

# The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 18, 1901.

Number 163.

**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.

Mr. Rockefeller's humble boast that he has done good by giving away millions of dollars in wages, is conclusively answered by the Pittsburgh Post, which says that this "was not a gift, but value given for labor performed."

The French chamber of deputies has voted to post the French revolutionary declaration of the rights of man in army barracks and other official places. The suggestion is a good one. Let the American house of representatives vote to post in similar manner the American revolutionary declaration of independence. Even if obsolete, it is a good document.

Mr. Ament, the Chinese missionary whose extortionate conduct Mark Twain held up to public condemnation, seems from his speeches to be utterly incapable of measuring a moral question except by the magnitude of the facts. He thinks he has completely answered Twain when he asserts that his extortion was less than the amount first telegraphed. That it is the extortion and not its amount that makes the thing iniquitous he appears to be incapable of apprehending.

One of those acts of self-sacrificing heroism, without sensational accessories, of which there are many more than fame makes record of, is reported from Indianapolis. Two colored workmen were cleaning a boiler into which steam was accidentally admitted while they were at work. One of them, William Phelps, of Richmond, Ky., jumped for the ladder and might have escaped; but he voluntarily

stood aside and shouted to his companion: "You go first, Jim; you are married." Jim ran up the ladder, which only one could use at a time, and Phelps waited. The hot steam cooked his living flesh while he bravely stood there, and when at last he emerged from the boiler the flesh was dropping from his bones. After two hours of terrible agony he died. William Phelps was "a common man" and a despised "nigger" into the bargain; but in the spectacular bravery of warfare there are no finer instances of deliberate courage than his.

Before the industrial commission at Washington last week, Byron W. Holt testified that the visible assets of the billion dollar steel trust amount to only \$300,000,000. Mr. Morgan has himself explained that this is represented by bonds. The stock, therefore, amounting to \$800,000,000 is all water. Yet half of it, preferred, is worth on the market over 100 per cent., and the other half, common, is worth over 50 per cent. Thus that water has an actual market value of more than \$600,000,000. Whence comes this value? How can nothing be worth so much? The protective tariff, says Mr. Holt, tells most of the story in this case. Because of other special privileges, he thinks the trust might continue without tariff protection, but would have to cease paying dividends on the common stock and finally cut down its capitalization. In any view of the matter the value of the water is the value of legal favors which the trust controls. It is the value of privilege, of monopoly.

Mr. Heath's nomination of Senator Hanna for the presidency must not be taken too seriously. Should Mr. McKinley refuse to run for a third term, Mr. Hanna would doubtless be

the best second choice. But Mr. McKinley will not refuse if the circumstances demand his acceptance. Should the country still be in the full tide of prosperity, he could not ignore the prayers of the thriving business community to prevent a collapse by remaining in office. Though the third term tradition would be an obstacle, Mr. McKinley has shattered too many traditions to stop at that one. Between retaining the third term tradition and retaining prosperity, there would be no choice; and he may be depended upon to yield, however reluctantly, to popular clamor.

The Wall street sensation of last week was not, as at first it was supposed to be, a culmination of the peculiar kind of prosperity about which so much boasting is done. Speculation did not produce it. It was an accidental result of a determined struggle of two financial cliques to get control of the Northern Pacific railway. Each made contracts for the future delivery to it of stock of that road, until each had acquired contracts for a majority. That meant, of course, that stock had been sold "short;" in other words, that sellers had agreed to deliver stock which they did not possess. It also meant that some of these contracts could not be carried out, that some of the sellers would be unable to procure the shares they were bound by contract to deliver, for the two purchasing cliques held contracts between them for the delivery of more stock than exists. A corner in Northern Pacific resulted. It had not been premeditated, but that did not minimize the effect. When its influence was felt, Northern Pacific stock went soaring as railway stock never did before. It went as high as \$1,000 a share—ten times its par value. Upon

discovering the reason for this unprecedented leap, the contending cliques came to an agreement to release "short" sellers from their contracts, upon payment of \$150 a share—one and a half times the par value. Thereupon the stock fell to that figure. This agreement prevented a panic. Many fortunes were lost in the scramble, but no important business house went down.

Concurrently with the accidental corner in Northern Pacific, the money market tightened, premiums on loans rose enormously, and other stocks were thrown wildly upon the market to enable their holders to cover their Northern Pacific contracts. In consequence, while the price of Northern Pacific soared upward, other prices fell amazingly. It made old bulls bellow, and the lambs must have been thoroughly shorn. With the loosening of the Northern Pacific corner, the rest of the market recovered, but the investing public has had a lesson which is likely for some time to come to discourage speculative ventures in Wall street. The speculative fruits of prosperity will be looked for elsewhere.

The financial papers are strenuous in their assurances, as it is their trade to be, that the Wall street flurry has not unsettled general business; and doubtless the kind of prosperity we have been having is unaffected. There are some indications, however, that this prosperity is now genuine enough to influence the real estate market. When it does that it will have proved itself. The real estate market can be affected, it is true, by speculative purchases induced by mere expectations of prosperity; but such expectations have prevailed so long that they can hardly influence that market now. If it improves it must be because there is enhanced demand for land to use. This demand, however, should it come, will in the natural course of things be quickly followed by speculative demand, and that will be enlivened by the Wall street scare.

Speculators who have experienced or observed the dangers of stock investments will turn to real estate as soon as it gives promise of activity. And when they do, especially if a few prizes are drawn and a little booming is done, a tide of speculation will set in that will produce an unpremeditated corner which no gentlemen's agreement can loosen up. It will produce a corner in land. And the tide of speculation that produces it will push the corner to the bursting point, and then the prosperity bubble will collapse. No syndicate nor bunch of syndicates will be able to save it.

Peace is the first law of social order, and we take second place to no one in demanding its maintenance. There are many rights we would rather forego than have them preserved by breaches of the public peace. But when peace officers themselves disturb the peace, by breaking up lawful and orderly public meetings without other warrant than their own whims, we unhesitatingly approve violent resistance. It is necessary to preserve the peace of vital social life, as distinguished from the peace that reigned at Warsaw. That is not a revolutionary exotic; it is an American idea, inherited from the days of the Boston massacre. With satisfaction, therefore, we record the forcible and successful resistance in Detroit last week, by 10,000 citizens, to an autocratic attempt of the police department to break up a lawful street meeting.

These were the circumstances. Thomas Bawden has for four years or more held meetings in one of the open spaces of Detroit, addressing his auditors from a wagon. He is a single tax advocate, but his subject is not material to the main question. Many well-known men have been heard from Bawden's wagon, and no disorder has ever occurred. Whatever municipal requirements there may be with reference to street meetings, he has evidently complied with, for his meetings have had the sanction of the city authorities. The first attempt to

break them up was that which provoked the resistance mentioned above. A "ripper" bill had been passed by the legislature. It is called "ripper" because it rips up local self-government and places a state police board above the city authorities in Detroit. This board determined to stop Bawden's meetings. Not because they had become disorderly, for they had not. Not because they were in violation of any city ordinance or state law, for they were not. But because the members of the police board did not like the sentiments of the speaker. Accordingly, without lawful warrant, without legal proceedings of any kind, but against the protests of the mayor and as an act of naked power, the board caused Bawden's meeting on the 10th to be attacked by the police force and driven from place to place. The police used their clubs, fired their guns, drenched the crowd with a hose, and charged it on horseback. In this charge men were run down, and two were trampled upon and their heads crushed by horses of the mounted police. This lawless breach of the public peace, for the purpose of suppressing lawful public speech, was bravely resisted by the crowd that had assembled, and the resistance had the effect it deserved. The police board decided to leave the regulation of street meetings in future to the local authorities; and on the 11th the mayor addressed a large crowd from Bawden's wagon, assuring the public that the local authorities had no intention or desire to interfere with free speech. It is to be hoped that this affair in Detroit may serve as a wholesome check upon the dangerous disposition of peace guardians everywhere to make themselves peace disturbers.

It is not easy to understand Gov. Yates's veto of the bill, passed this year by the Illinois legislature, to establish a uniform system of public accounting throughout the state. His chief reason is that it would shift the beginning of the fiscal year from the present date to the first of Jan-

uary. But it is difficult to believe that he would have vetoed a useful bill for so frivolous a reason. That would be showing too much deference to the temporary convenience of public bookkeepers. And this was a useful bill. It required all public accounts to be kept in the same way—uniform township accounts, uniform city accounts, and so on,—and thereby laid the foundation for comparing accounts throughout the state. It is not easy to avoid the suspicion that something more vital than any of the reasons the governor specifies influenced his action on this bill. It would have been a bad law for local rings.

But one bill which the governor has signed has in it good possibilities of public utility. It is the Crafts public opinion bill. As originally drawn this bill required a vote upon any question proposed by a petition of five per cent. of the tax payers—local questions in their appropriate communities, county questions in counties, and state questions in the state. The legislature changed the bill so as to require a petition of 25 per cent. of the voters and so the governor has signed it. This change makes it prohibitory in the state at large, in most counties, and in all large cities. A petition of over 100,000 would be necessary to secure an expression of opinion under the bill in Chicago. But it is workable in small places and there its merits can be demonstrated. Votes under it are not mandatory. They are purely advisory. But by disclosing the actual state of public opinion on a given subject, it would offer exceptional possibilities of influencing political action.

