

# The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1901.

Number 180.

**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.

Sober men will reflect upon the tragedy of the past week with conflicting emotions. The attempted murder of President McKinley they will recognize as an outrage upon the republic itself. He is its regularly chosen chief servant. In that office he personifies its laws and its liberty. A murderous blow, therefore, directed at him in this capacity cannot but be keenly felt by all of us who, believing in liberty secured by law, love the free institutions of our country and have faith in the triumph of its ideals. Mr. McKinley, together with his family and immediate friends, should have and will have universal sympathy. For the crime that brought him to the open door of another world no palliation is possible; and for the criminal the most charitable thought is that he may have been irresponsibly mad. But upon these thoughts, with all the sad and bitter emotions they arouse, other thoughts obtrude. In the lawless spirit which this crime has excited, sober-minded men will see more to deplore and more for the republic to fear, even than in the crime itself.

When the assassin's shots were fired and President McKinley fell, the spectators and the great crowds surrounding them became a revengeful mob. It was not unnatural. The first impulse of most men who witness the perpetration of a crime they abhor is to tear the criminal to pieces, just as it is the first impulse of women to weep. Neither was it unnatural in the futile detective, set as a guard for the president, to strike the assassin in the face, though the blow came too late to stop the murderous

assault. Uncontrollable anger at being frustrated in the object of his employment would be enough to account for him. Even the powerful Negro who seized the frail assassin after the shot, and would have mangled him to death but for police interference, is not to be condemned for the savage act. His lawless impulse may be attributed to the unwonted and overpowering excitement of the moment. Things like these are within the category of panic, and panic knows no law. But they are temporary outbursts, which, as a rule, speedily give way to better emotions.

These manifestations need give no one concern for the future of the republic. Not so, however, with much that has happened since. Christian preachers have intimated that they would welcome lynch law. Reputable citizens have coolly urged criminal acts against prisoners charged with crime and argue that our institutions allow too much liberty. One distinguished senator has given an interview to the press saturated with the spirit of lawlessness, and other public men have imitated him. Enactments of laws modeled after the infamous alien and sedition laws of a century ago are deliberately advised. The newspapers, instead of trying to calm popular excitement, to hold possible mobs in check, to foster a law-abiding and orderly public spirit, have, with a few honorable exceptions, endeavored to fan every spark of popular indignation into a flame of lawlessness. Instead of demanding that all the safeguards with which the law defends liberty and shields innocence be observed, they applaud the police and spur them on when in a futile search for mythical accomplices of the assassin the police contemptuous-

ly ignore these safeguards. The police have made domiciliary visits; they have seized persons and papers without warrant; they have subjected prisoners to secret cross-examination after the manner of "courts of first instance" in continental Europe, but without the protection which those courts throw around the innocent. Beyond this official lawlessness, cabinet officers and congressmen, forgetful of the historic motives for limiting treason to making war upon the republic, are gravely proposing to include assaults upon the president among acts of treason; and even the cabinet is reported to have agreed upon measures to be pressed upon congress, which, if enacted, would dangerously augment the central power. For those reactionary measures also the press is raising a hue and cry. These are things which make one wonder if popular fears may indeed be played upon to the extent of causing the American people to throw away what has been gained for freedom during centuries of heroic struggle.

If this un-American behavior were but an impulsive expression of true patriotic sentiment, if it were only a temporarily distorted manifestation of affection for the spirit of liberty under law that we have been trying for more than a century to foster in this country, then it might be encouraging. In that case, abhorrent as it would still be to all sanely patriotic minds, we should know that the old affection for the American ideals is still alive, even though for the moment they are discarded. But no such interpretation is possible. The best possible interpretation is that it is inspired directly or indirectly by personal or partisan affection for Mr. McKinley as an individual. Lower mo-

tives intermingle. That is the best one. We shall study in vain such manifestations of excitement as have occurred and such preventive and punitive legislation as has been proposed, to find even a sickly germ of affection for the democratic institutions of our republic.

There is in all this something peculiarly sad to Americans who, descended from revolutionary patriots, have inherited the democratic spirit of the revolution. They do not regard this republic as perfect. But they do regard it as the beginning of what has every possibility of becoming as perfect a republic as man is capable of developing. It is with no lightness of heart, therefore, that they reflect upon attempts on the one hand at assassinating their chief public servant, and observe upon the other a foreboding tendency to stamp out such crimes by turning the republic into a despotism. They cannot view with satisfaction the disposition to wreak ignoble vengeance upon the assassin, rather than subject him with dignity to the processes and penalties of regularly administered law; they cannot remain silent while policemen display contempt for laws they are appointed to execute, especially when the public tolerates this most dangerous species of anarchy; they cannot but deplore the apparent willingness of a large class of their fellow citizens to discard the safeguards of liberty for which their fathers fought. If it be true, as some say, that foreigners who have not learned our theory of government take advantage of its exceptional freedom to plot assassination, it is also true that Americans who have forgotten our theory of government are urging us on, not vainly either, to the acceptance of European models which our fathers cast away.

Let us not be deceived to the undoing of our republic, by appeals to rabid emotion. Let us consider the situation with sane minds. The question which the attempt upon Presi-

dent McKinley's life should bring home to everyone is not how to protect presidents' lives especially, but how to protect human life. It is human life, not the lives of public men merely, that we of this country hold sacred. "How can we make life inviolate?" asked Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, at a labor meeting in New York last Saturday, alluding to the assault upon Mr. McKinley. His own answer to this incisive question was: "By cultivating in the community a sense of the sacredness of life, not only in the white house, but also in the mines and mills." One voice interrupted him with a cry of "Shame!" That must have been the voice either of a destructive anarchist or a monarchist. Destructive anarchists might object to Mr. Bigelow's sentiment, because respect for all human life would be a deterrent to the assassination of rulers; monarchists might object because in their estimation workers in mines and mills are men of inferior blood. But clearly the only guarantee of safety to public servants is, as Mr. Bigelow said, universal recognition of the sanctity of all human life, the lives of the humble as well as the lives of the great. So long as human life in mine and mill, in tenement and slum, is cheaply held, to the end that a privileged few may revel in luxuries they do not produce, so long will victims of this injustice breed insane lusts for revengeful murder. But more than that and beyond that. So long as war is advocated by men in high places as a desirable mode of discipline for a strenuous national life, and the masses of men are looked upon as food providentially provided for powder, so long will conspicuous characters be shining marks for the assassin. In a moral atmosphere, redolent of blood and foul with the miasma of death, the unbalanced minds of strenuous lunatics naturally foster a passion for the blood of rulers. The only preventive of tragedies such as that at Buffalo is the one which Mr. Bigelow recommends. Instead of cultivating a privileged leisure class

at the expense of a working class plundered to the door of death, instead of cultivating a national strenuous life at the expense of a grim procession of individual lives marching through pools of blood to kill and be killed—instead of these violations of all that is holy in our religions and all that is truly noble in our national ideals, let us take Mr. Bigelow's advice and cultivate in the community a sense of the sacredness of all human life.

Yet there was more involved in this attempted assassination than the taking of an individual life from individual malice. Mr. McKinley was shot because he was president, by a man who had conceived the possibility of thereby assailing the republic. For that reason the assault becomes a matter of political concern to everyone who believes in our republican institutions. It is in this sense that the murderous assault upon Mr. McKinley is a public calamity. Not because he is a better president than we have ever had. That isn't true. Not because he is an exceptionally good man. There are many men as good as he. Not because the place he holds cannot be filled by another. It can be and will be over and over again. These are not the reasons. What makes the assault a public calamity, and all that can make it so, except as every murder is a public calamity, is the fact that it is in the nature of an attack upon republican government.

But such attacks cannot be guarded against. Neither can they in themselves menace the republic. Assassinations of public servants from political motives can no more overturn a government of the people than assassination of private citizens from private malice can. Both are to be deplored. Both kinds of assassins, together with their abettors, must be punished. But no more in the one case than in the other can arbitrary measures for their prevention be even partially effectual without producing

greater evils than they are designed to cure. If we are to have Russian security for our officials, we must establish Russian absolutism. Even then the assassin will now and again accomplish his end. Simplicity of life and confidence in the public are better armor for American officials against assassination than Russian methods. It is true that Lincoln trusted to these and was murdered. But that was at a time of fierce passions, when even a Russian bodyguard might not have saved him. It is true also that Garfield trusted himself in like manner. But he was killed by a maniac. Harrison was absolutely confiding, surrounding himself with no guard, traveling as unostentatiously as a private citizen, declaring that no one would hurt him but a madman, and that no possible precaution could avert that danger, and not a hand was raised against him. But President McKinley, protected by a double line of soldiers forming a lane through which the people passed to greet him, and guarded by two secret service officers close at hand, falls a victim to an assassin's pistol. What else can be done but lawfully to punish the offender and his accessories, if by lawful means it can be proved that he had accessories? Nothing more, unless we follow the dangerous advice of evil counselors and imitate the autocratic example of Germany and Russia.

Just here is the greatest menace of destructive anarchy. It is the danger that the popular fears it excites may cause the people to tolerate what is nominally for "the suppression of anarchy," but which in fact, be it so intended or not, will abolish traditional safeguards of liberty and open the way to that imperialistic era at home which our crown colony venture abroad has foreshadowed. Even now it is reported from Washington that Attorney General Knox is preparing a bill to be recommended to congress next winter, and of course pushed through if possible, making conspiracies against a president,

wherever committed, triable and punishable by the federal courts. The distinguished correspondent, Mr. Wellman, who tells his paper about this measure, describes it as one that—

will not be a statute of lese majesty, but it will be the republican counterpart thereof, in so far as our constitution and form of government will permit.

This is but an indication of the assaults upon the underlying principles of our government that will be quickly made if popular fears of anarchists can be effectually played upon.

