

# The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1901.

Number 188.

**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.

As a rule, the election returns of last Tuesday are much better calculated to please Republicans than Democrats. Yet to this rule there is one exception. Queerly enough that exception is Ohio, which returns a very much larger plurality for the Republican candidate for governor than he received two years ago, and strengthens the Republican vote in the legislature. It is not this result, however, that is satisfactory to Democrats. The result is not satisfactory at all. But some of the incidents are highly so.

To begin with, the increased Republican plurality in Ohio is a pointed rebuke to reactionary Democrats, which will please a good many democratic Democrats. The reactionaries insisted that the omission from the Democratic platform of the state, of any reference to the Chicago or the Kansas City platform or to Bryan, was intended as a repudiation of Bryanism. This omission they exploited as an invitation to the bolters of 1896 to come back into the front seats of the party. If the Democrats of Ohio did see that significance in the platform, they have very distinctly discouraged the "reorganizers." For Ohio is now in evidence, as "Exhibit No. 1," to prove that Bryanism is more popular in the party than "reorganizationism." The Bryanites have indeed failed to carry Ohio; but they were never before beaten by so large a plurality as responded last Tuesday to the slogan of the "reorganizers" that the democratic state convention had repudiated Bryanism.

Another gratifying fact about the Ohio election is the elimination of John R. McLean from Ohio politics. Two years ago, when he himself was the Democratic candidate for governor, his own county, Hamilton, gave him a majority and returned a legislative delegation largely Democratic. But this year McLean was either so impotent or so indifferent that the Democratic candidate fell several thousand short in Hamilton county, and the legislative delegation is wholly Republican. With McLean eliminated from Ohio politics, there is hope for democracy in Ohio.

Still another fact about the Ohio election which democratic Democrats can consider with satisfaction, is the largely increased plurality for Kilbourne in his own county—Franklin. Several influences contributed to this, among others Kilbourne's personal popularity where he is best known. But it is doubtful if any single influence contributed more than the anti-monopoly agitation which Mayor Johnson of Cleveland and ex-Attorney General Monett stirred up over the street car question in Columbus, the Franklin county city, last spring. That was radical work, and it cut deeper as a political influence than is apparent from the surface. One of the reasons for believing that this agitation was a factor in increasing the Democratic plurality is the fact that Cuyahoga county, the only other county in which an anti-monopoly agitation of that character had been made, is the only other county in which the Democrats are reported to have made gains. The other counties helped to roll up the increased Republican plurality.

It is true that Cuyahoga county did

not give Kilbourne a plurality. But in spite of the fact that it is one of the Republican strongholds, in spite of the fact that it is Senator Hanna's county, and that he strained every nerve to carry it, its Republican plurality for the state ticket is reduced to 73. In 1897 the Republican candidate for governor had a plurality in the county of 5,094. In 1899, Mayor Jones polled a phenomenal third party vote, which prevents any comparison with that year. In 1900 Mr. McKinley carried the county by 2,859. To reduce the Republican plurality there to 73, with a Democratic candidate who was unknown in the county, and against whom every other county but his own gave increased pluralities, was a political accomplishment of no minor magnitude. And that was done by the democratic Democrats of Cuyahoga, under the leadership of Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, and upon the taxation plank, which Johnson and his political friends forced into the Democratic platform at the state convention.

This phenomenal reduction of the Republican plurality in Cuyahoga county, which put the Democratic candidate almost at the head of the poll in that county, was unquestionably part of the campaign for equitable taxation which Johnson is engineering in Ohio. Kilbourne was carried along upon the local wave. For results with reference to the legislative and the county ticket were even more satisfactory than that with reference to Kilbourne. As to these candidates the county swung clear over into the Democratic line, all the Democrats being elected by pluralities ranging from 3,000 to 6,000. It was really a great victory, won by good campaigning with a good cause,

and is the only notable Democratic victory of this election in the country.

In New York, the election of Low to the mayoralty, though called a "fusion" victory, was really a Republican victory, secured with Democratic votes. That Mr. Low will give New York a better government than it has ever had, so far as the suppression of vulgar vice is concerned, may be conceded without admitting that it will be any better in that respect than Mr. Shepard would have made it. But neither will he nor can he remove the causes of Tammanyism; and Tammanyism in new form, possibly under a new name, will rise Phoenix-like out of the ashes of its defeat. For purposes of local reform this so-called fusion victory can have at best only a temporary effect, such as previous victories of similar kind with similarly "good men" have had in New York. And for purposes of state and national politics it can only tend to strengthen the Republican party and to promote the cause of reaction in the Democratic party.

It will strengthen the Republican party as Senator Platt designed that it should. For Mr. Low, fully committed to Republican partisanship, was Senator Platt's preordained candidate. This will be less readily believed now than a year hence, by independent Democrats who voted for Low. But they will yet come to believe it. As to reaction in the Democratic party, Mr. Low's election will strengthen it by strengthening the influence in the New York Democracy of David B. Hill, who was back of the split within Tammany Hall, which furnished Low with the bulk of his Democratic votes. Had Shepard been elected, his consequent influence upon the Democratic party in the state of New York would at least have neutralized Hill's, and so prevented the state of New York from making discord in the next national convention. As it is, by voting a Republican into the New

York mayoralty, when they might have elected a Democrat whose local administration would confessedly have been as good or better, the bolting Democrats of New York have probably at once issued to Senator Platt letters of marque against their own party, and to David B. Hill a commission of party leadership in city and state.

When at the opening of the Republican campaign in Ohio Senator Hanna urged his hearers to "let well enough alone," he referred not only to Ohio, but to the whole country, and implied that everybody is prosperous. Yet we are able to give instances, upon unimpeachable authority, to show that "well enough" is hardly "good enough" for everybody. The corporation for which our informant works, recently inserted the following advertisement in the Chicago Tribune:

Wanted.—Man for general office work. State age and experience. Salary \$50. Also office boy about 18.

In response to the man part of the advertisement there were 302 applicants. To be sure, many of the applicants were already employed; but, if they were willing to accept a \$50 position, this would seem to demonstrate that they were not satisfied to "let well enough alone." The applicants varied in age from 18 to 70 years. Many were married, and most of them, judging from their letters, were competent office men. Does Senator Hanna believe that \$50 a month is "well enough" for such men and that they should be satisfied with such prosperity? One letter is particularly pathetic.

Chicago, Sept. 27, 1901.

I am what is generally termed an all around office man. Experience—railroad office, real estate, packing house, etc. Am rapid and correct at figuring. My age—well, 70 years—is that too old? If so, what are we old men to do for a living? Have been unable to obtain work on that account for a long time, but am active, capable, and would rather work than beg, or live upon charity, which I am now obliged to do. Please excuse me.

Others might have told as pitiful a

tale, doubtless, had they been as frank.

Another experience of the same corporation is to the point. Needing a clerk temporarily, it called upon an employment agency and hired the first man who presented himself. He proved to be exceptionally capable—penmanship perfect, work accurate, and never idle. If times are good enough to "let well enough alone," why is he open for temporary employment? Nor are these exceptional cases. Our informant writes:

My acquaintance in Chicago is not large, but it seems to me that the most of those I know are out of work or wish to change their positions on account of small salaries. Two stenographers are out of work, although they have been hunting for it several weeks. Another complains that \$60 is not enough to support himself and wife. A father, trying to support a family of ten (eight children) on nine dollars per week, with the help of one son earning four dollars, is glad to receive donations of cast-off clothing. The list might be extended if I were not afraid of boring you with this disagreeable subject.

The same informant suggests a reason why the unemployed do not patronize employment offices. Those that do are tendered a contract to sign which, with other items, contains the following terms:

(1) That the applicant has paid to the company one dollar as registration fee.

(2) That the company shall make such investigations, give such tests, examinations, etc., as the company may deem necessary, to determine the applicant's qualifications for the position sought.

(3) That provided the results of such investigations, tests, etc., are satisfactory, the company shall register the applicant for employment and endeavor to secure for the applicant the position sought.

(4) That the applicant shall keep in strict confidence all information secured from the company regarding position vacant.

(5) That the applicant shall pay the expense of all special delivery letters, telegraph or telephone or other messages, sent by the company in the interest of the applicant.

(6) That when the company's recommendation, information or assistance has secured for the applicant a

permanent position, or increase of salary without change of position, applicant shall, within 30 days, pay to the company a commission equal to one week's salary. If applicant is paid by the month, the commission due the company shall be one-quarter of one month's salary.

(9) That for a temporary position applicant shall pay to the company one-tenth of amount earned in such position, for a period not to exceed ten weeks.

