

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 16, 1902.

Number 228.

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 page.

A tin plate factory closed down on the 2d indefinitely. It did so because the employes had refused to concede a 25 per cent. reduction in their wages in order to enable the factory to get an order from the Standard Oil company. This should be explained. The Standard Oil company gets large quantities of its tin plate abroad and brings it in two-thirds free of tariff duty. Are we asked how that can be done? Under the tariff law tin plate, when imported, pays a heavy duty, for the purpose of building up tin plate factories at home and "protecting" American workingmen. But the importer is entitled to a drawback or recovery of two-thirds of the duty paid upon the imported tin plate which he afterwards exports. Now the Standard Oil company uses much tin plate for the cans of oil it exports, and through the drawback system it is able to get this supply abroad. Of course it does so, for tin plate is cheaper abroad than here. To get its order for this supply, however, the American tin plate factories have been trying to induce their men to drop 25 per cent. of their wages, and it is the refusal of the men that has caused the shut-down. Labor indignation meetings were held; and, wonder of wonders, in Pennsylvania itself, these meetings denounced the Republican tariff policy. One of the speakers put the whole tariff question in a sentence. He described it as a system of "protection for the Standard Oil company against American workmen." In principle that is just what the whole wretched system is. It fosters and pro-

tection. trusts, which increase the cost of living for American workmen; and it gluts the American labor market, which weakens the contracting power of workmen and lessens their independence.

And now this same plundering system of protection appears by the confession of high Republican authority to have fastened itself like a devil fish upon the government itself. Walter Wellman tells about it in his Washington letter to the Chicago Record-Herald of the 12th: Both he and that paper are Republicans. Mr. Wellman declares that he quotes, though he does not name, a member of President Roosevelt's cabinet, who assures him that the Republican party is powerless even to revise the tariff, except upward. Said this cabinet officer:

In the last session of Congress and the one before that an effort was made to revise some of the schedules by means of reciprocity treaties. You know what happened. Nothing was done. The protection interests involved in those treaties were powerful enough to block the legislative wheels. The treaties were rejected, and that method of revising the schedules and getting slightly lower duties came to naught. . . . Our party passed the McKinley law, and that law put the tariff higher than it had ever been before. We enacted the Dingley law, and its average duties are higher than the average of the McKinley law. As the Senate is now constituted I see no hope for any proposition to revise downward.

This cabinet officer incidentally reminds the restless spirits in his party of what is true, that the protectionists who are asking reductions cannot agree as to where the protection shall be taken off. It is the old story of the British tariff reformer from a herring fishery constituency, who favored putting everything on the free list except herrings.

Just there is the only strength that

protection has. The narrow fools who want their own particular industries shielded from competition, so that they can sell their goods to their neighbors for more than they are worth, stand as a bulwark in front of the great trusts which inflate their values with water, and then warn you to keep hands off the tariff lest you disturb their fragile edifice and precipitate a financial cataclysm. It is in fear of this that Mr. Wellman's anonymous member of the cabinet begs his anti-protection copartisans to leave well enough alone. After explaining that the money of the West is in the banks of the smaller western cities, that the reserves of these banks are in the banks of Chicago, and that the reserves of the Chicago banks are in the banks of New York, he goes on to say that in New York—

the money is not in the banks. There are only six national banks in New York that have not been below their legal reserves since January 1. You want to know where this money is? Well, \$450,000,000 is loaned by national banks on the bonds of industrial corporations. These corporations issued bonds instead of stocks because the national banks can take the former and can't take the latter. Intrinsically they are no better than stocks. In most of them there has been a lot of water-curing. Here you see where the \$450,000,000 of the country's surplus stands against a lot of undigested, promotion-produced securities. The trust companies have put out millions more in the same way. That is where we stand. It is all right as long as it is all right. But I don't want to see anything happen. I don't want to see these industrialists begin to topple over, to fall against one another and come down in a heap like children's play blocks. And this is one reason why I am opposed to a tariff revision agitation that might start things going the wrong way.

If that is what protection has brought us to, the quicker we get rid of it, root and branch, the better. There may be pain in the process, but the more acute the pain the greater the

certainty that the swindle will never be perpetrated again.

As to a financial catastrophe, the timid cabinet officer whom Mr. Wellman quotes, may as well pacify himself. The crash is coming fast enough without reference to tariff tinkering. He himself shows how helpless the banks would be if a storm struck, no matter what direction it came from; and that a storm is gathering is evident from the news from the Northwest. Out there an agricultural land boom, the sure precursor of financial disaster, is now big enough to attract general attention. As all business, farming included, is dependent upon land of some kind, it is evident that rising prices of land, if they keep on rising, must in ever increasing degree crowd business profits to the wall. This process cannot go on forever. There comes a time when business profits can no longer stand the squeeze. Then the weakest fail. They bring down the stronger, and these those that are stronger still, until even the strongest sway in the gale. For several years this process of squeezing business profits has been going on. Land of all kinds has been rising. But the phenomena have seemed to be local or exceptional. Building lots have gone up in some places. In others the sellers' price has only strengthened without rising. Mining rights have gone up, but the rise in land prices has been concealed by the fact that the mines are represented by stock. As there are many kinds of land so represented, what has been a land boom has seemed to be a stock boom. But now the phenomenal rise in the values of the new agricultural lands of the Northwest leaves no room to doubt that the land boom is on. And as agricultural land values are usually the last to boom and the first to totter, it indicates also that the cataclysm is not far off.

From an article in the Chicago Tribune recently, it seems that bare land in the Northwest has doubled in value in the last two years, and spec-

ulation is rife. The director of the United States mint, George R. Roberts, is quoted as saying:

There is the greatest amount of land speculation going on west of Chicago that has ever been known in that part of the country. I believe the banks out there are loaning a good deal of money on these land enterprises, and that this is really the secret of the early movement of money westward. The people are everywhere organizing syndicates to buy land, and there is hardly a crossroads community in Iowa that has not organized a syndicate to operate in the Dakotas or in Canada. Prices have advanced 50 per cent. in the last two years and the upward movement seems still on.

Estimates furnished by well-informed real estate men of Sioux City make the following exhibit of the prices per acre for agricultural lands in that part of Iowa:

	1896.	1900.	1902.
Improved	\$15 to \$25	\$20 to \$35	\$30 to \$50
Unimproved ...	10 to 20	15 to 25	25 to 50

The reason given locally for the phenomenal leap of land values of which that table is typical, is that they have been caused partly by uniformly good crops and partly by the realization of the people throughout the United States of the coming scarcity of arable lands by reason of the rapid settlement of desirable government lands. This explanation, though true, is only superficial. The deeper reason is that a general land boom is on. But how much more can agricultural industry stand in the way of bounding prices for its raw material. For, let it be observed, that while these land prices may be due in part to the impulse of agricultural prosperity, they do not enrich agriculture. They are the premiums for natural opportunity which agricultural industry yields to land monopoly.

Last Sunday's sermon of a Catholic priest at Shenandoah, Pa., is reported as containing this sentiment:

Every man has placed upon him by the God who sustains him the responsibility of earning his bread by the sweat of his brow, and he must be permitted to do this without interference.

What a splendid truth! How gloriously different this world would be

if that truth were the mainspring of all our laws. But when a man utters it, spot him! No matter who he is—prophet, priest or statesman; rich man, poor man, beggar man, thief—let him be who or what he may, spot him! What does he mean? Does he mean that every man must earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, or only poor men? Does he mean that he must earn it by the sweat of his own brow, or of somebody else's brow? Does he mean that no man must be permitted to interfere, or only strikers? These are searching questions. If you don't believe it, ask yourself what ought to be done to the strikers who prevent other men from working in the Pennsylvania coal mines by intimidating them; and when you have answered that, then ask yourself what ought to be done to the corporations that have preempted thousands of acres of coal deposits which they allow no one to work in. If it is wrong for striking coal miners to keep "scabs" out of the mines that are opened, why isn't it wrong for the land-grabbing corporations to keep both strikers and "scabs" out of the mines that are not opened? If you are tempted to say that one is contrary to law and the other is in conformity to law, then probe your conscience a little further? How can the grant of a defunct king or an act of the legislature make it right to interfere with men who want to earn their bread by digging coal out of natural deposits which no one else is using? Can you legislate wrong into right? We doubt if the Catholic priest of Shenandoah who expressed the splendid sentiment we have quoted, could stand this examination without either withdrawing from his splendid declaration or shifting his anathemas from the turbulent strikers to the placid owners of Pennsylvania coal deposits. When labor's unlimited natural opportunity is monopolized, even by law, we must not be too severe with laborers if they quarrel turbulently with one another over the few opportunities that the forestal-

lers invite them to bid for. The bitterness of our condemnation belongs elsewhere.

Yet the owner of these coal mines, who have clamped so many of them down so that no one can work them, appear in the light of benefactors when they let labor into them—upon a bidding that leaves only the barest of a bare living to labor. Not alone thick-headed workmen, but many a long-headed business man as well, may see his stupidity reflected as in a mirror by this little story which comes up from the coal regions of Fairmount, W. Va., where the Watson family has long monopolized a terranean plug extending like an inverted pyramid from the earth's center upwards without limit:

An agitator was laboring with a miner to join the strike. He used the usual arguments. The miner was half convinced. "Well," he said, finally, "mebbe I strike. But before I do I go see Mr. Watson." "What do you want to see Mr. Watson for?" asked the astonished agitator. "What did the Watsons ever do for you?" "What they do for me?" exclaimed the miner; "what they do for me? Why, old man Watson put all this coal in the hills here forty-odd years ago, and has kept us at work ever since digging it out."