It ought to be evident to well-balanced men that the schemes proposed for "crushing anarchy" cannot crush what those who propose these schemes profess to fear. Nothing in the way of penalties can prevent one man from killing another, if he determines to do it and is willing to die himself. Such a man cannot be intimidated by penalties. Nor can anything restrain madmen. All that laws for the "suppression" of anarchy can accomplish is to interfere with the legitimate activities of persons who are not assassins, and have nothing in common with them.

It would be both misleading and unjust to close this discussion without a word for the brighter side. The question before us fortunately does not present a choice between one kind of anarchy threatening the lives of public servants and a second kind of anarchy threatening the liberties of the republic. There is another and hopeful alternative. A wholesome sentiment is plainly observable which appears to be gaining headway. If some preachers have made advances toward lynch law, others stand firmly for liberty and order. If some prominent citizens would make the calamity the opportunity for a stride backward toward the despotism from which we have emerged, others with clearer vision and steadier purpose warn us gravely and wisely to maintain our institutions and preserve our liberties. If some newspapers riotously raise a hue and

cry, inflaming public passion and disturbing orderly procedure, there are others that strike a different and more cheering note. In the latter category, in Chicago alone, there are three at least—two of them Republican and one Democratic—the Evening Post, the Record-Herald and the Chronicle. As an illustration of this better spirit, here is an extract from an editorial in the Post of the 11th:

Every enlightened citizen should urge, above all things, scrupulous obedience to the law on the part of its official guardians. There should be no manufacturing of evidence, no straining of statutes, no violation of the letter or spirit of the fundamental principles of American justice, American liberty and American jurisprudence. Let our practice conform to our preaching. Hysteria and intemperance of speech on the part of public men lead to disregard by the authorities of the very safeguards which protect our form of government from violence and successful attack. We must do justice justly, and beware of committing the folly of combating lawlessness in a lawless way.

So long as there is even a minority sentiment so sound, so sane, so reasonable as that, a sentiment so keenly sensitive to the vital principles of American polity, we need have no more than a passing fear of anarchy of any kind—be it the destructive form of anarchy that would assassinate public servants, or the worse form of anarchy that would assassinate public liberty.

The equitable taxation movement shows growing signs of vitality in the Democratic party every here and there throughout the country. One of the best of the party platforms on this subject is that of the Democracy of Union county, Pa., reported on the 26th by a committee of which L. F. Lybarger was chairman. The taxation plank of the platform is a model:

We favor the old democratic doctrine announced by Jefferson of "Equal rights for all, special privileges for none," and therefore we favor the abolition of all laws granting special privileges either to private individuals or public corporations. We favor the taxation of all corporations upon the basis of their full franchise value, thus placing them upon a par with all other forms of property, and greatly reduc-

ing the burden of taxation now resting almost wholly upon farming and laboring classes.

Just as the Democratic party shows a steady advance in the direction of equitable taxation, so does the Republican party, under plutocratic guidance, the more clearly disclose its purpose of backing the tax dodging corporations in their policy of throwing unequal burdens upon home owners and farmers. This purpose was exhibited by the state board of equalization of Ohio, all Republicans, when Mayor Johnson appeared before it last week to urge an increase in the valuation of the railroad property of that state. Our readers will recall Mayor Johnson's experience before the boards of county auditors, commented upon at pages 83, 100, and 115. His fight turned upon the refusal of the auditors to assess railroad property at as large a proportion of market value as residence and farm property is assessed at. The latter is assessed at about 60 per cent., while the former is put at only 10 or 15 per cent. Consequently residence and farm properties pay something like treble the taxes of railroad property, value for value. The county auditors, whether influenced by the railroad passes and privileges they receive, or other motives, made only slight changes in railroad valuations; and Mayor Johnson, supported by the League of Ohio Municipalities, consequently carried the matter before the state board, composed of State Auditor Guilbert, State Treasurer Cameron, Attorney General Sheets, and Railroad Commissioner Morris. A hearing was accorded on the 5th, the reports of which make interesting reading.

The animus of the board appeared from the start. One of its members, the state treasurer, was indiscreet enough to give expression to it. "What is the gentleman's name?" he asked, with a sneering assumption of ignorance, as Mayor Johnson took his seat after explaining the manner

in which the League had decided to be represented. "My name is Johnson," replied the mayor of Cleveland, good humoredly; "what is your name?" The state treasurer flushed as he answered: "Cameron." "Indeed," said Johnson, smiling suavely, "I am glad to meet you." While Mayor Johnson and his coadjutors were trying to get the board to indicate the time they would give to the hearing, the board declared that time was precious. But after the hearing, in which the railroad attorneys refused to participate, it discovered that time was not so pressing after all, and appointed the 14th for their accommodation. Mayor Johnson announced that he also would attend on that occasion.

The hearing proceeded. Newton D. Baker, attorney for the city equalization board of Cleveland, opened with a discussion of the legal aspects of the question involved, and was followed by Prof. Edward W. Bemis with a presentation of the facts. Prof. Bemis showed that the railroads of Ohio are appraised for taxation at less than \$117,000,000, or only 22.14 per cent. of their value for purposes of sale; while farms, city real estate and ordinary manufacturers and merchants are assessed on the average at about three times as much, in proportion to the value of their property. His brief is a compact digest of the values of the railroads in Ohio, and of the court decisions on the question of taxing those values. After citing the state constitution and statutes bearing upon this point, the brief proceeds:

From these considerations it is clear that it is the duty of the boards of auditors to appraise the properties of railroad companies at their true value in money, and that if these boards fail to perform, or err in the performance of this duty, the state board has ample powers and is in duty bound to act and to correct the local returns until the true value in money of all such property appears upon the duplicate. The true value in money of property is the price for which it will sell in an open and unexcited market. The price for which a railroad will sell is not

the estimated price of its rails, ties, roadbed and equipment separated and considered apart from their use, any more than the price of a house is the price obtainable for its several parts—its brick, mortar, wood, etc.—if taken away and sold; but is the aggregate market worth of the property as a going concern—as a railroad, not as a scrap heap. Our supreme court has decided that ties, rails, etc., when put to such use cease to be mere ties and rails and become a railroad. It is therefore a plain fraud upon the constitution and statutes of the state to disintegrate into worthless constituents a valuable property for purposes of taxation, and it is the duty of the auditors and of this board not to be misled into the commission of such a wrong. It may be urged that taxation of the selling price of the entire property would be a taxation of its franchises or good will and that "franchises" are not taxable in Ohio. The franchise to be a body corporate is not taxable, but the value which property derives from its use, from being in a certain place at a certain time, from its relation to other property, is in reality its entire value and no sound distinction can be made between the physical property and its time and place and use elements. Many cases arise in which the value of property is difficult of determination by mere inspection and estimate; the constituent elements of a railroad are not in the market; but the railroad as a whole is in the market and has a readily ascertainable real value in money. Its debts, represented by bonds and floating indebtedness, together with the market value of its stocks, represent accurately the exact price necessary to buy a minority holding, which always costs less than a controlling interest. Taking the market value of minority shares protects the property from overvaluation from competition for control or other market disturbance.

Inasmuch as the state board had indicated doubt as to its legal power to raise the grand total of railroad valuations as fixed by the county auditors, Prof. Bemis called attention to its own records:

In 1895 you increased the total \$3,500; in 1896, \$31,535; in 1897, 3,428; in 1898, \$3,700; in 1899, \$3,000, and in 1900, \$3,000. Of course, these amounts are not large, but they serve to show that in the past you have not been frightened about going above the grand total of the appraisements as made by the county auditors.

Mayor Johnson followed Prof. Bemis and closed the hearing. He dismissed constitutional questions by

referring them to the lawyers, saying he was there—

to complain because the boards of county auditors have failed in the performance of their sworn duties and thereby robbed not only the counties in which are located the large cities but those in which our rural brethren live as well.

"Perhaps the county auditors didn't know any better," interrupted the attorney general, jocosely; and Mayor Johnson took advantage of the interruption to retort:

Perhaps they didn't, but those who met at Cleveland could not offer such an excuse. We told them better and we didn't ask them to take our word for it, either. We asked them to call in the railroad officials and demand their books and see for themselves, and we ask this board to do the same. We do not ask you to accept our statement alone. We have pointed out the facts and have told you how you can find them for yourselves. I think the boards of county auditors are composed very much like other public bodies. Some of the men are honest, some are fools and rascals. I do not know of a public body that is constituted otherwise, from the senate of the United States down.

The Cleveland mayor then went on to outline the obstacles that taxing officials, for the protection of railroad interests, were throwing in the way not merely of equitable but of legal taxation:

When at Cleveland before the eight boards of auditors we asked them to appraise the railroads at 60 per cent. of their true value in money, they said to us: "Why do you ask us to do that when the other railroads in the state are not assessed that way? Why do you not go before the state board at Columbus and ask it to assess all roads alike?" I answered them: "Gentlemen, I recognize the merit of your claim that all railroad property should be assessed on the same basis, and I intend to go before the state board and demand that it be done. But what I ask of you is that you do your duty and assess the roads now before you at 60 per cent. of their true value."

Now suppose this board refuses to equalize these appraisements by assessing all the roads at 60 per cent. of their true value in money, what remedy have the people? None. If you do not do your duty there is no higher body to which the people can appeal. But that is not true of the railroads. If you exceed your powers by the fraction of an inch the railroads will at once appeal to the courts and have it corrected. The supreme court will

undo any illegal act that you may do, but it will not do any legal act which you should have done. I do not know what you will do, but I do know that there will come a time when the people will find a way of making the great steam railroad and other corporations pay their just share of the burden of taxation.

Mayor Johnson's last words must have stung, as they were doubtless intended to, not because the words themselves were harsh, but because they disclosed a fact which might account for the peculiar behavior during the hearing, of part of the board. He said:

The big corporations get all the benefits of the present methods of assessments. How? By influencing auditors, by influencing legislators, by influencing courts and by influencing elections. Let us take off the mask and be frank with each other. I say that no auditor or other official who has a railroad pass in his pocket or accepts other favors from these corporations is a fit man to say how much of the tax burden they shall pay. Some men may be above these influences, but I doubt it. Why, gentlemen, this business of extending favors to public officials has even gone so far as to extend to your august body. Two of you accepted an invitation of a certain railroad official to take a long trip in a private car to California. I hope it did not influence you.