Besides that contract, which goes on at great length in the same strain, there is this form to be filled out by the applicant:

Name? Residence?  
 Kind of position desired? Salary?  
 Have you a position now? If so, with whom?  
 What is their business? Address?  
 What is the nature of your position?  
 Why do you wish to change?  
 When did you enter their employ?  
 What is your salary?  
 When were you born? Where?  
 Nationality of your parents? Give father's business.  
 What is your height? Weight?  
 Health? Religion?  
 Are you married? What, and how many persons are dependent on you for support?  
 Do you live at home, keep house, or board?  
 In what way, and to what extent, do you use tobacco?  
 Do you smoke cigarettes?  
 To what extent do you use intoxicating liquors, etc., etc., etc.?  
 Give accurately your occupations or employments during past ten years, and previous thereto, if any.  
 Name five persons well acquainted with you, wherever you have lived in last five years. Do not name your relatives nor previous employers.

That might seem just a little impertinent to applicants who had read the speech of the late president, delivered the day before he was shot, in which he said:

My fellow citizens, trade statistics indicate that this country is in a state of unexampled prosperity. The figures are almost appalling. They show that we are utilizing our fields and forests and mines, and that we are furnishing profitable employment to the millions of workingmen throughout the United States, bringing comfort and happiness to their homes and making it possible to lay by savings for old age and disability. That all the people are participating in this great prosperity is seen in every American community

and shown by the enormous and unprecedented deposits in our savings banks.

But what we have quoted is no more contradictory of partisan assurances that prosperity is universal than the confession, on September 30, of the Cleveland Leader, Senator Hanna's home organ, that—

Tens of thousands of workingmen and workingwomen go to their daily toil fortified by a breakfast of bread and coffee, without meat and cream, which in hundreds of homes are regarded as luxuries at breakfast time.

Some of the papers are printing the pictures of a rather interesting baby whose name is John Nicholas Brown. Baby Brown is estimated to be worth \$6,000,000 in his own right. The inference is that this much wealth now existing is his. But of course that is not true. He has very little existing wealth—either in money or clothes or food or other products of past labor. What he has is a collection of papers certifying that he is entitled to levy upon the future productions of other people. If other people stopped giving him portions of their earnings—stopped exporting to him except in proportion as they imported from him—he would soon be not much richer than any other baby. But at only two per cent. his fortune of \$6,000,000 will yield him future wealth at the rate of \$120,000 a year. This is equal to the labor of some 200 men at \$2 each a day. So Baby Brown controls the equivalent of 200 \$2-a-day slaves who work all day for him and support themselves by working after hours. In consequence it is estimated that by the time he is come of age his fortune, instead of having dwindled from \$6,000,000 will have increased to \$30,000,000. Thus in 21 years or less, without working at all, this extraordinary baby will have earned some \$24,000,000. What will his contemporary babies, who find that they have to work in order to earn—what will they probably think when they understand the secret of Baby Brown's self-acting prosperity?

To optimists who are sure that

there are no classes in this country we commend a thoughtful consideration of the following really intelligent paragraph from the Chicago Tribune of October 21:

The day when a large proportion of young fellows who learn a trade may confidently hope to become themselves employers is passing—not because the youth of to-day possess a smaller stock of economic virtues than their predecessors, nor because their opportunities for saving are less, but because the amount of capital which they must control before they can set up for themselves is so much greater. Now men who believe that they have small chance of breaking into the employing class will naturally concern themselves less with attempts to gain a position of greater authority than with attempts to make the best of their lot as workingmen—that is, to get the highest wages employers can be induced to pay.

The New Age, of London, again directs attention to the murders that Lord Kitchener is committing in Cape Colony, by quoting a letter from R. K. Cherry, K. C., whom it describes as an eminent authority on constitutional law. The distinguished barrister published his letter in the London Daily News. He writes of "the trial, conviction and execution of rebels by military tribunals," of which the London public are informed from day to day, saying that these proceedings are "unknown to the law," having been instituted "without any authority whatever, either from the imperial parliament or the Cape parliament." After quoting from Dicey's "Law of the Constitution," than which there is no higher authority on the subject, he continues:

Now, if this statement of the law is correct, and there is no reason whatsoever to doubt it, not only are the various tribunals now administering so-called justice under martial law in Cape Colony as illegal and unconstitutional as the various committees which sat in Paris during the terror; but everyone who takes part in the so-called trial of a rebel, everyone who in any way assists in carrying out the sentence of death passed upon a rebel, is guilty of murder. If put on trial on their return to England, a judge would be bound to direct a jury to convict them of murder, and a jury, unless they disre-

garded their oaths, could not acquit them. The constitution has frequently been suspended in Ireland during the last century, but never without the authority of parliament, never by the mere proclamation of the executive, as in this case.

This opinion confirms that of Fred-eric Harrison, which we published recently at page 443.

In his Thanksgiving proclamation, President Roosevelt takes occasion to flatter the American people upon having "been able to work for our own uplifting in things intellectual and spiritual." It is not to be presumed that the president would play upon words in so solemn a state paper; yet what can be made of that sentence except that we have "been able" to work for spiritual uplifting but haven't done it? If ever a people were guilty of visible spiritual backsliding, this people has been since it began its career of sanguinary conquest. Tried by the president's own idea of spirituality as phrased in the same proclamation—"we can best prove our thanksgiving to the Almighty by the way in which on this earth and at this time each of us does his duty to his fellow men"—what claim can the American people honestly make to spiritual elevation? The memory of thousands of Filipinos whom we have slaughtered for defending their country against our invasion should be a perpetual rebuke, until we repent of that national crime, for any pretense that we are doing our duty to our fellow men.

Nominally for the suppression of anarchy, but really for the manufacture of anarchists, for that will be its practical effect even if it is not the actual intention, an organization has sprung up under the incorporation laws of Illinois which calls itself "The Republic." Like the "A. P. A.," of evil memory, it is a secret organization. And one at least of its methods of work is peculiarly vicious. We quote from its circular soliciting membership:

to ostracise anarchists socially and financially, thereby rendering them helpless and dependent creatures.

Could any better plan than that be conceived in the minds of a million devils, for making wild beasts of ostracized men? Here is a private organization, an irresponsible organization, a secret organization, which collects its own evidence by secret means, sits in judgment upon it in secret conclave, gives the accused no opportunity to be heard nor even to know that his opinions are being investigated, and then pursues him mysteriously and relentlessly, not only cutting him off from social relationships, but closing to him all opportunities for making a living. If he is in independent business, he finds his business sinking under him as if by some spell of black magic. If he is a workingman, his jobs melt away as fast as he gets them. In all cases the victims become, in the language of the circular, "helpless and dependent creatures." Yet they don't know where the blow comes from nor why it comes. They are victims of a secret band which assumes to decide whether they ought to live in society or not, and in its own lawless way executes its own lawless decrees. This band is itself in the wicked sense of the term, an anarchistic organization.

Whether anarchistic opinions ought to be suppressed or anarchists outlawed is not the crucial question in this connection. The question which this organization brings forward is whether what constitutes an anarchistic opinion or who shall be treated as anarchistic persons may be determined in that manner or punished in that way. What guarantee is there that law-abiding persons would escape outrages on the part of this society? Every man's rights would be subject to the vindictiveness of its malicious members and at the mercy of its secret decrees. No government can safely tolerate such a society within its jurisdiction.

In addition to the outrages upon innocent individuals of which a society like that would be guilty, consider its effect upon the public peace. It would provoke assassination and nurture assassins. When men found themselves ostracized financially, their business ruined and every avenue of employment closed, by a mysterious but palpable influence, what would they be apt to do? No matter whether they had been anarchists or not, they would have to be men of strong minds not to become homicidal lunatics, or, escaping that malady, they would have to be superlatively angelic in spirit not to become wilful assassins. Feeling that every man's hand was against them, they would raise their hands against every man. No one's life would be safe, who, though for the best of reasons, declined to employ one of these desperate outcasts. And where would the fault lie? Manifestly at the doors of the secret society which had set about condemning and ostracizing them "socially and financially, thereby rendering them helpless and dependent creatures." Such a society is a criminal conspiracy. If incorporated, as its promoters say it is, the charter should be revoked. Of course these men may be fools rather than criminals. Or their circular may be a fat-witted hoax. But criminal or foolish, serious or a joke, their circular, which bears the name of L. R. Hazen as "supreme president," and A. E. Gosso, "29 South Forty-eighth avenue, Chicago," as "supreme secretary," should receive the attention of the grand jury.

