlet explains it so well that it can be understood at a reading. The method has been actually used with success. Mr. Somers proceeds upon the sound principle that "in any attempt to compare valuations of tracts, the further the general assessment is below the true value, the greater will be the distortion brought about by any inaccuracy in determining the ratio between the true value and the assessment." His plan is adaptable to either city or country valuations.

"Oratory: Its Requirements and Its Rewards" (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co., 56 Fifth avenue), by John P. Altgeld, is a remarkable book from an unexpected source. It is a marvel, to begin with, of solid condensation. There are but 65 pages, and the print is coarse; yet the book is an education and an inspiration. Though it dissects the philosophy of oratory with precision, and teaches the technique with insistence, it never loses sight of the transcendent importance of naturalness and sincerity, nor fails to emphasize them with stirring eloquence. Gov. Altgeld distinguishes oratory from good public speaking. The latter is a common though useful function; the former is the greatest and one of the rarest of arts. His book will interest and benefit any reader, whether an aspirant for the rewards of oratory or not. If it does not make him an orator, it may at least improve him as a speaker. It will certainly elevate and strengthen him as a man. Hard common sense, and high ideals both of technique and conscience, characterize this latest product of Mr. Altgeld's thought. To read the book is to know the man.

#### FEBRUARY MAGAZINES.

—In the Ethical Record (New York: Society for Ethical Culture, Price, 75 cents a year; 15 cents a copy), Felix Adler discusses Mr. Wu's Interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount.

#### MARCH MAGAZINES.

—Social Ideals, published at Elgin, Ill. Price, \$1 a year.  
—Bellamy Review, published at Kearney, Neb. Price, 50 cents a year; 5 cents a copy.

—Home and Flowers, published by the Floral Publishing Co., Springfield, O. Price, \$1 a year.

—Why (Cedar Rapids: Frank Vierth. Price, 25 cents a year; 5 cents a number) is devoted to "Truths Seen by Contrast," by Eliza Stowe Twitchell.

—The New Christianity (Ithaca, N. Y.: S. H. Spencer. Price, \$1 a year; 10 cents a copy), includes a paper by J. S. David, on the relation of the church to amusements.

—The Land of Sunshine (Los Angeles, Cal.: The Land of Sunshine Co. Price, \$1 a year; 10 cents a copy), edited by Charles F. Lummis, gives an illustrated article on the high Sierra; and to a keen editorial on honest and dishonest reviewing, by the editor, adds another from the same pen to the discussion of the Stanford university-Ross case.

#### APRIL MAGAZINES.

—The Book World (New York and Chicago: Siegel-Cooper Co. Price, \$1 a year; 10 cents a number), edited by Madison C. Peters, contains an article on the Passion Play, and one on Richard Wagner, together with an account of experiences in Japan and several short stories.

—The Arena (New York: The Alliance Publishing Co. Price, \$2.50 a year; 25 cents a number), opens with a candid defense of our national discarding of the declaration of independence, by Prof. Prince, of Dickinson college, and contains a conversation with Ernest H. Crosby on Count Tolstol, as philosopher, prophet and man.

The edition of "The Public" this week is 6,000.

#### ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

**CHARLES A. BUTLER,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Suite 616, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.  
Telephone, Main 7711.

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

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

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

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

Houston.

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

New York.

**FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,**  
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,  
BENNETT BLDG.,  
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,  
Tel. Call, 1368 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.  
NEW YORK.

## Volume III of The Public

Will be completed with No. 157,  
to appear April 6th.

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

Bound volumes ordered before April 6 will be ready for delivery about May 1. Price, \$2.00. Express charges to be paid by consignee. Address,  
**PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.**

#### 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*

### HENRY GEORGE

Shortly before his death wrote: "I most heartily commend 'From Earth's Center.' It contains an entertaining form an explanation of the practical workings of the 'Single Tax.' 'From Earth's Center' is a book of 274 pages. We mail it to any address for 25 cents, 8 copies for \$1.00; 100 copies by express for \$7.50. We prepay expressage within 500 miles of Chicago.  
**CHAS. H. KERR & CO., Publishers, 56 Fifth Ave., CHICAGO.**

## Rare OLD Books!

CATALOGUE FREE.

**THE ANTIQUARIAN BOOK STORE,**  
43 East Van Buren Street,  
CHICAGO.

## 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. Familiarly 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,**  
1401 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

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

**IF** you have been up against it, by buying cigars indiscriminately,

## Try those out of boxes

**BEARING OUR NAME,**  
and get your money's worth.

**J. & B. MOOS,**  
95 Randolph Street, 58-64 Dearborn Street,  
CHICAGO, ILL.

## GIBSON ART GALLERIES

CHICAGO'S GREATEST  
PHOTOGRAPHERS .:

N. W. Corner Wabash and Adams.

P. S.—Group pictures of Chicago Single Taxers on sale at our galleries.

For any Book on Earth  
Old or New

Write to  
**H. H. TIMBY,**  
Book Hunter,  
Conneaut, Ohio.

CATALOGUES FREE.

#### BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC, FOURTH YEAR.

Binders convenient for filing **THE PUBLIC**, week by week, furnishing during the year and at the end as neat and quite as strong bound a volume as the bookbinder can make, can be had of **WM. O. FOLEY,** Connellsville, Pa. Price, 60 cents postpaid.