It is not a little curious that the coal miners of England, though disturbed by the export tax on coal, should be not at all concerned about the import tax on sugar. For there is every reason to believe that while the British working class must pay most of the sugar tax, it will bear none of the coal tax. British coal must sell in the open markets of the world

upon its merits. Tax or no tax, it can not bring a higher price unless it is of superior quality. Equal quality equality price, is the law of the market. The coal tax, therefore, must be borne by the coal exporters. But they will not export coal at a loss. Unless they can throw the tax back upon someone else they won't export. Naturally, there will be an inclination to throw it back upon the miners by reducing their wages. But wages are not regulated by export taxes, except as those taxes may disturb the equilibrium of demand for and supply of labor. This equilibrium will not be affected by the export tax on coal so long as there are mining royalties, unless it provokes mine owners to arbitrarily close down, and there is no danger of their doing that. Consequently the tax will come out of the owners' royalties, in every instance where the operator has no contract. Operators under contract will have to bear the tax until their contracts expire. But in the end, the tax will fall altogether upon mine owners. Not so with the import tax on sugar. That will raise the retail price of sugar about 50 per cent. Now sugar is a very cheap and wholesome food, and under free trade English working people got to using a great quantity—more per capita than any other nation. So large is this consumption that it has been said with substantial truth that an English workingman, if his family is not smaller than the duke of Manchester's, will have to pay as heavy a sugar tax as the duke. In presenting the measure Sir Michael Hicks-Beach estimated the annual average consumption at 56 pounds a head, and stated that the rich consume a little more than that amount and the poor a little less. And investigation shows that the consumption by agricultural laborers comes up to 52 pounds a head, which is only four pounds below the average for all classes. The sugar tax is a workingman's tax. The British ministry was right in its economics when it declared that the object of that tax was to compel the working

classes to contribute to the expense of the South African war.

Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, who is trying to enforce the tax laws against big tax dodgers, came in conflict last week with two railroads and the county auditors of the counties through which they run. The end is not yet. Railroads in Ohio are assessed by the mile. This the mayor regards as unjust to cities, since rights of way are much more valuable in cities than in the open country, yet the mileage basis of assessment yields no greater revenues per mile to city than to country treasuries. But Mr. Johnson considers that an act of the legislature is necessary to remedy this inequality, so he makes no complaint to the auditors on that score. His complaint is against appraisements of railroad property at about ten per cent. of its true value, when residence property is appraised at 60 per cent. or more.

He began on the 9th a fight on that point which he announces his intention of carrying not only into the courts, but before the people of the state. The first subject of his exposure was the Cleveland & Terminal Valley road, which controls one of the most valuable rights of way into Cleveland, holding it under a lease having 82 years yet to run, owns 700 feet of water front on the river and a dock on the lake, and is worth altogether over \$106,000 a mile, yet has been assessed for taxation at only \$9,191. Addressing the county auditors on this subject, Mayor Johnson asked if there was "any reason in law or equity why a railroad should be assessed differently than a farm or city real estate"—a different proportion of actual value. Being assured by one of the auditors in reply that railroad property is "generally assessed fairly high," he said:

I want to show, before you gentlemen get through, that the selling price, the market value, of this road is not less than \$106,000 per mile, and then I want to know why this road is assessed at \$9,191 per mile when oth-

er property pays on 60 per cent. of its true value. This railroad has issued \$5,000,000 of bonds alone, and it has a lot of other property. It ought to pay on a valuation of at least \$65,000 a mile. We are here prepared to take up the legal phases of this question, and Prof. Bemis is here to show how we reach the value of this railroad. I want to charge that this road through its lawyers, lobbyists and judicious use of passes and other favors, pays on only \$9,191 per mile in place of \$65,000, as it should. That's our case, and we're going to make it against every railroad company that appears to have its appraisal fixed.

At the session of the auditors on the following day, the 10th, the question of assessing the Valley road was decided. After Prof. Bemis had produced data to sustain Mayor Johnson's valuation, and the mayor had been heard in behalf of the city, asking the board of auditors to "apply the same rule that they adopt in valuing houses, stores and farm property," and fix the assessment at 60 per cent. of actual value, the board went into secret session for 30 minutes. At the end of that time it announced an assessment of \$9,756 per mile—an increase of \$565. The total valuation of the road upon this assessment is \$734,716.30, or less than one-third the value of the terminal facilities in Cleveland alone.

Prior to that decision, but on the same day, the auditors raised the aggregate valuation of the Cleveland & Pittsburgh road from \$5,000,000 to \$5,880,000. It was in connection with this case that the mayor referred to the injustice of the mileage system of assessment. He also again scored the taxing officials as probable recipients of railroad favors. A clearer statement, in brief, of the whole situation could not be made, and we reproduce it from the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

I don't ask you people to change your rule of assessing railroad property by the mile. At another time and another place we intend to make an effort to have that unjust rule wiped out. The railroads of Ohio, by

a judicious distribution of favors (passes I mean) to people who are in a position to do them good, all the way from the judges on the bench down to county officials, including auditors, have been able to get laws passed that enable them to pay taxes on about ten per cent. of the actual cash value of their property, while other people pay all the way from 60 to 100 per cent. What I ask to-day is that you assess this road on about 60 per cent. of its actual cash value. That will place in the treasury of the city of Cleveland about \$27,000. The company is now paying in only about \$7,000. If you did what the law and the constitution says you shall do, you would assess it for its full cash value and that would mean more than \$120,000 instead of \$27,000 to us. But you have adopted a rule to assess property for about 60 per cent. of its value. Will you do it to-day? Let's see if you dare do it now. Is there any man on this board who has in his pocket a pass from this company? No man has a right to sit here and assess this road if he has.

No one answered this challenge, and the mayor called upon Prof. Bemis to disclose the actual value of the road. Bemis showed that the whole road is worth \$43,812,000, and that, apportioned by mileage, the part of it within the state of Ohio would be worth 93 per cent. of that sum, or \$40,725,160. Yet the auditors assessed it, as stated at the beginning of this paragraph, for only \$5,880,000.

When the county auditors rendered their decision in the latter of these two railroads cases, Mayor Johnson made little concealment of his evident belief that they had been improperly influenced by the railroad company to grossly undervalue its property; and he warned them that if they should seek reelection, or election to any other office, he would do all in his power to defeat them. In a newspaper interview he declared his intention of carrying the fight into the board of state auditors:

The members of that state board will place the railroads on the same level with residence property and farm lands or there'll be such a storm of indignation throughout the state that they will be swept out of political life forever. While we are now making an effort to persuade the county auditors to live up to their oaths of office, this is but a skirmish. The grand

battle will come at Columbus, and there we'll turn our big guns loose. Fortunately the state auditor, state treasurer and attorney general are candidates for reelection. I have a notion that will help us some, for by the time the line of battle reaches to them they may decide to take warning and heed the voice of the people. Any schoolboy can see the outrageous discrimination in favor of railroads that has been going on in Ohio for years. It has got to stop.

One remark of a railroad attorney, made in the progress of the Cleveland tax fight outlined above, is worthy of serious consideration. Referring to some of the evidence offered by Mayor Johnson to show that his road was worth many times the tax valuation, he said: "Because we can now struggle along without borrowing more, you want to tax us on our ability to keep our interest down; it is like going back to feudal times, when a man was taxed because he built a chimney." But this railroad lawyer's railroad had to be put upon the taxation rack before he became aware of that depressing feature of our tax laws. They do literally tax men for building chimneys. They put burdens upon production in all directions. Better houses, higher taxes; more production, higher taxes. That is the rule. But it is applied on the basis of from 60 to 100 per cent. of cash value to ordinary folks, and from 10 to 15 to railroad corporations. This is the fact that Mayor Johnson is exposing and seeking to correct. He is limited and hampered by the tax laws as they are, which require taxation of industry and thrift; but by showing how these laws are evaded by the rich and influential and relentlessly enforced against the average man, and insisting upon their equal operation, he may compel the public to reflect. Out of this tax fight, therefore, may yet come a general realization of the wastefulness and wickedness of deriving public revenues from the taxation of chimney building, to use that as a type—from the taxation, that is, of serviceable products of human labor—when the values of landed priv-

ileges and special franchises offer for public use an abundant common fund which now goes into private pockets.

Johnson makes no secret of his ultimate aim. It is to so arouse the conscience and awaken the good sense of the people of Ohio, by exposures of the iniquitous system of taxation from which they now suffer, that they will concede to every locality the right to raise its own taxes in its own way. Nor would he consider this accomplishment the goal. Having secured that right of home rule, he would push the issue until the localities raised their taxes not only in their own way, but in the right way. And that way would be by taxing nobody but the owners of valuable rights of way, valuable building lots, valuable sites generally; and taxing them only in proportion to the value of their sites respectively. The following article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, containing an interview with Mayor Johnson on the subject, explains his purpose:

The fact that leading politicians throughout the state seem to have business in Cleveland at this particular time may be regarded as a coincidence by some folks, but the wise ones do not see it that way. They view it as a prearranged condition which tends to confirm what Mr. Johnson's friends hope and believe, viz., that he is becoming "It" in the Buckeye state.

One thing about which there is no dispute is that Mayor Johnson wants to get control of the legislature in the sense that he wants, so he says, to see fair-minded and unpurchasable men elected to it. "Any unprejudiced and unpurchased body of men may be easily and quickly convinced that the present laws relating to taxes and franchises work an outrageous injustice on the state and the people of Ohio," according to the mayor. "I intend to use all my influence to assist in electing a legislature composed of honest men," he said. By honest men, it is taken for granted the mayor meant honest democrats.

It is not believed that Johnson has in mind a law that will make the adoption of single tax imperative on the state. It is more likely that a bill will be framed providing that any county, on the vote of its people, may adopt the system. Having adopted it, the county, if it

does not find it satisfactory, by a majority vote can return to the old system. As Mr. Johnson sees it, the possibility of any community, having once adopted the plan, wishing to return to the old one, does not exist.