If this secret organization were the only thing of its kind, it and its notoriety-seeking promoters might be ignored. But secret agencies with similar sinister purposes are indirectly at work, more discreetly, yet no less viciously and lawlessly. Instances are reported of the discharge from employment recently of peaceable, law-abiding, estimable and competent persons for no other reason than that they hold views which inspire igno-

rant and malicious people to denounce them falsely as anarchists. The discharges seem to have been made by the employers in obedience to secret influences, and the victims appear to have been blacklisted. Whether this is the kind of work the Marquette club has been fostering, or is part of the persecuting scheme that Pinkerton, the private detective, outlines in the North American Review, is known, of course, only to the dark room conspirators themselves. But whoever is behind it should be ferreted out by the grand jury, in the interest of good order and respect for law. It is especially important that the grand jury take the initiative in these first cases. The victims are non-resistants and will take no revenge nor make any complaint themselves. But the matter concerns others as well as themselves. It concerns society as a whole. For there is danger that future victims of these stealthy conspiracies will not be non-resistants, and that they may be provoked by the lawlessness of the conspirators to lawlessness in retaliation. In view of that possibility, it is the duty of the grand jury to demonstrate at once that the law may be trusted to put down such persecutions. That body cannot wisely or justly leave outraged victims to infer that their wrongs will go without redress and their rights without protection unless they become their own avengers. Upon no other public men does the responsibility rest so heavily at this time as upon grand jurors, to convince all classes that the law is not a respecter of persons.

The supreme court of Ohio, on the 29th, dismissed the last of the cases which ex-Attorney General Monett had brought against the Standard Oil trust. It did so at the request of Attorney General Sheets. This was entirely regular, not only judicially, since it is proper for a court to dismiss an attorney general's suit upon application of the attorney general, but also politically. For the Republican convention had "turned down"

Mr. Monett, refusing to renominate him because he brought these suits against the oil trust. It nominated Mr. Sheets in his place, and the people of Ohio approved this action of the convention. Politically, therefore, Mr. Sheets was under orders from the people of the state to undo Mr. Monett's work. He has obeyed with all reasonable expedition. His ostensible reason, as announced to the court, was that the trust had dismantled its plant in Ohio and left the state. But Mr. Monett asserts that nothing of this kind has been done except evasively, and that the evidence against the trust is abundant. At any rate Mr. Sheets has faithfully obeyed the mandate he received in his nomination and election to supplant the attorney general of his own party who had been officially upright in his attitude toward the trusts.

The lower house of the Georgia legislature has made a move in the right direction with reference to taxation. By the passage of a franchise tax bill, it aims at taxing franchise values. This it does by requiring the state authorities to deduct the value of the tangible property of corporations from the total value of their stocks and bonds. The difference so arrived at is to be regarded as representing the value of the franchise, and is to be taxed accordingly. As the senate has yet to act, it is too early to be enthusiastic over this measure; but the fact that the measure has passed the lower house has an encouraging significance.

One of the able and influential Democratic papers of the west, democratic with a little d as well as Democratic with a big D, has long been known as the Dubuque Telegraph. By merger with another paper it has recently become the Dubuque Telegraph-Herald. Fortunately for the readers of these combined papers, and for the Democracy of Iowa, John S. Murphy, whose ability as editor made the Telegraph what it was, is the editor of the Telegraph-Herald. A few such editors as Mr. Murphy would

soon change the political complexion of Iowa.

Dr. Hiram W. Thomas, for many years an independent preacher of Chicago, one who left the orthodox fold because he rejected, among other doctrines, what has been perhaps irreverently called the "slaughter-house theory of the atonement," has retired from regular ministerial work. It is to be regretted that this was necessary. Christian preachers are not too numerous in these imperial days, when it is unhappily more than half true that, as Swinburne phrases it, we have "a Christian church which spits on Christ." But Dr. Thomas has done a good work in the past, both as clergyman and citizen, and from what may yet remain to be done, whether in the pulpit or out of it, he is not the man to shrink.

The German tariff on cereals, intended nominally for the benefit of the farmhand class, but really, of course, for the farm landlord class, has worked out precisely as its projectors expected, but not precisely as they promised. Says the New York Evening Post:

It was supposed that these duties would make possible the payment of higher agricultural wages, by enabling landowners to get better prices for their products, and thus keep the peasants from drifting to the cities in search of work in manufacturing enterprises. The main error in this notion is, of course, found in the failure of the new law to provide any means of transferring the higher returns in agriculture from the pockets of landowners to those of laborers.

That is the main error in all plutocratic schemes for "enabling" employers to pay higher wages. What is especially noteworthy about the above quotation, however, is its recognition of a truth of far-reaching importance, the truth that a tariff on products of land—and all goods are products of land—in so far as it is effective at all as a protection to home industry, protects only the industry of owning land. The industry of using land gets none of it.

As an answer—after the Yankee

method of answering inquiries—to the arguments now and then heard in defense of the proposition that slave-owners ought to have been compensated for their slaves, we commend the following brief letter from M. J. Foyer to the Cleveland Chronicle:

You say, in comparing the right of property in land with the right of property in slaves, "it would have been just and proper to make compensation for the capital destroyed by abolition" of slavery. In this connection I should like to inquire if you would be in favor of arresting a runaway slave on the charge of grand larceny on the theory that in running away from his "master" without first compensating him for the property involved he was guilty of robbery?

**A PARALLEL IN BARBARISM.**

Hardly a year has gone by since innocent Republicans were protesting against having the McKinley colonial policy described as a policy of imperialism. But events are now taking place which give to those protests an emphatic negative. If the American government we are developing in the Philippines is not the government of an empire, then it is a nondescript. It is not a republican government. It is not a military government. It is not free enough for a limited monarchy. It is the most absolute government, professing civilization, on the face of the earth. It is more absolute than the Russian government. For autocratic authority it is without a parallel outside the British military lines in South Africa.

It has forced the people of the island of Samar to leave their homes and to congregate in the towns. This is the infamous "reconcentrado" device of Gen. Weyler in Cuba. Partly because he drove the Cubans into the towns, we went to war with Spain, President McKinley declaring that this "reconcentrado" was—

not civilized warfare; it was extermination. The only peace it could beget was that of the wilderness and the grave.

Yet, in less than four years after those words were written, the McKinley colonial policy has led us on to doing in the Philippines what President McKinley so vigorously condemned Spain for doing in Cuba.

Nor is that the worst. The later dispatches from Manila tell of a

policy of oppression in the Philippines which goes beyond the drastic laws of the Spanish, when they, as our predecessors, ruled with imperial sway over those unhappy islands. This extreme and unprecedented policy consists in making treason punishable with death, and in defining it with such grim absurdity that the people who are fighting for the liberation of their own country may be executed as traitors by us who confront them as foreign invaders.

Treason! Is it treason? Treason against what? Not against the United States, for under our constitution only citizens can be traitors. These people are not citizens. It cannot be treason against the United States. What then? There is no answer that meets the requirements of public law. They are to be shot as traitors merely because they are in arms against the American army of invasion. It is a war measure. This may possibly be an effective way of carrying on a war of conquest, but it is new to modern warfare, strange to the principles of public law, and abhorrent to all our own traditions. Even in our efforts to subdue the American Indians, barbarous as our methods often were, we never went the length of executing hostile Indians as traitors.

For precedents for this new method of conquering our "pacified" Philippine subjects, we are confined to Great Britain in her war in South Africa. We have left even the Spaniard behind. But with Great Britain we swap precedents. Mr. Chamberlain refers for precedents for his South African outrages to our exploits in the Philippines; and we in turn may cite in support of our Philippine aggressions the exploits of Kitchener in South Africa. Between us we may yet build up a body of precedents for the imperial conquerors of weaker peoples that would make the rough and ready codes of the barbarous conquerors of ancient times seem by comparison like advanced lessons in moral philosophy.

If it were not for their own reverence to barbarism in the Philippines, the American people could contemplate only with horror the kind of warfare which the British are carry-

ing on in South Africa. As with us in the Philippines, their government reaches no farther than their rifles can carry—hardly so far, if recent events are any indication. Yet they, like us, have presumed to declare themselves conquerors. They are there, and they intend to stay, as the American vice-governor of the Philippines says of us with reference to that archipelago. They, too, have adopted the Weyler invention of "reconcentrado." They, too, are killing for treason. But as yet they are a little behind us in that respect. They do not make traitors of the enemy, as we propose to do, but confine their treason killing to inhabitants of Cape Colony. With our Philippine precedent to go by, however, the British also may adopt the handy expedient of proclaiming the enemy as traitors.

And why are the British maintaining this war of extermination in South Africa at enormous cost to themselves? Is it to settle a dispute impossible of settlement otherwise? Not at all. The Boers long ago offered to close the war by arbitration. Indeed, they offered arbitration before the war began. They have even offered to close it upon Great Britain's own terms, provided only that the independence of the two republics be continued. But the British ministry has declined every offer. They demand unconditional surrender. It is for that and that alone, for conquest and nothing else, that they now carry on this terribly disastrous war.