The report from which we quote simply but significantly observes that after Mayor Johnson resumed his seat, "for a few moments there was absolute quiet, everyone present expecting that some one on the board would challenge the mayor for an explanation." But no challenge came.

Whoever appreciates the fact, now clearly demonstrated, that Mayor Johnson is giving the country an object lesson in thorough and honest administration, without corrupt politics, and democratic in the best sense of the word, will be glad to know that he returned from his mission before the state auditors to win a complete victory for clean and genuine democracy at his county convention. Usually, when it is reported that a party convention adopts the administration slate, the public understand

rightly that machine politics has won another victory. But not so in this case. A faction of the party in Cleveland had organized to embarrass Johnson, and local report had it that street car money was behind the movement. At one stage, this opposition felt strong enough to propose a compromise, offering to fall into line if Johnson would allow its leaders to name three out of the ten candidates for legislative representatives. But objectionable men upon the ticket, even two or three, was feared by Johnson more than anything else; and he bluntly replied to the opposing faction that if they could nominate three candidates he preferred they should nominate all. The result is that a ticket of extraordinary cleanliness throughout was chosen last Saturday by majorities so large as to make the nominations almost unanimous.

The platform adopted by the convention is worth noting as another instance of the advances genuine democracy is making. It demands public sessions of assessing boards, the assessment of railroads at their "salable value as going concerns," the separation of state and local revenues, and public reports from public service corporations to the end that the value of their privileges may be known; renewal of franchises without a referendum is opposed; acceptance of free passes by public officials is declared to be cause for removal; municipal home rule as to bond issues, franchises and taxation is demanded; and government by injunction and denial of peaceable persuasion by pickets in strikes are denounced. The platform begins with this declaration:

The equalization of the burdens of taxation and the preservation of local self-government are the paramount issues of this campaign. We believe that the first duty of our legislators is to destroy legalized privileges and to secure to the people affected the control of their own affairs; that the first duty of our executive officers is faithfully to execute all the laws in the interest of all the people.

Chicago is somewhat excited over the question of supplying school children with school books free. That question was settled in New York more than a generation ago, and settled sensibly. It was there assumed that free school books and free schools go together. Under circumstances that make it right to maintain a free public school system, it must be right to furnish free school books. It is quite conceivable that in a free state of society, where every man's income was in proportion to his earnings, free schools would be abandoned. But under existing conditions we not only need free schools but we have them. In these circumstances the question of free books raises no minor issue. It raises the issue of the free school system itself. Granted that free schools should be maintained by general taxation, and free school books follow as a matter of course. They are a logical if not essential part of the system.

Mr. Bryan has been thoughtlessly criticised for saying in a labor day speech that "each decade in our history shows greater production of wealth, and the men who produce it have less to show for it." The criticisms are based upon statistics of increasing wages and diminishing cost of living. But Mr. Bryan is right. Statistics of wages are utterly misleading. The wages referred to are usually day wages or week wages. When computed into yearly wages, they are vitiated by inability, or at any rate neglect, to get at an average which fairly includes the unemployed. If, therefore, slack employment has increased, wages in general might be less though these defective statistics of wages showed a gain. But it is evident, without reference to statistics, that the condition of the working class has declined; and this, after all, is the essence of Mr. Bryan's indictment of economic conditions.

In the first place, the lowest grades of laborers are worse off than they used to be except as charity has come

in to help them. In the next place, the cost of living now is not comparable with the cost of living formerly, merely upon the basis of the prices of staples, which is the basis upon which statistics of the cost of living rest. When clothing and other necessaries were made at home, costing nothing in money except for the materials and next to nothing for them, a low rate of wages yielded a better living than higher wages would yield now, when nearly all necessaries must be bought. In the third place, there has been a great extension in the catalogue of necessaries. In the past, men could live self-respecting lives with a range of supplies which in these days would mark them as almost paupers. The single item of street car fare, caused by the necessity of living at a distance from working place and supply stores, adds not less than \$25, and probably \$50 a year to the living expenses of working class families. Living expenses, therefore, have been increased by the necessity for buying some things formerly made by the family and other things that formerly were unknown; but the statistics of living expenses take no account of these important changes. Could they be statistically measured, the relation of wages to living expenses would not look as pretty in the government reports as they do.

But the chief consideration is yet to mention. Suppose we admit, as we are far from doing, except for the argument, that Mr. Bryan was wrong if he meant that workingmen get a poorer living absolutely than they used to get. Even then he was not wrong if he meant that they get a poorer living relatively—a smaller proportion of what they produce. In half a century productive power has increased enormously. In many vocations one man can accomplish more now than 100 could then. It would be a conservative estimate to say of the aggregate of labor that it is five times as productive as it was in the middle of the last century. Yet who would dare venture the assertion

that workingmen, as such, are five times, or four times, or three times, or even twice as well off as they were 50 years ago. The point of Mr. Bryan's remark is that those who do the work of the world are plundered; and that point is proved when it appears, as to every observant man it must appear, that wages do not advance in proportion to advances in labor power.

### ANARCHISM.

The assault upon President McKinley by an assassin who avows himself an anarchist, and proclaims that his murderous act was a duty, once more directs attention to the subject of anarchism.

Of anarchists there are various schools or parties. They differ all the way from conspirators and revolutionists to men of Quaker-like principles and practices. To suspect all anarchists, therefore, of complicity in assassination because one has committed the crime, is like suspecting every Christian of believing in transubstantiation because Catholics do, or in immersive baptism because Baptists do, or in predestination because Presbyterians do, or in the non-existence of disease because Christian Scientists do.

One school of anarchists is simply what the name implies—extreme individualists. They believe that government is bad, because it interferes with equal freedom. But to abolish government by assassinating rulers is as far from their thoughts as the abolition of war by assassinating generals would be to a Quaker. They depend upon education in their philosophy, and upon the development of thought, for the triumph of their theories. The distinguishing characteristic of this school is its absolute reliance upon the efficiency, for the maintenance of order and the equitable adjustment of social relations, of the natural law of competition.

Another school is that of the communist-anarchist. All the schools except that mentioned above, might be classed as sub-groups of this one, the classification depending less upon di-

versity as to principle than upon disagreement as to practical methods. Communist-anarchists resemble socialists in rejecting or proposing to abolish the law of competition, but they are repelled from socialism by its governmentalism. They would have government, but not coercive government. Their system is, as its name implies, individualism modified by communism. Prince Krapotkin, whose views we considered last spring (p. 36), is a famous apostle of communist-anarchism.

That there are adherents of this school who advocate physical force, including assassination, is doubtless true. But that policy is no more a characteristic of the school than it is of the Republican party, some of whose members in Kentucky murdered Goebel, and whose governor of Indiana made an asylum for one of the indicted persons.

It is a policy, however, which subjects anarchists of the peaceable sort to serious misconception and grave danger. Not only are they liable to be prosecuted as accomplices of revolutionary anarchists, with whom they are in agreement upon philosophical principles but whose practical methods they reject; they are in even greater danger of being victimized by detectives masquerading as anarchists. It is an old detective trick to join suspected conspirators and urge violence with a view to disclosing their lawless character and fixing guilt upon individual members. With shrewd men, or men of clear convictions and strong individuality who oppose violence, the trick fails. But weak or enthusiastic men, though they have no sympathy with violence, are easily led into good-naturedly assenting to almost any abstract proposition made by a "comrade," even if he be a man they wish in future to avoid. Very much of the police information about anarchists has, we suspect, been obtained in this way.

We believe the truth to be that there are very few anarchists in this country who expect to resort to violence against American public servants, or who either directly or indirectly advocate such violence. There may be more who believe that a violent revo-

lution will come in time, even here; but this is not a programme with them, it is a prophecy. There are many who talk loosely, but their speeches would attract no more attention than the speeches of any other stump speaker, if their ideas were not already labeled "dangerous." But with that label the Lord's prayer or the declaration of independence, repeated by them, has a sanguinary sound to the ignorant.

There are also some weak-minded characters in the anarchist movement who think that these speeches inspire them to commit murder. Mr. McKinley's assailant appears to be one of that kind. He traces his murderous impulse to a speech by Emma Goldman. But the speech he refers to appears, as now published, to furnish no reason for suspecting Miss Goldman of being his instigator. So far from advocating violence in this speech, she expressly declared against it. She did refuse to condemn those who resort to violence, and she expressed sympathy with several who had done so; but our criminal law would have to be badly twisted to make her responsible, on the basis of those utterances, for the attack, four months later, upon President McKinley. According to a special dispatch from Cleveland to the Chicago Tribune, published on the 8th, Miss Goldman could not have said much to incite to assassination; for, as that dispatch read, "during Miss Goldman's address a strong detail of police was in the hall to keep her from uttering sentiments which were regarded as too radical." This intrusion of arbitrary power in police uniform at a lecture might very much more easily have incited a man like Czolgosz to commit his crime, than anything Miss Goldman is reported to have said.

The reckless speeches of anarchist orators are, as we believe, best left alone. We believe this because there are worse things than speeches advocating violence, and one of them is a public policy which turns policemen into censors of public speaking. We believe it also because speeches urging violence react, if left alone, upon those who make them, and if they fairly

represent a cause, upon the cause itself. We believe it also because we do not believe that assassins are ever really instigated by violent speeches, unless they are insane; and that if insane they are just as liable to be instigated by a temperance speech or a chapter from the old testament. No public speaker would be safe if any murderer might implicate him in the crime by asserting that he received the murderous impulse from a speech of his.