"A majority of the people of this country," remarked the mayor to a friend, the other day, "are single taxers, but they don't know it. But they're coming to a knowledge of the fact, and it's for us who have studied the matter and are a little in advance of them, to point out the way. Some well meaning people who don't know what they're talking about, say that a single tax on land values means placing a heavy burden on the poor man who owns a little home. If you ask these same people who bears the largest proportion of the tax burden now, they'll say the poor man; not alone the poor man who owns a little house and lot, but the poor man who has some personal property. He has so little that he can't conceal it, and the assessor gets it. If a farmer has two buggies, three horses, a piano, 50 head of cattle, etc., everybody knows it, and that includes the tax assessor. If the rich man has a million dollars in securities and says he has \$1,000, the assessor takes his word for it. We can't reach the rich man's personal property, and we don't, but we can the poor man's. Now, that is manifestly unjust. If we can't regulate the system, why not abolish it and adopt one that we can regulate? The rich man can't conceal his real estate any more than the farmer can."

#### SUCCESS IN LIFE.

If we were about to preach a sermon on success, we should pointedly distinguish different kinds. We should show how success may consist on the one hand in building up character with reference to moral principle, or, on the other, in gaining more or less of the whole world and losing your own soul; and we should urge acceptance of the lesson of the high mountain in the Holy Land, where the most successful personality in all history signalized his greatest triumph with the exclamation, "Get thee behind me, Satan!"

But this is not to be a sermon; at any rate, not that kind of sermon. It is to be an unreserved, and we trust a sensible, inquiry into the possibilities of achieving that species of success, now so generally applauded and so heartily coveted, whose treasures

are subject to the ravages of moths, thieves and corruption.

The prime condition of selfish success now most generally approved is somewhat different from that which prevailed two or three generations ago. In their youth, men now of middle age were persistently taught that their success depended upon their piety. This idea was inculcated in the church, in the home, in the school; and in debating societies arguments were fattened with it. It was the lesson of the marbled-back literature that constituted the literary staple of Sunday school libraries, and the burden of all other respectable vehicles of advice to the young. In the pietized imagination of that day, the good boy was destined, if he escaped an early and joyous death, to become a rich and exemplary man.

Usually the illustrative examples were mythical. Yet living ones were not wanting. The theory did suffer serious strain when the millionaire Girard was mentioned; but all infidels had not committed themselves, as he had, to hostility to churches in their wills, and even John Jacob Astor could be referred to, though with some reserve, as a poor and pious boy grown wealthy. Spectacular success, however, was not common then. The types were the little rich men of the neighborhood. With but few exceptions they were invariably pious; they had in almost all instances been poor boys; and as uniformly as circumstances would permit, their success was attributed to their piety from youth up. Incidental advantages were often known to have contributed, but these fortuitous circumstances were not considered important enough to count.

When the piety of that period is analyzed, its utility as a promoter of selfish success is less dubious than at first blush it appears. Its nature was not unfairly exemplified by the little negro of the wharves, who pushed and shoved and trampled upon his smaller companions to get the pennies that a stranger threw over a ship's side to see the youngsters scramble for them. After he had filled his pockets with the coin, of which he had prevented the others from getting a

share, this ebony Rockefeller in embryo refused to dance, even for good pay, because he had joined the church! Piety consisted, that is, chiefly in getting into church and keeping out of jail. Beyond those two points few questions were asked. And so the pious were supposed to succeed and the successful were supposed to be pious.

But few sensible men of to-day would attribute selfish success to piety. Too many pious men have failed. Too many pious men are hopelessly poor. Too many of the wicked have been crowned with success. Even professional pietists no longer recommend piety for business reasons. Almost universally it is now recognized that genuine piety is a positive bar to success; and as for the other kind, however valuable hypocrisy may once have been as a commercial asset, it is so no longer. While ambitious business men are as careful as ever to keep out of jail, they are not so anxious to get into church. Piety as a specific for selfish success has been displaced by individual industry. The successful are now assumed to have been industrious, and the industrious are assured of success.

This theory is adopted and fondled and propagated not only by those who are ambitious to gain as much of the world as possible though they lose their own souls in the process; it is also approved and applauded and assiduously impressed upon the minds of youth by our professional teachers of moral and spiritual philosophies. It is the latter day substitute for piety. But will it work any better than the theory it has displaced? That is the question.

The best expression, perhaps, of this modern theory of success, was written by a notorious pretender. It is known as "The Message to Garcia," a tract that has evoked very general applause. One railroad man, who had himself been successful, distributed copies broadcast among his unsuccessful subordinates to teach them how to rise.

The tract is the story of a young military officer who, early in the war with Spain, was given a message by

the war department to carry to the Cuban general, Garcia. The difficulties in the way of the messenger seemed insurmountable. But he made no protest, he asked no questions. He had been told to carry a message to Garcia, and he did it. The tract might gain force as a guide to success, if its author could write a sequel describing the promotion of the plucky young officer to the grade, say of brigadier general. But that reward did not go to the officer who carried a message to Garcia; it was reserved for one who delivered a forgery to Aguinaldo.

Despite this suggestive anti-climax, however, the story of the message to Garcia has been widely accepted as a true exposition of the secret of business success. When you are told by your superiors to do something, don't hesitate, don't question, but do it, and business success is yours. That is the moral.

President McKinley spoke to the same effect at a colored school in Louisiana, upon his continental tour. He told his youthful negro hearers that if they would get an education, build up a good character, and be unfalteringly industrious, they would have "success anywhere and everywhere," and that this is true of blacks and whites alike. A survival of the pietistic theory was introduced there, in the allusion to building up a good character. There was also a reference to another theory of success, which once had temporary vogue but is now almost monopolized by poor and ambitious school boys and college students—the theory that book education is the open sesame. But Mr. McKinley, like the author of "The Message to Garcia," laid his emphasis upon "unfaltering industry."

Most impressive, however, of all the teachers along this line is Mr. Charles M. Schwab, the man who, from an impoverished boyhood, is reported to have risen by Garcia-message-carrying methods to a salaried position of a million dollars a year. His stupendous success is the guarantee of his competency to advise.

In a recent address to the graduates of a technical school in New York, Mr. Schwab summed up the now dominant philosophy of success in one pregnant sentence. It is not

enough to do your duty. "Everybody," said he, "is expected to do his duty; but the boy who does his duty, and a little more than his duty, is the boy who is going to succeed in this world."

In one respect the theory of success thus indicated is like that which it has displaced. It embodies a measure of truth. Just as the idea was true that the good boy would succeed, other things being the same, so is it true that the industrious and persevering boy will succeed, other things being the same. But there is the difficulty. "Other things being the same," implies that a large proportion of boys shall not be good, in order that the good one may succeed, and that a large proportion shall remain inferior in industry, in order that the industrious one may succeed. In other words, this much belauded industry theory of success can be true only so long as most people don't act upon it.

If all were equally industrious, all would not succeed; and if all tried to succeed by exceptional industry, the great mass, who must necessarily fall short of such a standard, would come into a condition of virtual servitude to the successful,—a servitude that would be all the more profitable to its beneficiaries on account of the high standard of industry the struggle to avert it had established.

If, for illustration, the clerk who willingly works nine hours in an office when the rule is eight is the man for promotion, and all in the office are ambitious, the rivalry for success will result, if the employer also is ambitious, in extending the office day to nine hours. After that the clerk who would distinguish himself must work ten hours. When in the course of time a new rivalry shall have raised office hours to his standard, willingness to work 11 hours will be the test of industrial worthiness. And so on until the standard of office hours has been raised so high as to abolish leisure, and an exceptional few have become masters of the rest.

Returning from this illustration to the more general considerations which it roughly explains, if all workers were to do more than their duty in some degree, only the exceptional

ones who did it in greater degree could win; and if all rose to that standard, the winners would be those who raised the standard still higher. Should the process go on, none could succeed finally but those who so far overleap the limits of their duty as to go the full length of human endurance; and then, even if all were endowed with equal endurance, success could no longer depend upon excessive industry. None could excel when all had reached the limit.

The time would never come, of course, when all workers would reach the highest standard of human endurance. Some would be physically too weak and others morally too sane. But there would be some point at which the great mass would give up in despair; and when that point had been reached, the social problem would be just where it is now, just where it would have remained if no universal desire to succeed by excessive industry had taken possession of the people. Then, as now, only the few could succeed. The difference would be that with the rest the strain for a bare living would be more tense, while the successful few would have to be stronger than ever and more insanely ambitious. Those who fell below the highest standard would still be crowded to the wall, still be denounced as indolent, still be robbed of the lion's share of what they did produce; those who rose above the standard would still thrive upon the unrequited toil of their brethren.

Industry is truly a virtue, and one which is too much neglected by all classes. The work of even laborious toilers is drudgery rather than industry, and a vast amount of upper class labor is hardly more useful or honest than "the process known as four of a kind." Whoever, therefore, writes anything or says anything calculated to stimulate wholesome industry renders a public service. But he who stimulates it by raising false hopes of business success as the reward of industry, commits a social crime.

It is not true, what is often asserted, that the success of our rich men is attributable to doing more than their duty. While excessive devotion to their employers' interests may have given to their business career its orig-

inal impulse, other factors have entered in to produce the successful result. Good or bad, these factors may have been; just or unjust; sordid or not; mean or manly—but they, and not alone fidelity to an employer's interests, not alone excessive devotion to duty, not alone excessive industry, have helped turn the scale for success or failure.

And in the present as in the past, many factors are necessary to success. Most important of all is some advantage whereby the industry of the unsuccessful may be forced to contribute to the success of those who succeed. Not until a man can live in fabulous luxury upon the labor of others is he accounted successful. For that reason industry is no guarantee of success in life. The industrious as a class can not succeed so long as success consists in the possession of power to levy tribute upon industry.