Disastrous is a mild term to apply to a mode of warfare such as that which the British have in their desperation adopted to conquer the Boers. In the matter of "reconcentrado" alone, the facts are appalling. The figures as reported by the British press for the period beginning with June and ending with September are as follows:

	Total number in camps.	Deaths.	Rate per year per 1,000
June .....	85,410	777	109
July .....	93,940	1,412	150
August .....	106,347	1,878	214
September .....	109,418	2,411	264

It will be observed not only that the number of deaths has increased month by month, but that the rate per thousand per annum has likewise increased. The rate for September,

264, is more than ten times a normal death rate. It is higher than the rate in the midst of a plague. What may be the death rate we have imposed upon our Philippine subjects may never be known. For we have gone beyond the British in this species of inhumanity. Not only do we drive the noncombatant population into towns, as the British do, but we have blockaded the island of Leyte, preventing the importation even of food, and the inhabitants are upon the verge of starvation. We are actually starving women and children because their husbands and fathers refuse to surrender their guns to our invading troops.

At first the British spoke of their "reconcentrado" device as philanthropic. They said it was for the purpose of protecting the Boer women, children and noncombatants from the ravages of war. But now Lord Milner, in a letter through his private secretary, published in the London Leader of October 7, admits that this inhuman device was—

adopted purely on military grounds, as a means for hastening the end of the war, which is, after all, the first interest of the refugees themselves.

The military purpose served by the "reconcentrado" is to make the Boers realize that unless they stop fighting their families will be put into plague camps to die off at an enormous rate! It is the same motive that we have in starving the women and children of Leyte. If war is hell, what English word remains to describe this kind of war?

## NEWS

Although this year is in most of the states what the politicians call an "off year" in politics, only a few general elections being held and they as a rule being unimportant, yet one of these general elections, that of Ohio, and one of the municipal elections, the Shepard-Low contest in New York, were of widespread interest and not without general importance.

The New York election has attracted most attention outside. As is well known, the Tammany Hall organization, which controls the Democratic

party in New York city, has long been regarded as disgracefully corrupt. To drive it out of power, a Citizens' Union was recently organized, upon a non-partisan basis, and this Union entered into a fusion with the Republican party of the city. The fusion was perfected through the nomination of a local ticket by the Citizens' Union, and its indorsement by the Republican convention. Before that action, however, conferences between the Citizens' Union and Republican leaders had resulted in an agreement as to the ticket to be so nominated and indorsed. In the course of these negotiations the Republican leaders proposed as candidates for mayor Democrats whom the Citizens' Union could not nominate, at the same time advising the Citizens' Union that the Republican convention would refuse to indorse any Democrat who had supported Bryan for president. Out of this situation came the nomination of Seth Low, then president of Columbia university. Mr. Low is a Republican. He was once mayor of Brooklyn, and had been defeated for mayor of New York in 1897, when an independent candidate with the Tammany candidate, a Republican candidate and Henry George in the field against him. Other candidates on the fusion ticket were from both parties, the majority being Democrats. One of the Democrats was William Travers Jerome, the fusion candidate for district attorney of New York county. After the fusion nominations, Tammany Hall, as the regular Democratic organization, put forth a ticket with Edward M. Shepard as the candidate for mayor. Mr. Shepard had made a reputation as a vigorous opponent of Tammany methods in politics, and had supported Low in 1897. In accepting the Tammany nomination he formally declared that he retracted nothing. He had opposed Bryan in 1896 but supported him prominently and actively in 1900, and is on the whole as radical a democrat as would be available for high office in a city which is so largely affected in its politics by conservative interests as is New York. The remainder of the Tammany ticket was with few exceptions made up of typical Tammany candidates. After a short but exciting campaign, in which the ordinary political alignments broke bewilderingly, the election came off on the 5th. Low received 296,206 votes and Shepard 265,403, a plurality of 30,803 for Low. The remainder of Low's ticket

in New York county was elected, Jerome getting a plurality of 17,132.

Ohio comes next to New York city in point of general interest in the elections. In that state the principal office to be filled was the governorship. Gov. George K. Nash was the Republican candidate for reelection. His Democratic opponent was James Kilbourne. Both are residents of Columbus, Franklin county. The Republican campaign had been made under the leadership of Senator Hanna, upon the issue of confirming the policies of the late President McKinley and "letting well enough alone;" and in the election of legislative candidates a United States senatorship was involved, the term of Senator Foraker being about to expire. At the election on the 5th Gov. Nash was re-elected by a plurality of 68,145 with one county yet to hear from. This unexpectedly high plurality is about 19,000 higher than his plurality two years ago, and about the same as McKinley's of last year, which is attributed to defections of Bryan men from Kilbourne in resentment for what was widely advertised as a slur cast upon Bryan by the Democratic state convention. In Franklin county, where both candidates live, Mr. Kilbourne's plurality is 2,500, an increase of 800 over the Democratic plurality in 1899. But in Hamilton, the Cincinnati county, where John R. McLean resides, the Democratic plurality of 1,000 two years ago for McLean, has disappeared and Nash carries the county by about 4,000. The legislative delegation from that county is also all Republican, whereas two years ago but two Republicans were elected. Not only is Gov. Nash re-elected by an increased plurality, but the Republicans have carried the legislature by a large majority. About the only encouragement for Democrats which the Ohio election has to offer, besides the gratifying vote for Kilbourne in his own county, comes from Cleveland.

Cuyahoga is the Cleveland county. The situation there has been unique since Tom L. Johnson's election as mayor, on the Democratic ticket, by 6,000 plurality, where the usual majority is well up in the thousands the other way. Mayor Johnson confined the campaign to questions of equitable taxation; and the Democratic candidates for the legislature were pledged to devote themselves to this reform. The

campaign was more exciting here than anywhere else in the state, though a campaign on economic issues. The county is normally strongly Republican. In 1897 the Republican candidates carried it by over 5,000 plurality. In 1899 they ran ahead of the Democrats by 14,000, but Mayor Jones, of Toledo, polled more votes than both parties, and so made that an abnormal year. McKinley carried the county in 1900 by nearly 3,000 plurality. The normal Republican plurality on county tickets has been about 7,000. But at the election on the 5th, Kilbourne lost by only 73, that being Nash's plurality, and the entire Democratic county ticket, with the exception of one judiciary candidate, was elected. The Democrats also carried the entire legislative delegation from the county. On county and legislative tickets the Democratic plurality varied from 3,000 to 6,000.

A surprisingly interesting election was that of San Francisco. There were three principal candidates—Republican, Democrat and Union Labor. The nomination of a Union Labor candidate was one of the results of a bitter labor fight (see pp. 298, 411), which broke out in San Francisco last summer. The strikers lost their strike, but it now appears that they did so only to strike at the ballot box. The Trade Union candidate for mayor was Eugene E. Schmitz. He is leader of a small theater orchestra and manager of a machine shop. At no time was he regarded as a very formidable candidate, notwithstanding the bitterness which the strike had engendered. But he was elected by a plurality of several thousand. The labor unions voted solidly for him, and only about half the Democratic vote remained with the Democratic candidate.

Other elections of the 5th, with their results approximately, were:

Iowa, Republican plurality.....	84,245
Pennsylvania, Rep. plurality.....	52,360
Nebraska, Rep. plurality.....	12,000
Massachusetts, Rep. plurality....	71,352
Rhode Island, Rep. plurality.....	6,349
South Dakota, Rep. plurality....	7,000
New Jersey, Rep. plurality.....	10,000
Maryland, Dem.....legislature	
Kentucky, Dem.....legislature	
Virginia, Dem. plurality.....	10,000
Mississippi, Dem. plurality.....	35,000

The Republican plurality in Iowa is about 29,000 more than in 1899 and about that of McKinley in 1900. In

Pennsylvania, the regular Republican (or Quay) ticket overcame a fusion of Democrats and anti-Quay Republicans. The Nebraska contest was over judiciary candidates. The Republican plurality in Massachusetts is more than 30,000 higher than in 1899 and nearly as much less than in 1900. The Democratic candidate for governor of Rhode Island, Dr. Garvin, a well-known New England single tax man, polled an unexpectedly large vote in the cotton factory districts of the state, and reduced the Republican plurality from 9,706 in 1899 and 8,859 in 1900 to 6,349.

Parliamentary politics in Australia are evidently at a boiling point, but the cabled report is too meager to afford a basis for definite explanations. It appears from this report, however, that on the 2d, after a continuous sitting of 27 hours, the lower house of the Commonwealth parliament voted upon a resolution of want of confidence in the ministry, introduced by the opposition leader, Mr. Reid. The resolution was lost by a vote of 39 to 25. In all probability the resolution in question is in some way connected with the tariff controversy, regarding which we told the facts at page 441. As will be observed by reference to that page, an error, due to certain transpositions, was made in the table giving the political complexion of the parliament. The table should have read:

	Senate.	House.
Ministerialists .....	14	42
Opposition .....	22	33

Mr. Reid would seem to have been unable to unite the opposition against the ministry, since he secured only 25 votes in an opposition of 33.