One thing about the manifestations of violence in the region of the anthracite coal strike cannot have escaped general observation. It is the fact that the American and Americanized strikers are not the ones who have become violent, but that the violent strikers are Lithuanians. These are foreigners from a part of the world where governmental tyranny is so perfect that violent strikes are the only kind possible. They are not Americanized and do not appreciate the difference. When they see uniformed troops quartered in their midst they are unable to understand that these are simply citizens, temporarily massed in military organization for the preservation of the public peace. To their imaginations these citizen soldiers are the same as the imperial soldiery, the military machine composed of dehumanized

units with which they are familiar in their own subjugated homes. It is not remarkable, therefore, that they have stoned and mauled our citizen soldiers, any more than it is remarkable that they gave a violent turn to the strike. Nor would it be remarkable if, as their countrymen at home are even now doing, they broke out in open riotous revolt. But if they did, then where, as well for that as for what they have already done, should the moral responsibility rest? Plutocratic papers put it upon the officers of the miners' organization. But that is too obviously a special plea inspired by a special interest. No peaceable American strikers can be held morally responsible for the violence of unmanageable foreign mobs. The moral responsibility rests upon the managers of the coal companies. They have imported these violent classes for the purpose primarily of making a glut in the labor market to force down wages, and secondarily to have upon the ground an irresponsible mob which in times of strikes would create an excuse for calling out troops. Not only have they imported these men, but they have done so in violation of law. The presidents of the coal companies and the coal owning railroads, therefore, and not Mitchell and his associates, are the persons who are morally guilty of these crimes against the peace in Pennsylvania, and upon them the burden of moral responsibility should fall.

Once more Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, is obstructed by the Cleveland street car ring in his unyielding efforts to secure three-cent street car fares for the people there. The story to this point has been told at length in these columns (pp. 274, 281), the last report being that the intermediate appellate court had dissolved the injunction of one of its judges forbidding the granting of a franchise by the existing city council. The street car ring has now procured a new injunction from a judge of the Supreme Court of the state, before whom a motion to dissolve it is to

be heard on the 15th. That this was done at the instigation of the street car ring, though in another name, is evident from the circumstances. When the suit was brought originally, its promoters disclaimed any connection with the ring, insisting that their only object was to prevent the laying of tracks in a certain street. Mayor Johnson thereupon vetoed the ordinance relating to that part of the route. There was then no reason for proceeding with the injunction. Yet it not only was proceeded with until it had been dissolved by the intermediate court, but it is now carried to the Supreme Court. Since the veto, the residents of the one street in question could have no motive in spending further money in a law suit merely to keep tracks out of their street. The object of the further prosecution of the suit, then, must be to keep three-cent fare tracks out of all the streets.

Mayor Johnson's equitable tax agitation in Cleveland has had a comical effect upon the public service corporations. Having the ear, and not unlikely able also to "pull the leg," of the supervising tax authorities, they thwarted the mayor's efforts to make them pay taxes upon the same basis of valuation as other property owners, and secured the privilege of virtually deciding for themselves how much or little taxes they should pay. But "rattled" by fear of what Johnson might yet do, the street car companies have voluntarily increased their returns of values for taxation this year (p. 275) by more than a million and a half over last year; and, following that example of those demoralized tax dodgers, the electric illuminating company has almost doubled its tax returns of last year. It raises its valuation from \$489,050 to \$718,197. This is still much below an equitable valuation, but the whole thing is significant. Down in Delaware they have a saying that "one hornet can break up a whole camp-meeting, if it is industrious;" and Mayor John-

son seems to have played in the role of industrious hornet at the camp meeting of monopoly tax dodgers in Cleveland with no little effect.

It is somewhat risky to comment upon the reports in Chicago newspapers of what is said by professors and lecturers at the University of Chicago. The newspaper itch to be sensational produces habitually such glaring misrepresentations in the local press that the professors have in despair given up all attempts at correcting them. Yet G. Stanley Hall, president of Clarke university, who lectured at the Chicago institution the other day, on "The Education of the Heart," is reported as saying something which he may very likely have said, and which, if he did say it, should be as a feather in his professorial cap. He is quoted as having strongly condemned what he described as the "namby-pamby ideal" about making no enemies, urging that "we ought to have constant antagonisms," though these antagonisms ought, of course, to be "of the right sort." President Hall clearly did not advise personal antagonisms primarily, but antagonisms to wrong ideals and policies and purposes and methods, with personal antagonisms as incidents if necessary. That is wholesome doctrine for young men and women, and it is the very backbone of any true education of the heart. Its neglect accounts for the great amount of mollusk morality which in these days makes public opinion so spineless in its attitude toward moral questions. Our generation seems to have lost all capacity for righteous wrath.

If the printed and published statement of two graduates of the University of Chicago—Angeline Loesch and Theresa Hirschl—is not overdrawn, which it does not appear to be, President Harper, successful though he has been as a college steward, might have been even more successful as a "practical" politician. Let the incredulous read this statement of Mesdames Loesch and Hir-

schl, which has the additional advantage of concisely but clearly explaining the development of the co-education controversy at the university:

The question of separate instruction for men and women during the first two years' work at the University of Chicago came up before the trustees some time ago. At that time a gift was offered to them for the purpose of building separate quadrangles for the men and women of the Junior colleges. It was noticed by them that in the terms of the offer "quadrangles" was meant to include not only separate dormitories, but separate classrooms and laboratories as well. As this made the matter a question of educational policy, the board of trustees referred for advice to the Senate. This is the highest ruling body of the faculty, composed of heads of departments only, and ordinarily all educational questions are brought to it before being submitted to the board of trustees. The Senate, after discussion, voted to ask for the opinion of the Junior college faculty, before giving its own decision. At its meeting held on June 14, the Junior college faculty, over which President Harper presided, considered two reports from its committee: the majority recommending "that in the development of Junior college instruction, provision be made as far as possible for separate sections for men and women;" and the minority recommending "that the system of coinstruction be continued as heretofore." The committee's majority report was disapproved by a vote of 19 to 14. After the adjournment of the meeting, President Harper spoke to two members of the faculty and their votes were then changed from negative to affirmative, making the vote 17 to 16 still against separation. President Harper himself then voted, and threw out the opposing votes of six other persons. This was done on the ground that they were disqualified because they were on one year appointments only, a rule of the University, so far as can be ascertained, never before enforced. The president then, several hours after adjournment, announced the final vote as 17 to 11 in favor of separation of the sexes. Two days later the Congregation, a body which is composed of delegates from the faculties and alumni, and which has certain advisory powers, voted 24 to 7, disapproving the action of the Junior college faculty as reported to them, i. e., 17 to 11 for separation. The Junior college faculty was obliged then to reconsider. Its vote this time was informally announced 25 to 18 in favor of segregation. Among

the members of the faculty themselves, it is not positively known whose votes were this time allowed and whose not. The Senate next met and after hours of discussion, decided to take its vote by mail in order to include its members who were away on vacation.

Apropos of the discussion of the question of religious teaching in the public schools, the following remark of Gladstone's, quoted by Mr. G. W. E. Russell in a recent article in the London Commonwealth, is worth repeating:

An undenominational system of religion, framed by or under the authority of the state, is a moral monster. The state has no charter from heaven such as may belong to the church or to the individual conscience. It would, as I think, be better for the state to limit itself to giving secular instruction, which, of course, is no complete education, than rashly to adventure upon such a system.

People are unreasonable in expecting the public schools to do all the work of character-building. Hence the disappointment in the results. One of the lessons which our self-conceit has to learn is that our public school system, great as it is, cannot be expected to do all the work of making good citizens. It is quite conceivable that any state in the Union might show a percentage of 100 in literacy and still have a fair supply of bribable legislators and purchasable voters.

Among the Democratic daily papers of the country that are truly democratic is the Cleveland Waechter und Anzeiger, which is just now celebrating its golden jubilee with a handsome birthday edition. This paper is one of the monuments to that group of exiled German democrats, of whom Carl Schurz is one of the survivors, and Louis Prang and Gov. Mueller two of the others, which came to this country in 1848. The late Dr. Schmitt, of Chicago, was another of the group. Through all the changes in party policy, most of these men kept their democracy green; and the Waechter und Anzeiger has never turned back upon

the ideals that gave it birth. It was a free soil Democrat when the slave power was supreme; it is a democratic Democrat now. Jeffersonian principles have always moved it. From its infancy Gov. Mueller, at one time lieutenant governor of Ohio, whence his title comes, has been associated with the publication, and his spirit influences it still. It is a pleasure to recognize such a paper as the leading German daily of northern Ohio and to count it among the leading German papers of the West.

Chicago can boast of a jailer who, by uniting good motives to good sense, is sinking the jailer in the man. He has conceived the idea that he owes something more, both to the prisoner and to the community, than to feed the prisoners and keep them locked up; and he is pursuing a policy which is surely calculated to make them rather safer when at large than whole job-lots of well feathered men who never get into custody. John L. Whitman is the name of this model jailer. He has allowed the prisoners to organize in the jail the "John L. Whitman Moral Improvement association," over which he presides, but in which the prisoners govern themselves. Explaining this unique association in a public address last Sunday, Mr. Whitman said:

If I attempted to picture to you the scenes of one of the weekly meetings of the Moral Improvement association of the jail you would hardly believe me. Imagine, if you can, from 300 to 500 prisoners, all under the ban of the law and many of them considered to be vicious, being marshaled into the jail chapel under the leadership of some of their own number, absolutely no official authority being used, yet perfect decorum maintained. After they are all seated I open the meeting—no other officer being in the room—and during the rendition of the programme not a boisterous action or word to mar the proceedings, reverence shown where reverence is due, applause given where proper, and hearty, too, yet always within the bounds of propriety.