By natural law success does depend upon industry; and the degree and intelligence of the industry does naturally determine the measure of the success. This would be true also in actual experience, if industry were confined to rendering service. Then success would not be a prize for the extraordinary feats of the few. It would be the reward of all to the extent of their earnings. But industry is not so limited. In a slave country it may be devoted to buying slaves; and there the successful man is he who has acquired enough slaves to relieve him of all necessity of working. In more highly civilized countries it may be devoted to the purchase of financial interests that are nourished by veiled systems of slavery. The principle is the same; only the method differs. And just as it would be cruel mockery in a slave country to tell slaves that excessive industry would assure them business success, when in fact not they but their masters would profit by their greater usefulness, so is it in the country of higher civilization even more cruel, because more deceptive, to teach that success depends upon industry. It would be only the truth to teach that it depends upon monopoly.

Does not every intelligent man

know, will not every genuinely honest man admit, that the industrial power of the present time centers in monopoly? It is true that you may get your monopoly by excessive industry, so long as the standard of work leaves a margin for extraordinary labor feats; but it is the monopoly all the same, and not your industry, that finally makes you successful.

Monopoly is a process of levying tribute upon the industrious for the benefit of the monopolists. When it exists, increased industry among non-monopolists can not benefit them as a class; for as soon as this greater industry becomes general, its profits go to fatten monopolists.

Hence incentives to general industry are popular with monopolists and their agents and organs of opinion. If the people of this country could be induced to work harder in the vain hope that all may thereby win success, the value of monopolies would rise, but industry in general would be no better paid, and if not in excess of the higher standard would win no prizes.

When, therefore, the agents and beneficiaries of monopoly interests preach excessive industry as the solution of the social problem, yet "lie low" on the subject of monopoly, they expose either their intelligence or their motives to suspicion. The whole thing is suggestive of the primitive method of inducing the mule to turn the mill by hanging a bundle of hay where it continually dangles just before his nose, but always eludes his reach.

Yet there is hope in the new theory of business success. It does something in pushing aside the old idea that success is the reward of piety. It will do more presently in demonstrating its own deceptiveness.

Not more than one generation is likely to be fooled by it. After that experience, the people may be trusted to recognize that under existing conditions success does not depend upon industry—not as a rule of general application. Yet the logic of the rule will lose none of its force. The conviction will still remain that industry,

even though not the measure of success, certainly ought to be.

Let the people once look at the matter in that way, and the solution of the social problem will be at hand. They cannot look upon it so without being put upon inquiry. They cannot feel that industry ought to be the measure of success, and at the same time realize that it is not, without searching earnestly for the cause of this conflict between what ought to be and what is. And if they once set about searching for the cause they will find it in the institution of monopoly, an institution so obtrusive, so bold, so comprehensively explanatory, as to make them wonder they never thought of it before. When the theory that industry is the true measure of success once receives full consideration, the doom of monopoly will sound.

Meanwhile, however, the theory that industry is a guarantee of success as now exploited, is both vicious and dangerous. It is dangerous because it will bitterly disappoint most of the young men who adopt it; in their blind anger they may, if occasion for violence occurs, neither weigh its wisdom nor count its cost. Nothing could be better calculated to produce reckless revolutionaries. It is vicious because it gives the youth of the country a fundamentally false idea of life. Though embodying a substantial truth, the truth that success is the natural reward of industry, this theory of success deceptively inculcates the idea that social conditions permit the rewards of industry to find their natural objects. It conceals the monopolistic influences which now disturb the natural distribution of the proceeds of industry. By doing that, it falsifies the very truth it embodies, and realizes Tennyson's conception that "a lie which is half a truth is ever the blackest of lies."

## NEWS

Hardly had our last week's account of the darkening of the speculative outlook in Wall street got upon the press when the gathering storm culminated. Northern Pacific railway stock, which had closed on the 8th at

\$156 per share, of the par value of \$100, rose on the 9th, immediately upon the opening of the New York stock exchange, to \$170. From that point it went up to \$180, fell again to \$170, jumped with successive bounds to \$300, receded to \$230, soared to \$400, and then, with an initial falling sweep which touched \$320, shot up to \$660, fluttered back to \$550, and at one bound leaping up to \$700, sprang with another to \$1,000. This was its highest point, and it quickly fell to \$600. Simultaneously with the fabulous rise of Northern Pacific, other leading stocks enormously fell. Fortunes seemed to melt like ice on a griddle, and fears of a business crash were general.

It subsequently transpired that the fabulous prices offered for Northern Pacific stock had been caused by an unintentional corner in it. The Morgan interests on one side, and the Vanderbilt interests on the other, had been buying the stock in order to get a majority and so control the property. As their purchases were for future delivery, each succeeded in buying a majority of the stock, thus imposing an obligation upon sellers to produce some 200,000 more shares than actually exist. The manipulators of these purchases were therefore able to check the panic by a mutual agreement to let "short" sellers out of the corner, and they did so. Consenting to accept \$150 a share in lieu of Northern Pacific stock deliveries, they released the strain and restored the market. This soothing result was promoted by the banks, which extended special facilities to the Wall street fraternity. On the 10th, consequently, Northern Pacific fluctuated between \$150 and \$160, and the other stocks rose again. A similar effect was produced on the London stock exchange by similar means. The effects of the Northern Pacific corner were felt there also, and at the solicitation of Mr. Morgan the London stock exchange committee suspended obligations to deliver until the crisis had passed.

Nevertheless, the Wall street storm has left an irregular market behind it. After congratulating themselves for a day or two upon the return of promising speculative conditions, Wall street operators began to notice on the 13th that transactions were falling off; and on the 14th there was another fall in prices all along the line. This debility of speculation is ac-

counted for in two ways. The personal losses in the storm turn out to have been much more crippling than was at first supposed; and the scare is believed to have driven outside speculation into less dangerous financial waters.

President McKinley was reported as greatly disturbed by the Wall street panic, but a telephonic conversation with the east put him at his ease. He was at the time in Los Angeles, where he had arrived on the 8th, as reported last week. At this city on the 9th he rode at the head of the floral parade of the carnival, and on the 10th he and his party reached San Luis Obispo. At every stopping place along the route he was welcomed with floral displays, and at Santa Barbara he made his principal speech of the day, in which he said:

What a splendid civilization comes out of the old states and from the old nationalities that are represented here to-day, the best civilization in the world; a civilization based upon liberty, upon equality, upon self-government, and civilization that leads wherever it goes, whether here or in the distant seas, and wherever this civilization goes it carries the ark of freedom. Our liberty, our freedom, our sense of justice are not extinguished in any climate on the globe, and here, facing the Pacific, I am reminded that this ark of liberty has moved out into this great ocean.

Referring then to the Spanish war, he led up to the Philippine question, saying:

As the result of that war we are in the Philippines, and we do not mean to come away, and we mean to give to these distant peoples what we gave to California more than 50 years ago, the blessings of security and liberty.

The 11th was spent by the presidential party at Del Monte; and on the 12th they arrived in San Francisco, two days ahead of time. This departure from the schedule was necessitated by a sudden illness which attacked Mrs. McKinley, requiring special medical attention. The president ran down from San Francisco to San Jose on the 13th, where in his address he spoke flatteringly of the place and the people, and with reference to subjects of general interest said:

We live, my fellow citizens, under a constitution that was made for 4,000,000 people, and yet it has proved quite adequate for 75,000,000 people. It has embraced within it every national duty and purpose, and has never

stood in the way of our development and expansion. That instrument seems almost to be inspired to carry forward the holy mission of liberty. It seems not to have been made alone for those who framed it and their successors, but for all ages and all mankind. That instrument stands to-day almost as it left the hands of its framers. Few amendments have been added, and those have only been to enlarge the priceless blessings of liberty and free government to the people, and no amendment can ever be made to the constitution of this country that will curtail the supreme and sovereign power of the people. We have lived under it for 125 years, in storm and in sunshine, in war within and without, amidst passions and tumult, and, after a century and a quarter, that great instrument stands unsullied by a single lapse of principle. To us, my fellow citizens, young and old, the preservation of that constitution is committed. It is a sacred instrument, and it is a sacred trust given to us to see to it that it is preserved in all its virtue and vigor, to be passed along to the generations yet to come. Glorious constitution, glorious union, glorious flag. Seventy-five millions of people stand together as they never before stood to defend them all.

The president's formal entry into San Francisco was made on the 14th. He was received with unbounded enthusiasm, and was to have had a magnificent ceremonial reception on the 15th; but this was abandoned at his request, owing to Mrs. McKinley's alarming condition. For the same reason the presidential tour through the far northwest will not be made.

Crossing the Pacific to "our new possessions," to which President McKinley's speeches have referred, we may learn that the country is not yet wholly pacified. Filipino bands are still holding out. There are reports, however, of surrenders under promises of immunity; and Gen. Funston is said to have been in communication with a Filipino leader in northern Luzon who has promised to surrender his command within a few days. There is no statement of the inducements offered, nor of the reasons for delay. Steps are being taken, under orders from the war department, to reduce the army of occupation to 40,000. The rest of the Philippine news consists of reports of trials and convictions of military officers for frauds, insignificant attacks by Filipino bands, the breaking up of a gang of American brigands, the ambitions of the federalist party, and the civil or-

ganization of another province or two. None of it is especially important.

Over in China the foreign ministers have received the reply of the Chinese government to the indemnity demand of 450,000,000 taels (about \$326,250,000), reported last week. This reply, which is long, is summarized by the cable into a plea of national poverty. It concedes the obligation and declares the intention of China to pay all the legitimate expenses incurred by the foreigners during the recent Chinese troubles, but explains that the public resources of the empire are diminishing, and assures the powers that the best it can do is to pay \$15,000,000 taels (about \$10,500,000) annually, which it offers to do, without interest, for a period of 30 years. Li Hung Chang is desirous of having the different indemnity claims of the powers submitted for adjudication to The Hague tribunal, but he has been warned that if he makes this demand the foreign occupation will be extended pending the adjudication and that thereby the final indemnity will be augmented by millions of dollars. No action has yet been taken by the powers with reference to China's reply to their indemnity demand.