Over in the Philippines the American war still goes on. A battle is reported from the island of Samar, in which 25 Filipinos were killed, 175 houses burned and 5,000 pounds of rice captured by the Americans. No American casualties are reported. Around the Island of Leyte a strict blockade is maintained by the Americans. So strict is it that the people are suffering for want of food, and the presidents of the various towns have explained the situation to Gen. Smith and asked in the name of humanity that this threatened starvation of the inhabitants be relieved; but Gen. Smith replied that the blockade would be continued against the importation of food and be in every way

of the strictest kind, until the people of the island bring in their guns and give the American authorities full information regarding hostile Filipinos. "All the arguments of the officials of the towns," says the dispatch, "were unavailing." The Filipinos in the island of Cebu, so Gen. Hughes reports, have laid "down their arms in good faith." But he states in the same dispatch that affairs are "not yet satisfactory in Bohol island."

Owing to the illness of Gov. Taft, the Philippine commission has appointed Commissioner Wright as vice governor. It has also adopted a local treason ordinance. This ordinance defines treason as giving aid and comfort to the hostile Filipinos, and makes it punishable with death. It also forbids seditious speeches and libels against either the United States government or the colonial government. Strenuous objections to the ordinance were made at a public hearing, but on the 5th the commission adopted it.

The federalist party of the Philippines, which was organized under the patronage of the Americans and in the interest of American sovereignty (vol. iii., p. 680), has been holding a convention at Manila. The object is to arrange for a petition to the American congress asking for autonomy. The sessions of the convention are reported as turbulent and the body as at times almost unmanageable.

Much greater are the difficulties of Great Britain in South Africa even than those the Americans experience with their Philippine conquest. Another serious battle with the Boers is to be added to the number already reported. It was fought on the 30th in the eastern part of the Transvaal, within the area of Botha's operations. During a thick mist, a Boer detachment supposed to have been under the direct command of Botha himself, attacked a British column under Col. Benson. The fight lasted a day and a night. Twelve British officers (including Col. Benson) and 58 men were killed, and 158 wounded. It was the hardest battle and the worst British disaster of the year.

It is now asserted, the report coming from Paris, that on the 15th of September, when Gen. Kitchener's outlawry proclamation (p. 298) against the Boers was to take effect,

Gen. Botha issued a counter proclamation. It is given by the Paris reports in these terms:

Whereas, no official of the Orange Free State or the Transvaal republic, and no general, commandant, or burgher intends to obey Lord Kitchener's proclamation or to trouble with it. And, whereas, the proclamation contains falsehoods, habitual to the English. And, whereas, Lord Kitchener's proclamation has strengthened the determination of all burghers to resist to the end; now, therefore, I Louis Botha, commandant general of the republican forces, with the consent of the government, officers and burghers of both republics, proclaim Lord Kitchener, his staff, and the officers and soldiers serving under his orders and fighting us now, to be outlaws in South Africa, and all officers and burghers in the two republics and in Cape Colony are ordered to shoot every armed Englishman whom they meet.

Absolute confidence cannot be put in this report. The Botha proclamation has probably been forged, but upon the basis of knowledge of some sort that a Boer proclamation ordering reprisals is contemplated. An Amsterdam dispatch of the 1st, which makes this seem probable is as follows:

The Boer deputation here summoned Messrs. Leyds and Van Boeschoten yesterday to consider dispatches received from Boer leaders in the field, saying the fighting burghers were determined to make reprisals if the British continued hanging and shooting rebels; and others to the effect that the Boer authorities in South Africa affirm that the adoption of reprisals would be bad policy, and that, in order to strengthen their position, they request Mr. Kruger to let them know his opinion, as he still has the greatest hold on the minds of the burghers. The meeting lasted four hours, and it was decided to advise Mr. Kruger to comply with the request of the Boer authorities and to take the opportunity to bring the subject of British executions in South Africa before the European public in an open letter.

Another war cloud looms up, this time in Europe itself. France has made a hostile move upon Turkey, which may possibly bring on a European war. The nominal causes of this movement on the part of France were explained at page 331, at the time of the severing by France of diplomatic relations with Turkey. France had demanded certain money payments, regarding which Turkey did not offer satisfactory guarantees.

Since the severance of relations, Turkey has made no advances in the matter. The French government has consequently sent a fleet from Toulon to Turkish waters, under command of Admiral Caillard. It was reported on the 1st that the fleet had returned to Toulon, but this proved to be a mistake. The fleet arrived on the 5th, at the Island of Mitylene, off the coast of Asia Minor, and, according to some reports, which, however, are not verified, the admiral seized the three principal ports of that island and provided for the collection of their customs receipts by the French until the claims against Turkey are satisfied.

This move on the part of the French government was on the 4th made the subject of interpellation in the French chamber of deputies. A radical socialist, M. Sembat, criticised the naval expedition and was replied to by M. Delcasse, of the ministry. Not satisfied with the explanation, M. Sembat made a motion which indirectly condemned the expedition. It was rejected by 394 to 75. Thereupon a motion of confidence in the ministry was made and carried by a vote of 305 to 77.

NEWS NOTES.

—The Buffalo exposition came to an end on the 3d.

—Wu Ting Fang, Chinese minister at Washington, has been recalled.

—In Perry county, Miss., a negro was burned at the stake on the 2d by a mob.

—Joel Prentiss Bishop, the famous law book writer, died in Cambridge, Mass., on the 4th, at the age of 86.

—Li Hung Chang, the great Chinese statesman and diplomat, died at Peking on the 7th at 11 o'clock at night, at the age of nearly 80 years.

—The Socialist party of Austria met for the first time in two years in conference at Vienna on the 2d. Herr Bebel, leader of the German socialists, attended with a deputation from Germany.

—"Free Speech and Free Press," will be the subject of a lecture by Clarence S. Darrow, under the auspices of the Turn-Verein Vorwaerts, at 1168 West Twelfth street, Chicago, on Sunday, the 10th, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

—Edward S. Stokes, who shot James Fisk in 1872, and after being convicted of murder and sentenced to be hanged, secured a reversal of the judgment and upon subsequent conviction of a lower grade of crime

served four years in state prison, died at New York on the 2d.

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

Gold Reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000 00
Available cash balance.....	175,655,697 01
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$325,655,697 01</b>
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1901.....	326,833,124 02
<b>Decrease .....</b>	<b>\$1,188,427 01</b>

—The governor of Indiana refused on the 2d to extradite ex-Gov. Taylor, of Kentucky, who has taken refuge in Indiana. Kentucky demands his custody upon an indictment for complicity in the murder of Goebel (see p. 473), and the Indiana governor refuses on the ground that Taylor cannot be guaranteed a fair trial in Kentucky.

—Indications that the Mexican government is mistaken in asserting that the Yaqui rebellion (vol. iii., p. 602) has been subdued are reported in the form of an account of a bloody battle with Yaquis, near Onaias, a small town on the western slope of the Sierra Madre Mountains. The reports state that a greater portion of the western part of the state of Sonora is in rebellion.

—Judge Thompson, of the Sangamon county court, at Springfield, Ill., issued a mandamus on the the 2d, directing the state board of equalization to meet and assess for 1900 the capital stock of the 20 Chicago corporations named by the Chicago school-teachers in the mandamus proceedings which the supreme court (p. 467) has sustained. The board is required to report to the court on the 22d in what manner it has complied with the order.

MISCELLANY

THE SECRET OF LIFE.

For The Public.

Not through the churchmen's wordy creed,  
Nor pompous ritual, obsolete,  
Nor outward show of worship, is wrought  
Thy Soul's salvation;

But in knowing  
Through tedious toll of weary years,  
The God within thee, and the Universe.

Encompass Him, O Soul, with Thy whole being;

Nor reck the agony, the tears, and the heart-rendings

That visit thy reluctant, work-worn flesh.  
A joy born of a hallowed pain, it is, to be  
One with the Eternal—

In love, with fellow-feeling and humility,  
Unceasing labor with thy human kind,

To know the Truth,  
And read aright the Law that leads to progress.

Thy happiness is not in comforts of the flesh,

The sumptuous couch of indolence,  
Nor yet in Fortune's smile, or Fame's proud diadem.

Though Fame nor Fortune guerdon thee,  
Still must thou strive in cheerfulness,  
And offer up thine all for Truth and Right,  
without reserve.

Thy happiness is doing;  
Nor be thou laggard in the Cause, nor  
timorous;  
Dauntless, dispel all fear, O striving Soul,  
And be thou Pioneer!