It is needless for us to say that we have no sympathy with the physical force idea in this country. There are countries where public opinion is kept in ignorance and subjection, and where, consequently, physical force and terrorism of officials are excusable though exceedingly ineffective methods of agitation. But in this country press and platform are as a whole entirely free, so that the people can be educated along any lines that interest them. The right of anarchists to use these means for spreading a knowledge of their theories of civilization without government has been and must be maintained. This right can be safely taken from nobody who seeks the public ear. And if anarchists succeed in converting a majority of the people to their views, the ballot offers an adequate, even if crude, method of putting them into practice. Crude as it is, it is a better method than terrorism, better than assassination or violence of any kind, better even than passive non-conformity. With facilities like these there is no warrant for violence, no need for conspiracies, no excuse for speeches suggesting or applauding violence, no reason whatever for that playing at revolutionist in which some anarchists find a species of satisfaction. Not only is there no excuse, but such conduct is calculated to excite a popular frenzy, which, when some one shoots down a prominent man, may engulf not only the slayer, but those also who have played at conspiracy, and even better men who have not.

It behooves the peaceable anarchists of this country, if they insist upon using a name that is associated in the public mind with the idea of cowardly assassination, to break off all organic

relations with physical force anarchists, and not only to disclaim but to denounce assassination as a method of advancing their cause. On the other hand, it behooves people who are not anarchists to learn the difference between men who murder and teach murder and men who by peaceable methods propagate the political doctrine of individualism.

## NEWS

A vast concourse of people at the Buffalo exposition on the 6th were frenzied by an attempt upon the life of President McKinley. As the shocking news ran over the wires, the whole country shared for the moment in this feeling. But bulletins from the president's bedside soon encouraged hopes of his recovery; and as hope ripened into confidence, the fury that at first threatened to possess the people gave way to the sober second thought. Many newspapers and some policemen, seconded by politicians of a certain type, have endeavored to keep up the unwholesome excitement; but upon the whole the public mind is singularly calm.

The deplorable event occurred in the Temple of Music at the exposition. President McKinley was holding a reception. In this music temple were 3,000 persons, while 10,000 were pressing at the entrance for admission. A passage had been formed by two parallel lines of soldiers, through which the public passed, shaking the president's hand as they went by him. In this line was an obscure man, Leon Czolgosz (Tshawlgosts), who is now notorious the world over. His right hand was covered with a handkerchief as if it had been wounded. In fact it concealed a derringer pistol. Czolgosz came into the president's vicinity at about four o'clock in the afternoon. As he reached out with his left hand, apparently for the purpose of shaking the president's outstretched right, he fired upon the president twice, through the handkerchief that concealed his weapon. One bullet struck the president on the upper portion of the breast bone. It did not penetrate, but glanced off. The other penetrated the abdomen, five inches below the left nipple and an inch and a half to the left of the median line. It passed through the

stomach, and found lodgment in the muscles of the back, where it still remains and probably always will, the surgeons having decided to make no effort to extract it.

The president sank into the arms of friends and was speedily carried to the emergency hospital, where distinguished surgeons operated upon him. They opened the body through the line of the bullet wound, closed the perforation of the front wall of the stomach with silk stitches, bound and closed the perforation of the back wall in the same way, and searched without success for the further course of the bullet. No injury to the intestines or any other abdominal organ was discovered. Such is the substance of the public statement made during the evening of the 6th by Mr. Cortelyou, the secretary to the president. Since then Mr. McKinley's condition has steadily improved, and he is now considered out of danger.

As the shots reverberated through the great music hall, a secret service officer, who stood directly opposite the president, struck Czolgosz, hurling him to the floor, while another seized the assassin's hand and took away his pistol. As Czolgosz fell, a large Negro, the next person in line, threw himself upon him and would have mangled him to death had he not been rescued by some of the soldiers. When finally arrested the assassin gave the name of Nieman (German for no man), and explaining his crime said he was an anarchist and had done his duty. During the arrangements to remove him, lynching cries were raised in the crowd, and the carriage in which he rode was violently attacked by mobs. But some of the Buffalo police and the detachment of soldiers, to whom alike special credit is due for their intelligent efforts at the critical moment to perform their duty in a lawful manner, succeeded in carrying him safely to police headquarters, where he is still confined. Czolgosz has proved to be of American birth and a resident of Cleveland. He is about 27 years of age.

Immediately after the commission of Czolgosz's crime, the police of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and other cities became active and sensational, as well as somewhat lawless, in what they describe as "rounding up anarchists." They were especially vigorous in Chicago, where serious

charges of corruption overhang them. Capt. Colleran, with a squad of five officers, went on the evening of the crime to the house of Abraham Isaak, the publisher of a communist-anarchist paper, and a friend and disciple of Prince Krapotkin. The paper is called Free Society. It has come to our office as an exchange for several months, and has seemed to be a perfectly legitimate publication, advocating individualistic and communistic principles of society and government in a reasonable manner, and in no way encouraging lawless methods. As no lawless quotations from its columns have yet been given out by the police, it may be fairly inferred that the paper is not a lawless publication. Arriving at Mr. Isaak's house on the evening in question, the police broke in, and, without a warrant, arrested eight persons besides himself, including his wife and young daughter. Also without a warrant, they searched his house and seized his papers. The prisoners were locked up at the police station and subjected to what is known as the "sweat box" examination. Warrants for the prisoners' detention were obtained on the 7th, and a hearing has been set for the 19th. The women prisoners have since been unconditionally released; but the others are still held without the privilege of giving bail, and upon that ground writs of habeas corpus have been issued in their behalf, returnable on the 13th.

At the "sweat box" examination Isaak told in substance the following story, as reported by the daily press:

It is possible that I may have met Czolgosz. There was a man I met July 12, the night Emma Goldman left Chicago. I had never seen him or spoken to him before, but he came to me and said his name was Czlosz. I suppose he spelled it that way, though it might have been Schloss, for all I know of the spelling. I went to the Rock Island station to see Miss Goldman depart, and she said to me: "There is a man there who wants to talk with you." The man had spoken to her after her last lecture just before she left our home, and had come down to the city with her. He took me aside and asked about our secret meetings. He did not go away with Miss Goldman, but rode home with me on the elevated train, riding inside while I stood on the platform. When we got home he came into my house, remaining about ten minutes. He repeated his questions about our secret meetings, and wanted to know how to join. He said he was tired of theory, and was anxious



to do something active. He asked me if we would provide him means. I told him we would help him to get work, but would not give him money. Then I took him to Esther Wolfson's lodging-house and paid for a room for him. I asked him to breakfast, but he did not come, and I never saw him again. I thought the man was a spy. He talked too violently. Then his question about secret societies showed he was not a true anarchist. We have no secret societies. All our meetings are public. If he had come to breakfast I would have had my friends there, and would have searched him thoroughly to see if he was square. We fear spies because there are lots of them, and they try to stir us up to violence that we don't want, in order to betray us. They always talk about secret societies. I feared the man, and despised him. If he was as I thought, and as he has turned out to be, if he is the assassin, he was the kind of a man I wanted nothing to do with. I did not sympathize with him. I do not believe Czolgosz is an anarchist, or if he is he is a crazy one. I would not help him in any way. If he was sane, he took his chances, knew the penalty and will not ask help. I am an anarchist. I am for a campaign of education, not of violence, though. Assassination is not our way. We are fighting the system. If he had assassinated the czar I would have had sympathy with him. I sympathized with the man who killed King Humbert. There is tyranny in those countries. There is tyranny here, but the president is not necessarily a tyrant. He is like many other men—no better, no worse. Are our views responsible for this crime? Would you call the republican party responsible for the assassination of Goebel?

After Czolgosz, the assassin, had been secured, he attributed his murderous impulse to a speech he had heard in Cleveland, delivered three or four months ago, by Emma Goldman. For this reason efforts to arrest Miss Goldman were promptly made. They resulted successfully on the 10th, when she was apprehended in Chicago. When she appeared before the chief of police, Mr. O'Neill, he offered his hand, but she refused to take it, saying: "If you were at your home, chief, I would not object to shaking hands with you, but I can't shake hands with a police officer officially." She also was put through the "sweat box" process. Her statement, as printed in the Chicago papers, was in substance, so far as it relates to her views and her possible complicity in Czolgosz's crime, as follows:

Czolgosz is not my disciple. I don't

believe he ever said he got his inspiration to kill the president from my lectures. "I never talked in favor of violence. I never advised anyone nor encouraged anyone, even in a general way, to kill or assassinate anyone. Anarchists don't do such things." If he heard my lecture in Cleveland it "must have been my lecture of May 6, for I have lectured there only twice this year. You can get a copy of the lecture and see for yourself whether it encourages violence. The subject was 'Modern Phases of Anarchy,' and the whole object was to show that anarchy is a philosophy of life, to be attained practically by education. It showed how the recent anarchy is all opposed to violence. That was a great point in the lecture." I don't know Czolgosz at all. I probably saw him the night of July 12, when I was leaving Chicago. We were having a little supper at Isaak's house that evening, when some one came to the door and asked for Isaak. He was not in, and I was called to the door. I told the man that we were going to meet Isaak at the railway station, and that he could go down with us. At the depot I asked him how he got Isaak's name. He said he was a subscriber to Free Society, and that he also knew me. I asked how he knew me, and he said he had heard me lecture at Cleveland. When Isaak came I pointed him out to the man, and had no further talk with him. I did not talk to him five minutes altogether. He did not go East with me. "I have never seen him since, that I know of. Certainly I have never talked to him or recognized him again. I don't know whether I like his crime or not, for I know nothing of his psychology—whether he is crazy or not. I have never talked with him. I can't say whether he is an anarchist or not. He may call himself an anarchist, but that does not mean necessarily that he understands anarchy."

Interrupted by a detective with the declaration that "anarchy and murder are all the same," Miss Goldman vehemently retorted:

"That's not true. Acts of violence have nothing to do with the philosophy of anarchy. Violence is the product of governmental conditions. Government is wholesale murder. It is not strange that some individuals murder, even though they are anarchists. . . . The anarchist is a man. If he is in despair and subject to the conditions that lead to murder, he will kill and slay, but he does it as a man, not as an anarchist. The very fact that Czolgosz approached us asking for help for violence and asking about secret societies, as Isaak tells us, indicates he was no true anarchist. Anarchists have no such societies. They have no secrets. They educate."