In Japan the ministerial crisis noted last week continues. It has not been found possible as yet to form a new cabinet.

The Australian federal parliament was ceremoniously opened on the 9th at Melbourne. This is the first parliament of the new commonwealth. (See vol. iii, pp. 10, 93, 105, 601, 616.) It was chosen on the 31st of March (see vol. iii, p. 825), and at its opening on the 9th of the present month the heir of King Edward VII., the duke of Cornwall and York, presided over the ceremonies. Upon their conclusion, the governor general of the commonwealth, the earl of Hoptoun, directed the senate and the representatives to return to their respective houses and elect officers, and on the 10th he outlined the measures that the ministry intend to lay before the parliament. As cabled, they include bills for the constitution of a high court with extensive jurisdiction, for the creation of an interstate commerce commission, for restricting Asiatic immigration and the importa-

tion of labor from the South sea islands, for the arbitration of labor disputes, and for adult suffrage. Nothing is said of the question of federal taxation, which constituted the issue of the federal elections.

While this new autonomous dependency of Great Britain was celebrating the opening of its first parliament, the house of commons of the British parliament was voting upon the appropriation for the new king's civil expenditures, including his private purse. The amount asked for by the tory ministry and seconded by the liberal leader was £470,000 (\$2,350,000) annually. Mr. Labouchere moved to reduce the allowance to £415,000 (\$2,075,000), the amount allowed to Queen Victoria; but his motion was defeated—62 to 250. The vote granting the full amount proposed was 307 to 58, the opposition coming mostly from Irish members. Another question in the commons, which still more deeply concerned the Irish members was decided against them by a smaller majority. It arose on the second reading of a bill to amend legal procedure in Ireland. A system of jury packing in the interest of the government prevails there, which this bill was intended to remedy. The ministry opposed the bill, insisting that local conditions in Ireland necessitate the discriminations in selecting juries of which the Irish members complain; and the bill was defeated by the vote of 226 to 102.

Attention has been directed to Russian finances and the relations of France and Russia, by the authorization, officially announced from St. Petersburg on the 11th, of a Russian loan "to restore the treasury advances to railway companies in 1900, and to meet the expenditures of the current year." The nominal amount of the loan is 424,000,000 francs (\$84,800,000). It bears four per cent. interest; is not redeemable until January 14, 1960; is guaranteed by the Bank of France, the Credit Lyonnaise, the Rothschilds and other French banking houses, and was advanced to Russia by the French government.

From Spain reports of disorder noted last week (p. 74) continue, but still with meager details. An enormous riot is said to have occurred at Barcelona on the 9th. The mob tried to stop work in the factories, and col-

lisions with troops resulted. Several soldiers were among the wounded. Wholesale arrests of anarchists, socialists and Catalans have been made. Later dispatches report the restoration of order. Labor difficulties and political purposes appear to have combined to produce the outbreaks. Their political character is especially indicated by the order of Gen. Weyler, minister of war, to the captain general of Barcelona, to "reply by arms to every cry of 'Death to Spain,'" and the merging of political and labor interests is sufficiently shown by the announcement of the ministry that it will present to the cortes bills in the interest of the working classes, but will make no compromise with the Catalans of separatist tendencies. The latter part of this announcement suggests the nature of the political phases of the revolt in the Catalonian territory, which includes Barcelona. This part of Spain is not really Spanish, and secession has always been a popular sentiment with the Catalan inhabitants.

Down in South Africa the guerrilla resistance to British occupation still holds out, but there is little news from that part of the world. In fact, there is none at all, aside from a somewhat dubious dispatch to the effect that Lord Kitchener has decided to burn the veldt in order to force the Boers to surrender.

Returning now to our own side of the globe, Cuba furnishes a morsel of news apropos of the return to Havana, reported last week, of the Cuban commissioners to Washington. The constitutional convention reassembled on the 13th, and in secret session considered the report of this commission and referred it to the standing committee on relations with the United States. The committee is instructed to report to an adjourned session of the convention on the 20th.

In the United States threatening labor troubles are taking shape. One difficulty is at Albany, N. Y., where a street car strike has attracted national attention by the resort to troops and the apparent danger of a bloody collision. The strike is said to be against nonunion employes. As the dispatches report the case, all differences were settled between the men and the traction company except one—the

company refused to discharge nine nonunion men. It is to be observed, however, that the bitterness between the parties seems to be too extreme for such an explanation. Both in Albany and in the neighboring city of Troy, say the reports, the strikers destroyed the company's property; and although the company encounters no difficulty whatever in finding new men to take the place of the old ones, the manifestations of violence make it impossible to induce the new men to incur the bodily risks of going to work. The sheriff of Albany county admitted his inability to suppress the disorder, and the sheriff of Rensselaer (the Troy county) refused to order his deputies to ride on the cars as the company requested. Consequently the governor called out the militia. One collision between the strikers and the troops has occurred, and there are fears of bloody street fighting. The cars have not been run for several days.

What may be a much more important labor event is foreshadowed by the action of the machinists' union with reference to the coming change from a ten-hour to a nine-hour day. About a year ago an agreement with the employers' organization provided for a nine-hour day, to go into effect May 20, 1901, but no provision was made regarding wages. There is now exhibited on the part of the employers a disposition to pay only nine-tenths the present wages for nine-tenths of the present labor time; whereas, the workmen have expected to receive the same wages for the nine-hour day as for the ten. A general strike will doubtless be ordered if this expectation is not satisfied. At a meeting of the Machinery and Allied Metal Trades' National and International unions, held at Washington on the 14th, it was decided that in all shops which refuse on May 20 and thereafter to pay the same wages for the nine-hour day as they are now paying for the ten-hour day the workmen shall strike.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—The German reichstag adjourned on the 11th until November 26.

—The total population of London, including the outer suburbs, as returned by the recent census, is 6, 578, 784.

—The territorial legislature of Hawaii, which adjourned on the 30th, first passed a resolution memorializ-

ing President McKinley to remove Gov. Dole.

—The Cleveland branch of the social democratic party has decided to recommend the elimination from the national platform of all demands except the fundamental one of socialism—that for a radical remodeling of the capitalistic order of society.

—The Cleveland ordinance requiring the mayor to surrender the lake front to the railroads, the execution of which, by Mayor Farley, was prevented by Mayor Johnson's qualifying half an hour before the expiration of an injunction, was repealed on the 13th by the city council by a vote of 13 to 7.

—The republican governor of Wisconsin has vetoed the primary election bill. He was elected on a pledge to reform the primary election system, but the republican legislature, acting under corporate influences as he charges, gave him a bill to sign which was "so framed as to bring reproach upon the principle," and he refused to sign it. The senate majority resented his charges.

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

|                     |                  |
|---------------------|------------------|
| Receipts:           |                  |
| Tariff .....        | \$199,355,933 68 |
| Internal Revenue..  | 252,413,906 06   |
| Miscellaneous ..... | 31,115,121 39    |
|                     | \$482,884,961 15 |
| Expenses:           |                  |
| Civil and Misc..... | \$104,533,160 56 |
| War .....           | 124,753,366 38   |
| Navy .....          | 50,273,196 71    |
| Indians .....       | 9,242,805 00     |
| Pensions .....      | 116,741,635 57   |
| Interest .....      | 29,246,551 70    |
|                     | \$434,790,705 92 |
| Surplus .....       | \$48,094,255 23  |

## MISCELLANY

### THE FLAG-MASKED EMPIRE.

For The Public.

Where the flag-masked Empire sits  
On the throne of Liberty,  
And the vampire Warfare flits  
'Round the homesteads of the free,  
Taking toll of mothers' sons  
For the Empire's ruthless guns—  
There the slain Republic lies,  
And the hope of free men dies.

Where the golden monarchs ride  
By the puppet Chieftain's side,  
While the bartered soldiers tread  
Thro' the rice fields, reeking red  
With our own and alien dead,  
Where the might of modern guns  
Finds a market—for our sons!—  
There the course of Empire runs.

Where the great Earth-owners dwell,  
There the Kings the People sell  
To the War-god's living hell.  
Ye that strange—ye that die  
For the graves the War-gods buy—  
Ye that work—and working weep!  
Ye that make—and may not keep!  
Seek ye bloody market space;  
That ye sell is still the Race.

VIRGINIA M. BUTTERFIELD.

## RESPECTABILITY'S DISADVANTAGES.

An extensive owner of city real estate was called upon at his office one morning by a stranger, who asked him:

"Is this Mr. Philpot?"

"Yes, sir," he replied.

"You own the property at 575 Bumblethorpe avenue, I believe."

"Yes."

"I am told you are trying to sell it."

"I am."

"I should like to buy it, if your price is reasonable enough."

"May I ask who you are?"

"I am Prof. Goodkind, of the university. I have bought the place next to No. 575 on the south for a residence, and, to be frank, I don't like the kind of tenants you rent your house to. I wish to buy it and select my own neighbors."

"No, sir!" answered the owner of the property. "That puts a different aspect on the matter. I don't care to sell the place now. I shall keep it, and raise the rent on the ground that the neighborhood is improving."—The Youth's Companion.

## THE EFFECT OF A TAX ON LAND VALUES.

The farmers and small home owners have everything to gain by a tax on land values and nothing to lose. Under its operation all classes of workers, whether manufacturers, merchants, farmers, bankers, professional men, clerks, mechanics, farm hands or other working classes, would as such be totally exempt. It is only as men own land that they would be taxed; the tax being not in proportion to the area, but to the value of land. And no one would be compelled to pay a higher tax than others if his land were improved and used while theirs was not, nor if his was better improved or better used than theirs.

As it is now, we use a man for improving his property. If he builds an addition to his house that his family may be more comfortable, or to his barn that his stock may be protected from the weather, we send the assessor around, and raise his taxes, fine him for doing that which is praiseworthy and beneficial to himself and neighbors. On the other hand, if he neglects his property, allows his fences to go to pieces, his house to become shabby and dilapidated, neglects his crops and allows the weeds to spring up and go to seed to the injury of himself and neighbors, the assessor reduces his taxes—rewards him for his laziness and shiftlessness.