W. C. GUELS.

#### FARM WAGES.

A recent report on the wages of farm laborers in the United States, by the agricultural department, possesses some interesting and suggestive features. The highest average wages reported for a state is Montana, \$32.12 a month, with board. Nevada pays nearly as much, or \$31.76, and the other far western states and territories pay from \$28 to \$30. In North Dakota the average is \$21.82, in South Dakota \$20.41; Minnesota, \$19.98; Iowa, \$19.32; Wisconsin, \$19.20. Going east the average declines to \$13.27, in Ohio; \$14.31 in Pennsylvania; and then rises to from \$18 to \$18.75 in the New England states. These figures are for 1899, and include board in every case. The average for the whole country that year was \$14.07; the average being reduced by the low wages in the south, being as low as \$7.34 in South Carolina. This is the highest average since 1869, when it was \$16.55. Whenever differences are shown in wages in this country and Europe the higher wages here are attributed to the protection given labor by our tariff. But wages for this kind of labor in the south do not average half as high as in the north, though the same tariff covers and protects both regions. It may be said in explanation that labor is not as efficient south as north, and that the first gets all it is worth. This may be true; and the same may be said of European labor. At all events, the figures show that there are elements other than tariff that influence the wages of labor.—Farm, Stock and Home for Nov. 1.

#### MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

In the future when plumbers and others want to tear up a street for any purpose they will have to make a deposit at the city to cover the cost of relaying the pavement in a proper manner. The city will do the repairing and the cost will be deducted from the deposit made. If there is any balance it will be returned to the man making the deposit.

During the past street after street has been ruined by the careless work

of private concerns tearing them up to make water or gas connections or for some other reason and failing to relay the paving properly. Director of Public Works Salen has decided to appoint a man in his department with whom all deposits must be made, and without whose permit no street can be torn up. It will be the duty of this clerk to see that the pavements are relaid as they should be.—Cleveland Plain Dealer of October 28.

"Mr. Johnson," began a well-known Democrat, as he entered the mayor's office yesterday, "there are two men in the workhouse that I want to talk to you about. They are out there for simple intoxication, and they ought to be pardoned."

"Who are they?"

The caller named the men. "I know about them," said the mayor. "Somebody spoke to me about them a few days ago. I think they ought to be pardoned."

"Thank you, Mr. Johnson. These men are Democrats, and they are dead crazy to vote our ticket. They quit work the first registration day to register and they have never missed voting the straight Democratic ticket in 20 years. It would break their hearts if they were not able to vote this time."

"Is that so?" replied the mayor. "Well, we will pardon them the day after election."

"Wha—wha—what's that!" stammered the caller.

"I said we'd pardon them the day after election," and the mayor turned on his heel and walked away.—Plain Dealer of November 1.

#### HOW TO RENDER A NATION UNFIT FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT.

For The Public.

When a nation professing Christianity is confronted with the difficulty of reconciling the Christian religion with a war of conquest and robbery, the excuse commonly set forth by the supporters of such a war is that the nation to be subjugated is "unfit to govern itself." The motive of the war, as opposed to its excuse, will invariably be discovered in some desirable object, which is to be secured by the conquest of the weaker race, such as gold mines, valuable harbors, or commercial advantages.

Of course everybody knows that there never was such an anomaly as a nation "unfit to govern itself." Every nation is fitted, by the very

fact of its existence, to govern itself in exactly the manner which the character of its people requires, and in no other. To assert the contrary is to deny the laws of nature. I will even advance a proposition parallel to the above, which is that no nation is fit to govern any other nation, or, to put it more fully, no nation is capable of giving to any other nation exactly the government which the latter requires.

But although all nations are accurately endowed by nature with the faculty of self-government, they may be made to lose that faculty if the proper means be applied, that is to say, if they be deprived of the privilege of self-government for a very long period. There seems to be no doubt that a nation governed by another nation will eventually become incapable of governing itself. This follows a universal law: All organs, senses and faculties which remain unused become atrophied, and in the course of many generations disappear altogether. Again, organs and faculties are strengthened by their use; so that it must be accepted as a truth that a nation can advance in its powers of self-government only through the exercise (the full and complete exercise) of self-government, and must eventually lose such powers if deprived of their exercise.

BERTRAND SHADWELL.

#### A POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCE OF THE CRIME AGAINST POLAND.

An extract from a sermon delivered in the Vine Street Congregational Church, Cincinnati, November 3, by Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow.

I believe that it is more than a mere coincidence that one of the most frightful crimes of the century against the government should have been committed by one of the offspring of a people who have been the victims of the blackest crime that was ever committed in the name of Government—the partition of Poland.

The mills of the gods grind slowly. It may seem a long way from Warsaw to Buffalo. Yet we are all members of one body. The iniquities of the fathers are visited upon the children. The crimes of one nation are atoned for by another. Ignorance, brutality, hate—these are Oppression's ugly brood. Men do not gather grapes from thorns, nor figs from thistles. Neither do they gather anarchy from equitable social conditions, nor sedition from free political institutions.

With overwhelming armies Russia was crushing the national life of Poland while our forefathers were de-

fending theirs against the invading armies of King George. In 1830 the spirit of liberty flamed forth from the ruins of the little state, but only to invite the return of the avenging armies. Polish patriots were banished to Siberia. The little children of Warsaw were snatched from the arms of parents and carried away to military institutions in the heart of Russia, that they might be taught to forget their home and their religion. Then it was that the French minister announced to the chamber of deputies: "Order reigns in Warsaw."

In 1863 Russia celebrated the suppression of the last uprising by hanging a thousand patriots, by deporting to Siberia 300,000, and by imposing upon the remaining population a fine of \$20 for each word that they dared to speak in their mother tongue. The waves of the Atlantic have washed the wrecks of this Polish state upon our shores. This is the social retribution which Europe rains upon America.

With pity for the victims of this oppression, with hatred for the false ideals which led Europe and may lead us astray, let us work to make the conditions of life so just that the scars of old Europe may be speedily effaced here, that those who come to us may not have to live in slums and send their children to factories, that there may be more opportunity for the growth of morality and intelligence.

#### ABATEMENT OF THE SMOKE NUISANCE IN CLEVELAND.

During the months of March and April of this year observations were made on nearly all the chimneys by the smoke inspector's department on the east side of the river for the period of eight hours, there being 100 readings taken from each chimney, the smoke being graded by an experienced observer.

During the past month readings have been taken in the same way from quite a number of the above-mentioned chimneys. Comparison of these averages for September, with those made six months previously, shows some gratifying improvements.

There is a group of factories on the Pennsylvania tracks, near Cedar avenue, which shows a marked improvement. The averages are as follows:

Chandler & Price, March, 20 per cent.; September, 12 per cent.; General Incandescent Lamp Co., March, 16 per cent.; September, 4 per cent. Warner & Swasey, March, 18 per cent.; September, 3 per cent. I. N. Topliff, March, 22 per cent.; September, 8 per cent. Taylor-Boggis foundry, No. 2, March, 6 per

cent.; September, 3 per cent. Standard Tool Co., March, 5 per cent.; September 2 per cent. Grant Machine Co., now the Cleveland Cap Screw Co., March, 9 per cent.; September 1 per cent.

The Eighth ward near the foot of Alabama street, has been a very smoky locality. Improvement here is also very marked the change being principally due to the work done by the master mechanic of the L. S. & M. S. R. R.

L. S. & M. S. R. R. carpenter shop, March, 24 per cent.; September, 6 per cent. Locomotive shop, March, 28 per cent.; September, 11 per cent. Car shop, March, 41 per cent.; September, 11 per cent. Car shop No. 2, March, 32 per cent.; September, 6 per cent.

On St. Clair street, in this same section of the city, a great change for the better is noticed. Several firms in the Ninth ward on the lake shore have given this matter attention and effected a gratifying change.

These changes are due in some cases to the installation of improved furnaces or stokers, and in others to putting in order the equipment already in place, while in a few instances the improvement is due solely to more careful methods of firing.—Cleveland Plain Dealer of Oct. 5.

#### AN OPEN LETTER TO THE KING OF ENGLAND.

Published in the New Age of London, for October 10.