Mr. Whitman's just theory of criminal punishment is that it should not

be vindictive, but should have a twofold object; first, the protection of society from the continued commission of crime; second, the reformation of the offender. To accomplish the second purpose, this is his advice for the treatment of the prisoner:

Strengthen him morally; show him the error of his ways; hold out an incentive to him to lead an honest life. Light the beacon in the harbor of the troublesome sea of life, so that thereafter he can steer his craft out of the tempestuous waters into the calm sea of righteousness. Send him back to society benefited by his punishment, an honest and a better man. This second object, the spirit of the law, Justice has either been too blind or too busy to see, and until the dawn of the twentieth century it remained an unknown quantity.

Mr. Whitman might truthfully enough have added that society is not over-scrupulous in sinning against the prisoner before he begins to sin against society.

There appeared in a late issue of the Buenos Ayres (Argentina) Herald a suggestive item in these terms:

In May 18,069 immigrants arrived in the country by water and 22,937 left, making a loss of 4,868 people to the country. These people have no interests here and there is no inducement to stay, as the land is in the hands of big speculators who use it for cattle, and will not have agriculture unless they can make a profit out of the labor of other people. This emigration does not include the large numbers who are going to Paraguay, which country has trebled its population in 30 years, notwithstanding its less salubrious climate, great depreciation of currency and the difficulty of making money with which to return home. Paraguay is getting ahead of Argentina simply because she has shown herself more fit for self-government by wise land laws, a sensible tax system, facility for the immigrant to obtain land free and not through any colony-organizing capitalist, model system of agricultural banks, which besides buying produce, sell the farmer his chief necessities at cost price, and protection of property from lawyers as well as from thieves.

The idea that fitness for self-government is dependent upon wisdom in making land laws and tax systems, isn't bad. But what would become of this republic of ours if it were tried by that test? At bottom,

though, that idea is not only true, but the penalty is self-executing. A people who make bad land and tax laws are in very truth not fit for self-government, and as surely as effect follows cause such a people cannot remain self-governing. It requires no military subjugation to put them down. They lose their liberties imperceptibly but steadily as inequitable taxation and land monopoly, twin sisters of evil omen, gain a place in their affections or toleration. What it is that Paraguay has done to outstrip Argentina might make an exceptionally interesting and educational consular report.

The convict Thoms, who was hanged last week at Chicago for a brutal murder, may have been guilty, though his dying declaration, made on the gallows drop with the hangman's noose encircling his neck, had about it the ring of truth. Said he: "I am innocent of the charge brought against me. My only hope is that some day the truth will be known and the guilty man punished. For myself I approach death without a fear. It is for the honor of my wife and child that I wish the truth to be known. These are my last words. I am innocent of the crime with which I am charged." But whether guilty or innocent, that man was hanged without having had a fair trial (p. 260). Two men on the first jury that tried him did not believe the incriminating evidence and courageously stood to the end for acquittal. They were reputable men, and there is not a shadow of suspicion against their good faith. Yet the prosecuting officer publicly denounced them as unfit for jury duty, for no other reason than that they had disagreed with him about the merits of the case, and he put the prisoner upon trial immediately before another jury. What innocent man would have been content to face that second jury at that time under those circumstances?

In every man there are two men—the man of this age, and the man of the Stone Age.—Life.

WORKINGMEN AND THE CHURCHES.

One can have but little acquaintance with clergymen, if he shows an interest in labor questions yet is unfamiliar with the inquiry, Why do workingmen stay away from church? Though this inquiry may never trouble the minds of your luxurious Charles Honeyman's of the pulpit, hosts of clergymen with religious impulses propound it repeatedly and anxiously. It discloses what is to them a genuine and perplexing problem. But are they not mistaken in regarding this church problem as a labor problem? Isn't it rather a problem in human nature, which only seems to be a labor problem because, notwithstanding all our fine phrases about the dignity of work, we have in fact degraded manual labor? Let us see.

Habitual church-goers may be divided into three general classes—those who go because they profoundly believe in the divine mission of the churches, those who go from force of habit, and those who go because church going is respectable.

Now, workingmen who profoundly believe in churches are doubtless just as regular attendants as any other profound believers. Such, as stay away, therefore, must be of the class that goes either from force of habit or for respectability's sake.

But as church-going habits, unsupported by profound belief, are easily abandoned by men of every class, when less irksome recreation becomes reputable, there is nothing peculiar to the working class in relinquishing those habits. If all church-going were from force of habit only, there would soon be no attendance at all, in these galloping times when there is so little within the churches and so much without to interest the carnal mind.

But of the third church-going class, that which goes for respectability's sake, the falling off among workingmen is doubtless vastly disproportionate. Nevertheless, this also is attributable not to any peculiarity of workingmen, but to human nature. The only odor of respectability that workingmen can get from church attendance is that which may be described as "quite re-

spectable, for a common workingman." This puts workingmen in a similar category of respectability to that of "the good nigger" of old slavery days, and they resent it; not because they are workingmen, but because they are men.

To sum it all up, then, insofar as workingmen stay away from church for reasons peculiar to workingmen, they do so because they feel that the churches regard them as an inferior social class. One needn't be a workingman himself to appreciate this. It is enough to know something of human nature.

Nor is it alone to a hostile attitude that we may look to realize the tendency of churches to regard workingmen as of an inferior class. Patronage may be worse than open hostility. And from one or the other, what church organization is free?

Let any city clergyman,—excepting not even those who are conscious of a genuine spirit of brotherhood, unless, indeed, they be devoted missionaries—interrogate himself sharply and see if he does not harbor a spirit either of hostility or patronage to the workingman class. Would he dine with workingmen members of his congregation if there were any? Would they be invited to dine with him? Would their families visit his and his theirs, upon the same terms of respect and equality that characterize the social intercourse of his family with "the better element" among his parishioners? Would he go to their trade union halls in quite the same spirit in which he visits a club? A few questions like these, frankly answered, would not unlikely disclose ample cause for the feeling among workingmen, that instead of their having left the churches the churches have left them.

Let the churches go to the workingmen, not in the spirit of a haughty landlord's haughty or patronizing steward-going to the relief of menial dependents, but even as the old church went to him in the days of primitive Christianity, as to brethren and not to "inferiors," and the complaint that workingmen stay away from church would soon be heard no more. But the "superior" classes would drop away then, and that would make another problem.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF STRIKES.

A trades union is a labor trust. To "corner" the labor of an industry would be fully as disastrous to the people needing that industry as to corner the raw material or the finished product. A strike means a temporary curtailment or stoppage of the supply of labor, organized with the object of getting a high price or better conditions for labor than the existing market allows.

Now the price of labor, like the price of anything else that is exchanged, is governed in the long run by the ratio of supply and demand. Hence, if we want to raise the price of anything we must either increase the demand relative to the supply or decrease the supply relative to the demand. A strike is, while it lasts, a decrease in the supply of labor, and may amount to total stoppage; but as such decrease or stoppage is never permanent, the ratio between the supply and the demand will, in the end, assert itself, over and above any artificial settlements that may be reached.

The question: What is a fair wage? is only part of the general question, What is a fair price for anything. The fair price of anything we exchange is the largest measure of the product of other people's sacrifice which, under free conditions of production, transportation and exchange, we can obtain as an equivalent for a given measure of what we have to sell. So long as free conditions of production, transportation and exchange do not exist, so long will the fixing of a fair price, either of labor or commodities, be an impossibility. Denial of such free conditions means robbery to the workers in all industries; but in what proportion they are severally robbed, we are without any reliable criterion for forming a judgment.

When a strike takes place it is often ignorantly assumed by the parties of either side of the dispute that the public have little or no concern in the issues involved; that both employers and workmen have an absolute right, if either side think fit, to cease production until such time as they choose to come to an agreement. Undoubtedly if they produced for

their own use—if, for instance, in the strike now going on, the coal owners and colliers mined coal, not to sell, but to use for themselves, it would then be a matter for both sides exclusively. But we know that no industry, in our interdependent economic system, produces for itself; production takes place with a view to exchange, and the buyers, i. e., the general public, are deeply interested in the ratio at which the exchange must take place, having, as production lessens, to give more and more of the products of their labor in exchange for a given quantity of the article whose production is lessened.

This assumption of absolutism in judging economic questions, is fatal to any rational conception of the simplest common problem. We are all inextricably bound up in our complex social organism, and so long as mutual exchange is our common link, so long will the business of our fellow-workers be our concern, no matter how remotely and indirectly it may appear to affect us.

If the attainment of free industrial conditions must, as above stated, precede the attainment of fair prices, and if those conditions would, when attained, not only insure fair prices for goods but fair prices for the labor, and in fact for everything that forms the subject of exchange, it follows that special or artificial plans, such as "strikes" based upon absolutist views of the rights of particular trades, must fail in their object. The rational, radical and only enduring way to increase the compensation of labor in any trade is to set to work to bring about free industrial conditions in all trades alike by wresting all natural agents and opportunities for wealth production from the hand of monopoly, thus increasing the demand for labor until the relative utilities of the different trades settle themselves in the open market. To do this it is essential that the workers should look upon themselves not as craftsmen but as men. That they are men they owe to nature; that they are colliers or butchers or bakers they owe to accident. They should not lose sight of their natural rights for the sake of their assumed accidental ones.