A tax on date trees, imposed by Mohammed Ali, caused the Egyptian felahs to cut down their trees and greatly reduce the revenues.

If we wish to reduce the number of saloons we tax them heavily and forthwith their number is reduced. When dogs become too numerous and your sheep suffer, we raise the tax on dogs and they begin to grow scarce, and that is just the effect of a tax on houses and farm improvements and every other product of the industry of man. It makes them scarce and harder to get. But a tax on land value has just the opposite effect. It cannot reduce the quantity, but it makes those who are holding it put it to some use, and it makes it easier to get.

It would check the investment of money in land unless the land was wanted for use, for no one could afford to hold land out of use. This would stop land speculation and the sums of money invested in idle land would seek investment in productive industry, in manufactures, and this would give employment to the idle in the cities and a market for the products of the farmer.—Frank H. Howe, of Columbus, O.

## INVERTED FABLES.

IN THE LAND OF THE OUGHT-TO-BE.

"Now," said the Big Buck Deer to his eldest born, "I will show you a sight that you never saw before, and I am so proud of that I feel like walking around on my hind legs all the rest of my life."

"Why!" said the fawn, "it is a man, as I live!"

"Yes," said the fawn's proud parent, dragging out the carcass from behind a tree, "and now, like a little good deer, run and get me my sharpest knife, while I skin him and prepare his head as a dining-room ornament. And shall I tell you how your papa did such a brave deed? Then listen, my son. This morning, in company with my faithful bloodhounds, I tracked the man through the forest, drove him into the lake, having first ascertained that he was unarmed, and then, as he was swimming about almost exhausted, I put forth in my canoe and shot him at leisure in a nice vital spot where it wouldn't show."

## MORAL.

"But, papa," said the fawn, "the man had no chance at all against your skill and science. I don't see anything brave or to be proud of."

"But you will," said the Big Buck Deer, "when you get to be as big as I am."—Life.

## A HERO OF PEACE.

There is an elevator boy in Philadelphia, William H. Platt, whose clear and simple bravery, exhibited in the line of every-day duty, is worthy of highest praise. Shortly before noon Saturday the five-story building at 18 South Broad street, undermined by excavations for an annex to be built by the Pennsylvania Railroad company, collapsed and fell. The 20 tenants of the building escaped, and owe their lives to this elevator boy. He noticed a big crack in the side wall of the building, gave the alarm, and the occupants of the building fled to the street. When young Platt noticed the crack in the wall, at 11:10 o'clock, he notified the trustee of the endangered property, Mr. Sompers, who at once consulted the foreman of the excavating laborers. "No danger," said the culpably careless foreman. But Mr. Sompers was not satisfied, and notified Chief Hill, of the city's bureau of building inspection. Then the trustee and the elevator boy visited each of the tenants and warned them that the building was unsafe. Five minutes later, and 20 minutes after the boy saw the danger, there came a crash. Of what followed the Philadelphia Press tells:

The bulk window on the first floor had fallen streetward, and South Broad street was alive with an excited mob. "Run for your lives," shouted the elevator boy, and in a second the elevator was full of people. "I'll come up for you again," shouted Platt, reassuringly to the others, as he and the car shot downward. Twice more did he make the ascent, and brought persons down. Then, just as he started skyward again, the big crash came. The boy never faltered. The elevator shaft is independent of the main structure, and Platt pushed the lever to the left, and the car shot toward the fourth floor. Mrs. Gow, James Martin, Mrs. Shubert and Miss Ruprecht were there, and Platt helped them into the elevator. Bricks and mortar were falling about them, and the car was swaying frightfully from side to side as it shot downward at express speed. Not one of the occupants of that car expected to reach the ground alive. Passing the second story a big piece of timber hit the elevator with battering force, and glanced off into the debris. The car landed with a thump in the basement, and apart from a severe shaking up, the occupants were none the worse for their thrilling experience. They made their way to the street, thoroughly scared, but absolutely unhurt. Just as the building collapsed—at 11:30—Inspectors Supplee, Gillingham and Button, who were sent by Chief Hill to examine into the safety of the structure, arrived at the opposite side of the street. The building crashed in as the three inspectors were making their way toward it.

A keen and plucky boy that, whose fine exploit need be qualified nowhere. It is to be said for heroes of peace that they leave a good taste in

the mouth, with no treachery, only plain duty well performed.—Springfield (Mass.) Republican.

#### THE WAR SPIRIT.

To secure permanent peace the cause of war must be removed, and the cause of war is a psychological one. It is a temper, or what is called in New England "a frame of mind." It is readiness to fight, and the readiness awaits only the occasion. The occasion may be fanciful or real. The war spirit needs but the spark to set off the mine.

This readiness to fight rests upon a traditional belief, as old as savage tribes, that the interests of tribes and nations are antagonistic. What is well for Spain must be bad for Germany. What is bad for Russia must be well for England. China's and Japan's interests cannot be mutual, cannot harmonize, must be antagonistic. And this the world over. Among nations there must be supremacy on the part of one nation, not equality among all. The natives of India must be kept under, and England must be on top, as if it might never occur to any sane statesman that both might be on top. And because the interests of nations are antagonistic, each nation must be ready to defend its rights; not only this, but be alert to grasp more.

No one seems to dream that the logic of all this is isolation first, and lastly total annihilation.

Because to cripple another nation reduces the commercial value of that nation; to destroy that nation makes one less customer. And to cripple and destroy many nations looks to a logical result of leaving the destroying nation in a state of isolation, till one day it remains alone in the awful stillness wrought by subjugating extermination. Of course, this extremity is never reached. This is only the logic of it, but courses rarely run to their logical ends. And I point this out only to show that the principle involved is at fault somewhere. The truth is this—the interests of nations are not antagonistic, but are mutual.

To set up this principle of mutual interests is to remove the cause of war. I admit that temporary advantage often arises from the misfortunes of others, and this temporary advantage has blinded statesmen to the truth that mutual interest is the condition upon which rests the permanent prosperity of any nation.

A famine in India makes the London stock market active, and wheat is bullish. But when thousands and tens of thousands perish of hunger there is something involved besides

sentiment. A generation of consumers is swept from the earth, little or much as may be their consumption. The future markets react, and the bull market in wheat becomes a boomerang. It all illustrates the principle that nations, like individuals, and they in turn, like the members of the body—arms, legs and hands—are members one of another; and where one suffers, in the long run, each and all must suffer.—Rev. Samuel Richard Fuller, in *The Coming Age*.

#### LAWSON PURDY'S PLAN FOR TAX REFORM.

J. E. Scripps, in *Detroit News* of April 22.

Hon. Lawson Purdy's suggestions for tax reform, launched at the dinner given by the merchants and manufacturers of Detroit last week, were really a notable presentation of an entirely novel theory in governmental economics.

We have heard in the past a good deal about local option in taxation, but we have all understood by it something exceptional, rather than a general system. Without interference with the machinery of the general state tax law, the advocates of local option have urged the granting of the power to cities to raise revenues for municipal purposes in any way they choose. This has been the extent of the idea in the past.

But now comes Mr. Purdy with a proposal that local option be made the general rule, and not an exceptional thing. In effect, he would make the counties, or perhaps the townships, the independent units in the exercise of the taxing powers, the first prerogative of government. It is a step in the direction of bringing the power of government still nearer to the people.

When optional taxation has been talked of for the municipal revenues it has always been conceded that the state and county taxes would have to be raised in the old way, because the constitution requires uniformity of taxation. A double system has thus been supposed to be necessary where a city adopts any rule differing from that adopted by the state. No one hitherto seems to have thought any other condition possible.

Mr. Purdy's proposal, therefore, of a system under which local option could be enjoyed without the duplication of the taxing machinery came like a ray of light into what was all darkness before. His plan, briefly outlined, is for every county and city to raise its revenues in any way it pleases, then for the amount of the

state budget to be assessed upon the counties in direct proportion to the amount they tax themselves for local purposes. The beauty of this system lies in its giving to the counties some say as to how much they will contribute for state purposes. If any county wished to get off lightly it would only be necessary to keep down its local expenses, while if lavish in its appropriations for county purposes it has the full liberty to be so, but with full knowledge that thereby it assumes also a larger share of the state expenses.

Practically, under this system, the general law might be repealed, and all the expensive and cumbersome machinery of the tax department of the auditor-general's office done away with. The legislature would still control the amount of the annual budget, which amount would be assessed by the proper state officers upon the several counties and municipalities in direct proportion to the amounts which they taxed themselves for local purposes.

In effect, it would be an application of the principle of the income tax. Every locality would be taxed for state purposes upon the basis of its local income or revenues. Theoretically nothing could be more perfect or equitable.

There is one very strong argument for it. It would bring the control of the purse strings so close to the people that economy in the public service would be greatly promoted. As it is, the people are enslaved to a system. They have no voice whatever in the apportionment of the state tax, and this makes them careless as to the county and municipal burdens laid upon them. Their only present mode of relief is the swearing down of their individual assessments, or removal to some township, or state where local taxes are lighter or assessments more loosely made.

There can be no doubt that under our present system this is becoming one of the worst tax-ridden countries in the world. One Detroit citizen remarked the other evening that it took fully one-tenth of his entire income to pay his taxes. This would be the equivalent of a laboring man who earns \$600 having to pay a tax of \$60. It is altogether too burdensome. And yet the burden is growing year by year.

No better remedy has been suggested than that proposed by Mr. Purdy, which is to bring the taxing power down very close to the people.