Asked if Czolgosz's crime and its ef-

fects meant "the death of anarchy in this country," she replied:

"No, no; you can kill all the anarchists, but you can't kill their idea. The police are making anarchists by their acts toward me and the other prisoners. I was made an anarchist by the treatment of the Haymarket case. Thousands will be made anarchists by this treatment of us. They will make more anarchists than all of the lectures of the anarchists in the country can make. Facts convince."

To the question, "Was the assassination a good thing?" she answered:

I don't know whether it was or not. That is for the man himself to decide.

And specifically asked if she had ever advocated assassination her response was—

Never. How could I say: "Go and kill," when anarchism will not tolerate it, has no secret organizations and is opposed to murder and violence?

She disclaimed all acquaintance with any of the Buffalo anarchists whose names have been mentioned in connection with Czolgosz's crime; and while telling of having lectured in Paterson, N. J., said she did not know that group well, as she is ignorant of Italian. Miss Goldman is 35 years of age. She was born in Russia, the daughter of a tailor, and came to the United States at the age of 16. She lectures extensively, but makes her living as the representative of a supply house the identity of which she refuses to disclose. Seven years ago she served a term of imprisonment in the Blackwell's island penitentiary, New York, on conviction of inciting a riot. While there she studied medicine and became a trained nurse. The hearing in Miss Goldman's case is set for the 19th.

As a result of Czolgosz's crime, some extraordinary doctrines of violence have been preached, and revolutionary demands for change in the fundamental laws and principles of republican government have been made. The Philadelphia Press would apply to anarchists the "rigorous treatment practiced abroad." The presiding elder of the Methodist churches of Washington, preaching in President McKinley's church on the 8th, said in his sermon that the crime had almost converted him into "an advocate of lynch law;" while Dr. T. DeWitt Talmage, preaching on the same day at Ocean Grove, N. J.,

called forth applause from 10,000 church goers by saying in his sermon:

I wish the police at Buffalo who arrested the scoundrel who shot our adored president had taken the butt of the weapon and dashed the man's brains out on the spot.

From Washington on the 8th, Walter Wellman reported that the president's cabinet had agreed upon decisive action, which contemplates the drafting of a bill by the attorney general for submission to congress next winter making assaults upon the president as near like the monarchical crime of "lese majesty" as our constitution and form of government will permit. Congressman Schirm, of Maryland, proposes a constitutional amendment including conspiracies against the life of a president in the category of treason; and in this revolutionary proposal he is seconded by Senator Scott, of West Virginia, Gen. Harrison Gray Otis, of California, and other prominent men besides many newspapers.

The steel strike has been overshadowed this week by the attempted assassination of President McKinley. There appears, however, to be no important change in the situation. At the time of our last week's report it was understood that the National Civic Federation, assisted by Mr. Gompers and other labor leaders, was trying to effect a settlement. These efforts seem to have brought about a session of the general executive board of the Amalgamated association. It met at Pittsburg on the 6th. But it adjourned on the 9th without having come to an agreement with the steel trust. Though its proceedings are not formally disclosed, a statement is published that it directed President Shaffer, with the aid of his immediate advisers, to secure the best possible settlement in the least possible time. But that statement is denied by Mr. Shaffer, who gave out the following interview on the 10th:

There has been no settlement of the strike. That report was evidently started in Wall street for the purpose of boosting stock, and it succeeded. The strike cannot be settled without the Amalgamated association being a party to the settlement. The matter of making a settlement was presented to us, but we could not accept the terms offered with honor to ourselves. The strike now is in the same shape that it was a

week ago, so far as a settlement is concerned.

Mr. Shaffer added a denial that either he or his immediate advisers had been directed or ordered by the national executive board to settle the strike.

Affairs in South America are growing more serious. On the 7th, Dr. Becerra, a former Colombian minister to the United States, telegraphed to the Colombian legation in this country that a Venezuelan fleet was then bombarding La Hacha, a town on the north coast of Colombia not far from the Venezuelan frontier. This is the first open act of war on the part of the Venezuelan government, if the report be true; but later reports attribute the bombardment to Colombian rebels. Nevertheless Venezuela is evidently making preparations for war; and it seems probable, even if the attack upon La Hacha was made by Colombian rebels, that they were landed from Venezuelan vessels. Concurrently with these reports are further reports (see pp. 312, 330) of an invasion of Colombia by troops from Ecuador. Regarding the offer of President McKinley of the kindly offices of this country to adjust the differences between Colombia and Venezuela, noted last week, it is announced that the Colombian government accepts them, but that the Venezuelan government inferentially declines, merely acknowledging the courtesy of the offer.

From the seat of war in South Africa come reports of a British victory. It consists in the capture of an entire Boer command, Lotter's, after a sharp fight south of Petersburg, in the Middleburg region. The Boers lost 19 killed and 52 wounded; and 62 (besides the wounded) were taken prisoners. The British loss was ten killed and eight wounded. Two or three other small conflicts are reported.

The principles involved in this war almost gave rise to a controversy on the 5th in the ecumenical Methodist conference, in session at London. A delegate from Cape Colony spoke approvingly of the British cause. Bishop Hartzell followed him more vigorously in the same strain. A New York delegate thanked God for what Great Britain is doing in Africa. A delegate from Canada capped this climax with an ardent pro-British

speech. He was frequently interrupted by British delegates, one of whom gave warning that if he proceeded he would have to be answered in controversial strain, as he was voicing sentiments by no means shared by many present. At this point the chairman ruled the Canadian delegate out of order. But the matter intruded itself again on the 6th, when a well-known British jingo made a strong speech on the evils of war and the Christian idea of peace. As the applause it called out subsided, a Liverpool radical arose and asked, apropos of this plea for peace, if the Americans present had heard the voice of Christ in the Philippines or if the English had heard it in South Africa. An acrimonious discussion followed, which was terminated by a decision of the chair ruling references to the South African situation out of order.

The conference refused to receive a communication from the archbishop of Canterbury, expressing a hope that some day the Methodists will be united with the Episcopalians. The reason assigned was that the communication had been addressed to a religious paper, and not directly to the conference.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—The Universal Peace conference opened its sessions at Glasgow on the 10th.

—H. O. Armour, the last of the original Armour brothers, died at Saratoga on the 8th, of apoplexy, at the age of 64.

—The Socialist party of Iowa met in convention at Des Moines on the 5th, and nominated James Baxter, of Hiteman, for governor.

—Ruskin colony, of Georgia, the remnant of the original Ruskin colony of Tennessee, was sold out at sheriff's sale on the 7th.

—Dr. Philip Rice, of Milwaukee, returning to that city after residing four years in the Hawaiian islands, claims to have discovered a cure for leprosy.

—Dr. Johannes von Miquel, former Prussian minister of finance, was found dead in his bed at Frankfort-on-the-Main on the 8th. He was 72 years old.

—The national encampment of the G. A. R. is being held in Cleveland. On the 10th the eighty-seventh anniversary of Perry's victory on Lake Erie was celebrated there with a spectacular street demonstration and lake display.

—The chairman of the Democratic

state executive committee of Ohio proposed on the 9th to the chairman of the Republican committee that all political meetings be declared off during the illness of President McKinley. The Republican chairman declined.

—Regular Sunday evening services of "The Church of Man" will begin at the Athenaeum, Chicago, on the 15th, or, as the official circulars announce, "September 15, 126th, U. S. A." Cardinal D. W. Shoudy will deliver an address of welcome, and the pastor, Dr. J. Barr, will explain the objects and principles of the sect.

—Followers of Dowie who went to Evanston on the 10th, met with a reception characteristic of that Chicago suburb. They were bombarded with eggs and unmarketable vegetables by a mob; and although the meeting was not dispersed, six windows of the cars bearing the visitors away from Evanston were broken, and some of the party were injured by missiles.

—Lyman J. Gage, secretary of the treasury, announces as a measure of relief to the stringent money market and to relieve the pressure during the movement of crops, that the government will purchase out of the sinking fund \$20,000,000 worth of bonds of all denominations and issues except the twos, and will place with the banks government deposits of \$5,000,000.

—John J. McCann, who made a long, courageous and useful fight in St. Louis for the abolition of license taxes, as inhibitions on the right to work, even serving a jail sentence rather than pay or allow his friends to pay the fine imposed upon him for carrying on his business of real estate agent without a city license (see vol. iii, pp. 244, 260), died at Eureka Springs, Ark., on the 11th.

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

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000 00
Available cash balance.....	179,971,355 53
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$329,971,355 53</b>
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1901.....	\$326,833,124 02
<b>Increase .....</b>	<b>\$3,138,231 56</b>

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

<b>Receipts:</b>	
Tariff .....	\$42,726,134 40
Internal Revenue.....	50,374,975 31
Miscellaneous .....	4,613,356 72
	<b>\$97,714,465 43</b>
<b>Expense:</b>	
Civil and Misc.....	\$20,416,621 83
War .....	25,308,424 13
Navy .....	11,184,197 07
Indians .....	2,163,979 37
Pensions .....	25,437,164 46
Interest .....	7,118,701 69
	<b>\$91,659,088 55</b>
<b>Surplus .....</b>	<b>\$6,055,376 88</b>

New Resident—I think young Mr. Bower is such a model.

Old Resident—He certainly doesn't work at anything else.

C. E. L.

## MISCELLANY

### A NATION'S FAULT.

With Apologies to Kipling.  
For The Public.

A distinguished army officer, recently returned from the Philippines, said in a newspaper interview that the war had caused the Filipinos in many interior towns to live in a state of barbarism.

"It is our fault, and our very great fault," that war and a tyrant's hand  
Makes life a hell for a people weak, who fight for their fatherland;  
Our fault that the light of burning homes glows red on orient skies,  
And falls on forms of patriot men, who weep with their dying eyes.