T. SCANLON.

NEWS

The crowning of King Edward VII. of England (p. 251) is at last accomplished, the ceremony having taken place at London on the 9th.

On the previous day the king issued the following public address:

To My People: On the eve of my coronation—an event which I look upon as one of the most solemn and important of my life—I am anxious to express to my people at home and in the colonies and in India my heartfelt appreciation of the deep sympathy they have manifested toward me during a time in my life of such imminent danger. The postponement of the coronation ceremony, owing to my illness, has caused, I fear, much inconvenience and trouble to all who intended to celebrate it. But their disappointment has been borne by them with admirable patience and temper. The prayers of my people for my recovery were heard, and I now offer up my deepest gratitude to Divine Providence for having preserved my life and given me strength to fulfill the important duties which devolve upon me as sovereign of this great empire.

EDWARD R. and I.

Buckingham Palace, Aug. 8.

The day following his coronation, King Edward presented to the British nation, as a memorial of the event, Queen Victoria's favorite palace, Osborne House, on the Isle of Wight. He expressed his desire that, with the exception of the late queen's personal apartments, the building may be converted into a convalescent home for officers of the army and navy whose health has been impaired by military service, and that the people shall always have access to it.

While the coronation ceremony proceeded in London there was a meeting of the Irish parliamentary party in Dublin, presided over by John Redmond, which adopted a resolution declaring that—

Ireland separates herself from the coronation rejoicing of her merciless oppressors and stands apart in her rightful discontent and disaffection.

Further changes in the British ministry (p. 232) have taken place within the week. Austen Chamberlain, son of Joseph Chamberlain, has become postmaster general in the place of the Marquis of Londonderry, who becomes president of the Board of Education. Sir William Hood Walrond takes the place of Lord

James of Hereford as chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster. The Earl of Dudley succeeds Lord Cadogan as lord lieutenant of Ireland. The vacant place of Sir Micheal Hicks-Beach as chancellor of the exchequer is taken by Charles Thompson Ritchie, who was home secretary; while Aretas Akere-Douglas is shifted from first commissioner of works to the home secretary office. Mr. Balfour, the new premier in place of Lord Salisbury, retains his old place as first lord of the treasury.

Upon the announcement of these cabinet changes on the 8th, parliament took a recess until October 16.

Within the past few weeks, a British colonial conference has been in session, under the general patronage of Mr. Chamberlain, the British colonial secretary, which came to an end on the 11th. Its meetings had begun on the 30th of June, advantage having been taken of the presence in London of the colonial premiers on the occasion of the coronation. The meetings were held behind closed doors, and no reports of the proceedings have been officially given out; but it is understood that among other things the conference has recommended preferential customs duties between different parts of the British empire, though concluding that inter-imperial free trade is as yet impossible. The proceedings are not to be published at all, but it is announced that all the resolutions of the conference will be issued soon as a parliamentary document.

Except in one department of France the process of closing the Catholic schools (p. 280) that have not complied with the new associations law has gone on without violent resistance. This is the department of Finisterre, where three communes are standing out against the expulsion of the nuns from their schools. The Catholics condemn the new ministry for enforcing the law against the primary schools of religious societies, without first obtaining a judicial interpretation of the new law, which is as they claim ambiguous on that point.

Censored dispatches from Russia tend to confirm the impression that some great tidal wave of discontent is rising in that empire (p. 72), which derives its impulse and takes its di-

rection from the hopes of the common people for recognition of their rights to the land. One of these dispatches, coming from St. Petersburg, tells of the continued distribution in south central Russia of false proclamations and ukases, advising the people that the czar wants them to have their rights; and reports that the police are continually coming upon counterfeit priests, monks and pilgrims, who preach "incendiary doctrines, and encourage the peasants to expect another land division." The same dispatch notes the spread of the movement into the province of Obel, and quotes the warning given by authorities in the adjoining province of Tula to the "peasant leaders, village heads and others," as follows:

It is evident that certain malcontents are slandering the government, and are encouraging the people to disobedience against the authorities. They say the villagers are dying of starvation and that the government is for the rich alone. They also malign the orthodox pastors, who, as heirs of the apostles, proclaim Christian truth to the world. Therefore it is the Lord himself that is the object of this calumnious campaign.

From the "good government" of Russia to the "self-government" of Hayti is not so far, though an ocean does intervene. Notwithstanding the confidence in peace which Commander McCrea expressed last week (p. 282), the civil war in Hayti is raging more violently than before. The followers of Gen. Firmin, who heads the revolutionary government, have established themselves at Gonaives, in the department of L'Artibonite. Admiral Killeck, who clings to that side, of which he has been appointed secretary of war and of the navy, commands the gunboat Crete-a-Pierot, and has drawn the United States into the trouble. He having threatened to cut the United States and Haytien Telegraph and Cable company's lines, an appeal was made by the company to the American government, and the state and navy departments interfered. Through the latter, Commander McCrea was ordered on the 8th to interfere, which he did, and the cable remains intact. Admiral Killeck then gave formal notice on the 11th of a blockade of Cape Haytien, ordered by proclamation of Firmin; whereupon the American government instructed Commander McCrea that if the blockade was not effective, Cuban, American and unpro-

tected innocent neutral vessels should be protected in their international rights. He replied on the 17th that he had decided "blockade spasmodic" and therefore ineffective, and had consequently notified consuls that he would protect innocent neutral commerce. In a later dispatch of the same date he reported the blockade abandoned, an American schooner having reported the blockading vessel absent.

After a severe battle on the 9th Gen. Salnave, commanding Firminist troops, completely defeated an army of the provisional government under Gen. Nord, capturing the latter's cannon and munitions, killing many of his troops and making prisoners of many more. This revolutionary victory was won at Limbe. To offset it, on the same day a force of the provisional government drove the Firminist commander out of Petit Goave, on the bay of Gonaives, near the revolutionary capital. Before evacuating the town they burned it to the ground.

The rebellion in Venezuela (p. 216) has reached a further stage. President Castro's attempt to relieve Barcelona has failed, and the city is in the hands of the rebels. It surrendered after a six days' battle beginning August 3, and was reported from Trinidad on the 12th to have been pillaged and in great part burned. The same reports told of the sacking of the American, Italian and Dutch consulates. The Trinidad news of the 12th was confirmed on the same day by an official dispatch from the American minister, Mr. Bowen, at Caracas, who advised the sending of an American war vessel to Barcelona. Instructions were consequently forwarded at once to the commander of the "Cincinnati," who has accordingly gone to Barcelona. He leaves at Cabello the "Topeka," which vessel had been ordered several days previously to proceed to Cabello to protect American interests there. By reports of the 13th the revolutionists were attacking Cumana, a city of 10,000 inhabitants in the same state as Barcelona—the state of Bermudez.

NEWS NOTES.

—The Bolivian congress met at La Paz on the 12th.

—Anti-foreigner uprisings are reported from Siam and Corea.

—United States Senator James Mc-

Millan, of Michigan, died on the 10th.

—The American Osteopathic association closed its convention at Milwaukee on the 8th.

Gen. Lucas Meyer, the Boer military leader, died of heart disease on the 9th at Brussels.

—The grand lodge of the order of Elks met at Salt Lake City in the Mormon tabernacle, on the 12th.

—James Joseph Jaques Tissot, the painter who illustrated the "Life of Christ," died at Paris on the 9th.

—The Boer generals, Botha, Delarey and De Wet, arrived at Madeira on the 12th on their way to England.

—At the Democratic convention of Wyoming, held at Rawlins on the 7th, George T. Beck was nominated for governor.

—Lian Chen-tung, who is to succeed Wu Ting-fang, as Chinese minister to the United States, arrived at New York on the 9th.

—At San Francisco on the 12th the convention of the Knights of Pythias began its biennial session with 150 delegates present.

—The entire street car service of New Haven, Conn., was completely suspended on the 6th by one of the greatest strikes Connecticut has ever experienced.

—A coal strike which has been in progress in Michigan for four months was settled on the 9th upon the basis of a wage scale to be in effect until March 31, 1903.

—A comprehensive agricultural implement trust is being formed under the incorporation laws of New York, \$120,000,000. The corporate name is the International Harvester Co.

—The Republican text book for the Congressional campaign of 1902 was withdrawn from circulation on the 13th, because President Roosevelt objects to its negative treatment of the Cuban reciprocity question.

—The Negro Young People's Christian and Educational congress, said to be the largest gathering of Negroes ever held in the United States, and which opened at Atlanta, Ga., on the 6th., closed on the 10th.

—Horace Gray, associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, resigned on the 11th. The President has appointed Oliver Wendell Holmes, chief justice of the supreme court of Massachusetts, from which state Judge Gray comes, to succeed him.

—The internal revenue commissioner has decided that the use of a small quantity of palm oil in oleomargarine, ostensibly as a food constituent, is an evasion of the law imposing a heavy tax on oleomargarine colored to resemble butter, and that

the coloration tax will therefore be imposed in such cases.

—The fiftieth annual convention of the International Typographical union opened at Cincinnati on the 11th with the full representation of 365 delegates present. At the same time and place the International Stereotypers' and Electrotypers' union, hitherto a division of the typographical body, held its first convention.

—The motion of the publishers of the Manila Freedom, for a new trial of the case in which they were convicted of sedition, on the ground that they were refused a trial by jury, was denied on the 9th by United States Judge Ambled, who held:

The law-making power in the Philippine islands is vested in the United States civil commission. The laws do not grant the right to trial by jury. The Philippines are entitled to the bill of rights excepting the right to trial by jury. The constitution of the United States follows us here only so far as Congress enacts that it shall.