He did not say so, but it may be assumed that every township would enjoy the right of fixing its own taxes and determining the mode of raising the same. When the taxpayers have the matter absolutely in their own hands it may be depended upon there will be far less waste and extravagance and the public burdens will be lightened.

Objections have been urged that this would discourage enterprise and our cities would become unprogressive and niggardly in their own expenditures, in order to keep their proportion of the state expenses as small as possible.

For heaven's sake, have they not a right to?

Are we in such abject slavery to progress that the popular will must be overridden and communities forced to be enterprising by the operation of law?

Where is our boasted self-government if any such consideration can be valid?

There may be danger from too much progress. The great evil of the age is over-government. The best-governed people are those who are the least governed, and self-government tends to simplicity.

The essence of Mr. Purdy's plan is to bring the powers of government much nearer to the people. To claim that there is danger in it is to assert that popular government is a failure.

#### THE THEORY ON WHICH INJUNCTIONS ARE GRANTED.

An explanation made at a meeting of the Social Reform Club of the City of New York, by John Brooks Leavitt, chairman of a committee reporting on the Use of Injunctions in Labor Disputes.

The scheme of government adopted by our fathers, as best calculated to preserve our liberties and promote our welfare, was that of a three-fold division into legislative, executive and judicial functions; the first to make the laws, the second to execute them, and the third to pass on the rights and duties of the citizen under the guarantees of the constitution.

Unconstitutional acts by a president or governor can be punished by impeachment in the legislative branch. Unconstitutional acts of congress or state legislatures can be declared null by the courts. But the only tribunal where errors of the judiciary can be corrected is that of public opinion.

The jurisdiction of the courts is of two kinds, civil and criminal. The criminal courts only try cases involv-

ing crimes and misdemeanors upon complaint of the people through their duly elected or appointed officials. The controversies between private citizens can only be tried in the civil courts.

We inherit from England our system of administering justice, and in England there very early grew up a custom which has a direct bearing here, and one which it is necessary to know historically in order fully to understand the subject in hand.

Originally in England the only thing a man could do when injured by his neighbor, was either to have the wrong-doer punished in the criminal court, or to sue him in the civil court for damages, that is for an amount of money which 12 jurymen should consider proper compensation for failure to carry out a contract or to observe another's rights. This measurement of men by dollars was as unsatisfactory to our ancestors as it is to us. The remedy thus afforded by the law courts was in many cases inadequate. A noble lord might be guilty of some act of oppression, or of interfering with a right of private way over his premises, or of obstructing the public highway; and the humble citizen would find that neither punishment nor money would be sufficient reparation. The courts could, however, give him no other redress. In those days the king was looked upon as the fountain of power, of justice, of goodness. "The king could do no wrong." To him therefore the citizen, who had no adequate remedy in the courts, made humble petition that the king would of his great power and goodness make his oppressor respect his rights. The king, who in theory was a benevolent tyrant, in fact was more interested in the pleasures of war, the tourney, the chase, the table or the chamber. He had no time to look into the matter, unless it was something that could be settled off-hand. He would therefore refer a pertinacious suitor to one of his officers with instructions to the latter to examine into the affair and report his opinion as to what the king ought to do. As such controversies involved equitable rather than legal questions, they were generally sent to the keeper of his conscience, as he was styled, an official called his chancellor, usually a priest. He heard the parties, reported to the king, who would then either dismiss the matter, or decree that the offender do what he ought to do, or refrain from doing what he ought not to do. Thus the deficiencies of

legal procedure were supplemented by decrees of the king.

As time went on, the system became crystallized, his chancellor became a judge, who sat in a court of equity as it was called, heard cases as the law judges did, but without a jury; and in the name of the king granted decrees which recited the facts, pointed out that there was no adequate remedy at law, and commanded the defendant what he should do or leave undone.

It will easily be seen that if a chancellor were to be guided by nothing but caprice, his court would become a terrible engine for tyranny. It used often to be sneeringly said that equity decisions depended on the length of the chancellor's foot. So there came into existence certain set rules under which equity was administered. Those rules were admirably adapted to the end of keeping the chancellor within proper bounds. "Equity follows the law;" "Equality is equity;" "He who asks equity must do equity;" "He who comes into a court of equity must come with clean hands," and the like. The general rule was, that wherever money damage for a wrong would be adequate compensation a court of equity would not interfere. There grew up this stereotyped phrase, that the plaintiff had no adequate remedy at law. If he could show that the defendant was doing or threatened to do him a continuing injury, irreparable in its nature, and for which money would not be compensation, he could obtain in an otherwise proper case a decree enjoining the defendant from continuing to do the act, or from carrying out his threat. In order that the complainant might not be injured while the court was examining into the case, it would on affidavits showing the necessity grant a preliminary writ, calling a temporary injunction, commanding the defendant to abstain from doing the thing during the pendency of the action.

In our country the system of separate courts, one to give money judgments after a trial by a jury, the other to issue decrees after hearing before a judge, has been changed in most states, so that one court does both. This is the fact also as to the federal courts. We have still, however, in theory kept up the rule that a party asking for a command rather than money, must satisfy the court that compensation in dollars will not meet the case, and that precedents warrant the command.

Right here is where the danger point

is touched. The power of command has in all ages been a dangerous one. Its subjective results are often lost sight of in the presence of the oppression and wrong it has worked objectively. Kings and presidents, generals and judges, capitalists and walking delegates, if they search their own hearts, must know the evil effects upon themselves of the power of command. All persons know its pernicious consequences upon others when exercised unjustly. So long as our courts of equity wield the power of command under well-settled rules, and within carefully marked bounds of precedent there is nothing to fear. It is open to question, whether in every case where an employer has asked for an injunction against striking employes, the court has inquired whether he acted justly in the beginning of the quarrel. Yet the time-honored rules say: "He who asks equity must do equity," and "he who comes into equity must come with clean hands." No wrongful act of a defendant should ever be allowed by a court of equity to affect its mind to the point of ignoring a contributing act of injustice by the plaintiff. Of late years the failure of judges to satisfy themselves on such points, when granting preliminary injunctions, has resulted in making the preliminary injunction, instead of the final judgment, the chief objective point of the suit. And so our courts of equity are being gradually turned into criminal courts for the enforcement of law and order through the medium of the power of command. Such an evolution of judicial jurisdiction from kingly prerogative was hardly expectable under a republican form of government.

#### THE RECORD OF FAILURE IN SOUTH AFRICA.

From the London Speaker of April 20.

Nobody expects to find in men who have been living for 18 months on the edge of their emotions a judgment as balanced and a vision as clear and steady as he counts on in the tranquil circumstances of ordinary and uneventful times. Yet it is invariably a shock to men who have retained their old ways of looking at things to discover that ideas which they imagined were held by their countrymen in the inflexible grip of conviction and habit scatter like so many ephemeral fancies on the first contact with new and challenging circumstances. The process of change becomes brisker with each new demand on the adaptability of men's consciences. Stage after stage has arrived in this war when a situation

has arisen or a proposal sprung up which liberals have confidently expected their opponents would agree in deploring or condemning. They had forgotten that the war had all the time been lifting men out of the beaten track of their common morality. The change of temper is not at all deliberate and thought out. It is often quite unconsciously that men or communities learn to walk the tight-rope of moral casuistry. But, when once the change is come, there is an end to that substantial sympathy of idea which enables us to refer our mutual differences to some common standard. It is one of the saddest things about an aggressive war that it makes such a wilderness of our own civilization. All that is common to the ideas of a community is in sudden dissolution. The essence of a civilization is a certain degree of moral homogeneity, and after 18 months of revolutionary imperialism, in place of a fundamentally compact and coherent national temperament you find everything torn and fragmentary. All the links of an elemental moral agreement are broken.

The war in its progress has produced frequent and striking illustrations of the transformation of the ordinarily accepted notions of what is right and prudent by the necessity of justifying some new departure in morality. But the finished picture is better evidence than any number of illuminating touches. Let anyone contrast the regime actually established in the Transvaal, or that part of the Transvaal where we can pretend to exercise authority, with the sort of impression that the ordinary Englishmen had at the beginning of this war of the government he was about to create there. Whatever liberals said or thought about the danger and consequences of the war, the imperialists were confident that within their own formula they could make room for a fair and tolerant system of government that would be positively welcome to the Boers and afford a beneficent protection to the blacks. With the reply of the liberals that no system could be fair and tolerant that deprived a nation of its separate existence we are not now concerned. All that is important is to recall the promise of free and equal institutions with which the war started, and then to turn to the regulations printed in the Times of Friday week. There are few demands for which so much sympathy was excited in the outlander agitation as the demand for the independence of

the judges; the new regulations provide that the judges shall be strictly under the control of the high commissioner. One of the most vicious and indefensible symptoms of racial inequality under the Transvaal, we were told, was the sole use of Dutch for official purposes; under the new system there is still only to be one official language—the language of the invaders. But the most striking point about the new system comes from the Pretoria correspondent of the Morning Post, who informed us on Monday that the new magistrates in the Transvaal are to be chosen from the "Progressive Afrikaners, some of whom held commissions in our irregular corps during the campaign." It is only 18 months since our imperialists were protesting that the day of racial animosities was over and a new era would dawn on South Africa, in which Boer and Britain would forget their quarrels in their common confidence in a just and impartial government. The language in which the Boers are to be tried is English, and the magistrates are their most malignant enemies, men who two years ago were conspiring and two months ago were fighting against them. "Equal rights for white men" was accompanied by another formula that promised a new and happy life to the natives. Under Sir Alfred Milner's regulations magistrates may flog the natives. And who are the magistrates? The "Progressive Afrikaners," the men whose ideal native policy is summed up in the philanthropy of Mr. Hays Hammond, and the humanitarianism of Mr. Albu, whose allies are responsible for every harsh measure introduced into Cape Colony and whose leader invented the compound, destroyed the Matabele, deported the Bechuanas into slavery and made Rhodesia a slave-holding company.