It is our fault, and our terrible fault, that widows unnumbered mourn,  
And that famine stalks among children pale, and bony, and sorrow worn.  
Our fault that honor, and truth, and right, by our sword of might are slain,  
And the way that might have been peace and love, is a sad, dark way of pain.

It is our fault, and our terrible fault, that the law of the brute in men,  
The brute of an ancient and far-off time, now lives and controls again;  
That the law of love—'tis the law divine—is trampled within the dust,  
And in none that rule in the lands of earth, can the poor and the weak have trust.

It is our fault, and our terrible fault, for we knew, yet did it not.  
The greater law of God most high, and His judgment, we forgot.  
For "they are beaten with many stripes" who knowing, scorn His way;  
And He who heedeth the sparrow's fall, hears the weak and lowly pray.  
EFFIE E. SPARKS.

### UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL.

Printed from the Original Manuscript.

Dear John: We may never be as close friends as the politicians have it; but we are a bit alike, and I am always ready to give you a plain talk and my views of things we have in common.

Do you have any combines? If you don't you will have; and I noticed the other day that some Chicago packers had got possession of terminals or something, and were keeping Irish and English butchers out of the London market.

You'll have to watch 'em, John! They did it for me. After your butchers are starved out, the rest of you won't notice it much. You'll think it is hard times due to the Boer war or the steel strike. The native butchers themselves will cry out awhile, till they are gone with the sausage; and then all will be quiet.

I am watching an interesting thing here. The politicians have given the combines full string, an' if I don't

miss my guess they are hangin' themselves. You see the fool trusts have put all their heads under one hat. Hit it anywhere, and it hurts 'em all. All the people (all the labor unions for that matter) have to do is to hit it hard enough. If they don't this time, they will. You see before it was like this: If one was tied up the others could run and supply the country, and the tied-up one alone was hurt or busted. Now, tramp on the toe and the head squeals—not right away, perhaps; but when the sensation reaches the head—stocks will tumble. Wait and see!

UNCLE SAM.

### WHAT WOULD ENGLISHMEN DO IN THE BOERS' PLACE?

Editorial in the Manchester (England) Guardian of August 27.

The reply of the Boer generals to our government's last proclamation is what clear-minded persons must have feared. To foresee it one needed only to follow the old rule and put oneself in the other side's place. What, one only had to ask, would Lord Roberts and Lord Kitchener do if they were at the head of an English army still desperately keeping the field against an overwhelmingly powerful invader who had advertised his intention of leaving Englishmen "no shred of independence," who had then laid waste most of the country, picked out and burnt the houses of many English soldiers in the field simply because their owners were soldiers in the field, carried off many thousands of English women and children from their homes and kept them as prisoners in unhealthy camps where an extraordinary proportion of them had died of epidemic disease and exposure—what would Lord Roberts and Lord Kitchener say to a threat that if they held the enemy any longer in check they would be banished from England for life after the war, and their men charged with the expenses of setting some limits to the mortality caused among their wives and children by the enemy's own departure from the practices of honorable warfare? One need not give the answer. Everybody knows it. The question needs merely to be clearly put. But it seems as if our government, bewildered at its failure to crush an enemy whom at every turn it has armed with fresh incentives to desperate courage, were led by some freak of infatuation to do in each new set of circumstances whatever is most certain to prolong the Boer resistance and at the same

time to deepen the note of contempt in the outer world's comments upon our methods in South Africa.

#### PLENTY OF LAW ALREADY.

Probably no great harm will come from the vast amount of ignorant and foolish talk now indulged in by many people who ought to know better in regard to new penalties for anarchists.

The fact that even lawyers in all parts of the country are quoted in favor of defining an attack upon the president as treason; that other lawyers urge military trials; that congressmen and others who should be better informed propose that an *ex post facto* law should be passed covering Czolgosz's case, and the further fact that there is much clamor for immediate action by congress in various directions, all go to show that there is vast public ignorance of the law and the constitution, to say nothing of the nature of our government.

The constitution of the United States defines treason against the United States as levying war against them or in adhering to their enemies or in giving the latter aid and comfort. It also provides that no *ex post facto* law should be passed. Elsewhere it is written that cruel and unusual punishments shall not be inflicted.

There are laws enough in the United States and in every state to punish adequately every attempt against the life of any American citizen, from the highest to the humblest. The only thing that is necessary in the case of Czolgosz is that he shall be indicted, tried, convicted and punished for the crime which he committed. For all this the laws of the state of New York, and of all states, are adequate, except as to the matter of intent.

In his sober moments no intelligent citizen of the United States would undertake to open the way, even by a constitutional amendment, which would be necessary to that end, for wholesale prosecutions on the charge of treason. The history of the race shows the wisdom of the founders of this government in strictly defining the crime of treason.

It has been held for many years that our criminal laws are defective in respect to the punishment to be inflicted upon a man intent upon murder who may not accomplish his purpose. A great deal is to be said in favor of the proposition that an assassin who proceeds to his murderous business with deliberation, and who fails of his object through some fault not his own,

should receive the same penalties that would be inflicted in case death resulted by his act. If the attempt upon the life of the president shall happily prove unsuccessful the fact may induce many of the states to change their laws in this respect.

Deliberate intent to commit murder, whether the victim be the president of the United States or the humblest citizen, should be punished much more severely than it is. No other change in our laws appears to be necessary.—Editorial in Chicago Chronicle of September 11.

#### WHAT MAYOR JOHNSON WANTS.

Some time ago the La Crosse Press asked Mayor Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland, O., to write for it a statement of what he expected to accomplish, through the county auditors of that state, in the direction of compelling the railroad companies to pay their fair share of the taxes. Mr. Johnson replied:

Answering your inquiry as to what I hoped to accomplish by appearing before the county auditors, and as to what I did accomplish, I will say that I hoped to arouse the taxpayers to a realization of the fact that the railroads of the state were not paying their just share of the taxes, and think I did. I presented indisputable evidence that railroad property was being appraised for them at 5 to 18 per cent. of its true value in money, while other property—I refer particularly to residence and farm property—was appraised at from 60 to 100 per cent.—in some instances even more than 100 per cent.

I did not expect to persuade the county auditors to appraise railroad property as the constitution of the state and their oaths of office required them to do, for I knew they were dominated by the powerful influences of the railway corporations. The conduct of the auditors from start to finish was a corroboration of this fact. I pointed out that the returns made by the railroads were incomplete and dishonest, and I pleaded with them to call in the officials of these roads, as the law says they may do, and put them under oath for the purpose of examining them as to the correctness of the returns. This they refused to do.

Most, if not all, the auditors rode on passes issued by the roads, to assess which they were gathered together, and in many instances the auditors conferred with the officials of the railroads before assembling. Comment on these facts is almost unnecessary. They were shown up by reports made by the city detectives, who were put on the trails of the auditors, and by the admissions which we forced from the auditors themselves. No one will deny that an auditor who accepts a pass from a railway corporation is morally incompetent to make an honest appraisal of that company's property for taxation; particularly is that true when the railroads maintain expensive and powerful lobbies in the legislature to prevent the enactment of laws that will put their property, for tax purposes, on the same basis as other prop-

erty in the state, and by judicious distribution of favors corrupt our public officials—even judges on the bench. The proceedings of these meetings, through the columns of the daily newspapers, were brought forcibly to the minds of the people.

A steam railroad is worth just what it will sell for, the same as any other property. It will sell for just what its stocks and bonds will bring in the open market. The law says that all property shall be assessed for its true value in money, but county auditors have made an arbitrary rule that all property shall be placed on the duplicate for 60 per cent. of its true value in money—all property except steam railroads and other public service corporations. By some means which we could not learn, and the auditors themselves could not explain, they assessed railroad property on a different basis. If you remember, I asked our own auditor, Mr. Craig, to tell me what method was employed, and he answered: "I don't know that we have any, and how we do arrive at the value I don't know." As a matter of fact, he couldn't nor could any of his colleagues. There was no method. They simply guessed—guessed away thousands of dollars of the people's money. It wouldn't have been worse had they broken open and looted the counties' strong boxes.

The railroads in Ohio to-day are dishonestly escaping payment on over \$500,000,000 worth of property. Will the people permit this? They will not in my opinion. I offer the prediction that from the disclosures made from these meetings there will grow a sentiment that will sweep Ohio from end to end and overwhelm these men with shame and disgrace. Had the railroads yielded even a little they would have made the harder the work which is to come. We will go into the courts to set aside this dishonest appraisal, and we will go before the state board at Columbus and demand that all railroad property be raised to the same plane as other taxable property. If justice is denied us there we will appeal to the higher courts.

The grand and final battle will come when the people become aroused. The people are not easily stirred up, but when they are, something must give way. They are beginning to see the outrageous injustice in the present inequitable valuation of taxable property, and when the proper time comes they will rise up and demand that there be a change, and, in my opinion, there will be a change and that soon. The men elected to carry out the laws will do it honestly and with partiality to none, or the people will sweep them from their high places into the jails and penitentiaries or the eternal oblivion of private life.

What Mayor Johnson is endeavoring to accomplish in Ohio needs also to be accomplished in Iowa, for here as there officials whose pockets are filled with corporation favors discriminate in favor of railroad property by taxing it at one-tenth while taxing other property at one-fourth of its value, thus compelling the many to pay more than they would if values were assessed as the law of the state and justice require. In the Hawkeye as in the Buckeye state equality of taxation will be the leading issue of this year's campaign.—Dubuque Telegraph.

**MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.**

War on the bill boards was determined on by the city administration yesterday. Complaint had been made about a large bill board on an old building half way across the viaduct.

"Do you allow bill boards within the fire limits?" asked Director Salen of Building Inspector Harks.

"Yes, I have been allowing them."

"I wouldn't do that if I were you," remarked the mayor.

"Then I ought to have authority to tear down those already erected."

"All right, go ahead and tear them down," said the mayor.