—At the annual convention of the bankers of Wisconsin on the 13th, the Fowler bill (p. 244) was denounced as an attempt to form a great banking trust that would in time dominate all political parties and control all industries; and resolutions were adopted opposing the bill and "all legislation tending to the substitution of branch banks for our present independent system of banking," and also opposing all laws "tending toward the substitution of asset currency for the present national bank circulation."

—A human skull found near Lansing, Kansas, and now in the Kansas City museum, is said to have been pronounced by scientists to be prehistoric. The scientists quoted are Profs. N. Winchell, of Minneapolis; Warren Upham, of St. Paul; Erasmus Haworth, geologist of the University of Kansas; S. W. Willis, paleontologist of the University of Chicago; Sidney J. Hare; and A. C. Long, curator of the Kansas City museum, who have visited the place of the discovery of the skull and inspected the skull and the geological surroundings.

PRESS OPINIONS.

SENATOR HANNA, LABOR AGITATOR.
Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Aug. 12.—It is not the sort of talk the workmen (or capitalists, for that matter) have been taught to expect from Senator Hanna. Many will think the senator is overacting his excellent part. But what he says is largely true and wholesome—much more wholesome than denunciation from the bench of labor leaders as vampires and parasites. The senator is aiding the cause of unionism, but he is also aiding the cause of peace, good will, cooperation and industrial progress.
Chicago American (Dem.), Aug. 13.—Two men in Mr. Hanna's state whom he has fought politically, and is still fighting, should be greatly cheered by these signs of

broadening and mellowing in the senator. One of them is Mayor Jones, of Toledo, known as "Golden Rule" Jones, because of his devotion to the sound and noble doctrine which Mr. Hanna is now preaching. The other is Mayor Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland, who is profoundly disturbing Ohio politics by his efforts to bring the laws to bear upon impudent capitalists who persistently refuse to do as they would be done by in the matter of paying taxes, and otherwise selfishly insist on enjoying special privileges at the expense of their less opulent fellow citizens. Mayor Johnson believes in the Golden Rule, too, but he would not leave its enforcement wholly to the sympathetic heart of man, as would the more sentimental and trustful Senator Hanna. Could Mayor Johnson have his way he would reduce as much as possible the opportunities and temptations to break the Golden Rule by destroying monopoly in nature's resources, by abolishing the trust-breeding protective tariff, by taxing corporations at the same rate as the individual citizen, and by bringing about government ownership of public utilities. In general, he would rigorously curtail the power of the fit to plunder the unfit. Senator Hanna has yet a long distance to travel before he will arrive at where Mayor Johnson stands—and finds himself growing steadily and rapidly in the Ohio voter's favor because of his exertions in behalf of thoroughgoing reforms. But Senator Hanna is moving.

MISCELLANY

LIFE.

For The Public.

What is the aim of life? a youth inquired
Of one whose drooping form and heavy eye
Told but of quiet ease and rest desired,
And yet whose life was but to work and die.

A knotty hand of toil, rough, dirt-be-grimed,
Was gently placed upon the young man's head.

"My son," the lab'rer spake, as wishes climbed
The summit that his feet would never tread,

"The aim of life is happy rest from toil."
Another did th' inquiring youth accost;
This time no sweaty, smudgy man of toil—
One on whom Fortune's smile had ne'er been lost.

Though slothful, selfish in his pampered ease

And niggard of his loved (though un-earned) gold,

This idle worldling prince would often please

To freely give advice to young and old.

"Young man," said he, "the aim of life is work;

'Tis straining, strenuous toil that makes us free.

Be brave, and scrape and strive; from nothing shirk,

But dig and hoard and you'll be great—like me!"

The young man turned and sought an ancient sage,

A hoary man of more than mortal ken,
Who calmly dwelt apart and viewed the stage

Whereon are played or puled the parts of men.

"Sir Hermit, I would fain be plainly told,
When men who strive are sick and tired of strife,

And those who never toil the slothful scold—

I pray, what is the end and aim of life?"

"E'en marvel not," the hermit slowly spake,

"Men garner happily only where they sow,

Nor e'er does pleasure follow in the wake
Of him who plants but for another's mow.

"Work must be tempered with a meed of play,

And pleasure, too, is e'er with danger rife.

But happier than all other men are they
Who work by turns, and play—for this is life."

SPEED MOSBY.

"STREET RAILWAY COMPANIES ARE NOT PROPER TAX COLLECTING AGENCIES."

Mayor Johnson wants the city of Cleveland to take over and operate the lines when the present grants expire, or as soon thereafter as possible. Pending the inauguration of municipal ownership, he wants lower fares for the people, and he intends to get them if possible.

Mayor Johnson is an enemy to the whole idea of compensation for franchise grants. He takes the position that street railway companies are not proper tax collecting agencies. Instead, he would make fares just as low as possible, and would have revenues for public purposes raised by taxation levied and collected by the governing authorities, the street railway companies paying their fair share in proportion to the value of their property, and no more.

When a street railway company is permitted to charge a five-cent fare, say, on condition that it turn one penny of the fare into the public treasury, it is not the company that pays the compensation, but the passenger, for, without the compensation feature, the passenger presumably could ride for four cents.

Taxation of persons according to the frequency with which they ride on street cars is not a fair basis of taxation, because on that plan the poor man is required to pay as much as the rich man, or perhaps more, as he probably rides on the street cars more. Therefore Mayor Johnson favors making the fare just as low as possible, and he wants to demonstrate that passengers can be carried profitably for a straight three-cent fare.

Tom Johnson is the kind of mayor that does things.—Editorial in Chicago American, of August 13.

"Here's a proposition to abolish the senate."
"What! And make the United States a republic?"—Life.

THE FABLE WHEREIN IS RELATED
THE FALL-DOWN OF THE MAN
WHO THOUGHT HE HAD A MIS-
SION.

Once upon a Time there was a Man who got a Hunch that he had a Mission. He felt Impelled to Travel in a far Land and Teach its People how to be Good. He therefore secured a Pass and went Abroad, carrying a number of Reforms in his Carpet Bag. In good time he arrived in a Land whose People were Endeavoring to start up in Business for Themselves.

"Ah!" exclaimed the Man with a Mission, "I see I am just in Time. I have here in my Grip some Good Things."

"But we want to Experiment," said the People.

"Tut, tut," said the Man with a Mission. "I come from a Land where the People know all about the Governing business. I will now proceed to Start you off Right."

"But has your own Country no Need of your Services?" asked the People.

"No, we are so Thoroughly Good that we can Spare the Time to Show you How."

"But are your cities free from Corruption?"

"Well, we have a few corrupt city Governments."

"And are not Corrupt Men holding High Place in your Government?"

"Yes, but we will get rid of Them in Good Time."

"And do you not Occasionally Burn your Fellow-Citizens at the Stake?"

"Yes, but—"

"And is it not a Fact that the Party which Backs you owes its Success to Boodle?"

"Well, I confess—"

"And are not Millions of your Fellow-Citizens groaning under grievous Burdens?"

"Of course, but we—"

"Well, sir, we are Much Obligated to you, but we prefer Risking this Thing on our Own Hook."

At this the Man with the Mission waxed Wroth and Called to his aid a vast army to assist him in Shooting his Mission into the People. But the People resisted, knowing that the Mission was Frayed around the Edges and somewhat moth-eaten.

Moral: Some Missions are sadly in need of a coat of Whitewash.—Will M. Maupin, in The Commoner.

THE PROSPERITY OF NEW ZEA-
LAND.

The contrast in the conditions of the two Australasian colonies of Queensland and New Zealand has an interest

beyond the merely financial aspect. New Zealand is described by the acting premier as "wonderfully prosperous;" Queensland pleads for the "subordination of party and personal considerations" to preserve the state with "unbroken credit." New Zealand had its dark days when Queensland was in the zenith of prosperity, and it is not impossible that by the time that Queensland's drastic reforms have retrieved its position New Zealand may be feeling the reaction that seems inevitably to follow a "boom" in every young country. Apart, however, from these ups-and-downs in the development of these colonies, it is interesting to note the fact that during the past ten or fifteen years the "Labor party" has been most influential in politics in New Zealand and least influential in Queensland. In New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia the representatives of labor have for many years held the balance of power, and they do so to-day in the federal parliament. In New Zealand the Seddon government has kept so much in the forefront of "advanced" legislation that it has practically superseded the necessity for a labor party. In Queensland labor is neither in power nor does it hold the balance. Save for a few short weeks it has always been in a minority, and never more so than after the last general election. Yet, curiously enough, the most prosperous of the seven Australasian colonies is the one (New Zealand) where labor is master and "progressive" legislation is rampant. The circumstance has some interest just now in view of the fact that, years ago, Queensland critics were conspicuous among the many who predicted disaster for New Zealand when it entered upon its career of one-man-one-vote, woman suffrage, land value taxation, old-age pensions, compulsory arbitration in strikes and other so-called "revolutionary" legislation. Politically, financially and industrially New Zealand was never sounder than to-day, which is more than can be said of Queensland, although the conservative forces have been more powerful there, for good or ill, than in the island colony.—Editorial in The London Daily Chronicle of July 10.

"LOBSTERS" I HAVE MET.
THE PROSPEROUS ELEVATOR BOY.

For The Public.

I had only recently moved into the flat, and did not know how the building was managed. The elevator "boy" was about 25, very polite and obliging, but looked a bit "raw." One night I

came in after 11 o'clock. He was at his post, as usual. "Great Scott!" I said, "you took me down at eight o'clock this morning; what are your hours, anyway?"