If it were not for the subtle change we have described which steals away men's capacity for preserving their own standards in times of crisis, the absurdity of a crusade for free and equal rights, which ends in such an absolute system of racial ascendancy, would be apparent even to the imperialists. The Boers are to have no votes and no self-governing institutions; they are to be tried in a foreign language; they are to be judged and punished by aliens whom they have the best of reasons for hating, and the whole system that controls their daily lives is to depend on the pleasure of a man whose name stands first and last for an authority they

detest. Perhaps one day the chastening effects of disappointment and failure will convince the imperialists that the system is not only ridiculous, but impossible. We are told that the Boers are to be kept under our heel only until they can learn what a privilege it is to be in close contact with such a civilization as ours. It is like teaching a man to love you by pricking him all over, and telling him you will cease to prick him as soon as he has learnt his lesson. We wish to establish a government by consent, and we propose to gain that consent by exasperation. Loyalty is to be the condition of a modified freedom; and loyalty is to be won by associating our rule with oppression and affront. This is the vicious circle on which we are starting, and it is impossible to say how many revolutions we shall make before we discover that we are effecting nothing at all.

The Boers are doing their best to teach us that chasing quicksilver is an exhausting and unproductive operation. They have already taught Sir Alfred Milner something. That gifted journalist imagined two years ago that he had grasped the essential conditions of the problem and that a short, sharp struggle with the Boers would bury all the memories of Majuba and weld a loyal, grateful and prosperous South Africa. His latest dispatch, which under ordinary circumstances would deserve the praise due to candor and which in comparison with the timid suppressions of a cowardly ministry stands out as a monument of courage, tells us 18 months after the outbreak of war that "the present position of affairs alike in the new territories and in the Cape Colony, if by no means the most critical, is possibly the most puzzling that we have had to confront since the beginning of the war." "It is no use denying that the last half year has been one of retrogression." Six months of bloodshed, destruction and expenditure with the result that we have not only gained nothing, but that we have positively lost ground! Those six months have cost us 6,000 men and 50,000,000 of money, to say nothing of ruin and havoc in the two states that no calculations can measure. And we have lost ground, as Sir Alfred Milner sees, for the reason that we applied to the conduct of our operations just those methods and principles on which we are asked to rely in rebuilding law and order in South Africa. The destruction of property and crops, the rough and

ready punishments of farm burning, the offering to burghers of the alternative, in Mr. Shaw's words, of becoming rebels to one power or traitors to another, this is the strong policy that drove into an inexorable hostility men whom Sir Alfred Milner had hoped to appease if not to conciliate. The Times and the Standard are calling out for more of this "strong policy" in the conduct of the war. The "loyalists" whom Sir Alfred Milner wishes us to consider think you can never have enough strong policy in war or in peace. It is a policy that has been tried for nearly two years and Sir Alfred Milner's dispatch records its headlong failure. We have spoken of the chances of the chastening discipline of disappointment. Is it impossible to restore just so much of the practical commonsense which the war has dissipated as to persuade reasonable men of all parties to try the experiment of a new policy to be carried out by a new agent? Sir Alfred Milner's action in sending this dispatch, and in asking to be relieved for three months, provides what may turn out to be the government's last opportunity of averting the irreparable ruin which it has spent so much life and treasure in bringing on South Africa.

FROM THE SAND HILLS.

For The Public.

With the alkali and sagebrush,  
In this great and arid West,  
A man may sometimes wonder  
If everything is fer the best.

With our prairie dogs and cactus,  
It might pear that as if God,  
Hadrn't allers toted level  
In arrangin uv the sod.

Ef we pine fer trees and flowers,  
And sl fer fields uv livin green,  
The poetry uv the sandhills,  
Ain't mighty easy to be seen.

But if we ponder closely  
On the ways uv Providence,  
We will find in the arrangement  
Some considerable uv sense.

The one thet made the sandhills,  
Scorchin with their burnin thirst,  
Maybe all the time was plannin  
Fer the best, and not the worst.

Between the hills theys valleys,  
And thars lots of level plains,  
Whar the land is jist as fertile  
As in places whar it rains.

And when we git the worter  
In the ditch to irrigate,  
We are sure of crops as plenty  
As in any rainy state.

Out thar upon the mountains,  
Whar a man can seldom go,  
Thar is allers great abundance  
In the winter time, uv snow.

And the summer sun a meltin,  
Like the spring thaw uv the blood,

These here heaps of frozen treasure,  
Fills the river with a flood.\*

So allers in the spring time  
Worlds of worter goes to waste,  
Fer the floods they go a kitin  
With precipitatin haste.

These here facts they set us thinkin  
In the arid sandy West,  
And a wonderin if man's plannin  
Is allers fer the best.

And we wonder ef our nation,  
Stid uv wagin furrin wars,  
Hednt better spend that money  
Buldin up uv reservoirs,

Fer to ketch this springtime floodin  
That would liven up our soil,  
And gin to lots of farmers,  
Rich rewardin uv their toil.

When you talk about the burden  
Uv the man thet's brown or white,  
It is best to be considerate  
Uv the thing thet is the right.

So instid of this expandin  
Our domain across the seas,  
In the West we could improve that  
With considerable ease,

By a turnin uv these prairies,  
With their alkali and dust,  
Into broad and teemin grain fields,  
Thet would make our grainries bust.

But I reckon after all uv  
This here talk uv furrin wars,  
It may jist be all the better  
Waltin fer our reservoirs.

And we ort to be considerin  
Fer jist a little bit,  
If we did store up the worter,  
Who would git the benefit?

And its jist as plain as daylight,  
When you come down to the pinch,  
That the man that would be richened—  
Is the man that's got the cinch.

And instid uv makin homesteads  
Fer the man that wants to work,  
It would simply fill the pockets  
Of the land speculatin shirk.

So until we've learned the lesson  
Thet the land uv Israel knew,  
Thet God never ment his heritage  
To be gobbled by a few,

We can go right on a wagin  
Uv our useless furrin wars,  
And bide a while the buldin  
Uv our worter reservoirs,

Till the plan of God is workin  
Fer dividin uv the soil,  
When the man that does the workin  
Will git the product of his toil.

B. F. VAUGHAN.

La Junta, Col.

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.

"My country is behind Great Britain in absolutely nothing!" asseverated the indignant American officer.

The Filipino who had betrayed Aguinaldo looked relieved; for he had been perusing the history of the American revolution, and had feared that the price to be paid him would not equal the \$30,000 reward which had been granted to Gen. Arnold.

G. T. E.

Parke—What do you think of the dishonest trick Funston played on Aguinaldo when he captured him?

Lane—Great! Wasn't it?

"Wasn't it? But all the same, if one of my boys had done a thing like that, I would have whipped him within an inch of his life."—Life.

**BOOK NOTICES.**

"An Affair in the South Seas," by Leigh H. Irvine (San Francisco: Payot, Upham & Co.; London, E. C.: I. Fisher Unwin), is a story of adventure in the tropics, the incidents growing out of a mythical empire which a retired sea captain, a millionaire, establishes on an unknown island.

"The Reformers' Year Book" for 1901, published for six years, 1896-1900, as the "Labor Annual" (London: Clarion Co., Ltd), which is still ably edited by Joseph Edwards, has just appeared. Mr. Edwards aims to deal broadly and sympathetically with all kinds of reforms, thereby making his annual a handy reference book for reformers of every creed. In this object he has in the current issue surpassed his previous successes. The directories of names and addresses of persons of all countries whose names are associated with some reform or other are quite comprehensive, and the descriptions of different movements are numerous; while the lists of recent books and pamphlets on social questions, and the directory of associations are full. One of the unavoidable defects of such a publication is its false perspective. Since it deals and can deal only with organized reforms, those that are making greatest headway appear to be overshadowed by weaker ones which put forth impressive descriptions of organization. Another defect, however, is avoidable and ought to be guarded against

in future. A reference year book like this is not a proper place for attacks, even if deserved, upon reform movement representatives. An instance appears on page 84. On the same page Mayor Jones, of Toledo, is charged with having "deserted the socialist camp" at the late election. As Mayor Jones was never a party socialist, and notoriously makes a point of refusing to attach himself permanently to any political party, such a statement is not calculated to inspire the confidence that a reference book ought to command.

**ATTORNEYS.**

**Chicago.**

**CHARLES A. BUTLER,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Suite 618, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.  
Telephone, Main 2711.

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

**WALTER A. LANTZ,** T. G. MCELLIGOTT  
Telephone Central 254.

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

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

**Houston.**

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

**New York.**

**FRED. CYBUS LEUBUSCHER,**  
COUNSELOR AT LAW,  
BENNETT BLDG.  
90 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.  
Tel. Call, 1353 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.  
NEW YORK.

**BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:**

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

**The Public**

Is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by  
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY,  
1401 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

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

**WRITERS,  
CORRESPONDENTS or  
REPORTERS**

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

The Bulletin Press Association, New York.

**Volume III of The Public**

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

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

WE DON'T SELL OUR

**CIGARS**

FOR LESS THAN THEY ARE WORTH. WE DON'T HAVE TO. THEY ARE FULL VALUE, NO MORE, NO LESS.

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

For any Book on Earth Old or New

Write to H. H. TIMBY, Book Hunter, Conne aut, Ohio. CATALOGUES FREE.

**The Commoner.**

A Weekly Journal Devoted to Political, Economic and Sociological Questions.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, Editor and Proprietor.

TERMS—Payable in Advance: { One Year.....\$1.00  
Six Months......50  
Three Months......25

Send for Sample Copy. No Traveling Canvassers are Employed.

Subscriptions can be sent direct to The Commoner. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through precinct agents where such agents have been appointed. All remittances should be sent by postoffice order, express order or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps, or money. Advertising rates furnished upon application. Address

THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Nebr.