Sire—More than a hundred years ago your great-grandfather, George III., was at war with the American colonies. The wisest men of the time condemned the war. They had striven to the utmost of their might to prevent it, and while the war was running its disastrous, its fatal course, they used every effort to stay it and to bring about an honorable peace. All warnings, all efforts were in vain. Your illustrious predecessor had been grievously deceived. At the beginning of the revolt his incompetent ministers had assured him that four regiments would suffice to crush the colonies; the next year an army of 10,000 men would infallibly complete the task; the year following this saw 70,000 men engaged. In vain; all Britain could do was to hold "just so much of the country as she could occupy, or command with the mouths of her cannon." The struggle grew more and more savage: it continued amid the execrations of the civilized world, which shuddered at the barbarities inflicted on a people of our own race—barbarities growing more barbarous as the prospect of reducing a handful of brave people to submis-

sion grew less and less. It was openly charged that when conquest had evidently been impossible, the destruction of the people was sought. Farms were burnt, tribes of savage Indians were let loose on the Americans. "It looked," said a great statesman, "as if there were an intention not to conquer the Americans, for that seemed impossible, but to exterminate them; for while there was a guinea in Britain, or a man to go for a soldier there seemed to be a resolution to carry on the war, even until Britons and Americans should mutually fall by each others' swords." Men asked in despair whether this great country, the home of freedom, was to "establish desolation on system, and, to gratify an impotent resentment, deal fruitless destruction on the wives and children of an enemy we could not conquer."

Ministers were told: "If you would make peace with America upon equal and fair terms, foreign powers, instead of despising us for our folly, and lying in wait to take advantage of the wasting of our strength, would stand in awe of the powers of this country when conducted upon the principles of wisdom and justice." But "unconditional submission" was the first and last word of the king's advisers; every failure was followed by fresh assurances of conquest and subjugation. The nation was told that the enemy was destitute of munitions of war; his forces were reduced to 5,000 starved and half-naked men. More than half—the ministers said four-fifths—of the colonists stood by the mother country; traitors, bought over by the British, abounded. Never did a contest seem more unequal. But the colonists were made of stern stuff; to them liberty was so precious a possession that they thought little of life without it. They had entered on the war without seeking to break the bonds uniting them to Britain; their demand for independence was forced on them.

The most solemn warnings to the king availed nothing. "How," said Fox, "will it sear the eyeballs of the prince to see the decline of the empire date from his accession and its fall completed within his single reign! His private virtues will in the lapse of time be forgotten; the character of the man will be lost in the character of the monarch, and he will be handed down to the latest posterity as the loser of his empire."

The end, long foreseen by the wisest men of the empire, came at last; Amer-

of most glaring social inequality, political institutions theoretically equal, is to stand a pyramid upon its apex.

Whoever then considers the problems, social and political, that confront us must see that their solution lies upon the problem of the distribution of wealth. Says Mr. Shearman:

The adoption of a scientific and intelligent system of taxation would bring about a just distribution of wealth, give a lasting stimulus to industries and production, would greatly increase the profits of capital, would give a security to property, now unknown, would encourage manufacture, commerce and agriculture and incidentally solve many social problems, which, under present conditions, seem almost insoluble.

That system of taxation advocated so strongly by this intelligent and scientific thinker is commonly known as the single tax. It was first expounded 150 years ago by a distinguished French doctor, but lost sight of in the great turmoil of civil strife in France soon after. It has now been revived and is exerting an influence not only upon the poor, who recognize in it their deliverance from helpless poverty, but also upon the rich, who by their strenuous opposition to it show they acknowledge its power.

Single tax, reduced to its simplest form, is: To tax nothing produced by the effort and industry of man, to tax everything not made by man, and to collect this tax on the basis of what one man would be willing to pay for the privilege another man enjoys of using that not made by man. It is based upon the theory that every man, woman and child born into this world has a birthright to the use of the land and its production, and every one deprived of this natural right is defrauded and in a state of involuntary slavery.

The single tax implies not the invention of a new tax, for it is present to-day, though covered by a multitude of taxes, but the entire repealing of all taxes except one—that one being the one on ground rent or the value of land. Of course, this would do away with taxes on personal property, buildings and improvements, tariff, excise duties, poll taxes, in short, with every tax except the existing one levied on land values.

Everyone knows that the collection of the tax on ground rents to-day is entirely free from the corrupting incidents of other taxes. One result of a single tax would be an efficient collection of taxes. There would be no need of assessor's oaths, or prying into private affairs.

The burden would no longer be

shifted from the man without a conscience to the man with a conscience, from those who can escape it to those who cannot. Not a question would be asked. The communal value of the land would be self-evident, and, if it were not, to underrate it would be to the disadvantage of the owner.

A great majority of the present taxes, however, are indirect, and here the comparatively poor bear the greater share of burdens. For necessarily the poor must eat and be clothed, as must also the rich, although of course of these things the millionaire's family has a greater variety and more valuable kind. But however the rich may desire it otherwise, there is a limit to what they can eat and wear, and the ratio between the amount expended by the rich man and the poor man for these necessities is infinitely less than that existing between their means. Although the effort has often been made no country in the world has even been able to obtain one-tenth of its income from indirect taxes out of articles consumed only by the rich.

It may be asserted that the single tax would fall heavily upon farming districts, where property is mostly land; but the contrary is the fact. The farmer is preeminently a producer, not a land owner.

As the single tax is upon land values, it is great where land values are great, and small where land values are small. The value of the land depends upon the growth and improvement of the community. It is this that makes a square foot in the heart of a large city worth more than a hundred acres of most farming land.

The fact that now for every tree a farmer plants, for every well he digs, for every fence he builds, he must pay for over and over again, in taxes, is what is driving him from the country to the crowded cities.

But as land under the single tax would be taxed according to its potential value, and not according to the use made of it, so that the tax on a vacant lot in a large city would be as great as that on an adjoining lot on which a ten-story building stands, and as a speculator holding unused a tract of land in the country would pay as much as a farmer owning a neighboring farm on which are fine buildings and extensive improvements, and from which he is receiving a good income, the country would experience an immense gain by thus killing land speculation and encouraging the use of natural opportunities.

For instance, not two blocks from here is an improved lot valued at \$300,000. With the generally accepted fact that assessment is made on three-fifths the value of property at a rate of 37 mills, the tax will be \$6,660. The tax on the part which would be touched by single tax would at the same rate be \$1,110, or the tax on the bare land, just as is now true of the vacant lot opposite. Of course, with single tax the rate would necessarily be increased, but the same increase would fall upon the similar lot opposite, now merely a hole in the ground. This six-story building with its beautiful marble floors and stairway is an ornament to our town, by its erection employment was given to laboring men, rents lowered, immeasurable good done to the community in general; and we in our ignorance fine this public benefactor, thus putting an embargo on improvements and a premium on disuse of property.

Says Mr. Wright:

So long as there exists a "corner in land" the storehouse of all wealth, so long must labor and capital alike suffer from inadequate returns and from an artificial scarcity of opportunities. If the unused land had to pay a tax, it would be made to produce it. Thus the deadly struggle among wealth producers would be changed into a competition among land owners to obtain capital and labor in order to utilize the now unused sites:

Continuing, he says:

The evil of to-day is not scarcity of capital nor of men willing to work for fair returns, but it lies in the system of taxation by which landowners are not only enabled to pocket public values and thus deprive wealth producers of their just earnings, but by which they are allowed to act the dog-in-the-manger and completely control the production of wealth by the rest of the world

Taxation of land values and that alone will destroy this scourge of modern civilization.

All nations recognizing that something is radically wrong with existing social conditions of the masses are interesting themselves in the solution of that problem as evinced in the single tax. But to first apply the remedy rests upon the people of the United States, upon the people whose only legitimate government rests upon the principles of the natural rights of man asserted in the declaration of independence, upon the people who when they came to see that there were some in the land not enjoying those inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, abolished negro slavery. We have not abolished slavery, but have retained it in its most insidious form.

plane of mineral phenomena, so the child, the natural man, the race must first learn obedience to the civil statutes, to the commandments on tables of stone, to the social prohibitions of the "thou shalt nots" of nature and the voice of God in human experience.

All the inherent force in anarchy as a diseased social factor comes from the truth, partial and obscured though it be, which is sincerely cherished by the idealists who are dreaming of a nobler state of human society. It is absurd to suppose that there is any real power menacing our institutions in organized or unorganized devotees of crime. Evil in itself has no power against the good; its power comes only from the perversion of truth. When we see the truth that is perverted the evil is disarmed. As long as men yearn for a kingdom of heaven on earth, and other men are willing to sacrifice their lives from a mistaken principle of devotion to the good of the race, mere civil force will prove unavailing as against anarchy. Criminals taken in the act of violating or of abetting the violating of law must be dealt with as the statutes require, but the cure for the disease of anarchy is no matter for the police or even for the legislator. The cure lies in the popular knowledge of economical and social truth, and in the alertness of the people to appreciate and realize the principles, which are perverted and misapplied by those who are disaffected with the shortcomings of our present institutions.

There is another aspect of this whole subject. We are in the habit of looking at the anarchist as a horrible creature off in the distance, with whom we can have no part or lot. But the vicious and criminal classes are a part of our race, and are the embodiments of certain elements common to us all. The criminal simply holds up a mirror to society, revealing a native quality which is inherent in every man unless he has been trained out of it by moral and spiritual instruction and culture. For what is the essence of anarchy? It is the spirit of lawlessness. Our American idea of government, and our social institutions, could not produce the assassinating anarchist as a legitimate fruit; but we do not need to go to the products of European governments or to men with un-American names to find anarchists just as real at heart and in influence as the silly enthusiast who is at this moment the object of our national opprobrium.