With a rather feeble smile, he replied: "From 7 in the morning till 12 at night."

That was a scorcher to me, and I remarked: "If you'd put in a few more hours you would have a steady job, wouldn't you?"

"I guess that's right, sir," he answered, meekly.

I was interested to know how a young man like this could accept such a position.

"How long have you had this job?" I asked, with as much show of interest in his welfare as I could muster up at that late hour.

"Only about three months, sir," he replied, wearily.

"What do they pay you?"

"Twenty-five dollars a month."

"And cakes?"

"Wha— I don't know what you mean."

"Do you have to pay your own board?"

"Yes, sir."

How nice, I thought.

"What did you do before you came here?"

"Worked on a farm."

"Why did you leave?"

"Cause the hours were so long, and there was nothing going on."

"Were the hours as long as they are here?"

"Well, no, not exactly; but there was nothing going on. Everything is so quiet on a farm; can't have any fun."

"Oh, I see. You thought you would come into town where you could attend the theater and ball games and horse races?"

"Ye— yes, sir," he answered, feebly, as if he appreciated the irony of my question.

"Been to the grand opera this week?"

"No, sir," with a half-suppressed laugh.

"Now, as a matter of fact," I said in a more serious tone, "you are really no better off here than you were on the farm, are you?"

After a moment's reflection he said he didn't think he was.

It was just after the November election in 1900, and I wanted to satisfy another curiosity, so I asked him for whom he had voted. He replied that he had voted for McKinley. Somehow I suspected that before I asked the question.

"Why did you vote for McKinley?" I asked.

"Well, I was afraid if Bryan was elected I might lose my job," he replied, as if he was sure that was a good reason.

"Why, man," I said, with possibly some show of feeling, "you could get a better job than this if you went over there to the jewelry store and threw a stone in the window."

"Wha— Wha—I don't understand what you mean, sir," he gasped, almost gagged by the suggestion.

"Why, if you did that they would send you to the penitentiary, where the hours are from seven in the morning till six at night, with an hour for dinner at noon."

"Is that so?" he said, seemingly pleased with the prospect.

"That's what it is," I replied, "and if you went there you would get everything you get now, and have the advantage of being compelled to work only ten hours a day instead of the 17 you have here."

With that I bade him good-night and left him thinking it over. I felt pretty certain he would do some tall thinking, too.

The next morning we bade each other the usual "good-morning," no reference being made to our conversation of the night before. But when I came home about nine o'clock that night the janitor was running the elevator. I was somewhat surprised, but thought I knew what was up.

"Where is the elevator man?" I inquired of the janitor.

"The boss let him off at seven o'clock," he replied, sullenly.

"Night off?" I asked.

"No, it's going to be a regular thing," he replied.

"You going to run the elevator every night now?" I asked, with a show of interest in the situation.

"I'll run it to-night, and maybe to-morrow night, but I'll be d—d if I run it the next night," he answered, angrily.

"How did the boss come to make the change?" I asked, as solicitously as I could, while trying hard to keep my face straight.

"The elevator man told him he would quit if he didn't get shorter hours, so the boss let him off at seven o'clock, and told me to run the elevator from then till 12," he replied, as if I were to blame for it.

I said I was sorry for him and bade him good-night. Poor fellow! I was sorry for him, but couldn't help laugh-

ing to think of the commotion I had caused.

When I met the elevator boy next morning he was all smiles. "I don't have to work nights any more, sir," he said, delightedly.

"Is that so?" I said. "What hours do you have now?"

"From 7 in the morning till 7 at night," triumphantly.

"Do you have an hour for lunch?"

"No. I have to have my lunch brought in to me, and eat it on the elevator."

"How about Sundays?"

"I have to work from 8 in the morning till 12 at night every other Sunday."

"Well," I said, reflectively, as I stepped out of the elevator, "you are just two hours a day worse off than the men in the penitentiary; besides the Sundays you have to work. They don't work Sundays in the penitentiary."

M. J. FOYER.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

MILITARY POST NOT WANTED.

Mayor Johnson said yesterday that he was not in favor of the establishment of a military post in Cleveland.

"I'm not much of a military man," said the mayor. "I cannot see what is to be gained by quartering a lot of soldiers in this city. I believe that we have peaceful enough citizens and I do not think the military is at all necessary. I would rather see one new cigar factory in the city than three military posts."—Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 29.

FREE SPEECH ON THE PUBLIC SQUARE.

Mayor Johnson made a tour of personal inspection of the Public square orators Friday noon and made some important changes in the regulations governing the speakers. These changes were, in short, practically to do away with regulations altogether.

Nick Geiger, a well-known socialist, was speaking from a dry goods box in the middle of the street on the west side of the square. Mr. Johnson, accompanied by Police Director Dunn and Park Superintendent Kegg mingled with the crowd and listened for a short time to the arguments of Geiger. Then the mayor sent Superintendent Kegg to stop the man speaking and to ask him to move over on the grass of the square under the shade of a tree. Geiger was surprised, but gladly complied with the request, as

the sun was hot. The crowd followed, and the mayor, being recognized, was heartily cheered.

"In the future," said the mayor to Director Dunn, "instruct the police that no permits whatever are required of men who desire to speak on the square. This does not include peddlers and fakirs, to whom you will issue no more permits. Allow the speakers to occupy any part of the northwest section of the square, but keep them on the grass, so that the street will not be blockaded. If the flower beds are in the way take away the flower beds. All men who wish to talk can thus be heard without blockading the sidewalks and becoming a nuisance to the business men."

Among others who heard the mayor's directions was Attorney F. N. Wilcox, who opposed him in the low fare railroad matter. Mr. Wilcox came forward and congratulated the mayor, saying it was the best thing he had done during his administration.

"Keep off the grass signs always grated on my nerves," said Mr. Wilcox.

The mayor's action was in direct opposition to Beilstein's resolution passed by the council last Monday, providing for the prohibition of curbstone oratory.—Plain Dealer of August 2.

Mayor Johnson's new order of things for the curbstone orators was highly appreciated yesterday. The men harangued crowds in the shade of trees in the Public square and everyone was serenely regardless of the grass. There wasn't much grass left when the speakers had finished.

By order of Park Superintendent Kegg two little stands have been erected on the grass. These little stands are far enough apart to prevent any conflict between the followers of rival orators. A socialist and an anti-socialist were the attractions yesterday. Both were fervidly eloquent and both were applauded by a good crowd of listeners, but no conflict occurred.—Plain Dealer of August 3.

THE DIRECTOR OF CHARITIES' PLAN FOR A NEW TRAINING SCHOOL.

There will soon be a unique home for the wayward youths of Cleveland, if it is possible for the city administration to carry out Rev. Harris R. Cooley's idea before the expiration of his term as director of charities and correction.

Director Cooley has made extended study of caring for unfortunate children and for some time has been the

prime mover in completing plans to give them a proper home.

Last week Mr. Cooley visited the "George Junior Republic," which is located in central New York, and with his return comes new zeal and new determination to give Cleveland a similar domicile.

The New York institution is founded on the idea of self-government, and Director Cooley's plan is to model the new Cleveland school upon the lines of this miniature United States.

The plan of the training school will be new for this part of the country. Boys will be sent to the place from the courts; but upon arriving they will be citizens instead of criminals.

The aim is to make the institution far from penal, and in accord with Mr. Cooley's idea, boys are instilled with self-reliance and independence instead of being put under a system of restraint.

"The Republic" is modeled after the federal government, and has a real legislature, a stern executive and sober judges.

Under its workings the boys elect a president and members of congress, as well as a police department. The policing is in the hands of the youths themselves, and they also elect judges and prosecutors and have trials by jury.

The motto of the school is: "Nothing Without Labor." If the children do not work they possess no money of the realm, which is aluminum coinage and is accepted at par.

Girls as well as boys are received at the institution and are given the right of suffrage. Beside this right they are only allowed the true privileges of womankind, which are honored by the opposite sex in a manner that would put to flight the boasted chivalry of history.

In this "Republic" there is every vocation of life. Some follow joining, others take up law and many oft drift to the field of newspapers.

The colony is truly a world of its own. It is a society of souls that does not realize the great future and glories in the present. In it all frictions are dealt with by law and the weakest settle to their places as in the larger world.

A peculiar feature of the new school is that the inmates play the role of both children and grown-up people. The play houses and the real structures are put up at the same time. It is work like a man and play like a child, live like a citizen and at the same time not realize it.

The basis of the institution is charity in its true sense—the charity that gives opportunity for self-help.

Every-day life at this school teaches the lesson of helping others, at the same time, pointing out the way of self-defense and preservation. It changes its "citizens" from the conditions of environment and heredity over which they have no control and toward all is the outstretched hand of stability and power.

Though Mr. Cooley's idea is to follow the plan of the New York institution the children will not be allowed entire self-government in the Cleveland school at first. Later it will probably drift that way, and in time may be the double of the William George idea.

The land has been purchased and all that now remains is to secure the speedy erection of all the necessary buildings. The director has been authorized by the council to advertise for bids for the construction of these buildings.

Mr. Cooley is doing everything to bring this work to a speedy end, and the members of the former committee, which for some time helped to make the home possible may be encouraged.

The citizens of Cleveland may be proud of the place that is being furnished for many weak, a place where education and experience are combined for the benefit of those who most need it.

The plan that is being followed by Director Cooley is in principle the application of the golden rule and the working out of divine commands.—Plain Dealer of August 3.

BRITAIN'S RIVALS AND BRITAIN'S TRADE.

An article by A. C. Campbell, published in the Commonwealth of Ottawa, Can., for August, 1901.