"I think that is proper," said Assistant Director of Law Babcock, "but you will probably be sued."

"A few more lawsuits won't hurt us," observed the mayor. "Tear them down, Mr. Harks."—Cleveland Plain Dealer, of Aug. 24.

Director of Public Works Salen has ordered six watering troughs to be located at various points throughout the city. They will be attached to fire hydrants, a bowl on each side of the hydrant. A team of two horses hitched singly can drink at the same time. If the troughs prove a success the director will install 25 more.—Plain Dealer of Aug. 24.

Mayor Johnson is not at all satisfied with Grade Crossing Engineer Ritchie's plans for doing away with crossings and proposes to fight them. Ritchie wants to raise the C. & P. railroad tracks 21 feet and depress all the East end streets which now cross them. The mayor says this plan would ruin the beauty of the east end of the city and says the tracks should be lowered so as to go under the streets. The grade of the land makes that the natural solution of the problem, he contends. Ritchie avers this plan would cost nearly twice what it would to raise the tracks and would drive away a lot of the industries along the C. & P.

"I am not so sure of that," said the mayor, "and besides there are sometimes things of more importance than industries. I will never consent to raising those tracks above the streets and I want to attend the meeting of the grade crossing commission when it takes up that matter."

Ritchie said the mayor would get an invitation.—Plain Dealer of Sept. 4.

By the terms of an ordinance passed by the city council Tuesday night, all telephone, telegraph and electric poles from the river to Willson avenue must disappear by January 1, 1903. On the

West side the time limit will not expire until January 1, 1904.

The wires which these poles carry must be placed in conduits underground.

From Orange and about a dozen other streets the poles must be cleared away before the snow flies. Improvements are to be made on the streets in question this fall and the mayor wants the poles down and the wires underground before that is done.—Plain Dealer of Sept. 5.

Mayor Johnson called on City Engineer Carter Friday for his report on the condition of the G. A. R. stands on Bond street.

"Several changes were ordered," said Carter.

"Did you have them carefully examined?"

"I did."

"I want a written report from you that the necessary changes are made."

"I cannot make a report of that kind until the changes are made."

"Well, I want you to follow that up and see that they are made. We won't let them use the stands if they are at all unsafe."

"How about the lights under the stands?" continued the mayor.

"I think the G. A. R. committee will put them in," said Deputy Director of Public Works Galvin.

"Very well. I want you to follow that up at once and see that the lights are put in before the encampment opens."—Plain Dealer of Sept. 7.

The question of the strength of these reviewing stands and their ability to hold with safety the large crowds which will assemble upon them on Tuesday and Wednesday, has been, of course, foremost in the minds of the decorations committee, and the reviewing stands committee, who have had charge of their erection. The reviewing stand for the children at the foot of Bond street was designed and erected under the supervision of James Ritchie, who is an experienced bridge builder, and it is as strong as a railroad trestle and will bear many times the weight which will go upon it—in fact it would be perfectly safe to run a train of cars over it, as it is made of the same materials used by railroads in their bridges.

All the other stands were designed by architects. Both of these plans were submitted to the building inspector and met with his approval, and since that time have been inspected by him and by the city engineer.—Plain Dealer of September 9.

**AGAINST PRIVILEGE.**

An address delivered before the Allied Trades Unions of Jefferson City, Mo., Monday, September 2 (Labor Day), 1901, by Speed Mosby.

Every man who is not a social ex-crescence is in some sense a laboring man, but upon this day we are accustomed to devote our attention peculiarly to organized labor, and my remarks shall therefore be particularly, though briefly, directed to what I conceive to be the true interests of union labor, whose representatives it is my privilege to address to-day.

The organizations which you maintain are, it seems to me, to be especially commended. Under existing political conditions unionism is the palladium of the labor interests. It is a vital necessity. You must at all hazards maintain the union, or you are lost. As Edmund Burke says: "When bad men combine the good must associate." With each new consolidation of gigantic corporate interests the situation more imperatively demands that you weld more firmly the bonds of that defensive alliance which the solidarity of your interests requires for your mutual protection.

But after all, as it seems to me, labor unions are but the means o an end, and that end is, I take it, the complete emancipation of labor; and there can surely be no objection to attaining the end by a more certain, a more secure and a shorter route, if that route may be followed without yielding up the defensive weapons which you now employ.

**KINSHIP OF CAPITAL AND LABOR.**

You are united not only by a sense of mutual interest, but also by the sense of common danger. What danger? What is it you fear? Whatever that thing is, it is the real object against whose encroachments you are united. Now, what is it? Some of you may call it capital. And what grievance have we against capital? Capital is merely wealth—wealth devoted to productive uses. Nothing that is not wealth can be capital. Capital does not employ labor, my friends. Labor employs capital. Capital must seek its life at the hands of labor. Destroy capital, and, if labor is free, it will spring again into newness of life; strike down labor, and capital will rot in its vaults.

Capital and labor are not natural enemies, nor is there any good reason why they should be. There is an indissoluble bond of relationship between them. Labor creates capital for its own uses, and capital is the

natural tool of labor; and in its heart of hearts labor loves capital as the father loveth the son. What has brought about this unnatural estrangement between them? Why should the created turn against its creator, and the father spurn his offspring?

Is it not because capital is too often fortified by Privilege? So it seems to me. It is only by means of special privileges owned and controlled by capitalists, that capital can ever secure an advantage over labor. And it is only by securing privileges from which other men are debarred, that the so-called "capitalist" is enabled to take wealth from society without giving anything in return for what he receives.

There should, in the nature of things, be no conflict between labor and capital. But there is, under present economic conditions, necessarily a very decided conflict between labor and a certain class of so-called capitalists, and the very thing they are fighting about is capital—or, more properly speaking, wealth. We cannot deny it, and we need not attempt to disguise the fact that we all want wealth. We all need it, and those of us who earn it ought to have it; and, I may add, those of us who do not earn it ought not to have it.

#### THE MENACE OF PRIVILEGE.

Now, what is it that prevents labor from reaping the full measure of its reward, while permitting other men to fill their pockets with what they have not earned? It is Privilege. You are to-day combined against the power of special privileges. And what is the nature of these privileges? You frequently hear courts and lawyers speak of them as "vested rights." They are vested wrongs. They are nothing less than the power, vested in private hands, to control the ultimate sources of production and the means of distribution. There can be no iron-clad, indestructible monopoly under our present system which does not rest, directly or indirectly, upon one or the other of these privileges or their corollaries.

The man who holds these privileges controls the bulk of all natural opportunity, and he alone can deny your right to live and labor and be free. The few men who now control the sources of production and the means of distribution in the United States are in one sense the most potent political factor in America to-day, and when the greater part of those privileges shall have passed under the dominion of a single man,

which you will admit is now the undoubted tendency, that man will be the absolute lord and master of this western hemisphere just as truly as Nicholas is to-day the czar of all the Russias.

By far the most serious question that confronts labor to-day, my fellow citizens, is how best to cope with this man and the class which he represents. In my judgment there is but one way. You must attack monopoly by laying the ax at the root of the tree. You must destroy Privilege. You cannot give to labor its earnings until you take from monopoly its privileges.

Men of reputed wealth have been called the natural foes of the laboring class. They are not necessarily so. They are not any more to blame for the condition of labor to-day than the laboring men themselves. They have merely taken advantage of the political institutions for which you are even more responsible than they are, because you are vastly in the majority and could change those institutions if you would. Personally, I feel no grievance against John D. Rockefeller or J. Pierpont Morgan, but I do cherish a most profound and everlasting grievance against the political and social system which has made them the uncrowned kings they are to-day, for the institutions which have given unrivaled power to them have made slaves and paupers of untold thousands.

#### ROCKEFELLER'S "CHARITY."

Speaking of Mr. Rockefeller reminds me of a statement he made to his Sunday school class a month or two ago. He said that he had been "giving" men steady work, and that during the last 30 years he had paid out between \$600,000,000 and \$700,000,000 to laboring men in wages. "That," said Mr. Rockefeller, "I regard as the best kind of giving." So, when he allows men to work, Mr. Rockefeller considers himself benevolent, and evidently regards the wages he has paid as just so much charity. How can he arrogate to himself the right to "give" men work? What right in nature has he to keep them from it? The right to labor for our sustenance is a natural right which we all possess, and that right continues just as long as men are born with hands to work with and bodies to clothe and feed. The Good Book doesn't read: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread—provided you can get a job from Rockefeller."

Man's right to produce wealth, to

visit freely the storehouse of nature and freely exchange his produce, without hamper and without restraint, is as fundamental as his right to life itself, because the exercise of that right is equally necessary to the life and happiness of all men. The fact that Mr. Rockefeller has been able to monopolize certain productive opportunities, fortified by legal barriers and transportation rebates, gives him no right to boast of his benevolence in allowing men access to those opportunities to which they were entitled by the laws of nature, nor can he with good grace speak of his "charity" in permitting his employes to retain a very small percentage of the wealth which they produced. If his moral sense were as keen as his love of gain, his conscience might well accuse him of robbery in extorting so large a share from the labors of other men. For he must have known, when he received his last dividend upon his oil stock (a dividend of 48 per cent.), that he had received just \$2.21 in dividends for every dollar paid out in wages, and that he had thus summarily pocketed the wages of 31,638 men.

All the wealth he possesses is what labor has given him—and for what? For the bare opportunity of working; nothing more. But I cannot find it in my heart to blame Mr. Rockefeller for the sins of the American people. If I had any opinion of him at all, it would rather be one of pitying contempt for his brazen and pretentious assininity. He is only one of the moral idiots whom we have created by our political institutions, and if Rockefeller were dead other Rockefellers would spring up and flourish upon the soil that nourished him.

When we sow injustice we may expect to reap oppression.