The true end of all law is to further God's aim in behalf of human advancement. The law-abiding man is essentially the one who seeks the voice of truth in the law and obeys it because it is right. He curbs his own passions, represses his own evils, guides his positive conduct and shapes his life in obedience to law. In so far as in principle or in fact he purposely defies or disobeys the law, he has the anarchical spirit.

We have anarchists in our halls of legislation, who seek to make and unmake laws for their own selfish ends, utterly regardless of the common good, and in defiance of the higher laws of conscience and religion. We have anarchists on the bench and at the bar, who interpret and pervert the statutes in the interest of class prejudice and corporate influence, in defiance of equity and the good of all the people. The commercial world is full of anarchists, who, by every trick of trade and sharp practice, are violating the laws enacted to protect the consuming classes.

The greatest corporations of the land have sometimes been the greatest law-breakers, and by consequence the greatest abettors and breeders of anarchy. We cannot get away from the simple truth that the foes that do us real harm are they of our own household. Just as no individual can be morally hurt except through the evils inherent in his own character, so no nation can be damaged in any vital sense save through diseases that are rooted and sustained within its organic members.

It is folly to suppose that all the anarchy of Europe could hurt our country if we were internally a sound and law-abiding people.

The assassination of the official head of the American people in the infernal interest of lawlessness was the outward and visible sign of that inward and spiritual anarchy which is gnawing the national vitals with a godless lust for wealth and an insane fever for supremacy. We show our patriotism best not by execrating the distraught tool of mad schemers, but by resolving from this day to expunge the spirit of anarchy from our own hearts and methods, by practicing a conscientious obedience to the laws of our beloved land.

Moreover, patriotism here requires that every American assume his share in the responsibility of the government of the people for their own good. Under our institutions all the citizens should see to it that just laws are en-

acted and that they are universally and impartially administered.

#### WHY NOT?

An essay read at the commencement exercises of the high school at Spokane, Wash., June 6, by Miss Mary Davis Bell, of the graduating class.

To-day we are a united people. The hands of the north and south that a few years ago so bitterly warred against each other, are clasped in eternal friendship, and together we rejoice that a great evil was removed from our shores when African slavery was abolished. As one people we glory in the fact that in every land the stars and stripes stand for freedom and equality and justice.

But this fortunate state of affairs did not come about by the efforts of the so-called practical man, who feared to change existing conditions, however bad, lest worse should follow; but through the agency of the dreamer, who was able to look ahead across the intermediate scenes of distress and confusion to the goal beyond. Even that far-sighted man Emerson, said, in 1858, that slavery could not cease to exist in the United States before three generations. It all happened in five years.

Is it not possible that we to-day are laboring under the same misapprehension in thinking that it will be an impossible task to remove the cause of the present social troubles? Lest this possibility become a fact we can afford occasionally to lay aside preconceived opinions and take for a few minutes a point of view which may be unusual.

What is the social problem of to-day? It is why, with the marvelous development of practical science, the revolution of industry which it has effected, the application of steam and electricity in an enormous scale to machinery, the extension of railroads, telegraphs and other means of rapid communication, why with all these things comes, on the one hand, poverty with its misery, ruin and starvation, natural results of ignorance, despondency and despair, while on the other hand, scarcely less pitiable, stand riches attended by its cares, idleness and waste.

The problem of our time, says one, is:

It is a grand thing to be a sovereign, but how is it that the sovereign often starves? How is it that those who are held to be the source of power often cannot, even by hard work, provide themselves with the necessities of life?

Says Mr. George:

Whither is our progress in such circumstances leading us? For to base on a state

Home." It is written by a former member of the New Zealand parliament, and its special value lies in its comparisons between the public policy of the United States and that of Australasia.

The chapter on "Monopolies in the People's Hands" would alone justify the publication of the book. Here are a few quotations:

The people of New Zealand have in the last 25 years provided for themselves more railway accommodation per head than the loudly-boasted enterprise of the capitalists of America has done for the American people in double the time.

Speaking of railroad construction in Australasia, he says:

The experience, not of one government alone but of seven; not of one small railway, but of 15,000 miles of railroad in new and thinly-peopled districts, shows that governments can build and equip railroads for less money than the associated capitalists of America say that it costs them to do the same work.

Again:

"They (the governments) can do the work more cheaply; they can manage it more economically; their annual outlay for interest is about two-thirds as great, because the security of a people is better than that of a railroad; and finally, they pay no dividends on bogus capital.

The above statements are supplemented by figures. Again:

"The crimes against honest trading which are the rule with the railroads in free America are utterly unknown in free Australasia. No oil trusts or coal barons can kill honest competition by means of the railroads."

As to telegraph and telephone:

In every one of the colonies of Australasia the people make a far greater use of the telegraph, and also of the telephone, in proportion to their numbers than the people of America.

The author estimates that the cost of telegraph messages is about one-third what it is in America:

A ten-word message can be sent a thousand miles in New Zealand for 12 cents.

So with telephone charges:

One-third part of the charge made in New York for a telephone connection to a business house would be considered extortionate in any business center in Australasia—and yet there is not one dollar of loss.

The book has one very serious fault. In the chapter on "Profitable Taxation," the author shows a lamentable failure to grasp the full force of the single tax. Indeed, his frequent use of the unfortunate term, "taxation of the land," shows that he has much to learn. He, however, recognizes the importance of the single tax (even as he sees it) as "a valuable weapon in the armory of social and political reform;" his trouble is that he does not see the single tax is

extensive as well as intensive, and means a tax on privilege and monopoly.

The author also seems to halt and hesitate at the old bars of "vested rights" and "confiscation," which were so familiar in the single tax discussions of ten years ago. Further study of this subject will show him that the one aim of single taxers is to reach special advantage, special privilege; that this tax is merely a levy on this, and, strictly speaking, does not touch property.

But, as I have said, the book is one of very great value, and deserves a wide sale. It is published by the Doubleday & McClure Co., and may be had in paper covers.

JAMES H. DILLARD.

#### MAGAZINES.

—In the November Arena, Joseph Dana Miller discusses some of the futilities of reformers, in an article which is valuable for many of its points, but is suggestive rather of solitary contemplation than of experience in the active struggle. His references to the single tax movement are supplemented by an article on the ethics of the land question, by J. Buckley Bartlett, a New England educator. Prof. Parsons discusses the causes of the modern democratic movement, and Mr. Flower, the editor, revives the memories of the late assassination in a considerate editorial.

### The Public Leaflets.

From time to time THE PUBLIC reproduces in pamphlet form suitable for mailing in open envelopes at the one-cent rate of postage, the editorial articles of permanent interest that appear in its columns. These pamphlets will be supplied upon the following terms.

Single copies, delivered at office, . . . . .	\$0.02
Quantities delivered at office, per 100, . . . . .	1.00
Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, . . . . .	.03
Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, upon orders for 100 or more, per 100, 2.00	
In quantities, mailed in bulk to one address, postage paid, per 100, . . . . .	1.25

The following pamphlets have been issued:

1. *A Business Tendency* (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
2. *That Favorable Balance of Trade* (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898.) Out of print.
3. *Here-Then*, by E. J. Salisbury (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
4. *Department Stores* (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
5. *The Remedy for the Evil of the Trust*, by the Rev. Robert C. Bryant (from THE PUBLIC of June 24, 1899).
6. *Monopoly and Competition* (from THE PUBLIC of August 19, 1899).
7. *Documentary Outline of the Philippine Case* (from THE PUBLIC of May 19, 1900.) Out of print.
8. *Assassination and Anarchism* (from THE PUBLIC of September 14, 1901).
9. *Australasian Taxation in Colorado* (from THE PUBLIC of August 31, 1901.)
10. *Landmarks of Liberty* (from THE PUBLIC of September 28, 1901).

## The Public

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

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

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

R. ZEPH & CO.,  
OPTICIANS,  
Room 26, 53 State Street,  
Eyes Examined Free. CHICAGO

#### ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

WALTER A. LANTZ. T. G. McELLIOTT  
Telephone Central 284.

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

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

SAMUEL DOERFLER,  
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELOR,  
501 American Trust Bldg. Cleveland, O.  
Houston.

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

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,  
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,  
BENNETT BLDG.,  
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,  
Tel. Call, 1263 Cortlandt. Rooms 101-104  
NEW YORK.



# THE PUBLIC

WILL BE SENT **ON TRIAL**  
for the purpose of introducing it  
to new readers, for the term of  
six weeks for  
**10 CENTS.**