It is a favorite conceit with the lesser minds of every generation that the problems of that generation are new, and that the solution of them must be worked out on original lines. These people are beating their tom-toms now to drive nervous folks into hysterics over the decline of British trade and the necessity for special legislation to arrest that decline. They revamp Mr. Cleveland's dictum about the nation being confronted by a condition and not by a theory, and they seem to think that this is good reason why the people should be directed by hysteria and not by judgment. To justify further their alarmist policy of quick and inconsiderate change, these parties set forth as indisputable and most momentous certain maxims

which sound well but have nothing else to recommend them. The favorite dictum of the present day is that the trade of the world depends upon iron and that only iron-making countries can be great. Another is that the whole world is leagued against Great Britain, and that Britain must be prepared to make reprisals.

A very brief study of history will convince anyone that there was a time when the same class of philosophers declared that wheat was the basis of trade. One of them, in days gone by, drew a most touching and dramatic picture of some great man holding a few grains of wheat in his hand and declaring that the wars, the laws, the intrigues of centuries had had for their object only the control of the areas upon which such berries could be grown. Sounding and solemn were the warnings to Britain to grow their own wheat, lest the stillness of death should settle upon their country through the break-up of its industrial system. Combinations for industrial war were advocated, and restrictions without number were tried—we all know what success. At length the British people began to see that the important thing was not this or that particular trade, but trade as a whole. They began to see that trade is not of the nature of war, but the very opposite. Acting upon these ideas, they removed great restrictions and left each man free to engage in the most profitable business he could find. The result was that Britain's wheat-growing business went to pieces, and Britain grew rich exceedingly. This example could be multiplied many times, for the British people have a saving common sense about them which enables them to profit by experience. The industrial history of the country is a history of slow accumulation of restrictions, followed, before it was too late, by wise modification of the laws on lines of freedom. It is clear to anybody now that the trouble with British trade before Cobden's time, for instance, was not undue competition from without but undue restriction within. And what was true in this case would be found true in every other case in British history, could we but learn the facts.

Is it likely, then, that now, for the first time in her history, Britain needs to increase restrictions, to model her trade upon lines of war rather than upon lines of freedom and mutual benefit?

It may be true that Britain's iron trade is in jeopardy or is doomed. It

may be German woollens will drive British woollens from the market. But, if Britain prospers, the fate of these trades is a matter unworthy of thought, just as the retention of the wheat trade of 50 or 60 years ago was unworthy of thought. If there are elements that threaten Britain's trade as a whole, that is a matter for consideration. Judging from past experience, however, we are to look for those dangers in restrictions upon industry at home rather than in threats of competition from abroad.

When we think of trade restrictions, we naturally think first, and some of us think exclusively, of tariff duties. We think of "trade" as the mere exchange of goods, not realizing that wealth is in course of exchange from the very inception of production, and that production is not complete until exchange is complete and the goods are in the hands of the consumer. There are 10,000 ways in which the statute laws, or those customs which are stronger than statute laws, can restrict trade. The lowland farmer in the Shetlands, as pictured in Scott's story, "The Pirate," found that the superstitions of the only people he could hire made their labor so intermittent and uncertain that no system could be based upon it, and agriculture was impossible. There is no fact better attested by reason and the consensus of all authorities than that a rack-rent system is death to industry. A condition of war will destroy trade, if it lasts long enough. These are but examples of forms of restrictions quite apart from tariff laws,* but each effective in making trade impossible.

While the condition-and-not-a-theory people join in demanding tariff and other restrictions to confine to Britain certain forms of production, there are many sensible people who realize that the hope of Britain's trade lies in extending the freedom of that trade. The demand for less interference from the trades unions is one form of this movement. Of course, it is rank heresy in the eyes of some people to suggest that trades unions ever did or ever could do aught but good. But when we are free to say that even the churches do harm as well as good, surely the high priests of trades unionism will not deny us the right to question the perfection of some of their own acts. Every system is faulty, at least in its application. At a time when continental Europe despised trade and all it involved; when the orient exported only what Britain could not produce; when the United

States had only domestic problems to face and was determined to trade within itself, except in farm produce; when South America was merely a happy hunting ground for the agitator and intriguer—when these conditions prevailed—Britain, the only country where trade was the main object of life, could make what she pleased, choose her market and demand her own price. Under such conditions British trades unionism grew. Freed from foreign competition, the British manufacturer could make concessions to his men and still live. To-day, it is not too much to say, a British factory in almost any staple and long-practiced industry is a copartnership between employer and employed. If the conditions of the market change, the manufacture cannot be changed to meet the new conditions until the "hands" have been consulted and have given their consent. For instance, the southern states are coming forward as competitors for the sale not merely of raw cotton but of manufactured cotton goods. In those states, there are no laws—no effective laws at any rate—such as there are in Britain, restricting the employment of females or minors, or controlling the conditions under which the work shall be done. Nor are there trades unions to protect the workers against the rapacity of slave-driving employers and overseers. In any class of goods which they can make, it is clear, the southern states will be able to undersell Great Britain. In the same way, it is probable, the poorly-paid, badly-organized workmen of Pennsylvania or Alabama may be able to turn out coal or iron which shall displace that of Great Britain in some competitive markets. Further restrictions on the part of British trades unions will not better this position. The hope of Great Britain lies in more freedom. With a due elevation of her labor in skillfulness and general intelligence, Britain can leave to others the manufacture of the mere staples in iron and cotton, just as she leaves to a lower class of labor or a cheaper class of land the production of wheat—while she turns to a higher grade of industry. This will be the natural tendency, and only restriction can check that tendency. The trades unions, by rigid rules, can prevent the adaptation of industry to new conditions, but they must not be allowed to do so.

In fact, they cannot do so unaided. The upper millstone cannot crush until it approaches the lower one. Peo-

ple laugh at dictators whose sole power to punish is the expression of their displeasure.

This lower millstone of restriction, landlordism, against which grind many small upper millstones, is now coming into plain sight again. It has never been hidden from popular view in bad times. Over and over again, landlordism in Britain has absorbed the benefits of successful wars, notable inventions and the more perfect organization of labor; and over again, its "vested rights" have been set aside that the people might not be strangled in its greedy clutch.

As British trade has grown under the glorious sun of freedom, landlordism has demanded greater and greater toll from labor. Town lots, farming lands, mining areas, foreshores—all forms of land ownership—have increased in value immensely in the last 50 years. There may be cases of falling value by reason of exhaustion of minerals, the decay of towns or the removal of special privilege such as the iniquitous corn laws, but there are but trifling exceptions to the rule. Landlordism, like any other form of privilege, never yields a point willingly. Times have been good in England for some years past. They will not be always good. But the landlord will demand to be kept in the same luxury as before, regardless of how the laborer may be housed or fed. And, as in the time of Wat Tyler, and as in the time of Richard Cobden, the landlords' privileges must be restricted that the people may have freedom to work and live. The final report of the royal commission on local taxation, though most conservative in its tone, indicates that the remedy is known to many and advocated by not a few.

In every case up to the present the shackles of landlordism have only been loosened and the people have joyfully turned to their work as soon as they could move. It is to be hoped that when the struggle comes this time, the bonds will be broken and cast aside.

HOME RULE SCIENTIFIC: BOARD RULE DECADENT.

Clinton Rogers Woodruff, Secretary of the National Municipal League, is visiting the chief cities of Ohio, to see the men most prominently interested in the matter of city government. He will have personal interviews with the lawyers and experts who are to assist Gov. Nash in compiling a code bill, and he will have a session with the governor and urge the adoption in that bill of the doctrines of the National Municipal League, as set forth in the municipal programme which was adopted in 1899. The

following account of the principles advocated by the League we republish from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 23.

The fundamental principle of the league's creed can be expressed in two words, Home Rule. The code adopted at the 1899 convention held at Columbus lays down certain broad, general limitations, just as does the constitution of the United States. It makes no effort, as did the Pugh-Kibler code, to meet every possible emergency and lay down laws for every possible municipal contingency. It was framed to govern the cities as the states are governed. It does not recognize any distinct difference between the relations of the several states and the national government and those existing between each state and the cities therein. If the states are able to govern themselves with only the few general limitations set down by the constitution, why should not the cities be equally capable of that kind of home rule? This is the question which the national league asked, and answered by saying there is no valid reason.

The league's municipal programme, as its code is called, is based upon the principle of self-government, which lies at the very foundation of the United States government. It insists that the municipalities be given sufficient power to govern themselves. In the place of a long enumeration of delegated powers it proposes to confer upon the cities sufficient power to meet their needs. It substitutes a positive, affirmative grant of power for a negative policy of petty limitation, while at all times recognizing and preserving the rights of the state in all matters of a purely state character. It recognizes the principle that in state matters there should be centralization and uniformity, and in municipal affairs autonomy and home rule. The voter is told that he must divorce municipal affairs from state and national policies at the polls. In 1897 a committee of seven was appointed by the National Municipal league to compile a municipal programme. The chairman was Horace E. Deming, of New York, a prominent citizen and an authority on matters of municipal rule. His six colleagues were Dr. Albert Shaw, editor of the Review of Reviews; Frank J. Goodnow, of the Greater New York charter commission, both of New York; George W. Guthrie, Pittsburg, recently Democratic candidate for the lieutenant governorship and chairman of the city committee that in Febru-

ary overthrew the ring that had ruled his city; Dr. L. S. Rowe, of Philadelphia, who was appointed by the late President McKinley to codify the municipal laws of Porto Rico; Charles Richardson, Philadelphia, and Clinton R. Woodruff, a member of the Pennsylvania legislature for two terms and counsel for the municipal league for ten years and at present secretary of the National Municipal league.