#### PRIVILEGE IN THE GUISE OF WEALTH.

The millionaire whom we have been considering is a type of the "capitalists" between whom and organized labor the conflict has been so long raging. And yet, if you will examine the sources of his power, you will find him to be more of a privilege-monger than a capitalist. You will find that most of his so-called capital is not wealth in the economic and scientific sense. It consists largely of title deeds to oil and mineral lands, and of the stocks and bonds of public service corporations, and their great value is due to the fact that they rest upon monopoly fortified by legalized privilege. They are not wealth in themselves, but they repre-

sent the power to extort wealth from other men.

Representing a monopoly of productive opportunities and of public utilities, by virtue of that fact they represent the power of the holders of these monopolies, to utilize, to their own advantage and upon their own terms, the labor of other men. This is what gives to that misnamed thing called "capital" all of its deadly power. Your strikes and boycotts will help you to contend against this power, but in my humble judgment, if you would pierce the heart of the monster you must do some striking through the ballot box.

If you will analyze the majority of the great "fortunes" of the present day you will find that they consist mainly of the fruits of Privilege. They exist for the most part upon paper, and if you will annihilate the privileges upon which they are based you will find many of those fortunes as valueless as the paper upon which they are written. Bonds and other evidences of indebtedness are not wealth. If they were, you could increase the aggregate of a country's wealth by increasing the sum of its indebtedness, which is plainly impossible. Stocks in privilege-holding corporations, whose values depend upon the values of the privileges upon which they are based, are not wealth. They are neither more nor less than an incumbrance upon labor, and to an enormous degree they operate as a detriment to the production of wealth. A title deed to the Lehigh valley coal lands, for instance, is not wealth. It merely represents the power of the holder of that deed to permit the mining of coal in that valley upon terms dictated solely by him. None of these things can be properly called wealth. They represent the means by which holders of certain legalized privileges may put shackles upon your hands and mine, and thrust their hands into our pockets whenever they choose to do so—for that is the power of Privilege.

When you permit a man to monopolize productive opportunities you enable him to shut the doors of nature's storehouse against all mankind, and walk away with the key in his pocket; but the name of that key is not capital, not wealth—it is Privilege. Too many well-meaning men, I fear, have merely been fighting for the possession of this key. But I propose to you to throw away the key and batter down the doors. Open up to all men free and equal oppor-

tunities to produce wealth, and secure to them their right to keep all that they may honestly earn. The real trouble, my friends, is not primarily in the unequal distribution of wealth, but in the cause that leads to unequal distribution; it is in the inequality of opportunity to produce wealth and retain it after having produced it.

And if you were to utterly and forever destroy Privilege, what would be the result? Doubtless the first thing you would notice would be the slump in the bond and stock market. Many men now reputed to be worth millions would be found to be practically penniless. But they would have lost nothing that they ever had a natural right to call their own; nothing but the legal power to extort wealth and labor from other men; absolutely nothing but the unjust power to grind the blood and bones of American workingmen into dollars at their own sweet pleasure! But the effect upon labor would be vastly different. With equal opportunities opened to all, with the functions of production and distribution untrammelled and unrestrained, with all men enjoying equal rights and the gains of each man's industry secure unto himself, we should never again see the astounding spectacle that greets our eyes to-day—the spectacle of one per cent. of our families owning more wealth than all of the remaining 99 per cent!

#### THE REMEDY.

But how can we destroy Privilege? The simplest way is by a judicious exercise of the taxing power. Remove all taxes that fetter labor. Wipe out every tax that restricts consumption and production. Exempt labor and its produce. Levy your taxes where nature intended they should be levied—upon the privileged monopolists of natural resources and public utilities. And when you have taxed those privileges to the full extent of their value, you will merely have absorbed, as a community, those values to which the community alone is entitled by virtue of its creative right, for franchise values are community values. When you have done this you will have established a government as free in fact as it is in name. Then, and not until then, will labor be set free, and each man at liberty to employ himself at will, and his wages will be his own. Then will you have a government where each will possess what he earns, and no man will possess what he does not earn. I feel that such a government would be

just, and that none other can be. I believe it is possible.

It is for such men as you to say when it shall begin, or whether or not it shall ever be. I know that you are sincere in what you do. But your only weapons now are the boycott and strike. I sympathize with you. God knows my heart bled with pity when I read in the accounts of the great strike in the anthracite coal regions last year, of the little helpless boys who came up out of the ground to see what it was all about, and marched in their dirt and rags, at the behest of their leaders. And there were grown men, too—hundreds of them—who had never learned to read or write. And then I thought of the damnable cupidity and the soul-sickening brutality of that grasping, grinding, God-hating commercialism which has doomed those poor men to a life of hopeless and degrading servitude, while their omnivorous lords and masters were founding Christian universities wherewith to put the golden padlocks on the lips of Truth, because, forsooth, they owned the stock in the corporation which held the legal title to the ground! Pardon, me, gentlemen, if my language is intemperate, for I cannot mince words when speaking of the barbarous, heart-wrecking cruelty and injustice of our present system, and when with Robert Burns, I

See yonder poor, o'erlabored wight,  
So abject, mean and vile,  
Who begs a brother of the earth  
To give him leave to toll;  
And see his lordly fellow-worm  
The poor petition spurn,  
Unmindful though a weeping wife  
And helpless offspring mourn.

If I'm yon haughty lordling's slave  
By nature's law designed,  
Why was an independent wish  
E'er planted in my mind?  
If not, why am I subject to  
His cruelty and scorn,  
Or why has man the will and power  
To make his fellow mourn?

Yes, my fellow citizens, I am with you in your strikes and boycotts. But I would stand for something better than the strike and more effective than the boycott. I would stand for a system of government which shall

## 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.

make them both unnecessary; a system which shall wipe out the inequality born of privilege, and elevate labor to its true dignity as the rightful sovereign of the earth; a system which, by removing from men the power to rob their fellows in the guise of law and leaving to each the equal chance that belongs to all, would substitute new hope and noble aspirations for the soul-destroying passions of greed and gain, and thus pave the way to a civilization, infinite in its possibilities, and higher, nobler, better, grander than the human mind has yet conceived.

The names of institutions  
Are thoughtless and unjust.  
The "trusts" will trust nobody  
And nobody trusts a trust.

—Washington Star.

"I overheard that man who calls on you say something about betting, Briquet; I hope he doesn't frequent pool-rooms?"

"Sure, ma'am, he doesn't know there's such a place in New York. He's a policeman, ma'am."—Yonkers Statesman.

R. Enter—I don't see any difference between a landlord who is a Christian, and one who is not, do you?

T. E. Nant—Oh, yes! A landlord that is a Christian will not call for his rent on Sunday.

C. E. L.

He was very young. To be precise, he was five years and seven months. As long as he could remember he had had to set aside a part of the moneys he received to educate the little children of China. He didn't love them as much as he should, or he would not have asked:

"Mother, they're killing all the Chinese children, aren't they?"

"Yes, isn't it dreadful? Are you not glad you are not a little Chinese boy?"

"Yes. But when they get them all killed, I won't have to send them any more of my money, will I?"—N. Y. Evening Sun.

Brooklyn Workingman's Wife (in 1910)—What's happened, Danny?

Her Husband (desperately)—Well, I've been fired by J. P. Morgan, and there's nobody else in the world to work for!—Brooklyn Citizen.

Shippers of fruit and vegetables to South Water street have some queer ways of endeavoring to impress the superiority of their products on the prospective purchaser. On each six baskets of Flemish Beauty pears which reached the street the other day was scrawled with a red lead pencil

this legend: "This pairs if poud away will be foud chuse & fine flavor."

The pears were green and the shipper meant to convey the statement that if they were stored until ripe they would be found to be juicy.—Chicago Chronicle of Aug. 20.

BOOK NOTICES.

A second edition of "Government," by John Sherwin Crosby, has been issued in the Library of Liberal Classes (New York: Peter Eckler, 35 Fulton street. Price, 25 cents). Mr. Crosby's work is one of especial value because, while the principles of government which it lays down are entirely sound and comprehensive, there is nothing about it of the subtle or mysterious. It is addressed to the understanding of the ordinary citizen and appeals with friendly grace but statesmanlike force to his common sense. In these times of topsy turvy theories about government, which are rived by a helter skelter practice of government, Mr. Crosby's little book, with its lucid explanations, cannot but make a good impression upon every reader, whether he may happen to be a scientific muddler, an indifferent ignoramus, or an ordinarily intelligent citizen. The general principle of government which constitutes the basis of Mr. Crosby's civic philosophy is this: That the civil power may be legitimately used for only one or more of the following four purposes, namely: (1) For the preservation of the government itself; (2) for the preservation of the public peace; (3) to secure to individuals the equal enjoyment of their natural and inalienable rights; and (4) to accomplish "such undertakings" and perform "such services, if any there be, as are necessary to the preservation of the peace or the security of natural rights, but, by reason of their nature or extent, cannot be carried on by individual or partnership enterprise without the aid of government." One chapter of the book is devoted to the elucidation of these functions, and the remaining 73 pages to a discussion of their practical application.

MAGAZINES.

—Talcott Williams contributes to the September Review of Reviews a judicial article on the steel strike, written from the point of view of the trust. A better, as well as franker consideration of the subject will be found in the September Pilgrim.

THE BEST PORTRAITS FOR FRAMING

- THOMAS JEFFERSON, etched by Rosenthal, 1897..... \$6.00
- ANDREW JACKSON, stipple by Welch, 1852..... 10 00
- ALEXANDER HAMILTON, etched by Rosenthal, 1896..... 6.00
- GEORGE WASHINGTON, stipple by Welch, 1852..... 5.00
- CHIEF JUSTICE MARSHALL, etched by Rosenthal, 1898..... 6.00 (And Others.)

Delivered free of charge in any part of the United States, subject to return if not liked and money refunded.

WILLIAM J. CAMPBELL, 1218 Walnut Street, Philadelphia.

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

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

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.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

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

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

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

Houston.

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

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER, COUNSELOR AT LAW, BENNETT BLDG., 99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan. Tel. Call, 1358 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012. NEW YORK.

Volume III of The Public

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

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