It took this committee of able men two years to compile a code bill. The result of their labors was submitted to the convention of the league held at Columbus in 1899 and adopted. It is a brief and succinct document covering 34 pages.

As stated, the code starts from the hypothesis that cities should govern themselves. Perhaps the most important general restriction made is the complete divorce of the policy making and the executive parts of the government. That is, the mayor and his corps of assistants have nothing whatever to say regarding the laws made by the city council. On the other hand, the council has no powers in the putting into force of the laws passed.

Much power is given the mayor. But that executive is effectually held in check by two important and comprehensive restrictions. In the first place he is tied down to a rigid civil service system and in the second his acts can be reviewed by the governor, who, after a trial proving his misconduct, can remove the mayor from office.

By the code the elective offices are cut down. The people elect only a mayor and the members of the council. The mayor is elected for a term of two years. The councilmen are chosen for a term of six years, one-third of that body going out every two years. The lessening of the number of names on the ticket is believed to be a good thing because it will have the effect of simplifying elections and making them more truly indicative of the mind of the people. It is argued that where there are a multiplicity of names the voters are confused. They do not know for whom to vote and it is too much trouble to find out. The consequence is that they fall back on the decision of their party and vote the slate ticket blindly.

Because the elective offices are fewer the appointive power is correspondingly greater. The power is vested absolutely in the mayor with but one exception. This constitutes the great increase in power spoken of before as granted to the chief executive under

the municipal programme. The auditor alone is named by the city council. The only reason for this privilege being denied the mayor is that the auditor has the reviewing of the mayor's accounts and consequently could not be fittingly named by that official.

Although the mayor has this large appointive power he cannot by its use build up a machine such as is now the case so generally. The civil service restrictions are rigid. Men must be appointed to office on merit and merit alone. The mayor may remove from office any official when misconduct or incapability is proved. But there his power stops. He cannot fill the vacancy with any of his friends or henchmen. The man next in line, the one most capable of holding the place, must be named.

As stated before, the mayor may be removed from office by the governor on proof of malfeasance or incompetency. The governor, on the other hand, cannot use this power further to pay any political debt. The vacant mayor's chair is filled by the president of the city council until a successor is elected.

On the question of board rule, which seems to be hanging over the heads of Ohio cities, the National Municipal league comes out flatfooted. Board rule is not countenanced in any form. It is believed to be a decadent means of government. The city of New York, which is probably the most progressive and advanced municipality in respect to government, has discarded board rule. So also has Boston. Bipartisan boards have been proved inadequate. They do not accomplish what they are supposed to, that is, provide independent and unprejudiced government. A board may be made up equally of Republicans and Democrats, but the appointive power is so broad that the complexion of the board can be so changed by those in power that it is no longer bipartisan. A Democratic executive can name, for instance, two Republicans on a board of four. If these two are not amenable to "reason," they can be removed and other Republicans substituted until two are found who for the sake of the money represented by the salary attached will be amenable. No corporation carries on its affairs under the board plan. The departments are under managers whose heads can be removed if there is mismanagement or incompetency.

A stand is taken against the government of a city from the capital of the state. The state legislature, it is argued, has no more right to dictate

what a city shall do than has the United States congress the right to dictate to the several states. A broad general form of government is laid down by the national government for the states. As long as each state has a republican form and does not attempt to set up a monarchy or republic within the United States it can do about as it pleases. The divorce laws, the restrictions as to trade and business relations, the qualifications for suffrage and a multitude of other kinds of legislation differ widely in the several states, and it would be foolish to try to bring all under a uniform government.

The same is true of cities. Each municipality has its own peculiar needs. The people within its limits are best fitted to tell what these needs are and how they shall be met. It is distasteful to a city of free men to be forced to gain even its petty rights from a legislative body which is situated at a distance. What right has the rural legislator to say what and how a city shall carry on an enterprise. As foolish to ask the city man to dictate to the farmer what crops he shall plant and how he shall plant them.

It is for this that the Municipal league is mainly striving. It is taken as axiomatic that a city cannot learn to rule itself aright until it has been given a chance to do so. The young man who is dependent upon his father all his life, who relies on him to supply his needs, meet his debts and rectify his mistakes, is never able to stand alone. The same is true of a municipality. Honesty in the carrying on of public affairs, the highest efficiency in government can best be obtained when the individual cities have the power to govern themselves. Then and only then will the people take enough interest in the question of government to insist that it shall be pure and capable.

It is on this theory that the municipal programme is laid down. Take for instance the regulations in that document pertaining to the granting of franchises, a subject just now of great interest locally. The code prescribes only that no franchise shall be inalienable, that is, that no franchise shall be perpetual. A grant can be given for a period of 21 years only and by a four-fifths vote of the city council, and approved by the mayor. The recipient of the franchise must pay a percentage of the gross receipts to the city. Nothing further is stipulated. The percentage may be large or merely nominal, that rests with the honesty and business astuteness of the city

government. The city may give the bare privilege to use the public streets for transportation purposes, for instance. Or it may construct tracks and power houses and lease them to a corporation, or it may operate these equipments itself. The same is true of gas or electric lighting plants, docks and other public utilities. It is not necessary to ask the lawmakers at the state capital for the privilege of doing any of these things.

Two states by their constitutional conventions have adopted some of the salient features of this municipal programme. The first of these was Alabama, which a year ago embodied the home rule feature in its new constitution. Virginia followed, its constitutional convention having just recently disbanded after adopting the ideas of the league in respect to home rule, municipal debt and franchises.

The King to Salisbury—Why is Ireland not here on my invitation?

Salisbury—She is in prison, my liege.

The King—Is that the way to promote loyalty?

Australia and Canada—No, try a commonwealth.—The Weekly Freeman (Dublin).

John Bull—Joe, that war came high.

Joe Chamberlain—Well, you see, John, we have been paying the expenses of both sides.—Life.

"Then the police didn't raid the pool-room?"

"No. When they got there they found that somebody had neglected to give the tip and the place was running in full blast."—Puck.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE KENTONS.

As the latest and one of the cleverest books of Mr. Howells, who is certainly our foremost man of letters, this novel, "The Kentons" (Harpers), calls for a fuller notice than the mere allusion hitherto made in contrasting it with one of the popular novels of the day.

Mr. Howells's power of quiet satire may be enjoyed here at its best. One hesitates to call it satire. It has not the form and vocabulary of professed satire; and yet it is satire of the finest variety. It permits its victims to satirize themselves.

What Mr. Howells does is just to let ordinary folks lay themselves out in print. That is enough. The satire is automatic!

We have all met families that are totally immersed in themselves. The whole world revolves around their arrangements, and there is apt to be a petted one about whom revolve the family arrangements. No matter what is going on in the world, no matter what secondary interests some one of the members may have, all serious talk bends to the same little center. It is really pathetic how the judge surrenders his great work on the history of his Ohio regiment, and the whole family breaks up and leaves, Fusingum, "the best climate, on the whole, in the Union," all on account of

Ellen, who fancied herself in love with the brisk and festive Bittridge. The life in New York, whither the villain still pursues them, and on the steamer, where a substitute is found in the person of a Unitarian clergyman, who does not quite know whether he is a clergyman or not, and in Holland, where the youngest boy, Boyne, falls in love, at a distance, with the young Queen—it is all told with a subtle humor that is as full of charm as it is of truth.

J. H. DILLARD.

In memory of "Lewis G. Janes, Philosopher, Patriot and Lover of Man" (Boston: James H. West Co), an appreciative volume under that title is dedicated to the "known and unknown friends of Dr. Janes in all lands." This is not a perfunctory memorial book, but a collection of tributes from high sources to the character and value of Dr. Janes's devoted work. Among the contributors are Thomas Wentworth Higginson, John W. Chadwick, Frank B. Sanborn, Edwin D. Mead, Herbert Spencer, William Lloyd Garrison, Erving Winslow, Dr. Francis E. Abbot, and Jenkin Lloyd Jones. Dr. Janes was one of the principal religious interpreters of the Spencerian philosophy, and a man who while noted for tolerance was nevertheless strong in conviction. He "never hesitated," says Mr. Higginson, "to take an open stand without reference to popularity." As organizer and director of the Cambridge conferences, founded at Cambridge, Mass., by Mrs. Ole Bull for the comparative study of ethics, philosophy, sociology and religion, he contributed largely to the promotion of harmony of opinions apparently conflicting and of tolerance where conflicts are real. Another instance of his work in the same general field was the establishment of the "Greenacre Conference School of Comparative Religion, in Maine, which, as he wrote one of his Oriental admirers, Shehad Abd-Allah Shehadi, of Syria, "to the hearts of those who realize that men can serve each other most when they understand each other best." He was a prolific writer, his principal books being "Health and a Day" and "A Study of Primitive Christianity;" and before going to Cambridge, he had been for 15 years the president of the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Ethical society. One of those patriotic men among whom the principles of 1776 had not waned when the wave of imperialism lashed our national traditions, Dr. Janes became a leader in the new fight for government by consent of the governed. He died at Greenacre, September 4, 1901.

PERIODICALS.

—The North American Review for August contains a "fancy" article on "The Constitution of Carnegie", the distinctive feature of the constitution being that all the property of men who have reached the

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

Campaign Subscriptions to The Public

from bona fide new subscribers will be received from the present issue to and including that of November 8, 1902, for

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS.

ADDRESS,

THE PUBLIC

Box 687.

CHICAGO, ILL.

